

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE General Studies
(6GS03)

Unit 3: Change and Progress

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

June 2015

Publications Code UA041589*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Section A

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1a	<p>There are several possible answers, but credit must only be given for the factual part/sentence where there is no subjective addition e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "We have buried underwater pipelines several metres under the seabed" (<i>but do not allow the full sentence – "so that floating ice does not damage them"</i>) • "We are also developing a well containment system for Alaska" • "In Alaska we have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in spill response vessels . . .training." <p>1 mark for a wholly correct phrase/sentence DO NOT CREDIT an answer that contains an opinion</p>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1b	<p>There are relatively fewer answers here</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are ready to respond to a spill within 60 minutes, 24 hours a day • We take very seriously the consequences of any potential incident • We are also improving our spill response capability...programmes • Technical solutions are helping us to reduce the risk of oil leaking into the ocean . . . <p>1 mark</p>	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1c	<p>Only one possible answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The tests revealed more about the behaviour of oil in ice-covered waters and how quickly response teams must act for each technique to work. <p>1 mark</p>	(1)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2	<p>The 3 criticisms are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a criticism of Shell’s arctic containment system • a criticism of Shell’s Arctic exploration policy - it is reckless • Irresponsible to drill for oil in such a fragile environment • a criticism of Shell’s risk management objectives (there are too many unmanageable risks) <p>1 mark each point up to a maximum of 3</p>	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parliamentary/MPs/cross-party/specialist knowledge • Coincides with release of figures from US National Snow and Ice Data Centre • Arctic sea ice levels almost half of what they were 30 years ago • Arctic could be free of summer sea ice within a generation <p>1 mark each point. An additional mark can be given for each point for development to a max of 3 marks. eg. Cross party of committee of MPs (1) means fairer representation (1)</p>	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil leaks from well heads • Damage to pipelines from floating ice • Oil trapped under solid ice • Oil in broken ice/burning oil • Systems designed to detect pressure drops in the pipe <p>1 mark each point up to a maximum of 3</p>	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	<p>Any specific examples from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capsize/sinking of a tanker (Torrey Canyon, Exxon Valdes) • Nuclear accidents • Pollution incidents eg chemical spills, gas leaks • Natural disasters eg earthquakes/tsunamis/volcanic eruptions/forest fires • Extreme weather eg hurricanes/typhoons/floods • Warfare <p>Do not credit reference to ongoing environmental problems eg global warming, acid rain, deforestation etc.</p> <p>Effects/consequences</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on wildlife/natural habitats • Effect of accident on operatives/ locals • Effect on local economy/infrastructure • Effect on public health • Effect on public opinion/company • Any other valid consequence <p>1 mark each effect up to a maximum of 4</p> <p>A maximum of 2 marks for effect if an incorrect or no specific example given.</p>	(5)

Question Number	Indicative content	
6	<p>Climate change is a fact – global temperatures have increased and are increasing, with consequences for climate. The causes of global warming are disputed by some, but there is much evidence to suggest that human activity, particularly that resulting in increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide is at least partially responsible.</p> <p>Source 1A presents a view from an oil company, the use of whose products leads to an increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide. No matter how carefully the company carries out its work in minimising environmental disruption, the more fossil fuel it finds and makes available, will, on the face of it, increase atmospheric carbon dioxide.</p> <p>Source 1B points out that climate change is already reducing ice cover in the Arctic, which presumably makes exploration easier (and less risky?) The more exploration and the more extraction that takes place, the greater the risks of environmental damage, alongside the greater amount of fossil fuel available to use.</p> <p>The conclusion that climate change is certain to affect oil production soon is almost inescapable.</p>	
AO2	<i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i>	
4 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.
Level 1	1	Limited, (mainly) one sided answer with a simple conclusion
Level 2	2	Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion, which may or may not be appropriate. There may be little explanatory comment
Level 3	3	<p>A developed answer which largely examines one viewpoint or looks at two sides of the argument in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.</p> <p>In a weaker answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted.</p> <p>In a stronger answer it is: either clearly interpreted and applied to a single view of the question or addresses different views in a superficial way with few specifics and little or no development</p>
Level 4	4	Evidence is used to examine contrasting viewpoints. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show clear awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.

A03	<i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i>	
5 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	1	Quotes/identifies relevant evidence from the sources
	1	Recognises/distinguishes between fact and opinion
	1	Comments on the quality/authority of the evidence/sources
	1	Identifies any issues of bias or prejudice
	1	Comments on the strength or weakness of the arguments used
	1	Draws/states an appropriate conclusion
A04	<i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A02 and A03 marks</i>	
4 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	0	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication
	2-3	The answer is broadly understandable; writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	4	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

Section B

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such surveys can inform social science researchers about changes/trends in attitudes/beliefs • This information is useful in informing political debate • Information is useful in informing public debate over moral/economic issues • May influence decisions on economic, social/moral and political matters <p>1 mark each point up to a maximum of 2</p>	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point up to a maximum of 2 eg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Religious leaders are unelected/only represent their own views or followers/narrow views • Religion is much less important to most people/fewer people go to church/many people are not religious • If they wish to promote or plead a special case to change UK law/policy to favour their own moral standpoint or followers/religion eg sharia law, polygamy. Religious values are an individual choice/should not be imposed on others • Too many different religions/ society too multicultural/cannot have equal representation for all beliefs 	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although sample sizes may be different, they can still be compared as it is still the same question/use percentages • The different sample sizes means the comparison is less reliable/valid (uses numbers) • The proportions/percentages of each category/class can be compared • Although if the actual numbers are small, sampling errors become more significant/less reliable/valid • If the numbers are very large, then we can be confident that the proportions are representative of the whole population • We don't know how the samples are selected- are they representative or random? • This could make a difference, because the sampling could be biased. <p>Accept any other valid suggestion 1 mark each point up to a maximum of 4</p>	(4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10	<p>Suggestions may be based on reasons connected with attitudes to authority:</p> <p>A1 People with no religious belief/atheists/humanists may be less inclined to respect authority for its own sake...</p> <p>A2 ...and particularly those with a religious mission/zeal</p> <p>A3 Compared to those with religious beliefs, who may be taught to look up to elders or leaders/authority.</p> <p>Suggestions may be based on attitudes to religions/faith</p> <p>B1 Non-believers may be suspicious of religious leaders promoting sectarian views</p> <p>B2 Religious believers presumably believe that they have strong (or stronger) moral and ethical principles which deserve to influence government decisions</p> <p>B3 Religious conflicts/scandals likely to cause doubt/mistrust among non-believers</p> <p>Comments on the actual difference (it is not great) should be credited</p> <p>C1 The differences are not enormous, although those agreeing from the no religion group add up to 66% of their category</p> <p>C2 compared with 59% of the Anglicans/or the other groups/ or total.</p> <p>1 mark each point up to a maximum of 4</p>	(4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase is across the board for all religious groups • Anglicans have gone from 59% to 69%/RCs from 57% to 63%/Other Christians from 49% to 60%/Non-Christian from 56% to 65% • The increase for Catholics is least marked • The increase is most marked in other Christians • We could conclude that it is something that affected society as a whole, more or less equally. • Could be due to decline in role for religion in society • Or society becoming more materialistic/increase in scientific and technological advances/social media <p>1 mark each point up to a maximum of 4</p>	(4)

Question Number	Indicative content	
12	<p>Answers need to draw out the evidence that OCs as a group favour religious leaders influencing government decisions to a considerable extent (36% of the group in 1991 and 23% in 2008).</p> <p>The only other group to approach this is the Non-C group (30% and 19%).</p>	
A02	<i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i>	
4 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.
Level 1	1	Limited, (mainly) one sided answer with a simple conclusion
Level 2	2	Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion, which may or may not be appropriate. There may be little explanatory comment
Level 3	3	<p>A developed answer which largely examines one viewpoint or looks at two sides of the argument in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.</p> <p>In a weaker answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted.</p> <p>In a stronger answer it is: either clearly interpreted and applied to a single view of the question or addresses different views in a superficial way with few specifics and little or no development</p>
Level 4	4	Evidence is used to examine contrasting viewpoints. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show clear awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.
A03	<i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i>	
6 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	1	Quotes/identifies relevant evidence
	1	Subjects some of the evidence to critical scrutiny
	1	Comments on the authority of the evidence/sources
	1	Recognises/distinguishes between fact and opinion
	1	Draws/states an appropriate conclusion
	1	Makes a comment on the limitations of the evidence presented
	1	Comments on the strength of the conclusion

A04	<i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A02 and A03 marks</i>	
4 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	0	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication
	2-3	The answer is broadly understandable; writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	4	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

Section C

Marking of Questions – Levels of response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplifications of content is not exhaustive. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded on the quality of thought expressed in their answers and not solely on the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- argues a case when requested to do so
- is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- has responded to all the various elements in the question
- where required, explains, analyses, discusses assesses and deploys knowledge appropriately rather than simply narrates

Using the levels mark scheme

Examiners must mark initially on the AO1/AO2 levels. In order to arrive at a level, examiners must look for a best fit to the descriptors. Within the level, examiners must start at the middle mark and move up or down according to the quality of response.

Having fixed the level, the answer should be assessed using the AO3 and AO4 descriptors. Answers which are placed in the lower levels are unlikely to achieve a high mark in AO3.

Examiners are required to make use of the full range of marks.

Question Number	Indicative content	
13	<p>The evidence available pushes the reader to the conclusion that the Press should be more tightly regulated because of the illegal and shocking things that have happened in the past.</p> <p>Answers need to balance this with the fact that in the UK we rely heavily on the Press for news and views and that, on the whole and as far as we know, they do so with integrity.</p> <p>Some sort of cost benefit analysis might be appropriate in the arguments – what might be the benefits of regulation (prevention of intrusion into individuals’ lives, say) with the costs (preventing or restricting investigative journalism).</p> <p>Synoptic features</p> <p>Candidates are required to look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines. They may also bring together ideas from other areas – social, political, economic and not least ethical issues.</p>	
AO1 and AO2	<p><i>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</i></p> <p><i>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></p>	<p>AO1 4</p> <p>AO2 16</p>
LEVEL	Indicators of Level	Mark
	Insufficient evidence to assess. Irrelevant or facetious answers	0
1	Insufficient evidence to assess. Incomplete and inconclusive answers.	1
2	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence used, drawn from a single discipline. Superficial or formulaic answer	2-6
3	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines. Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial or unbalanced manner.	7-13
4	A range of evidence drawn from two or more disciplines, showing some understanding. Issues examined in a balanced and coherent way from two or more viewpoints. An answer which adopts a one-sided view but develops in depth can be awarded at the lower end at this level (max 16).	14-18
5	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding. A balanced perceptive and evaluative answer.	19-20

A03	<i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i>	
4 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	1	Quotes/identifies facts
	1	Quotes/identifies subjective opinion
	1	Comments on the authority of the evidence used
	1	Identifies any issues of bias or prejudice
	1	Draws/states an appropriate conclusion from the evidence
	1	Comments on the strength of the conclusion
A04	<i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A02 and A03 marks</i>	
6 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	0	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication
	2-3	The answer is generally understandable; writing is often in the correct form. Arguments are sometimes coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not serious inhibit communication.
	4-5	The answer is broadly understandable; writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	6	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent, well laid out and relevant, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

Question Number	Indicative content	
14	<p>Scientists are human, and have human failings like everyone else. If it is accepted that the scientists who have produced evidence of global warming and climate change have done so without bias and with integrity, then it needs other scientists with integrity to produce evidence otherwise in order to challenge this evidence.</p> <p>The argument falls in to two parts – is global warming and consequent climate change sufficiently well established? if this is accepted, then is the evidence that the warming has been produced by human activity also well established? Answers can illuminate both strands, and may discuss the possible motives of those engaged on promoting or criticising the view.</p> <p>Synoptic features Candidates are required to look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines. They may also bring together ideas from other areas – technological, sociological, economic political and not least the ethical issues</p>	
AO1 and AO2	<p><i>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</i></p> <p><i>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></p>	<p>AO1 4</p> <p>AO2 16</p>
LEVEL	Indicators of Level	
	Insufficient evidence to assess. Irrelevant or facetious answers	
1	Insufficient evidence to assess. Incomplete and inconclusive answers.	
2	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence used, drawn from a single discipline. Superficial or formulaic answer	
3	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines. Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial or unbalanced manner.	
4	A range of evidence drawn from two or more disciplines, showing some understanding. Issues examined in a balanced and coherent way from two or more viewpoints. An answer which adopts a one-sided view but develops in depth can be awarded at the lower end at this level (max 16).	
5	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding. A balanced perceptive and evaluative answer.	

A03	<i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i>	
4 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	1	Quotes/identifies facts
	1	Quotes/identifies subjective opinion
	1	Comments on the authority of the evidence used
	1	Identifies any issues of bias or prejudice
	1	Draws/states an appropriate conclusion from the evidence
	1	Comments on the strength of the conclusion
A04	<i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A02 and A03 marks</i>	
6 marks	Mark	Descriptor
	0	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication
	2-3	The answer is generally understandable; writing is often in the correct form. Arguments are sometimes coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not seriously inhibit communication.
	4-5	The answer is broadly understandable; writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	6	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent, well laid out and relevant, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

