



Pearson

# **Mark Scheme (Results)**

June 2017

GCE General Studies (6GS03/01)

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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

June 2017

Publications Code 6GS03\_01\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## 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.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>1</b>	<p>Award up to TWO marks for <b>advantages</b> such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fewer collisions/safer</li> <li>•Reduced congestion/increased road capacity</li> <li>•No restrictions on drivers – underage/intoxicated/blind/distracted etc.</li> <li>•No need for driving tests</li> <li>•Smoother ride</li> <li>•Cheaper insurance</li> <li>•Cars can park elsewhere/go to garage on their own</li> <li>•Higher speeds/observe speed limits</li> <li>•Increased car sharing</li> <li>•Occupants can use time for other purposes/egs</li> </ul> <p>Award up to TWO marks for <b>disadvantages</b> such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Software problems/could be hacked/DIY repairs could be dangerous</li> <li>•More unemployed drivers</li> <li>•Lack of privacy</li> <li>•Communications problems due to poor radio signal/bad weather etc.</li> <li>•Communication difficulties with pedestrians/traffic police etc.</li> <li>•Expensive</li> <li>•Terrorism</li> </ul> <p>Accept appropriate alternatives</p>	<b>(4)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>2</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for identifying the main features of an inductive argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific observations leading to a generalised conclusion</li> <li>• Conclusion uncertain</li> </ul> <p>Allow ONE mark for identifying any specific <b>observations</b> from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• analysing traffic-flows</li> <li>• adjusting signals</li> <li>• junction priorities.</li> <li>• automated traffic flows</li> <li>• direct certain cars in certain directions</li> </ul> <p>Allow ONE mark for identifying a <b>generalisation</b> from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• automotive social network</li> <li>• large-scale integrated intelligent public transport system</li> </ul>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>3</b>	<p>Candidates can be given ONE mark for making a general point about progress: e.g. progress implies improvement/ progress is a subjective concept</p> <p>Allow ONE mark for each point up to a maximum of three marks from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Idea of technological development/improvement as driving more automated/robotic</li> <li>• Increased safety/reduction in accidents as there is 'feedback and assurance against failure' or 'following GPS routes carefully'</li> <li>• Improvement in human condition as time not wasted in driving/used for more useful purposes/easier</li> <li>• Increase in wellbeing and happiness from safer cars and increased communication and interactivity</li> </ul> <p>Accept appropriate alternatives</p>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>4</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point up to a maximum of three marks from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus/taxi lanes</li> <li>• Cycle paths</li> <li>• One-way streets</li> <li>• Kerbs/barriers</li> <li>• Cul-de-sacs/dead ends</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures /width restrictions</li> <li>• Pedestrian crossings</li> <li>• Traffic lights</li> <li>• Road signs</li> <li>• Traffic islands</li> <li>• Speed limits/cameras</li> </ul> <p>Ignore references to laws/ fines. Do not credit the quote '. . routes, speeds and lane use . . .' from source</p> <p>Accept appropriate alternatives</p>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>5</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point up to a maximum of four marks from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input of data from analysing traffic flows</li> <li>• Control of signals</li> <li>• Control of junction priorities</li> <li>• Programmable signage</li> <li>• Communication with drivers/GPS updates/interactivity</li> <li>• Control of routes/lanes/speeds/direction</li> <li>• Integration with public transport/trains/trams/cycle paths</li> </ul> <p>Accept appropriate alternatives</p>	<b>(4)</b>

Question Number	Indicative content	
<b>6</b>	<p>In general the passage is clearly one-sided and favours intelligent transport systems.</p> <p>There is some factual evidence in paragraphs 2, 3 and 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• referring to the stages of the driverless car and the initial processes involved in intelligent transport systems</li> <li>• however this evidence doesn't back up the argument in favour of intelligent transport systems.</li> </ul> <p>There is an inductive argument used in paragraphs 4 and 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• which starts from what's currently being done in cities (paragraph 4)</li> <li>• then builds up to a generalised picture of a social network of driverless automated cars</li> <li>• but the author seems to get carried away in a flight of unsupported assertions and ends up with a vision of a totally integrated transport network.</li> </ul> <p>The author uses several statements based on opinions to advance his argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• keywords here include 'advanced', 'revolutionary' and 'social'</li> <li>• which also have an emotive effect as they suggest that research on driverless cars is somehow selfish and backward-looking</li> <li>• the final paragraph is mainly unsupported assertions and personal opinions implying that the best and most responsible option for the future lies in social transport networks.</li> </ul>	
<b>A02</b>	<b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	
<b>4 marks</b>	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.
<b>Level 1</b>	1	Limited, (mainly) one-sided answer with a simple conclusion.
<b>Level 2</b>	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.
<b>Level 3</b>	3	<p>A developed answer which largely examines one aspect of the argument or looks at both issues in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.</p> <p>In a less successful answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted.</p> <p>In a more successful answer it is either clearly interpreted or applied to a single aspect of the question or addresses different issues in a superficial way with few specifics and</p>

		little or no development.
<b>Level 4</b>	4	Evidence is used to examine contrasting arguments. 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.
<b>A03</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b>	
<b>5 marks</b>	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.
<b>A04</b>	<b><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></b>	
<b>4 marks</b>	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 and arguments are not clearly expressed. 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.



Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>7</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for identifying an analogy.</p> <p>Possible analogies are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Using fMRI to spy on neurons is like using Cold-War-era satellites to spy on people' (paragraph 1)</li> <li>• 'The brain adapts in the same way as a muscle gets larger with extra use'. (paragraph 3)</li> <li>• 'Men are from Mars, women are from Venus' (para 1)</li> </ul> <p>Allow TWO marks for identifying weaknesses such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Things that look similar may actually be very different</li> <li>• The use of the analogy may lead to misconceptions about the thing compared, and therefore must be seen as weak</li> <li>• There is no guarantee that similar events will lead to similar outcomes</li> <li>• Any conclusion is at best 'possible'/often a matter of opinion</li> <li>• Comparisons usually focus on perceived similarities but ignore differences</li> <li>• Comparisons are often superficial</li> <li>• Comparisons may be spurious</li> </ul>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>8</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point up to a maximum of four marks from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sample size too small</li> <li>• subjects not randomly selected</li> <li>• bias in sampling or method</li> <li>• lack of controls/not a fair test</li> <li>• methodology judged to be unsatisfactory/invalid</li> <li>• fMRI technology too imprecise/inaccurate</li> <li>• technology out of date/inaccurate</li> <li>• correlation does not necessarily mean causation</li> <li>• other factors may affect the results</li> <li>• other evidence may support different interpretation of results</li> <li>• religious prejudices/beliefs</li> </ul> <p>Accept appropriate alternatives</p>	<b>(4)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9	<p>Part A Allow ONE mark for each point up to a maximum of three marks</p> <p><b>A “Drip, drip, drip”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reference to incessant nature of gender signals/slow ongoing change/repetitive</li> <li>• idea of all-inclusive/pervasive nature of gendered environment.</li> </ul> <p><b>“Gendered environment”</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social attitudes/expectations.</li> <li>• stereotypical roles for males and females/eg, “pink and blue colours”/“father” and “mother”</li> <li>• Subtle communication/unconscious bias</li> </ul> <p>Allow ONE mark for part B</p> <p><b>B Example - any one of the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• societal expectations for women eg work/home</li> <li>• different toys for boys and girls</li> <li>• segregating the way children play</li> <li>• boys’ toys are more training based/girls’ toys are more nurturing.</li> </ul> <p>Do not credit any examples not given in the source</p>	<b>(4)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>10</b>	<p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assertion that fMRI studies are not reliable.</li> <li>• fMRI technology not very precise.</li> <li>• Factual evidence that brains of boys and girls indistinguishable from each other.</li> <li>• Factual evidence showing the brains of London taxi drivers changes after learning 'the Knowledge'.</li> <li>• Inductive argument used to apply observations on taxi drivers to brains of boys and girls in general.</li> <li>• Assertion that boys' and girls' brains change as a result of using their brains in a way society expects of them.</li> <li>• Anecdotal evidence about effect of toys on boys and girls – based on belief.</li> </ul> <p>The question is designed to lead to critical examination of evidence and argument and not just repetition of content or personal comment on the issues raised.</p> <p>Allow 1 mark for each yes answer for the following questions to a maximum of 5 marks. Note each question carries a maximum of 1 mark.</p> <p>A1 Does the answer identify specific relevant evidence/arguments from the passage?  A2 Does the answer subject the evidence/argument cited to limited, albeit critical, interrogation/comment?  A3 Does the answer recognise bias and/or lack of balance/prejudice?  A4 Does the answer distinguish explicitly between 'fact', opinion and assertion?  A5 Does the answer examine flaws or omissions in the evidence?  A6 Does the answer identify and discuss the type(s) of argument(s) used?  A7 Does the answer offer a plausible final objective assessment of the strengths or limitations in the argument(s) or evidence presented?</p>	<b>(5)</b>

Question Number	Indicative content
11	<p>Several possible approaches possible here – key questions are how are children socialized into particular gender roles, how do gender roles shape individual behavior, how are attitudes and expectations surrounding gender roles influenced by stereotypes, how is sexism affected by stereotypes, how do gender roles today differ from those in the past or in other cultures?</p> <p><b>Evidence/ideas from the source:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some studies suggest male and female brains wired differently</li> <li>• E.g. female brains more suited to social skills, memory and multi-tasking</li> <li>• Male brains are better at perception and co-ordinated movement</li> <li>• Professor Rippon suggests no major structural differences between boys’ and girls’ brains</li> <li>• Gender differences in brain emerge through environmental factors</li> <li>• E.g. women’s brains adapt to multitasking because of society’s expectations</li> <li>• Gendered environment/ stereotypical attitudes</li> <li>• Based on traditional stereotypes of male and female roles</li> <li>• Social conditioning of boys and girls by gender-stereotypic attitudes/expectations</li> <li>• Choice of toys and games e.g. dolls for girls and cars for boys/ training-based toys for boys/nurturing toys for girls</li> </ul> <p><b>Evidence from own knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gender roles = roles men and women expected to occupy based on their sex</li> <li>• Gender is a social concept created by humans/product of interaction between genes and environment</li> <li>• Traditionally masculine roles associated with strength, aggression and dominance while feminine roles associated with passivity, nurturing and subordination</li> <li>• Attitudes and expectations surrounding gender roles based on stereotypes about attitudes, traits or behaviour of women or men rather than biological differences</li> <li>• Sex role stereotyping different in other cultures/in the past</li> <li>• Examples of gender stereotypes - e.g. males not emotional, women are irrational and overly emotional</li> <li>• Gender stereotypes can form basis of sexism</li> <li>• Sexism in the workplace – e.g. men expected to be managers or executives, women secretaries. Glass ceiling for women in traditional male occupations. Glass elevator for men working in traditional female occupations such as nursing or social work</li> <li>• Differential socialisation holds that male children undergo different socialisation than do females – main agents being</li> </ul>

	<p>family, education, peer groups and mass media</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence of roles changing in modern society e.g. more 'house-husbands', more women as sole breadwinners</li> <li>• Any other valid points</li> </ul> <p>Answers which only consider evidence from the source should be restricted to Level 2 (max 6 marks) for AO1/AO2.</p> <p>Note this question does not require a candidate to examine a statement from contrasting viewpoints nor does it require a conclusion to gain full marks. If included these should be credited but candidates should not be penalised if they are omitted.</p> <p>After marking the answer for AO1 and AO2, assess it for AO4.</p> <p>AO1 and AO2 are combined for the purpose of marking. Answers should be placed in the mark range which provides a 'best fit' for the quality of answer taking account of both AO1 and AO2. Where an answer meets a mark range descriptor for AO2 the evidence of AO1 should be used to help place the answer at an appropriate mark within the range.</p>	
<b>AO1 and AO2</b>	<p><b>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines. (4 marks)</b></p> <p><b>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions. (6 marks)</b></p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Answer which is irrelevant, frivolous or incomplete. Insufficient evidence to assess.
<b>Level 1</b>	1-2	Limited, (mainly) one-sided answer with a simple conclusion.
<b>Level 2</b>	3-6	Presents some/few reasons relevant to the issue of gender or the roles of men and women in society. Some supporting evidence presented but limited in scope. Points made may be assertions rather than examined critically. Some evidence will be presented from only one viewpoint, possibly drawn from the source rather than from own knowledge. To gain full marks at this level the response should have a range of supporting evidence.
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	Presents reasons examining different aspects of the issue of gender or the roles of men and women in society. There will be an attempt to present a balanced rather than one-sided answer. Some of the points made will be treated critically. Points made will be supported by a range of evidence from both the source and own knowledge. Supporting evidence will be presented for different influences. To gain full marks at this level the response should have a range of supporting evidence. May recognise that different viewpoints have some merit.
<b>Level 4</b>	10	Will adopt a balanced view presenting a range of ideas with a wide range of supporting evidence. There may or

		may not be a clear conclusion. There will be some critical evaluation of the evidence and arguments presented. The answer will be supported with a comprehensive range of evidence examining different viewpoints.
<b>A04</b>	<b><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></b>	
Level	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 and arguments are not clearly expressed. 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 exemplification 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
<b>12</b>	<p>Answers need to begin by discussing what is meant by 'a country's progress', and state of economic development. Then the argument falls into two parts – benefits and drawbacks.</p> <p><b>Benefits</b>  GDP only measures economic factors such as incomes. Does not measure other factors relevant to development such as health, education, personal safety, social relations, work conditions, spirituality etc. Also there is no reference to human rights or equality issues, quality of life, life expectancy, rates of disease. Happiness is a measure based on people's own perceptions about their lives and their perceived happiness. Therefore a more holistic measure of state of development.  Also happy people live longer, are more productive, earn more and are also better citizens and as such happiness itself should be encouraged and developed for its own sake.</p> <p><b>Drawbacks</b>  Problem of measurement – usually done by surveys - 'subjective' wellbeing by its very nature is less valid than an 'objective' measure like GDP.  Measurement affected by cultural issues – people adapt to poor conditions so even if in bad health, poor housing, malnourished and so on, people will still rank their wellbeing fairly high on their survey responses. Also human rights may be sacrificed as long as happiness indicator looks good. A key factor for personal happiness is mental health and in many countries most people with mental health issues are not treated.  Beyond a certain income happiness does not increase significantly with income – many rich people are also miserable. Though money can enhance wellbeing by facilitating access to clean environment, education, healthcare etc.</p> <p>Happiness as a sole measure of progress is probably not satisfactory – better indicators would be more inclusive of several factors and include both economic and wellbeing factors</p> <p><b>Synoptic features</b>  Candidates must look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines, e.g. ethical, economic, social and political. In particular they need to compare and contrast the extent to which (or the means by which) the proposal would or would not be acceptable, depending on the perspective chosen. Ideas from other parts of the specification may be introduced and, if relevant, should be awarded credit.</p>



<b>A01 and A02</b>	<b>A01: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines. (4 marks)</b> <b>A02: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions. (16 marks)</b>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Insufficient evidence to assess. Irrelevant or facetious answer.
<b>1</b>	1	Insufficient evidence to assess. Incomplete and inconclusive answer.
<b>2</b>	2-6	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence used, drawn from a single discipline. Superficial or formulaic answer.
<b>3</b>	7-13	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines. Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial or unbalanced manner.
<b>4</b>	14-18	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).
<b>5</b>	19-20	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding. A balanced, perceptive and evaluative answer.
<b>A03</b>	<b>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</b>	
<b>4 marks</b>	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.
<b>A04</b>	<b>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A02 and A03 marks.</b>	
Level	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.
	1-2	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.
--	--	--

	3-4	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.
--	-----	---

	5-6	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.
--	-----	--

Question Number	Indicative content
<b>13</b>	<p>Arguments in favour of euthanasia and assisted suicide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People should have freedom of choice, including the right to control their own body and life.</li> <li>• People have a right to die when terminally ill, according to some religions and in some countries.</li> <li>• Death is a private matter and if there is no harm to others, the state and other people have no right to interfere.</li> <li>• Euthanasia happens anyway.</li> <li>• Euthanasia can be safely regulated by government legislation.</li> <li>• Allowing people to 'die with dignity' is kinder than forcing them to continue their lives with suffering.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments against euthanasia and assisted suicide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Religious arguments: for example, many people believe that only God has the right to end a human life.</li> <li>• 'Slippery slope' arguments: accepting voluntary euthanasia could lead to non-voluntary and involuntary euthanasia and the killing of people who are thought undesirable, by giving doctors the power to decide when a patient's life is not worth living.</li> <li>• Medical ethics arguments: that asking doctors to assist in a person's death would be a violation of fundamental medical ethics and if patients did have a right to die this would impose on doctors a duty to kill, thus restricting the autonomy of the doctor.</li> <li>• Euthanasia exposes vulnerable people to pressure to end their lives, e.g. moral pressure on elderly relatives by selfish families or to free up medical resources; patients who are abandoned by their families may feel euthanasia is the only solution.</li> <li>• Problem of what suffering means and difficulty of establishing an objective threshold for when it is bad enough to permit voluntary euthanasia.</li> <li>• Allowing euthanasia will lead to less good care for the terminally ill; it undermines the commitment of doctors</li> </ul>

	<p>and nurses to saving lives; it becomes a cost-effective way to treat the terminally ill; it will discourage the search for new cures and treatments for the terminally ill.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternative treatments are available, such as palliative care and hospices. We do not have to kill the patient to kill the symptoms. Nearly all pain can be relieved.</li> </ul> <p>Synoptic features</p> <p>Candidates must look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines, e.g. ethical, legal, social, medical/ scientific. In particular they need to compare and contrast the extent to which (or the means by which) the proposal would or would not be acceptable, depending on the perspective chosen. Ideas from other parts of the specification may be introduced and, if relevant, should be awarded credit.</p>	
<b>AO1 and AO2</b>	<p><b><i>Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines. (4 marks)</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions. (16 marks)</i></b></p>	
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	Insufficient evidence to assess. Irrelevant or facetious answers.
<b>1</b>	1	Insufficient evidence to assess. Incomplete and inconclusive answer.
<b>2</b>	2-6	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence used, drawn from a single discipline. Superficial or formulaic answer.
<b>3</b>	7-13	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines. Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial or unbalanced manner.
<b>4</b>	14-18	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).
<b>5</b>	19-20	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding. A balanced, perceptive and evaluative answer.
<b>AO3</b>	<p><b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b></p>	
<b>4 marks</b>	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.

<b>A04</b>	<b><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></b>	
<b>6 marks</b>	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.
	1-2	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.
	3-4	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.
	5-6	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.