



Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2018

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 2018

Publications Code 6GS03\_01\_1806\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

## 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>1a</b>	<p>There are <b>four possible answers</b>, but credit must only be given for the factual part/sentence where there is no subjective addition</p> <p>e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Cars were coded by their make, prestige and age'</li> <li>• 'In another study, Keltner examined the behaviour of drivers at crossings where pedestrians had the right of way'</li> <li>• 'One researcher stood at the crossing; another waited out of sight nearby and watched what happened'</li> <li>• 'drivers of BMWs and Mercedes ignored the pedestrian nearly half the time'</li> </ul> <p>1 mark for a wholly correct phrase/sentence DO NOT CREDIT an answer that contains an opinion</p>	<b>1</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>1b</b>	<p>There are three possible answers here</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'drivers of the least prestigious vehicles would wait patiently for the pedestrian to cross'</li> <li>• 'They're morally superior, so they blaze through stop signs'</li> <li>• 'Surprisingly the worst were drivers of electric hybrid Toyota Priuses'</li> </ul> <p>1 mark</p>	<b>(1)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>2</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point (max 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best path to power is being nice/empathetic</li> <li>• Having power makes people nasty/ feel superior/ break the rules/</li> </ul>	<b>(2)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>3 (a)</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point (max 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statement C</li> <li>• Statement F</li> </ul>	<b>(2)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>3 (b)</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point (max 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be nasty/ ruthless/ feared/ authoritarian</li> <li>• Bully/ use force/ violence/ manipulation</li> <li>• Use immoral means/ignore 'ethical' concerns/ break the rules</li> <li>• Use compassionate/ kind policies as a means of gaining more power</li> </ul>	<b>(2)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>4(a)</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence given to support this statement / based on assumption / no basis in fact</li> </ul>	<b>(1)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>4(b)</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point such as (max 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problems of assessing rich and poor/</li> <li>• Could try surveys but respondents don't give honest answers/ won't admit to shoplifting</li> <li>• Could try CCTV surveillance but this raises moral issues/ ethical issues</li> <li>• Could look at data on prosecutions for shoplifting but many not caught/ sample size problem</li> <li>• Rich shoplifters more likely to escape prosecution / bias in legal system/ rich use influence to make it difficult for researchers</li> <li>• Not able to do experiments</li> <li>• Rich and poor use different shops/ different levels of surveillance/ regional differences</li> <li>• Any other valid point</li> </ul>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>5</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point such as (max 5)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reference to natural selection/survival of the fittest or suitable description</li> <li>2. Competition with other animals for scarce resources</li> <li>3. Reference to dominance hierarchy/ 'pecking order'/ group power dynamics / aggression</li> <li>4. Cooperation within human groups / division of labour/ strong helping weak</li> <li>5. Enables human groups to act decisively/ quickly/ ruthlessly / intelligently</li> <li>6. Any of points 3, 4 or 5 give humans a selective advantage / contribute to evolutionary success</li> <li>7. Any other valid point</li> </ol>	<b>(5)</b>

Question Number	Indicative content
6	<p>Up to 4 marks can be awarded for AO2 points developed from the passage relating to the statement that 'representative democracy, on this account, seems pretty much doomed to fail'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Representative democracy is based on electing people to make decisions/laws on behalf of others. The power paradox suggests that elected representatives change on gaining power to become more selfish and inconsiderate of others; act unethically; "turn into jerks" etc.</li> <li>○ The statement about 'representative democracy being doomed to fail' is a conclusion reached by inductive reasoning.</li> <li>○ There is some factual data presented from studies of the behaviour of people regarded as 'powerful'. This includes 'rich' people who are also assumed to be 'powerful'. There are no details given as to how 'rich' and 'poor' categories were defined in these studies.</li> <li>○ There is no evidence presented from any of the studies quoted apart from the one that shows that 'rich' people are more selfish and inconsiderate drivers than 'poor' people. This assumes that 'driving behaviour' corresponds to their behaviour as political leaders.</li> <li>○ Strengths - good range of evidence from different studies including some factual data. Keltner is an appropriate authority. Sound basis of evidence for inductive argument</li> <li>○ Weaknesses – some subjective evidence also given, including possible bias shown by Keltner. Weakness of inductive argument/ generalisation/ argument from authority. Several unqualified assertions given. Slightly cynical/ jokey attitude of author suggests he's not supportive of this idea of the power paradox.</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	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. In a weaker answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted. In a stronger answer it is: either clearly interpreted and applied to a single aspect of the question or addresses different issues in a superficial way with few specifics and 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	Assesses the strength/relevance of specific evidence
	1	Refers to facts or objective statements
	1	Recognises/distinguishes between fact and opinion
	1	Identifies gaps, flaws, bias, speculations or contradictions in the passage.
	1	Refers to different arguments or types of argument
	1	Offers a conclusion supported by some form of justification

<b>A04 Descriptor</b>	<b><i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way</i></b>  <b>Note: The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A01 and A02 marks</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	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 reliability (6 lines or less)	<b>0</b>
<b>1</b>	The answer is only understandable in parts and may be irrelevant. Writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	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.	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	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.	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	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.	<b>4</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>7</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point such as (max 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saves money</li> <li>• No pollution / doesn't contribute to global warming</li> <li>• Low ecological footprint/ no need for additional infrastructure</li> <li>• Moral satisfaction of being self-sufficient/ living a 'natural' life</li> <li>• Avoids 'addiction' to technology/ less distraction / more social</li> <li>• Avoids risk of electrocution/ fires / safer</li> <li>• Any other valid point</li> </ul>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>8</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point such as (max 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exposed to bacteria/ dust from barns from a young age</li> <li>• Exposed to farm animals from a young age</li> <li>• Not exposed to fumes from machines / tractors / industrial machines</li> </ul> <p>Do not credit any responses that do not use evidence from the source</p>	<b>(2)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9	<p>Allow either '<b>Authority</b>' or '<b>Inductive</b>'            Credit 1 mark for correctly identifying type of argument</p> <p>Credit 2 marks for different reasons for saying whether it is a strong or weak form of argument.            Credit answers which give one reason for strength and one for weakness. (1+1)</p> <p>1 mark for each valid point eg:</p> <p>Authority            A1 Can be strong if authority recognized by everybody            A2 Such arguments are only valid if relative supporting evidence is provided (strong/weak)            A3 Status is often confused with authority (weak)            A4 Other experts may take a different view (weak)            A5 It's an assertion /opinion / subjective / no facts / authority biased (weak)            A6 Results of such arguments can only ever be 'possibly' true but are not inevitably so (weak)            A7 Authority quoted is anonymous / expertise may not be recognized/ accepted as such (weak)</p> <p>Inductive            B1 Generally regarded as strong/sound but conclusion is possible/probable rather than certain            B2 Usually based on observation (strong)            B3 Additional evidence can lead to different or modified conclusion (weak)            B4 Uses specific evidence to lead to general conclusion (therefore weak)            B5 Conclusion may be weak even if premises are true            B6 Mistakes in observation can easily lead to flawed conclusions (weak)</p> <p>Do not credit answers which simply say whether it is strong or weak or which fail to identify argument type in acceptable terms.</p> <p>Do not give any credit to answers which identify or describe any other type of argument.</p>	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>10</b>	<p>Allow ONE mark for each point such as (max 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Religious / article of faith</li> <li>• Living life according to fixed moral 'truths'</li> <li>• Social issue – important for group cohesion</li> <li>• Security / safety – protection from harm</li> <li>• Protection of children from fire hazards of wooden houses</li> <li>• Enforcement / if not having smoke alarm illegal then issue of breaking the law</li> </ul> <p>An additional mark can be given for the development of any of the points above (to max of 3).</p>	<b>(3)</b>

Question Number	Answer	Mark
<b>11</b>	<p>Indicative content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two groups of faith-based farming communities with similar origins and lifestyles are compared which differ in two crucial ways – the use of technology and rates of asthma in children.</li> <li>• The Hutterites use some modern technology and by implication, lead cleaner, more hygienic lifestyles - their children have high rates of asthma, higher than the national average (US) rate.</li> <li>• The Amish do not use any modern technology and so lead less hygienic lives – their children have low rates of asthma and allergies.</li> <li>• A lot of factual evidence to support the hypothesis.</li> <li>• Small sample size (60 children) /only 2 communities studied</li> <li>• Inductive arguments needed to support hypothesis</li> <li>• Evidence from dust experiments contradicts hypothesis as it suggests 'Hutterite dust' increases asthma rates</li> <li>• Several other factors involved – eg Hutterites live communal lives – more chance of infections</li> <li>• Researchers may be biased – seeking evidence for their own belief in hygiene hypothesis</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	Answer	Mark
<b>12</b>	<p>Indicative content</p> <p>Arguments in favour of this view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Technology makes life easier in lots of ways</li> <li>• Able to access lots of information via internet etc.</li> <li>• Economic reasons – less labour costs/ many financial transactions now online</li> <li>• Medical – promotes good health and longer life spans</li> <li>• Transport – enables easy global travel</li> <li>• Communication - enables easy interaction with wider society</li> <li>• Enables individuals to achieve their potential</li> <li>• Any other valid point</li> </ul> <p>Arguments against this view</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintains separation from outside world (were persecuted in past)</li> <li>• Faith/religious/spiritual reasons – simple life is a preparation for the afterlife</li> <li>• Avoids moral temptations/distractions</li> <li>• Avoids problems of ‘addiction’ to technology such as mobile phones/ internet/ games/ facebook etc.</li> <li>• Enables a community-orientated way of living as opposed to technological individualism</li> <li>• Simple/plain living – avoids competitiveness</li> <li>• Technological lifestyle damages the environment</li> <li>• Any other valid point</li> </ul> <p>Candidates who focus simply on content in the passage should receive credit but full marks should be reserved for those who use their own knowledge.</p> <p>Answers which only consider one side of the question should be restricted to max 5 marks for AO1/AO2. The question requires a conclusion to gain full marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• After marking the answer for AO1 and AO2, assess it for communication, AO4</li> </ul>	<b>14</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO1 4 marks</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>AO2 6 marks</b></p>

<b>A01</b>	<b><i>A01: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines</i></b>	<b>4 marks</b>
<b>and</b>		
<b>A02</b>	<b><i>A02: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	<b>6 marks</b>
	Answer which is irrelevant, frivolous or incomplete. Insufficient evidence to assess.	<b>0</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	Limited assertion supporting a single viewpoint in a superficial manner with limited supporting evidence.	<b>1 - 2</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Presents some/few reasons either in support of or contrary to the issue. Answers may indicate a second viewpoint but will fail to develop it beyond making a simple unsupported assertion. 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 should have a range of supporting evidence.	<b>3 - 5</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	Presents reasons both for and against the view in the question. Will clearly examine both viewpoints. There will be an attempt to present a balanced rather than one-sided answer. Some of the points made will be treated critically. Supporting evidence will be presented for both viewpoints. To gain full marks at this level should have a range of supporting evidence for both viewpoints. There may be a simple conclusion, especially towards the top end of the band. May recognise that both viewpoints have some merit.	<b>6 - 9</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	Will adopt a balanced view recognising there are arguments for and against both viewpoints. Will reach a clear conclusion arising from the answer. There will be some evaluation of the relative merits of the different viewpoints. The answer will be supported with a range of evidence supporting both viewpoints.	<b>10</b>



<b>A04 Descriptor</b>	<b><i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way</i></b>  <b>Note: The A04 marks are not dependent upon the A01 and A02 marks</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	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 reliability (6 lines or less)	<b>0</b>
<b>1</b>	The answer is only understandable in parts and may be irrelevant. Writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	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.	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	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.	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	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.	<b>4</b>

## **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.

<p><b>Question No.</b>          'The creativity of an artist is different to the creativity of a scientist'.          Critically evaluate this assertion.</p>	<p><b>13</b></p>
<p><b>Indicative content</b></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Answers may begin with a definition of creativity as the production of something new and useful</li> <li>• May include some discussion about the nature of creativity and innovation – creation of new objects, concepts, ideas - examples.</li> <li>• An artist can be described as someone who creates art, which raises the question - what is art? Difficulties of defining art – something that corresponds to certain aesthetic criteria?</li> <li>• Examples of artistic styles in different branches of the arts – visual, literature, music, dance, drama, architecture etc.</li> <li>• The role of creativity in art – though artistic ability and creativity not the same thing - former implies skill, talent, craftsmanship, not necessary to being 'creative'. Creativity may involve new ideas, new 'ways of seeing', new techniques, imagination, divergent/ lateral thinking, brainstorming etc.</li> <li>• Scientist is someone who makes discoveries to explain the way the universe works – outline and discussion of scientific method. Examples of famous scientists and/or scientific revolutions.</li> <li>• Creativity in scientific research involves theorising and experimenting – thinking up hypotheses to explain observations, designing experiments to test said hypotheses, using inductive reasoning to produce theories to explain observations and make predictions etc.</li> <li>• Examples of creative leaps in science eg Newton's 'apple' leading to theory of gravity; Einstein's thought experiments (riding on beams of light etc.)</li> <li>• Differences – artist more divergent thinker/ scientist more convergent thinker; artist more independent/alone whereas scientist may be part of a team or following theories created by others; artists create new 'work' of some kind/ scientists produce new explanations or falsify other theories.</li> <li>• Differences in the expression of creativity: a scientist has a responsibility to society, and his/her creativity is limited significantly by essential scrutiny from regulatory bodies. Artistic freedom is much greater, and regulation or censorship in the arts is often seen as negative.</li> <li>• Similarities – both use imagination /visualisation / lateral thinking /personal experience. Both produce something new.</li> </ul> <p>Synoptic features          Candidates must look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines - eg: 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>	<b><i>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</i></b>	<b>AO1 4</b>
	<b><i>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	<b>AO2 16</b>
<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>Indicators of Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	Insufficient evidence to assess. Irrelevant or facetious answers	0
<b>1</b>	Insufficient evidence to assess. Incomplete and inconclusive answers.	1
<b>2</b>	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence used, drawn from a single discipline. Superficial or formulaic answer	2-6
<b>3</b>	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines. Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial or unbalanced manner.	7-13
<b>4</b>	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
<b>5</b>	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding. A balanced perceptive and evaluative answer.	19-20

<b>A03</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></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><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 (6 lines or less).
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts and may be irrelevant. 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.

<p><b>Question No.</b>          Modern medical advances have probably helped millions of people to live longer and healthier lives. However, some investigators have said that medical research has led to several unpredicted consequences.</p> <p>Describe and evaluate some of the unforeseen outcomes that have arisen from modern medicine.</p>	<p><b>14</b></p>
<p><b>Indicative content</b></p>	
<p>Answers may begin by discussing the roles and benefits of modern medical treatments such as the use of drugs to cure various diseases or the development and use of medical technology to help prolong life.</p> <p>Points relating to unforeseen implications of modern medicine may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of drug-resistant pathogens eg MRSA.</li> <li>• Reference to natural selection / evolution of resistant strains</li> <li>• Problems of infections within hospitals</li> <li>• Overuse of antibiotics eg in animals grown for food</li> <li>• Over prescription of antibiotics eg prescribed for colds and flu even though viral diseases unaffected by antibiotics</li> <li>• Inappropriate use of antibiotics – eg patients not completing prescribed course of tablets</li> <li>• Unintended side-effects of certain drugs eg thalidomide</li> <li>• Reference to drug testing regimes</li> <li>• Increase in cancer and dementia due to increased longevity.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates may also discuss the some of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moral and ethical implications of genetic and embryo research eg designer babies/ stem cells/ religious objections</li> <li>• Implications to society of increasing numbers of elderly people due to increase in lifespan</li> <li>• Societal discomfort due to continued use of animals for experimentation and drug testing.</li> <li>• Increased economic burden on the health service and the state in general of supporting those who would have previously died.</li> <li>• Social problems caused by an increased expectation that modern medicine will always deliver</li> <li>• Unexpected benefits are also significant such as the reduction in prejudices against people with certain conditions through a proper understanding of the causes</li> </ul> <p>Synoptic features          Candidates must look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines - eg: ethical, legal, social, economic and 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>	<b><i>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</i></b>	<b>AO1 4</b>
	<b><i>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	<b>AO2 16</b>
<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>Indicators of Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>
	Insufficient evidence to assess. Irrelevant or facetious answers	0
<b>1</b>	Insufficient evidence to assess. Incomplete and inconclusive answers.	1
<b>2</b>	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence used, drawn from a single discipline. Superficial or formulaic answer	2-6
<b>3</b>	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines. Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial or unbalanced manner.	7-13
<b>4</b>	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
<b>5</b>	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding. A balanced perceptive and evaluative answer.	19-20

<b>A03</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></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><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 (6 lines or less).
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts and may be irrelevant. 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.