

Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2008

GCE

GCE General Studies (Unit 6455/01)

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
1(a)	IRELAND	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	<p>Note: Candidates may present reasons to explain negative and/or positive variations in life expectancy levels.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each reason. Each reason must clearly account for higher or lower levels of life expectancy and be significantly different from the others. They may contain only 2 or 3 words such as different levels of nutrition or high rates of disease.</p> <p>Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low/High pollution levels. • Low/High levels of healthcare. • Genetic differences. • Low/High income/wealth levels/standard of living. • Length/type of work conditions. • Access to public services e.g. education. • Drugs/smoking/alcohol levels. • Climate. • Diet/fitness. • Quality of housing. • Quality of life/lifestyle <u>with example</u>. • Levels of sanitation <p>Note: It may be that there are two different reasons given in any one answer space and these should be awarded marks accordingly.</p> <p>No marks for wars/murders/levels of crime.</p>	3

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2	<p>Award 1 mark for each reason. Each reason must be explained and be significantly different from the others - e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Longer sentences will act as a deterrent and so discourage rational people from committing crime/ reduce levels of crime. • Longer sentences may deter those in prison giving them more time to reform/rehabilitate/learn respect for the values of society. • Keep criminals locked up as long as possible in order to keep society safe. • Retribution - wicked people deserve to be punished severely/ pay their debt to society. • Longer sentences give the public re-assurance that the fight against crime is effective. • Longer sentences create a greater sense of justice for the victims of crime/ society in general. • People must take the law and its judgments seriously. (In recent times tagging and ASBOs are being increasingly used to keep criminals controlled but outside prison - but many are failing to behave as required so they are being called or recalled to prison) 	3

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(a)	D 6 000 000	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3(b)	<p>Answers must relate to the issues identified in the table i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Family breakdown - Lack of schooling/truancy. - Lack of schooling/exclusion. - Lack of qualifications. - Low numeracy levels. - Low reading levels. - High levels of unemployment. - High levels of homelessness. - High levels of mental disorder. <p>Note. Generic answers which give rehabilitation measures such as Community Service schemes or citizenship lessons in schools or more tagging of offenders which are not related to the data in the table do not answer the question and should be given no marks.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each <u>alternative way</u> (underlined) and a further mark for development/explanation. Each alternative must be significantly different from the others. e.g. :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>Identify potential criminals early</u> - focus resources on education/ home/employment. ● <u>Make efforts to improve education system</u> - so qualification levels improve ● <u>Raise reading skills</u> - as literacy is a key to further education ● <u>Raise number skills</u> - as numeracy is a basic life-skill ● <u>Give better job opportunities/elimination of unemployment a higher priority</u> - being out of work leaves lots of time and perhaps incentive for criminality ● <u>Recognise the need to attack homelessness</u> - maybe by increasing social housing provision for the vulnerable ● <u>Take people with mental health disorders out of the prison system</u> - allocate responsibility for their care to the NHS or a special task force or local authorities but not the police and the prisons. <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>treatment/diagnosis of mental health disorders</u> - early diagnosis to prevent crime before it is committed ● <u>More investment in family support to prevent children taken into care</u> - recognise the importance of establishing measures to reduce disruption/ uncertainty/ disadvantage in lives of young children. ● <u>Secure better attendance at school</u> to reduce truancy e.g. through school contracts/ links to parents. 	4

Section B

All questions in Section B examine AO4 - Students should be able to demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge and of the relationship between them, appreciating their limitations.

Question 4(e) should be used to examine AO2 - Students should be able to communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(a)	<p><u>Assertion</u> - A proposition/claim/declaration without supporting evidence.</p> <p><u>Argument</u> - A proposition/claim/declaration with supporting evidence (for or against) - usually leading to a conclusion.</p> <p>For 2 marks: Candidates need to make a clear and accurate distinction between assertion and argument. The explanation will include definitions similar to above. Someone who says arguments are justified/assertions are not justified will get 2 marks. Or refer to the assertion made by Short in the text, pointing out the lack of justification for her claim as compared to an argument supported by evidence.</p> <p>For 1 mark: A difference might be expressed with reference to a general statement about an assertion only (but not argument only)e.g. An assertion is a claim made which is not supported or justified Or refer to the assertion made by Short in the text, pointing out the lack of justification for her claim.</p> <p>Note: where a candidate gives a definition of argument and assertion and argument is right but assertion is wrong, no marks should be awarded.</p>	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(b)	<p>An <u>inductive</u> argument is one in which the observations provide some degree of support but less than complete support for the conclusion reached - it is thought that the observations provide reasons supporting a <u>probable</u> truth of a conclusion but not the <u>absolute</u> truth.</p> <p>A <u>deductive</u> argument is one in which premises are intended to provide <u>complete</u> support for a conclusion - it is thought that the premises provide a <u>guarantee</u> of the truth of a conclusion - the premises are so strong it is impossible for the conclusion to be false.</p> <p>For 2 marks candidates will use definitional concepts such as those above to clearly establish and explain why inductive arguments are thought to lead to weaker conclusions than deductive arguments.</p> <p>Note: candidates must make reference to both inductive and deductive arguments in order to access 2 marks (if only one of the terms is mentioned award no marks).</p> <p>For 1 mark: Candidates will give a more limited and generalised but accurate explanation of inductive and deductive arguments only (for example an inductive argument will move from a particular observation to a general conclusion and a deductive argument from a general observation to a particular conclusion), and will probably not address explicitly the issue of which leads to the stronger/weaker conclusions.</p> <p>Or Use points from the second paragraph in the passage to give an example of a weak inductive argument leading to a conclusion taken from lines 15 and 16.</p>	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(c)(i)	<p>1 mark for saying the statement is a fact <u>and</u> giving a reason. (No reason = no mark)</p> <p>It is a fact because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It can be tested/verified or • It can be proved to be correct or • It is objective or • It actually happened/it is true or • It is supported by evidence. <p>Note: simply saying “figures/stats” is not sufficient for a mark.</p>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(c)(ii)	<p>1 mark for saying the statement is an opinion <u>and</u> giving a reason. (No reason = no mark)</p> <p>It is an opinion because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a value judgement or • It can not be tested/verified or • There is no evidence to support it or • It is subjective or • It can not be proven or • Not everyone would agree <p>Note: Simply saying “She is expressing her view or opinion” is not sufficient for a mark.</p> <p>“It is not true” is not acceptable for a mark.</p>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(d)	<p>2 marks for showing how the 3 terms: belief, fact and opinion might be related <u>using the example from the passage</u>.</p> <p>e.g. “Claire Short and others <u>believe</u> that democracy has been weakened. That is their proposition and they are convinced of this - it is also their <u>opinion</u>, they have made this judgment even though others may dispute it. This belief that democracy has been weakened will be hard to verify, quantify or prove. However the belief that Muslim alienation has increased may be more readily quantified and proven so this belief could be supported with <u>facts</u>. (2 marks)</p> <p>Note: candidate might only use either one of the two sentences in the example to show how they believe that all three terms relate to the sentence they have chosen.</p> <p>1 mark for a more limited and general explanation linking opinion and facts to beliefs that demonstrates some understanding of at least two of the terms (with or without using the example from the passage).</p> <p>Helpful information for examiners:</p> <p><u>Beliefs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - may be a mixture of, or based on facts and opinions - a state of being convinced of a proposition - a mental acceptance of being true or real but not necessarily supported by objective or factual evidence. - a belief is only a belief if someone believes it <p><u>Opinions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A person’s ideas and thoughts towards something - an assessment, evaluation or judgement - a belief not based on absolute certainty or positive knowledge but on what seems to be true or probable in one’s mind - a belief that is open to dispute. - an opinion or value judgement is an opinion whether anyone holds it or not <p><u>Facts</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Things that can be shown to be true to exist or have happened - knowledge, information, statements based on real occurrences/ reality/actuality. 	2

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4(e)	<p>1 mark for stating that the writer believes (lines 19-20) we need a hung parliament.</p> <p>Then up to 3 marks may be awarded for assessment of the evidence supporting this conclusion.</p> <p>1 mark should be awarded for each acceptable discussion point: e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most of the points made in lines 1 - 19 are opinions, apart from lines 8 - 9, so strictly there is very little evidence here. • The quantitative data on voter support for the Labour party could be considered to be powerful evidence for questioning the health of representative democracy. • There is a progression of ideas and assertions but the piece does not actually justify any of them by providing confirmation. For example in lines 12 - 13 where Short says ‘The Prime Minister’s powers of patronage turn too many MPs into obedient ciphers who await the call to ministerial office or quiet elders who await the House of Lords’ it would have been possible to give examples but she does not do so. • Short’s case is unfolded in lines 20-26. The reasons why she supports the argument are clear. But they are not backed up with tangible and explicitly stated examples/evidence. • Candidates may refer to different types of argument e.g. inductive or from authority, linked to evidence or lack of evidence. <p>There will also be 3 marks (A02) for quality of written communication.</p>	4

A mark should be given for the level of written communication using these level guidelines:	
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.	3 marks (above average)
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.	2 marks (average)
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.	1 mark (below average)
The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question too seriously, there may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling OR there is too little of the candidate’s own writing to assess reliably (as is sometimes the case in Section B).	0 marks (exceptionally poor)
NB The A02 mark is not dependant on the A04 mark. .	

Section C

All questions in section C examine A03 and A02.

A03 - Students should be able to marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data concepts and opinions.

A02 - Students should be able to communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way

General guidance on marking essays

Examiners should look for qualities to reward rather than faults to penalise. This does NOT mean giving credit for irrelevant or inadequate answers, but it does mean allowing candidates to be rewarded for answers showing relevant, plausible explanations using evidence and for critical and imaginative thinking. Candidates should also be credited for considering more than one point of view. Examiners should therefore read carefully and consider every response: even if it is not what is expected it may be worthy of credit.

A mark should be given for A02 the level of written communication using these level guidelines:	
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.	3 marks (above average)
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.	2 marks (average)
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.	1 mark (below average)
The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question too seriously, there may be serious lapses of grammar and spelling OR there is too little of the candidate's own writing to assess reliably (as is sometimes the case in Section B).	0 marks (exceptionally poor)
NB The Quality of Communication marks are not dependant upon the A03.	

Question 5

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer
Level 1	1	<p>Partial and inconclusive answer. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit</p> <p><i>Candidates may write in general terms about one or more aspects of the question or some may feel the victim should always decide the punishment an offender receives without addressing the full range of the specific question set. Supporting evidence will almost certainly be missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced.</i></p>
Level 2	2-6	<p>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence</p> <p><i>The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. e.g. some answers may feel that those who have been wronged should be able to tell the court how the criminal act has affected them and those they love. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.</i></p>
Level 3	7-12	<p>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints. Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.</p> <p><i>Here there is an answer which does at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be (but not necessarily) heavily one sided; - answers could focus on the motives and situation of the guilty person and may argue there is little chance they will be reformed or rehabilitated if their needs and perspective are not addressed.</i></p> <p><i>A level 3 answer does not have to be one-sided but can be one where there are short points for and against justifying a simple conclusion.</i></p>
Level 4	13-19	<p>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s).</p> <p><i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question issues such as the following may be discussed.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Candidates may feel the victim should have the right to influence and decide the punishment an offender receives.</i> - <i>Others may feel that if justice is to be blind the feelings of the victims should be taken into account but a balance needs to be achieved.</i> - <i>Some might argue for a better balance between the needs of offenders and victims.</i> - <i>How important is it for the motives and situation of the offender to be taken into account rather than the emotional feelings of the victim.</i>
Level 5	20	A fully balanced perceptive answer. Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion.

Question 6

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer
Level 1	1	<p>Partial and inconclusive answer. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit</p> <p><i>Candidates may write in general terms about sport at school, perhaps suggesting children should not be made to take part if they do not wish to do so without addressing the specific question set. Supporting evidence will almost certainly be missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced.</i></p>
Level 2	2-6	<p>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence</p> <p><i>The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. e.g. Obesity is a genetic factor rather than an individual responsibility.. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.</i></p>
Level 3	7-12	<p>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints. Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.</p> <p><i>Here there is an answer which does at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and be very heavily one sided; the conclusion reached will be consistent with the discussion. The focus here might only be on obesity to the virtual exclusion of levels of fitness issues.</i></p> <p><i>A level 3 answer does not have to be one-sided but can be one where there are short points for and against justifying a simple conclusion.</i></p>
Level 4	13-19	<p>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s)</p> <p><i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question issues such as the following may be discussed :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Is it the responsibility of schools to solve the problems of obesity levels and low levels of fitness - what would need to be sacrificed in the curriculum?</i> - <i>Why <u>compulsory</u> active vigorous sport?</i> - <i>Sport has more to offer than mere fitness eg. Team work, team loyalty and achieving success.</i> - <i>One size fit for all? - potential damaging effects on children.</i> - <i>More balanced approach - diet, exercise, healthy eating.</i> - <i>Can poor afford to eat well?</i>
Level 5	20	<p>A fully balanced perceptive answer</p> <p>Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion</p>

Question 7

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer
Level 1	1	<p>Partial and inconclusive answer. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit</p> <p><i>Candidates may write in general terms about one or more laws of which they particularly approve or disapprove without addressing the specific question set. Supporting evidence will almost certainly be missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced</i></p>
Level 2	2-6	<p>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion. Selects and marshals a limited evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence</p> <p><i>The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. e.g. Governments make decisions about the operation and interpretation of existing laws - but do we really need hundreds of pages of new law every year?. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.</i></p>
Level 3	7-12	<p>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints. Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.</p> <p><i>Here there is an answer which does at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be (but not necessarily) heavily one sided; - answers could focus on how the UK budget translates into a new Finance Act every year so candidates may see this as a reason for not adopting the suggestion at the heart of the question.</i></p> <p><i>A level 3 answer does not have to be one-sided but can be one where there are short points for and against justifying a simple conclusion.</i></p>
Level 4	13-19	<p>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate specific evidence to show a differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion(s)</p> <p><i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question, candidates may discuss the following issues:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Is Britain over governed /too much legislation?</i> - <i>How extreme is this view? Could we survive without any new laws for five years? e.g. Budget requires a Finance Act.</i> - <i>Need for legislation to respond to new situation eg. Security issues, new crimes (yob culture/binge drinking)</i> - <i>What is the evidence for ineffective laws-is ineffectiveness not a reason for new laws to plug gaps.</i> - <i>Laws required as life becomes more complex eg. Europe expands so UK passes new laws to control immigration.</i> - <i>Knee-jerk legislation e.g. Dangerous Dogs Act has proved unnecessary and ineffective.</i>
Level 5	20	<p>A fully balanced perceptive answer. Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion</p>

Question 8

Level	Mark	Indications of level for this question
Level 0	0	Irrelevant or facetious answer
Level 1	1	<p>Partial and inconclusive answer. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence relevant to the question, but with NO CONCLUSION either implied or explicit</p> <p><i>Candidates may write in general terms about reasons for some mothers not wanting to have children without addressing the specific question set. Supporting evidence will almost certainly be missing and the answer will be largely assertive and probably prejudiced.</i></p>
Level 2	2-6	<p>Superficial or formulaic answer with a simple conclusion. Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence to draw a simple conclusion or express a personal opinion, which may not be appropriate. The answer may consider two views in a simple for/against format with little explanatory comment or relevant evidence</p> <p><i>The evidence will be limited and be unsupported, with much personal opinion expressed and relate to only parts of the question. e.g. . why the government has sought to get single parent mothers back to work.. Answers at this level may demonstrate ill informed prejudice. Conclusions are likely to be personal responses to the issue rather than developed from arguments for and against the view in the question.</i></p>
Level 3	7-12	<p>An answer which develops mainly one viewpoint, but which may refer briefly to other viewpoints. Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.</p> <p><i>Here there is an answer which does at least partly relate to the specifics of the question set - there is some development and relevant descriptive points are introduced, though the discussion may slip from argument into assertion and may be (but not necessarily) heavily one sided; answers could focus on whether a child conceived for a grant of £10,000 would be well brought up by parents and whether such a payment would be either economic or ethical.</i></p> <p><i>A level 3 answer does not have to be one-sided but can be one where there are short points for and against justifying a simple conclusion.</i></p>
Level 4	13-19	<p>A developed answer which examines coherently, and in a more balanced way, two sides of the question. Selects and interprets a moderate range of specific evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion.</p> <p><i>Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the issues raised in the question and will develop a balanced and comprehensive treatment of these issues. In the stronger answers to this question, issues such as the following may be discussed:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>The ethics and implications of a £10,000 grant to produce children.</i> - <i>Reference might be made to Child Trust Funds introduced by Gordon Brown though these are for children not parents.</i> - <i>Why do we need more children? - Immigration could provide a stronger working population to support an ageing population.</i> - <i>Why shouldn't we use economic incentives to solve an economic problem?</i> - <i>Non-financial and well as financial support needed to encourage more children eg. Better nursery and childcare facilities.</i> - <i>Would this financial really work with more people especially women concentrating on education and careers rather than on producing children - children are not only very costly but also very time consuming.</i>
Level 5	20	<p>A fully balanced perceptive answer</p> <p>Comprehensive response in which arguments are well supported by concepts and evidence to reach a strongly justified conclusion</p>