

# Mark Scheme (Standardisation)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel in GCE General Studies  
Unit 3: Change and Progress  
(6GS03)

## **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.qualifications.pearson.com](http://www.qualifications.pearson.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 2016

Publications Code: 6GS03\_01\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## **General Marking Guidance**

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

## Section A

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(a)	<p>Award 1 mark for each point (max 2) such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A social construct is an idea or meaning shared and understood by society, having been created by society'.</li> <li>o Social constructs change over time e.g. cohabitation, class, race, etc, compared to times past</li> <li>o A national park is generally associated with remote or wild places, there is no reason why it cannot include more urban / populous areas</li> </ul>	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1(b)	<p>Award 1 mark for each point (max 2) such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A notional park is the <b>idea</b> as opposed to the reality of a Greater London National Park</li> <li>o The fact that many people will already be thinking about and looking at London in more ecological or conservationist ways</li> <li>o So even before a Greater London National Park is officially designated, the notion of such a park will already be making a difference.</li> </ul>	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2	<p>1 mark for each point (max 3) such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o many opportunities to see / enjoy nature (e.g. 3000 parks, 13,000 species, allotments, gardens and 1,300 separate reserves)</li> <li>o education about green issues</li> <li>o plenty of scope for achieving fitness / enjoying leisure pursuits / recreational activities / walking</li> <li>o opportunities to see wildlife - bird species, snakes, foxes, etc.</li> <li>o numerous ways to support / promote conservation / increase biodiversity / protect wildlife / first sentence in passage quoted</li> </ul>	(3)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3	<p>1 mark for each point (max 2) such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o allows land to be drained or to prevent flooding</li> <li>o create space for building houses / factories / infrastructure etc.</li> <li>o easier to brick over river than to have to build bridges / makes it easier for transport</li> </ul>	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	<p>1 mark for each example with simple justification (max 5)</p> <p>Candidates can be given credit for a general point about the difference between progress and change e.g. progress implies improvement / progress is a subjective concept</p> <p>Candidates are likely to see some changes as representing progress (max 3 marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Crossrail - faster, more convenient travel</li> <li>o Thames Barrage - prevents City from being flooded</li> <li>o Beckton Desalination Plant - means sea-water or brackish water from London rivers can be cleaned for human use</li> <li>o Bazalgette's sewers built in 19<sup>th</sup> century provided cleaner rivers and roads</li> <li>o Bricking over rivers - create space for more infrastructure / improved health etc.</li> <li>o Population growth - more infrastructure / jobs / opportunities / economic growth / leisure opportunities</li> </ul> <p>But other changes may <b>not</b> be seen as representing progress (max 3 marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Increase in commuters - more delays / congestion / transport problems / pollution</li> <li>o bricking over rivers - less amenity space / river views / leisure opportunities</li> <li>o suited bankers replacing the manual labour of dockworkers seen as anything but progress</li> <li>o population growth - increased pollution / housing and transport problems / systems overwhelmed</li> </ul> <p>ONLY credit points from the passage.</p>	(5)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	<p>1 mark for each point (max 3).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="458 318 1290 382">o an assertion is a positive statement or declaration, without support or reason...</li> <li data-bbox="458 424 1290 487">o an argument will involve reasoning or evidence to support the points being advanced</li> <li data-bbox="458 530 1290 593">o the passage quoted is an assertion because, though strongly expressed, it is not supported with evidence...</li> <li data-bbox="458 635 1290 741">o if an answer links evidence from the passage to the statement it may be successfully claimed that the sentence can be regarded as an argument.</li> </ul>	(3)

Question Number	Indicative content
6	<p>Up to 4 marks can be awarded for AO2 points developed from passage supporting the idea of a Greater London National Park, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Investing in London's green infrastructure would be beneficial and help to reduce the effects of pollution, provide affordable food, mitigate flood hazards, tackle climate change and increase biodiversity.</li> <li>○ Maybe London's 'lost' rivers (the rivers Westbourne, Tyburn, Fleet, Walbrook and Effra), long ago bricked over in the name of progress, could be revealed to become once again welcome and valued parts of the London landscape, though some may believe that for heritage reasons they should remain as they are.</li> <li>○ The author is simultaneously advocating that urban life is valuable whilst seemingly wishing to make it more like remote rural areas but some may regard allocating space to housing and commerce as equally or more important.</li> <li>○ Green space, contact with nature and recreation can all have positive effects on people's mental and physical health.</li> <li>○ The idea of the Greater London National Park could lead to a new way of 'seeing' London, acting as a lens through which planners, designers, architects, recreation managers, wildlife coordinators, teachers, parents and children could reimagine the city, giving new focus to London's cultural and ecological mosaic.</li> <li>○ 'Think about the children born in London now. When they start school, imagine their teachers know that they're in a Greater London National Park, and teach them differently about green space and nature. As they grow up to become architects or designers or planners, what ideas might they have to make us even healthier, even happier, and make this city even better?'</li> </ul>

<b>AO2</b> Level	<b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	Mark (up to 4)
	No rewardable material (fragmentary, inaccurate, incoherent)	
<b>Level 1</b>	Limited response, probably one-sided with simple conclusion (if any)	<b>1</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Selects and marshals a limited range of evidence, probably with little explanatory comment, to draw a simple conclusion which may or may not be appropriate	<b>2</b>
<b>Level 3</b>	Selects and interprets evidence and uses it to justify a conclusion (or conclusions). This will be a developed answer which examines one aspect in depth or at least two aspects in a more superficial and generalised fashion	<b>3</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	Appropriate evidence is used to support contrasting viewpoints. There is a clear awareness of different points of view; this response is comprehensive and the evaluation more developed	<b>4</b>

<b>AO3</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b>	Mark (up to 5)
	Does the candidate . . . (Award 1 mark for each YES - max 5)	
	Assess the strength/relevance of specific evidence?	<b>1</b>
	Refer to facts or objective statements?	<b>1</b>
	Recognise or distinguish between facts and opinions?	<b>1</b>
	Identify gaps, flaws, bias, speculations or contradictions in the passage?	<b>1</b>
	Refer to different arguments or types of argument?	<b>1</b>
	Offer a conclusion supported by some form of justification?	<b>1</b>

<b>AO4</b>	<b><i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way</i></b>  <b><i>The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO2 and AO3 marks</i></b>	Mark (up to 4)
	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.	<b>0</b>
	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.	<b>1</b>
	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.	<b>2-3</b>
	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.	<b>4</b>

## Section B

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7	<p>1 mark for each of two simple definitions (no transfer)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Natural Law – inherent in nature / preexisting / universal</li> <li>○ Social Contract – agreed by members of a society in return for protection</li> </ul> <p>For Differences award 1 mark for each relevant point to max of 3 such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ NL based on Rules determined by an external force / God / creator / supreme being or power but SC says they are invented by society / contract between individual and society</li> <li>○ NL Universal / innate – apply to everybody irrespective of personal beliefs but SC is constructed / seen as relevant to a specific society</li> <li>○ NL Unalterable – apply at all times and under all circumstances but SC can be amended if circumstances change</li> <li>○ NL is ‘absolutist’ / believes a right action is always right because standards are ‘absolute’ but SC is variable / particularist / it is only right if it benefits society</li> </ul> <p>No transfer of marks between points, even if a point is well-developed.</p>	(4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8	<p><b>Do not</b> credit answers which give reasons for accepting arguments from authority as 'strong'.</p> <p>Credit 1 mark for each of 2 acceptable reasons, such as:</p> <p>Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Rely on an individual's alleged expertise</li> <li>○ Expertise may not be recognized/accepted as such</li> <li>○ Status is often confused with authority</li> <li>○ Expertise may not be strictly relevant to issue under consideration</li> <li>○ Other experts may take a different view</li> <li>○ Expert in one field is not necessarily expert in another unrelated one</li> <li>○ Such arguments are only valid if relative supporting evidence is provided</li> <li>○ Assertions, however eminent the person speaking, does not justify a claim</li> <li>○ It's an opinion / subjective / no facts</li> <li>○ Results of such arguments can only ever be 'possibly' true but are not inevitably so</li> <li>○ Authority quoted is anonymous – status uncertain</li> <li>○ Authority maybe biased</li> </ul> <p><b>Do not</b> award more than 1 mark for any single point however well developed; but if two credible points are included in a single statement both should be separately credited.</p>	(2)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9	<p>Credit 1 mark for each of two correct items of evidence to a sub-max of 2 marks. If 2 credible points are included in the same statement, award 2 marks.</p> <p>Evidence which may be credited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In first century BC Cicero believed ... justified war</li> <li>• Cicero believed war must have own set of ethical constraints</li> <li>• By 4<sup>th</sup> century AD argued for competent legal authority</li> <li>• Theologian claimed must have just cause</li> <li>• Aquinas in 12<sup>th</sup> Century demanded 'right intention'</li> <li>• Others thought should use proportional means</li> <li>• Others thought should be last resort</li> <li>• Others thought must have realistic chance of success</li> <li>• Combat between opposing armies v combat between peoples</li> <li>• Modern warfare turns civilians into combatants</li> <li>• Some (in contrast to then) now claim Just War no longer possible</li> <li>• Recent changes in warfare undermine previous thinking</li> <li>• Top British soldier argues old-style conflicts replace by wars between people</li> <li>• Old-style wars aim to smash the opposing army</li> <li>• New warfare aims to break the will of people.</li> </ul> <p><b>Strengths</b></p> <p>1 mark for each of 2 different comments about relative strengths / weaknesses of this evidence.</p> <p>General assessment of strength/weakness without reference to specific evidence from the passage should not be credited.</p> <p>Comments may include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of factual evidence / based on opinion</li> <li>• Factual statements usually fairly strong – if relevant</li> <li>• Opinion is usually regarded as weaker than fact</li> <li>• Unsupported statements (assertion) usually weak</li> <li>• Strength may be greater or weaker depending on status of person offering the evidence</li> <li>• Evidence may be particularistic and not give full picture</li> <li>• Different views at different times may show change over time</li> <li>• Purpose / context of evidence may affect strength/weakness</li> </ul>	(4)

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10	<p>Award up to 4 marks for each valid point, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Depersonalise warfare by increasing killing distances (eg: development of bows; guns; missiles; air-power)</li> <li>○ Increased killing power (eg: explosives; bombs)</li> <li>○ More indiscriminate (eg: targetting areas rather than individuals blanket bombing; nuclear weapons)</li> <li>○ More specialised fighting forces (sophisticated weaponry)</li> <li>○ More expensive (high costs of equipment)</li> <li>○ More remote (drones; missiles)</li> <li>○ More precise (accurate surveillance; radar; pinpoint guidance)</li> <li>○ Improved communication (eg: electronic giving more accurate picture)</li> <li>○ Greater involvement of civilian populations and noncombatants (eg effect of long distant bombing'blanket bombing'rocket attacks)</li> <li>○ Changing focus from attacking people to attacking property and infrastructure (war in Syria, carpet bombing, Dresden, Coventry)</li> <li>○ Increasing imbalance between opposing sides dependent on technology available to them; (skill in using it)</li> <li>○ Encouraging counter measures (eg: escalation; alternative approaches)</li> </ul> <p>The scope is considerable.</p> <p>Allow up to 3 marks for giving relevant supporting examples such as those in brackets in the list above</p> <p><b>Note:</b> the question does not ask for a list of technological advances; the focus should be on ways in which warfare has been changed – that is it is about the impact of technology.</p>	(6)

Question Number	Indicative content
11	<p>Key questions are have moral values changed and if so what has brought about the change. The focus should be broader than the question of warfare as raised in the source. Answers which only use material from the passage and do not consider the issue in broader terms should not be awarded more than level 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Technology has raised moral questions related, for example, to developments in medical science such as organ transplants; contraception; IVF; cloning; genetic foods.</li> <li>○ Use of technology raises issues about communication; data protection; privacy; surveillance; individual freedom</li> <li>○ Effect of communications revolution challenging established values</li> <li>○ Other changes in moral values brought about by increased scientific knowledge challenging established beliefs and practices such as origin of life/universe; divine authority</li> <li>○ Decline of religion, legislative changes and increased individualism have changed the basis on which many traditional moral values were established</li> <li>○ Not all moral values have changed; many traditional values are still widely accepted and govern everyday life.</li> <li>○ Globalisation creating greater awareness of alternative values.</li> </ul> <p>It is unlikely that an answer failing to offer a conclusion will be awarded the top mark in level 3 or a level 4 mark</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>

	<p><b>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</b> <b>4 marks</b></p> <p><b>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</b> <b>6 marks</b></p>	
LEVEL	Indicators of Level	Mark
	Answer which is irrelevant, frivolous or incomplete. Insufficient evidence to assess.	<b>0</b>
<b>1</b>	Limited assertion supporting a single viewpoint in a superficial manner with limited supporting evidence.	<b>1-2</b>
<b>2</b>	Presents some/few reasons either in support of or contrary to the 'statement'. 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 some supporting evidence.	<b>3-5</b>
<b>3</b>	<p>Presents reasons both for <b>and</b> against the view in the 'statement'. Will clearly examine two or more contrasting viewpoints. There will be an attempt to present a balanced rather than one-sided answer. Some of the points made will be treated critically.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There may be a tentative conclusion. May recognise that both viewpoints have some merit.</p>	<b>6-9</b>
<b>4</b>	Will adopt a balanced view recognising arguments for and against the statement. Will recognize the variety of factors which have contributed to changes in moral values and will be able to show that not all traditional moral values have changed. Should see that moral values have always been in a process of evolution and change to adapt to changing circumstances. Will support answer with evidence showing both sides of the argument.	<b>10</b>

<b>AO4</b>	<b><i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way</i></b>  <b><i>The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO1 and AO2marks</i></b>	Mark (up to 4)
	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.	0
	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
	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.	2-3
	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.	4

## **SECTION C**

### **Marking of Questions – Levels of response**

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

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

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

### **Using the levels mark scheme**

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

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

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

Question Number 12	Indicative Content
	<p>Problems could be - ethical, legal, medical/scientific. Answers should address points such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Existing forms of funding are unlikely to pay for the research on rare illnesses endured by just a few people, since it would not seem financially viable to spend research funds in this way.</li> <li>○ But that leaves the danger that cures may be neither sought nor found for rare illnesses,</li> <li>○ If such clinic trials were funded by the wealthy to cure their own illnesses (or perhaps that of a family member), would that be ethically acceptable if others with similar illnesses were also allowed to benefit?</li> <li>○ The proposal could yield many extra millions of pounds for clinical trials, especially for rare and difficult-to-treat diseases which traditional funders are reluctant to support - unless ethical or other objections prevail.</li> <li>○ In the UK, the NHS offers a service which is claimed to be 'free at the point of use' so wouldn't this approach smash such commitments by apparently legitimising the idea of 'richest first'?</li> <li>○ The process of taking a research idea through to use on humans takes many years with many safety checks to ensure the patient will not suffer harm; would such considerations be undermined if rich patients were allowed to try new treatments at an early stage?</li> <li>○ Many doctors and nurses may find such 'cheque book medicine' an offensive idea - would it be fair to expect them to work on this basis if they considered it wrong to do so?</li> <li>○ Where would legal liabilities lie if the patient was harmed by the treatment for which he or she had paid?</li> <li>○ Isn't this another legal minefield, best avoided?</li> </ul> <p><b>Synoptic features</b>      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 20 marks</b>	<b><i>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</i></b>  <b><i>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	<b>AO1 4</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>AO3</b> <b>4 marks</b>	<b>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</b>		Mark (up to 4)
Does the candidate . . .(Award 1 mark for each YES - max 4)			
Assess the strength/relevance of specific evidence?		1	
Refer to facts or objective statements?		1	
Recognise or distinguish between facts and opinions?		1	
Identify gaps, flaws, bias or speculations in the argument?		1	
Refer to different arguments/reasoning or types of argument/reasoning?		1	
Offer a conclusion supported by some form of justification?		1	
<b>AO4</b> <b>6 marks</b>	<b>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO2 and AO3 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.	

<b>Question Number 13</b>	<b>Indicative Content</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ All data collected for a purpose, whether scientific, academic, economic or political</li> <li>○ Must distinguish between different types of data collection and their underlying purposes</li> <li>○ Some data collected and surveys conducted for commercial reasons: such as identification of shopping trends. Allows suppliers to predict and meet potential need and remove product that does not meet market demands</li> <li>○ Such data may be used to inform advertising campaigns and generate or encourage popular demand for products</li> <li>○ May be used for academic purposes to test theories and make informed projections</li> <li>○ National statistics, such as census conducted by government to predict future social and economic needs and shape provision: likely demand for housing, educational provision, infra-structure, future demands on pensions, health and social service provision.</li> <li>○ Opinion polls can be focussed on either social or political questions</li> <li>○ May be used by pressure groups to justify campaigns seeking changes in policy: such as attitudes to abortion, gm foods, assisted dying, animal rights</li> <li>○ May be to ascertain popular political feeling: if conducted by political parties for their own internal use, or by media outlets to inform public or pressure change in feelings and attitudes</li> <li>○ Problem of data collected secretly/without our knowledge or consent by commercial or government organisations – issue of surveillance society</li> <li>○ Raises issue of individual rights – should we be subject to pressure or do we have a right to be informed</li> <li>○ Raises issue of reliability of statistics –do questions generate answers looked for rather than genuine opinion</li> <li>○ Can be justified because such statistical information may be a means to encouraging progress and improvement in our quality of life</li> </ul> <p><b>Synoptic features</b></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 20 marks</b>	<b><i>AO1: Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues using skills from different disciplines.</i></b>  <b><i>AO2: Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	<b>AO1 4</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>AO3</b> <b>4 marks</b>	<b>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</b>		Mark (up to 4)
Does the candidate . . .(Award 1 mark for each YES - max 4)			
Assess the strength/relevance of specific evidence?		1	
Refer to facts or objective statements?		1	
Recognise or distinguish between facts and opinions?		1	
Identify gaps, flaws, bias or speculations in the argument?		1	
Refer to different arguments/reasoning or types of argument/reasoning?		1	
Offer a conclusion supported by some form of justification?		1	
<b>AO4</b> <b>6 marks</b>	<b>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO2 and AO3 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.	

