

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2012

GCE General Studies (6GS03)  
Paper 01

## **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)

Summer 2012

Publications Code UA032253

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Question No.	Question	Mark
<b>1</b>		
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If it is a scientific experiment, then it must conform to criteria/have aims and objectives/ test something</li> <li>2. There is no distinction to be made between “experiment” and “scientific experiment</li> <li>3. An experiment involves a hypothesis/theory..</li> <li>4. Which is testing “something will be different if the social networking was not there”</li> <li>5. The test is to turn off all social networking and observe the consequences.</li> <li>6. It aims to test or verify the hypothesis, through observations</li> <li>7. The experiment should include a control, and therefore would not qualify as a sound scientific experiment/ an experiment tries to keep one variable the same.</li> <li>8. Experiment is not scientific since no specific measurements are or/data collected.</li> <li>9. A scientific experiment involves recording/analysing results or evidence.</li> <li>10. Experiment has some validity since it involves large group (sample)/mixed gender group.</li> <li>11. The experiment is scientific since it involves an independent variable (blocking the site) and dependent variables (student’s reaction)</li> </ol> <p>One mark each point UP TO 4</p>	<b>4</b>

Question No.	Question	Mark
<b>2</b>		
	<p>Possible <b>advantages:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A1. Students have access to internet sources of information</li> <li>A2. Students can communicate easily/work collaboratively/without disturbing others</li> <li>A3. Students are not limited in their place of work</li> <li>A4. Students can have access to work/lectures they may have missed</li> <li>A5. There may be applications available which provide good learning resources (not just information)</li> <li>A6. Management of information can be more effective/no need to use paper/better and quicker presentation</li> <li>A7. Any other valid point</li> </ol> <p><b>One mark each point UP TO 2</b></p> <p>Possible <b>disadvantages:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B1. Students work more individually when they might benefit from working collaboratively</li> <li>B2. Working on computers may inhibit use of original sources</li> </ol>	<b>4</b>

	<p>B3. Use of social networking sites could lead to cyber crime (e.g. cyber-bullying)</p> <p>B4. The student can be easily distracted by the ease with which one can browse or follow irrelevant options/there may be many interruptions through email or instant message requests</p> <p>B5. Students may lose “face-to-face” skills</p> <p>B6. Work can be lost if the technology breaks down/gets stolen</p> <p>B7. Any other valid point</p> <p><b>One mark each point UP TO 2</b></p>	
--	--	--

Question No.	Question	Mark
<b>3</b>		
		<b>2</b>
	<p>1. Darr made an observation about his daughter’s behaviour</p> <p>2. He generalised the observation (from a small number (single) of observations).</p> <p>3. His generalisation was - blocking social networking sites would alter students’ behaviour/test or tries to find out the effect</p> <p>4. A description of inductive reasoning – e.g. using observations to make a generalisation, which can then be tested (only ONE mark), because the question asks about Darr’s reasoning.</p> <p>One mark each point UP TO 2</p>	

Question No.	Question	Mark
<b>4</b>		
		<b>3</b>
	<p>1. All three countries have dissident minorities/majorities</p> <p>2. All three have no or limited democratic traditions (maybe with a communist ideology)/are authoritarian/seek to control the population</p> <p>3. Social networking sites/internet have been used to spread anti-government views between private individuals</p> <p>4. To prevent citizens avoiding censorship</p> <p>5. So that citizens are not swayed/distracted by ideas from other countries/may be thought to be decadent</p> <p>6. Restricting protest.</p> <p>7. To prevent the outside world knowing about activity in their country</p> <p>One mark each point UP TO 3</p> <p>DO NOT ALLOW reasons based on bullying, grooming or paedophile behaviour.</p> <p>DO NOT ALLOW reasons based on distracting students from learning</p>	

Question No.	Question	
<b>5</b>		
		Mark
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Such a ban can be interpreted as censorship</li> <li>2. It restricts learning</li> <li>3. It restricts of freedom of information/students are adults and have rights</li> <li>4. However it would be very difficult/impossible to enforce</li> <li>5. What sanctions could be imposed on transgressors?</li> <li>6. It does not necessarily restrict the ability for students to communicate with each other/the system can be hacked or circumvented.</li> <li>7. Lack of trust in students</li> <li>8. Who decides what is to be allowed?</li> </ol> <p>One mark each point UP TO 3</p>	<b>3</b>

Question No.	Question																			
<b>6</b>																				
Indicative content		Mark																		
	<p>The strongest evidence comes from the outcomes reported by some students – they found time to pay attention to lectures  However since the “experiment” is not controlled (it has not set up matched (e.g. users/non users/) groups.  The outcome, for some students involved, leads to the conclusion that students would benefit from fewer distractions  Limitations are that this is an action produced with very little thought for how the effects could be assessed, and therefore provide only one piece of anecdotal evidence for a draconian policy.</p>																			
<b>AO2</b>	<b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	<b>Mark</b>																		
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Criteria</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.</td> <td><b>0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>Limited, (mainly) one sided answer with a simple conclusion</td> <td><b>1</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>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</td> <td><b>2</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>A developed answer which largely examines one viewpoint or looks at two sides of the argument in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.  In a weaker answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted.  In a stronger answer it is:  <b>either</b> clearly interpreted and applied to a single view of the question  <b>or</b> addresses different views in a superficial way with few specifics and little or no development</td> <td><b>3</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>Evidence is used to examine contrasting viewpoints. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show clear awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.</td> <td><b>4</b></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Criteria		0	Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.	<b>0</b>	1	Limited, (mainly) one sided answer with a simple conclusion	<b>1</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>2</b>	3	A developed answer which largely examines one viewpoint or looks at two sides of the argument in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions. In a weaker answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted. In a stronger answer it is: <b>either</b> clearly interpreted and applied to a single view of the question <b>or</b> addresses different views in a superficial way with few specifics and little or no development	<b>3</b>	4	Evidence is used to examine contrasting viewpoints. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show clear awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.	<b>4</b>	
Level	Criteria																			
0	Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.	<b>0</b>																		
1	Limited, (mainly) one sided answer with a simple conclusion	<b>1</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>2</b>																		
3	A developed answer which largely examines one viewpoint or looks at two sides of the argument in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions. In a weaker answer, explanatory comment is simple and restricted. In a stronger answer it is: <b>either</b> clearly interpreted and applied to a single view of the question <b>or</b> addresses different views in a superficial way with few specifics and little or no development	<b>3</b>																		
4	Evidence is used to examine contrasting viewpoints. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show clear awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.	<b>4</b>																		

<b>AO3</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b>
Candidates should make clear the nature of the evidence they are using.	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the candidate comment on whether or not the evidence comes from reliable measurements?</li> <li>2. Does the candidate comment on whether or not the argument is dependent on authoritative statements?</li> <li>3. Does the candidate indicate that the university/Provost/author may have a biased/distrustful view of students?</li> <li>4. Does the candidate test whether the arguments rely on assertions, which are not scientifically supported?</li> <li>5. Does the candidate question whether the procedure gives unbiased information?</li> <li>6. Does the candidate question whether or not findings are interpreted correctly (or at all) – the Provost does not seem to have a procedure for collating findings and hence evaluating them?</li> </ol>	
<b>Allow 1 mark for each question to which you can answer “Yes”, UP TO 6</b>	

<b>AO4</b>	<b><i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO2 and AO3 marks</i></b>	
A mark should be given for the level of written communication using these guidelines		
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 marks</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 mark</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 marks</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 marks</b>

Question No.	Question	
<b>7</b>		
	Answer	Mark
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. OXFAM</li> <li>2. CAFOD</li> <li>3. (Bill and Melinda) Gates Foundation</li> <li>4. Save the Children</li> <li>5. Fair Trade</li> <li>6. World Bank</li> <li>7. UNICEF</li> <li>8. WFP (world food programme)</li> <li>9. Band Aid</li> <li>10. Comic Relief</li> <li>11. ACF (Action against hunger)</li> <li>12. WAF (World agricultural fund)</li> </ol> <p>There are many more. If in doubt, search the internet, and make sure that the organisation is not-for-profit, and in UK will have charitable status.</p> <p><b>DO NOT ALLOW:</b>  Greenpeace (it is an environmental activist organisation)  Global Agriculture and Food Security Programme (it is a programme set up by organisations)  British Red Cross  Red Cross  AMREF ( a medical organisation)  UN - on its own – too generic.</p> <p>One mark each UP TO 3</p>	<b>3</b>



Question No.	Question	
<b>8</b>		
	Answer	Mark
	<p><b>Make sure that the answer is derived from paragraph 1 alone.</b></p> <p>The form of the argument can be put: It is a good thing for the world to be more just/fair/equitable (an assertion based on an ethical code). The “needs” of the poor are interpreted (on the basis of the rest of the article) as a freedom from hunger. The world will be more just if the poor were less hungry. It is therefore the duty of people to save the poor from hunger. Expressed this way the argument is deontological.</p> <p><b>Award ONE</b> mark for appeals to emotion or saying that this is an emotive/sympathetic argument.</p> <p><b>Award UP TO TWO</b> marks, if the answer makes any reference to ethical codes, or begins to break down or analyses the statement in any way</p> <p><b>Award UP TO TWO</b> marks, if the answer tries to analyse the form of the argument. This may be, as above, to decide that the argument is deontological (or based on DUTIES), or the candidates may suggest another form of argument, such as utilitarianism (because the act of alleviating hunger is increasing the sum of human happiness).</p> <p>The argument used by the authors is <b>not</b> an inductive one, because it starts from a premise, rather than an observation.</p> <p>Together, the maximum number of marks is 4</p>	<b>4</b>

Question No.	Question	
<b>9</b>		
	Answer	Mark
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In 2000, the world agreed to halve extreme poverty and hunger by 2015 as part of the UN millennium development goals.</li> <li>2. In fact, global hunger has actually increased</li> <li>3. Today, one out of every six people on earth is undernourished.</li> </ol> <p>DO NOT ALLOW an answer which contains objective and subjective points in the same point</p> <p>One mark for each point, up to 3</p>	

Question No.	Question	
<b>10</b>		
	Answer	Mark
	<p>Aim is to help the world's/Africa's poorest farmers/smallholders</p> <p><b>ONE mark</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Some countries/organisations have promised and provided funds (grants) for this purpose</li> <li>2. The GAFSP is one of the very few funds available</li> <li>3. Additional countries/organisations have not promised funds/instability of funding/needs new donors</li> <li>4. The Programme is about to be approached by more countries</li> <li>5. There is not enough current funding to support all applications. Needs additional pledges.</li> </ol> <p><b>ONE mark for each point, up to 2</b></p>	<b>3</b>

Question No.	Question	
<b>11</b>		
	Answer	Mark
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Improvements in collection/storage/delivery of water</li> <li>2. Strategies to avoid soil erosion/terracing</li> <li>3. Development of better road systems</li> <li>4. Development of more appropriate plants/seeds/soils</li> <li>5. Better training of farmers/ training to cope with climate change</li> <li>6. Credit and private sector investment</li> <li>7. Facilities to reduce their post-harvest losses</li> </ol> <p>Improvements in water, roads, training and investments must be amplified to gain each mark. A list of 2 items gains 1 mark and a list of 3 or 4 gains 2.</p> <p><b>ONE mark each point up to 4</b></p>	<b>4</b>

Question No.	Question	
<b>12</b>		
Indicative content		
<p>The strength of the evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The evidence is anecdotal – no sources are provided for us to assess the evidence.</li> <li>- The writers might be expected to have good knowledge of the problems, based on their senior political status in the countries they represent, so one could say that they have an argument based on authority.</li> <li>- On the other hand, they may not have any technical or specialist knowledge of the problems they are addressing – we just don't know.</li> <li>- Their arguments form an appeal to emotion</li> <li>- On the other hand they base their appeal on commonly accepted moral precepts</li> </ul> <p>Further evidence that might be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- UN reports</li> <li>- Evidence from charitable organisations with experience in the subject/area</li> <li>- Evidence from surveys in their countries</li> </ul>		
<b>AO2</b>	<b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>	
Level	Criteria	Mark
0	Fragmentary, content is inaccurate, missing or miniscule, reaches no conclusion.	<b>0</b>
1	Limited, (mainly) one sided answer with a simple conclusion	<b>1</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>2</b>
3	A developed answer which largely examines one viewpoint or looks at two sides of the argument in a superficial and unspecific manner. Selects and interprets evidence, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions. In a weaker answer explanatory comment is simple and restricted. In a stronger answer it is: <b>either</b> clearly interpreted and applied to a single view of the question <b>or</b> addresses different views in a superficial way with few specifics and little or no development	<b>3</b>
4	Evidence is used to examine contrasting viewpoints. Selects, interprets and begins to evaluate evidence to show clear awareness of differing points of view, and uses it to draw a justified conclusion or conclusions.	<b>4</b>

<b>AO3</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b>	
	<b>Award 1 mark where appropriate, up to a maximum of 5</b> Does the answer refer to identified, but not necessarily quoted, <b>evidence</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer subject the evidence to albeit limited <b>critical scrutiny</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer distinguish between <b>fact and opinion</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer identify any issues of <b>bias or prejudice</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer assess the <b>strength/weakness</b> of any of the <b>arguments</b> used? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Is an overall objective assessment made of the <b>sufficiency</b> of the <b>evidence</b> and <b>arguments</b> presented? <b>If YES award one mark</b>	<b>5</b>

<b>AO4</b>	<b><i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way</i></b>	
	<b>(Max 4 marks)</b> <i>The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO2 and AO3 marks</i>	
	A mark should be given for the level of written communication using these guidelines	
	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 marks</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 mark</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 marks</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 marks</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 A)2/AO3 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 No.	Question
<b>13</b>	
<b>Indicative content</b>	
<p><b>AO1</b>  <i>Examiners should consider any of the following 3 elements in deriving a level.</i></p> <p>Element 1.  How do we define a “better place”?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The implication here is better in an <b>ethical</b> rather than a <b>material</b> sense.</li> <li>- Answers may reflect on how the human condition varies within and between countries, and how the way in which a country’s system of government affects its citizens.</li> </ul> <p>Element 2  Candidates should show an understanding of <b>moral codes</b> and how they are derived.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- are they derived as an expression of <b>natural law</b>?</li> <li>- are they imposed as a <b>duty</b>, for example, as an outcome of religious beliefs?</li> <li>- are they a <b>utilitarian</b> mechanism?</li> <li>- are they a product of a <b>social contract</b>?</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE – it is not necessary to use the correct technical terms, the candidate can imply these categories and still be credited.</b></p> <p>Element 3  The difficulties of legal enforcement should be explored:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- cultural differences mean that any moral code accepted in one country may not be in another</li> <li>- even if moral codes could be formulated to be accepted internationally, ways of monitoring them will be difficult</li> <li>- legal enforcement implies a supra-national force</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2</b>  <i>Marks within levels for AO2 depend on how well the answer explains, argues or relates the elements in AO1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Answers may consider an evaluation of “world” – does this mean just the people, or the planet we live on, and the surroundings we live in?</li> <li>- How can we possibly get different countries/communities to agree an international moral code?</li> <li>- Does the UN Universal declaration of human rights fit the bill?</li> <li>- If so, how successful are nations in a) accepting b) implementing such a declaration?</li> <li>- Answers may refer any of the recent/on-going conflicts in or between nations (for example Iraq, Libya, Burma, Syria, Afghanistan) and using these as evidence to support an argument and derive conclusions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Synoptic features</b>  Candidates are required to look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines. They need to draw together, or compare and contrast, different ideas on the nature moral codes, societal objectives and human needs. They may also bring together ideas from other areas – ethical issues, utilitarianism, issues about human living.</p>	

<b>AO1</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines</i></b>			
<b>AO2</b>	<b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>			
<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>AOs</b>	<b>Indicators of level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
0	AO1	Irrelevant or facetious answers	0	0
	AO2	Irrelevant or facetious answers	0	
1	AO1	Insufficient evidence to assess	0	1
	AO2	Incomplete or inconclusive answer	1	
2	AO1	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence drawn from a simple discipline	1	2-7
	AO2	Superficial or formulaic answer	1-6	
3	AO1	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines	2	8-13
	AO2	Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial <u>or</u> unbalanced manner	6-11	
4	AO1	Range of evidence drawn from two or more disciplines, showing some understanding	3	14-18
	AO2	Issue examined in a balanced and coherent way from two or more viewpoints	11-15	
5	AO1	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding	4	19-20
	AO2	A balanced perceptive and evaluative answer	15-16	

<b>AO3</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b>	
<b>Award 1 mark where appropriate, up to a maximum of 4</b> Does the answer refer to identified, but not necessarily quoted, <b>evidence</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer subject the evidence to albeit limited <b>critical scrutiny</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer distinguish between <b>fact and opinion</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer assess the <b>strength/weakness</b> of any of the <b>arguments</b> used? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Is an overall objective assessment made of the <b>sufficiency</b> of the <b>evidence</b> and <b>arguments</b> presented? <b>If YES award one mark</b>		4

<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>	
		<b>Mark range</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 reliably.		<b>0 marks</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>1-2 marks</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>3-4 marks</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>5-6 marks</b>



Question No.	Question
<b>14</b>	
<b>Indicative content</b>	
<p><b>AO1</b>  <i>Examiners should consider any of the following 3 elements in deriving a level.</i></p> <p><b>Element 1</b>  What are the functions/purposes of the Census?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knowing the size of the population enables planning of all kinds to be more securely based</li> <li>- Censuses have been used to establish who is liable for taxation, and hence to enable a government to have more information on the resources it will have available.</li> <li>- Censuses may have more repressive functions, where those in power need to have control</li> </ul> <p><b>Element 2</b>  How do governments ensure that citizens complete census forms?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They may impose sanctions</li> <li>- They may impose conditions but also explain clearly to the public, the purposes/rationale of the census (persuasion)</li> <li>- They could reward citizens for completion</li> <li>- They may employ people to collect the data, in their own homes</li> </ul> <p><b>Element 3</b>  What reasons can be put forward for citizens refusing to complete a census form?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- They may consider that the census gives no more information to the government than is available in other ways</li> <li>- They may hold particular convictions about providing information that they believe is private</li> <li>- They may hold that it infringes their human right to privacy</li> </ul> <p><b>AO2</b>  <i>Marks within levels for AO2 depend on how well the answer explains, argues or relates the elements in AO1</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Arguments could explore the duties of citizens in relation to their government, and possibly consider differing moral codes</li> <li>- What justifications are for the government/state to impose this expectation?</li> <li>- Can arguments be made for other ways in which the information could be obtained?</li> <li>- If so, what other ethical issues arise?</li> </ul> <p><b>Synoptic features</b>  Candidates are required to look at the question from a range of viewpoints and disciplines. They need to draw together, or compare and contrast, different ideas on the nature of statistics. They may also bring together ideas from other areas – scientific, technological and sociological and not least the ethical issues on the collection and use of data on individuals and state control.</p>	

<b>AO1</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines</i></b>			
<b>AO2</b>	<b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i></b>			
<b>LEVEL</b>	<b>AOs</b>	<b>Indicators of level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Mark range</b>
0	AO1	Irrelevant or facetious answers	0	0
	AO2	Irrelevant or facetious answers	0	
1	AO1	Insufficient evidence to assess	0	1
	AO2	Incomplete or inconclusive answer	1	
2	AO1	Limited (in variety or amount) range of evidence drawn from a simple discipline	1	2-7
	AO2	Superficial or formulaic answer	1-6	
3	AO1	Some evidence used from two or more disciplines	2	8-13
	AO2	Issue examined from one or more viewpoints but in a superficial <u>or</u> unbalanced manner	6-11	
4	AO1	Range of evidence drawn from two or more disciplines, showing some understanding	3	14-18
	AO2	Issue examined in a balanced and coherent way from two or more viewpoints	11-15	
5	AO1	A good range of evidence, showing clear understanding	4	19-20
	AO2	A balanced perceptive and evaluative answer	15-16	

<b>AO3</b>	<b><i>Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge, appreciating their strengths and limitations.</i></b>		
<b>Award 1 mark where appropriate, up to a maximum of 4</b> Does the answer refer to identified, but not necessarily quoted, <b>evidence</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer subject the evidence to albeit limited <b>critical scrutiny</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer distinguish between <b>fact and opinion</b> ? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Does the answer assess the <b>strength/weakness</b> of any of the <b>arguments</b> used? <b>If YES award one mark</b> Is an overall objective assessment made of the <b>sufficiency</b> of the <b>evidence</b> and <b>arguments</b> presented? <b>If YES award one mark</b>			4

<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>	
	<b>Mark range</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 reliably.	<b>0 marks</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>1-2 marks</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>3-4 marks</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>5-6 marks</b>	

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA032253 Summer 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website  
[www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

