

Final



**General Certificate of Education (A-level)  
January 2013**

**General Studies B  
(Specification 2765)  
Unit 2: Space**

**GENB2**

**Final**

***Mark Scheme***

---

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from: [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2013 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

**Copyright**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the QCA Subject Criteria for General Studies are:

- AO1** Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.
- AO2** Marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.
- AO3** Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge appreciating their strengths and limitations.
- AO4** Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.

- Candidates will often perform at a uniform level across the four Assessment Objectives. Sometimes, though, their performance will be uneven across the AOs.
- The mark awarded for a response should reflect the relative weightings of AOs for the unit (see below).
- **Thus, for Unit 2, knowledge and understanding [AO1] and marshalling evidence and drawing conclusions [AO2] have equal weight. These should determine the level (1 – 3) to which the response is allocated.**
- Whether communication is clear and accurate [AO4] – and, to a lesser extent, whether fact and opinion are distinguished [AO3] – should determine the mark within the level.
- **Answers given in the mark scheme are not necessarily definitive. Other valid points must be credited, even if they do not appear in the mark scheme.**

### Distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 2

Question Numbers	AO1	AO2	AO3	AO4	Total marks per question
1(a)(i)	1	2			3
1(a)(ii)	1			1	2
1(a)(iii)	1	2			3
1(a)(iv)	1			1	2
1(b)(i)	1	2			3
1(b)(ii)	1			1	2
1(b)(iii)	1	2			3
1(b)(iv)	1			1	2
1(c)	2	2	4	2	10
2(a)	3	4	1	2	10
2(b)	3	4	1	2	10
2(c)	4	2	2	2	10
3(a)	5	5	2	3	15
3(b)	5	5	2	3	15
	<b>30</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>90</b>

**1 (a)** Using the data in **Source A**, identify and describe **two** trends in immigration to the UK over the period 2001–2010 **and**, for each, give **one** reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.

**1 (a)(i)** **Trend one** description. Show appropriate calculations to support your answer. **(3 marks)**

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(iii)**

Points that might be made could include: *(see corresponding examples with calculations below)*

- the total number of 25–44 year olds went up between 2001 and 2010 *(eg 1)*
- rapid rise in 25–44 year olds, 2003–2004 *(2)*
- the total number of 15–24 year olds went up between 2001 and 2010 *(3)*
- significant rise in 15–24 year olds during 2001–2004 *(4)*
- rapid increase in 15–24 year olds, 2008–2010 *(5)*
- an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period *(6)*
- post 2006 decline in Under 15s *(7)*
- a slight increase in the Over 60/65 age group *(8)*.

Any other valid points should be credited.

**Candidates are asked for two trends x 3 marks for each (maximum 6 marks)**

- 1 mark each for identifying and describing two trends.
- 1 mark each for using figures to illustrate each of the two trends.
- 1 mark each for showing correctly a calculation to support each of the two identified trends: this could be shown as a percentage, an actual figure or a realistic approximation.

Candidates who ignore the fact that the figures are in ‘thousands’ are unlikely to score more than 1 mark because they would not have read the graph correctly

*Examples of responses might be:*

(1)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| – The total number of migrants aged 25–44 years old went up between 2001 and 2010.                                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| – The total number of migrants aged 25–44 went up from about 180 000 in 2001 to about 255 000 in 2010.                                                                                             | (2 marks) |
| – The total number of migrants aged 25–44 went up from about 180 000 in 2001 to about 255 000 in 2010, an increase of 75 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 41.667%, or rounded to: 41.7%, 42%). | (3 marks) |

(2)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 25–44 year olds, 2003–2004                                                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 25–44 year olds from about 180 000 in 2003 to about 250 000 in 2004.                                                                                       | (2 marks) |
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 25–44 year olds from about 180 000 in 2003 to about 250 000 in 2004, an increase of about 70 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 38.889 or 38.9% or 39%). | (3 marks) |

(3)

- |                                                                                                                                                                         |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of migrants aged 15–24 years old went up between 2001 and 2010.                                                                                      | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of migrants aged 15–24 went up from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 230 000 in 2010.                                                                  | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of migrants aged 15–24 went up from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 230 000 in 2010, an increase of 105 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 84.00%). | (3 marks) |

(4)

- |                                                                                                                                                                              |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds, 2001–2004                                                                                                              | (1 mark)  |
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 195 000 in 2004.                                                                    | (2 marks) |
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 195 000 in 2004, an increase of about 70 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 56%). | (3 marks) |

(5)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds, 2008–2010                                                                                                                            | (1 mark)  |
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 185 000 in 2008 to about 230 000 in 2010.                                                                                  | (2 marks) |
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 185 000 in 2008 to about 230 000 in 2010, an increase of about 45 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 24.324% or 24.3% or 24%). | (3 marks) |

(6)

- |                                                                                                                                                                |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period.                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - There was an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period from about 25 000 to about 40 000.                                                               | (2 marks) |
| - There was an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period from about 25 000 to about 40 000, a difference of 15 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 60%). | (3 marks) |

(7)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of migrants aged under 15 years old went down between 2006 and 2010.                                                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of migrants aged under 15 years old went down from about 41 000 in 2006 to about 27 000 in 2010.                                                                                                     | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of migrants aged under 15 years old went down from about 41 000 in 2006 to about 27 000 in 2010, a decrease of 14 000 (a percentage <u>decrease</u> of 34.146% or rounded to -34.15%, -34.1%, -34%). | (3 marks) |

(8)

- |                                                                                                                                                                      |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was an increase in the Over 60/65 age group over the period.                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - There was an increase in the Over 60/65 age group over the period from about 5 000 to about 15 000.                                                                | (2 marks) |
| - There was an increase in the Over 60/65 age group over the period from about 5 000 to about 15 000, an increase of 10 000 (or percentage <u>increase</u> of 200%). | (3 marks) |

**1 (a) Using the data in Source A, identify and describe two trends in immigration to the UK over the period 2001–2010 and, for each, give one reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.**

**1 (a)(ii) Reason to explain Trend one. (2 marks)**

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(a)(ii) and 1(a)(iv)**

***Candidates are asked to explain each trend from 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(iii) : max of 2 marks for each***

- 1 mark for identifying a reason for each trend, such as the ones below
- a further mark for providing a suitable expansion for each trend.

Points that might be made could include:

- rapid rise in 2003–2004 following EU expansion
- young migrant workers in 25–44 age group seeking a better life
- increase in those with student visas (15–24 year olds)
- younger migrants may mean fewer dependants, hence decline in Under 15s
- children under 15 have migrated with their parents
- older relatives coming to the UK to join existing family members.

Any other valid points should be credited.

1 (a) Using the data in **Source A**, identify and describe **two** trends in immigration to the UK over the period 2001–2010 **and**, for each, give **one** reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.

1 (a)(iii) **Trend two** description. Show appropriate calculations to support your answer. **(3 marks)**

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(iii)**

Points that might be made could include: *(see corresponding examples with calculations below)*

- the total number of 25–44 year olds went up between 2001 and 2010 *(eg 1)*
- rapid rise in 25–44 year olds, 2003–2004 *(2)*
- the total number of 15–24 year olds went up between 2001 and 2010 *(3)*
- significant rise in 15–24 year olds during 2001–2004 *(4)*
- rapid increase in 15–24 year olds, 2008–2010 *(5)*
- an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period *(6)*
- post 2006 decline in Under 15s *(7)*
- a slight increase in the Over 60/65 age group *(8)*.

Any other valid points should be credited.

**Candidates are asked for two trends x 3 marks for each (maximum 6 marks)**

- 1 mark each for identifying and describing two trends.
- 1 mark each for using figures to illustrate each of the two trends.
- 1 mark each for showing correctly a calculation to support each of the two identified trends: this could be shown as a percentage, an actual figure or a realistic approximation.

Candidates who ignore the fact that the figures are in ‘thousands’ are unlikely to score more than 1 mark because they would not have read the graph correctly

*Examples of responses might be:*

(1)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                    |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| – The total number of migrants aged 25–44 years old went up between 2001 and 2010.                                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| – The total number of migrants aged 25–44 went up from about 180 000 in 2001 to about 255 000 in 2010.                                                                                             | (2 marks) |
| – The total number of migrants aged 25–44 went up from about 180 000 in 2001 to about 255 000 in 2010, an increase of 75 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 41.667%, or rounded to: 41.7%, 42%). | (3 marks) |

(2)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                       |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 25–44 year olds, 2003–2004                                                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 25–44 year olds from about 180 000 in 2003 to about 250 000 in 2004.                                                                                       | (2 marks) |
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 25–44 year olds from about 180 000 in 2003 to about 250 000 in 2004, an increase of about 70 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 38.889 or 38.9% or 39%). | (3 marks) |

(3)

- |                                                                                                                                                                         |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of migrants aged 15–24 years old went up between 2001 and 2010.                                                                                      | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of migrants aged 15–24 went up from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 230 000 in 2010.                                                                  | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of migrants aged 15–24 went up from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 230 000 in 2010, an increase of 105 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 84.00%). | (3 marks) |

(4)

- |                                                                                                                                                                              |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds, 2001–2004                                                                                                              | (1 mark)  |
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 195 000 in 2004.                                                                    | (2 marks) |
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 125 000 in 2001 to about 195 000 in 2004, an increase of about 70 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 56%). | (3 marks) |

(5)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                  |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds, 2008–2010                                                                                                                            | (1 mark)  |
| - There was a rapid rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 185 000 in 2008 to about 230 000 in 2010.                                                                                  | (2 marks) |
| - There was a rise in immigration of 15–24 year olds from about 185 000 in 2008 to about 230 000 in 2010, an increase of about 45 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 24.324% or 24.3% or 24%). | (3 marks) |

(6)

- |                                                                                                                                                                |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period.                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - There was an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period from about 25 000 to about 40 000.                                                               | (2 marks) |
| - There was an increase in 45–59/64 age group over the period from about 25 000 to about 40 000, a difference of 15 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 60%). | (3 marks) |

(7)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of migrants aged under 15 years old went down between 2006 and 2010.                                                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of migrants aged under 15 years old went down from about 41 000 in 2006 to about 27 000 in 2010.                                                                                                     | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of migrants aged under 15 years old went down from about 41 000 in 2006 to about 27 000 in 2010, a decrease of 14 000 (a percentage <u>decrease</u> of 34.146% or rounded to -34.15%, -34.1%, -34%). | (3 marks) |

(8)

- |                                                                                                                                                                      |           |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - There was an increase in the Over 60/65 age group over the period.                                                                                                 | (1 mark)  |
| - There was an increase in the Over 60/65 age group over the period from about 5 000 to about 15 000.                                                                | (2 marks) |
| - There was an increase in the Over 60/65 age group over the period from about 5 000 to about 15 000, an increase of 10 000 (or percentage <u>increase</u> of 200%). | (3 marks) |

**1 (a)** Using the data in **Source A**, identify and describe **two** trends in immigration to the UK over the period 2001–2010 **and**, for each, give **one** reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.

**1 (a)(iv)** Reason to explain **Trend two**. **(2 marks)**

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(a)(ii) and 1(a)(iv)**

***Candidates are asked to explain each trend from 1(a)(i) and 1(a)(iii) : max of 2 marks for each***

- 1 mark for identifying a reason for each trend, such as the ones below
- a further mark for providing a suitable expansion for each trend.

Points that might be made could include:

- rapid rise in 2003–2004 following EU expansion
- young migrant workers in 25–44 age group seeking a better life
- increase in those with student visas (15–24 year olds)
- younger migrants may mean fewer dependants, hence decline in Under 15s
- children under 15 have migrated with their parents
- older relatives coming to the UK to join existing family members.

Any other valid points should be credited.

1 (b) Using the data in **Source B**, identify and describe **two** trends in the number of non-UK nationals resident in the UK during the period 2004–2010 **and**, for each, give **one** reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.

1 (b)(i) **Trend one** description. Show appropriate calculations to support your answer. (3 marks)

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(iii)**

Points that might be made could include: (see corresponding examples with calculations below)

- major increase in the number of Polish, 2004–2010 (eg 1)
- decline in the numbers of Irish, 2004–2010 (2)
- steady increase in the numbers from India during the period (3)
- increase in the number from Pakistan, 2004–2009 (2010, overall) (4)
- from 2007 the greatest number of non-UK nationals in the UK are from Poland (5).

Any other valid points should be credited.

**Candidates are asked for two trends : max of 3 marks for each**

- 1 mark each for identifying a trend in up to two categories.
- 1 mark each for using figures to illustrate each of the two categories.
- 1 mark each for showing correctly a calculation to support each of the two identified trends: this could be shown as a percentage, an actual figure or a realistic approximation.

Candidates who ignore the fact that the figures are in ‘thousands’ are unlikely to score more than 1 mark because they would not have read the graph correctly

*Examples of responses might be:*

(1)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                        |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| – The total number of <b>Poles</b> went up rapidly from 2004 to 2010.                                                                                                                                  | (1 mark)  |
| – The total number of <b>Poles</b> went up rapidly from about 70 000 in 2004 to about 540 000 in 2010.                                                                                                 | (2 marks) |
| – The total number of <b>Poles</b> went up rapidly from about 70 000 in 2004 to about 540 000 in 2010, an increase of 470 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 671.4286%, or rounded to 671.4%, 671%). | (3 marks) |

(2)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                               |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of <b>Irish</b> went down from 2004 to 2010.                                                                                                                               | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of <b>Irish</b> went down from about 380 000 in 2004 to about 330 000 in 2010.                                                                                             | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of <b>Irish</b> went down from about 380 000 in 2004 to about 330 000 in 2010, an increase of 50 000 (a percentage <u>decrease</u> of 13.16%, or rounded to -13.2%, -13%). | (3 marks) |

(3)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of <b>Indians</b> went up steadily from 2004 to 2010.                                                                                                                        | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of <b>Indians</b> went up steadily from about 195 000 in 2004 to about 320 000 in 2010.                                                                                      | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of <b>Indians</b> went up steadily from about 195 000 in 2004 to about 320 000 in 2010, an increase of 125 000 (a percentage increase of 64.103%, or rounded to 64.1%, 64%). | (3 marks) |

(4)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of <b>Pakistanis</b> went up from 2004 to 2009 (2010).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of <b>Pakistanis</b> went up from about 90 000 in 2004 to about 190 000 in 2009 (about 160 000 in 2010).                                                                                                                                                                                           | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of <b>Pakistanis</b> went up from about 90 000 in 2004 to about 190 000 in 2009, an increase of 100 000 [a percentage <u>increase</u> of 111.11%, rounded to 111.1% or 111%]<br>(about 160 000 in 2010, an increase of 70 000 [a percentage <u>increase</u> of 77.778%, rounded to 77.8% or 78%]). | (3 marks) |

(5)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                          |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - From 2007 onwards, the number of Poles exceeds any other group.                                                                                                                        | (1 mark)  |
| - In 2007 the number of Poles, at about 395 000, exceeded the next largest group (the Irish) at about 350 000.                                                                           | (2 marks) |
| - In 2007 the number of Poles, 395 000, exceeded the next largest group (the Irish) at 350 000, a difference of 45 000 (a percentage <u>difference</u> of 12.08% or 12.1% or about 12%). | (3 marks) |

**1 (b)** Using the data in **Source B**, identify and describe **two** trends in the number of non-UK nationals resident in the UK during the period 2004–2010 **and**, for each, give **one** reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.

**1 (b)(ii)** Reason to explain **Trend one**. **(2 marks)**

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(b)(ii) and 1(b)(iv)**

**Candidates are asked to explain each trend from 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(iii) : max of 2 marks for each**

- 1 mark for identifying a reason for each trend, such as the ones below
- a further mark for providing a suitable expansion for each trend.

Points that might be made could include:

- Polish workers have labour skills that Britain needs
- many Poles may be here for higher wages than in Poland
- Poles are considered to have a better work ethic which is welcomed by UK employers/businesses
- expansion of the EU has allowed free movement of Poles into the UK for a range of reasons
- slight decline in Irish migration due to strong Irish economy at the time the data was produced and alternative destinations for migration
- Britain has always had a shared relationship with Ireland over work and residency
- Indians have lived in Britain in relatively large numbers since the 1960s and so there is a history of migration
- there are significant Indian and Pakistani communities in Britain which encourage non-UK nationals to migrate and remain in the UK
- political uncertainty in Pakistan may have encouraged people to migrate to and remain in the UK.

Any other valid points should be credited.

1 (b) Using the data in **Source B**, identify and describe **two** trends in the number of non-UK nationals resident in the UK during the period 2004–2010 **and**, for each, give **one** reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.

1 (b)(iii) **Trend two** description. Show appropriate calculations to support your answer. (3 marks)

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(iii)**

Points that might be made could include: (see corresponding examples with calculations below)

- major increase in the number of Polish, 2004–2010 (eg 1)
- decline in the numbers of Irish, 2004–2010 (2)
- steady increase in the numbers from India during the period (3)
- increase in the number from Pakistan, 2004–2009 (2010, overall) (4)
- from 2007 the greatest number of non-UK nationals in the UK are from Poland (5).

Any other valid points should be credited.

**Candidates are asked for two trends : max of 3 marks for each**

- 1 mark each for identifying a trend in up to two categories.
- 1 mark each for using figures to illustrate each of the two categories.
- 1 mark each for showing correctly a calculation to support each of the two identified trends: this could be shown as a percentage, an actual figure or a realistic approximation.

Candidates who ignore the fact that the figures are in ‘thousands’ are unlikely to score more than 1 mark because they would not have read the graph correctly

*Examples of responses might be:*

(1)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                        |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| – The total number of <b>Poles</b> went up rapidly from 2004 to 2010.                                                                                                                                  | (1 mark)  |
| – The total number of <b>Poles</b> went up rapidly from about 70 000 in 2004 to about 540 000 in 2010.                                                                                                 | (2 marks) |
| – The total number of <b>Poles</b> went up rapidly from about 70 000 in 2004 to about 540 000 in 2010, an increase of 470 000 (a percentage <u>increase</u> of 671.4286%, or rounded to 671.4%, 671%). | (3 marks) |

(2)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                               |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of <b>Irish</b> went down from 2004 to 2010.                                                                                                                               | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of <b>Irish</b> went down from about 380 000 in 2004 to about 330 000 in 2010.                                                                                             | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of <b>Irish</b> went down from about 380 000 in 2004 to about 330 000 in 2010, an increase of 50 000 (a percentage <u>decrease</u> of 13.16%, or rounded to -13.2%, -13%). | (3 marks) |

(3)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |           |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of <b>Indians</b> went up steadily from 2004 to 2010.                                                                                                                        | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of <b>Indians</b> went up steadily from about 195 000 in 2004 to about 320 000 in 2010.                                                                                      | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of <b>Indians</b> went up steadily from about 195 000 in 2004 to about 320 000 in 2010, an increase of 125 000 (a percentage increase of 64.103%, or rounded to 64.1%, 64%). | (3 marks) |

(4)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - The total number of <b>Pakistanis</b> went up from 2004 to 2009 (2010).                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             | (1 mark)  |
| - The total number of <b>Pakistanis</b> went up from about 90 000 in 2004 to about 190 000 in 2009 (about 160 000 in 2010).                                                                                                                                                                                           | (2 marks) |
| - The total number of <b>Pakistanis</b> went up from about 90 000 in 2004 to about 190 000 in 2009, an increase of 100 000 [a percentage <u>increase</u> of 111.11%, rounded to 111.1% or 111%]<br>(about 160 000 in 2010, an increase of 70 000 [a percentage <u>increase</u> of 77.778%, rounded to 77.8% or 78%]). | (3 marks) |

(5)

- |                                                                                                                                                                                          |           |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| - From 2007 onwards, the number of Poles exceeds any other group.                                                                                                                        | (1 mark)  |
| - In 2007 the number of Poles, at about 395 000, exceeded the next largest group (the Irish) at about 350 000.                                                                           | (2 marks) |
| - In 2007 the number of Poles, 395 000, exceeded the next largest group (the Irish) at 350 000, a difference of 45 000 (a percentage <u>difference</u> of 12.08% or 12.1% or about 12%). | (3 marks) |

**1 (b) Using the data in Source B, identify and describe two trends in the number of non-UK nationals resident in the UK during the period 2004–2010 and, for each, give one reason to explain why these trends might have occurred.**

**1 (b)(iv) Reason to explain Trend two. (2 marks)**

**Nb: This section of the mark scheme applies to questions 1(b)(ii) and 1(b)(iv)**

***Candidates are asked to explain each trend from 1(b)(i) and 1(b)(iii) : max of 2 marks for each***

- 1 mark for identifying a reason for each trend, such as the ones below
- a further mark for providing a suitable expansion for each trend.

Points that might be made could include:

- Polish workers have labour skills that Britain needs
- many Poles may be here for higher wages than in Poland
- Poles are considered to have a better work ethic which is welcomed by UK employers/businesses
- expansion of the EU has allowed free movement of Poles into the UK for a range of reasons
- slight decline in Irish migration due to strong Irish economy at the time the data was produced and alternative destinations for migration
- Britain has always had a shared relationship with Ireland over work and residency
- Indians have lived in Britain in relatively large numbers since the 1960s and so there is a history of migration
- there are significant Indian and Pakistani communities in Britain which encourage non-UK nationals to migrate and remain in the UK
- political uncertainty in Pakistan may have encouraged people to migrate to and remain in the UK.

Any other valid points should be credited.

**1 (c) Discuss the view that immigration enriches a country and makes it more vibrant.**

**(10 marks)**

In this question, candidates should use their own knowledge, but may refer to the data in the Sources to support their arguments. The question requires discussion and evaluation and this should be evident in order to reach Level 1.

Points that might be offered could include:

- immigrants often bring new/needed skills
- immigrants are often younger and their children will fill gaps in the labour market
- immigration may bring different cultural traditions, festivals and religious events
- wider range of food, music, entertainment and fashion
- conflict can occur where cultures clash
- segregation and extremism may undermine social order
- immigration may improve tolerance through understanding and exposure
- immigrants often start new businesses and create jobs.

Any other valid responses should be credited.

To gain full marks for any point, a candidate would be expected to enter into a discussion explaining each of the points made.

**Level 1 (8 – 10 marks)**

- 3 or more points which show knowledge and understanding of the issues and which draw on specific examples **or** two well-made points and at least one other point with some exemplification may feature at the lower end of the mark range [AO1]
- Answers will show clear development, interpretation and analysis of the points made and come to conclusions [AO2]
- Discussion of the views held by different groups is likely to be evident [AO3]
- Communication will be clear and accurate [AO4].

To reach Level 1 a candidate would be expected to show some understanding of both sides of the question.

**Level 2 (4 – 7 marks)**

- At least 2 suggestions which show development, knowledge and understanding are competently made with some exemplification [AO1]
- There will be some development, interpretation and analysis of the points made [AO2]
- A discussion of the views held by different groups may be evident but not be well developed [AO3]
- Arguments should be clear and any errors in the language used are unlikely to impair communication [AO4].

A candidate who addresses more than two points without development or analysis may feature at the lower end of this mark range.

**Level 3 (1 – 3 marks)**

- A single point or a list of undeveloped points showing limited knowledge and understanding [AO1]
- Exemplification and development of points may be weak and analysis may be limited or not present [AO2]
- There is unlikely to be any discussion of the views held by different groups [AO3]
- There may be errors in communication or the response may be list-like and it may be brief [AO4].

**(0)** No relevant information.

**(–)** No response.

*Bullet-pointed answers are unlikely to progress beyond the lower end of Level 2, as they are unlikely to include discussion of the issues.*

**2 (a) Argue in favour of the view that it is better that forests and woodlands are the responsibility of government bodies such as the Forestry Commission (Source C).**

**(10 marks)**

**Nb:** This answer requires a one-sided argument in favour of the statement.

Points that might be offered could include:

- they are already state owned and the Forestry Commission has been very successful so far
- income from profits is ploughed back into the land
- public access is guaranteed and enshrined
- the Forestry Commission takes a long-term view, not a quick profit one
- such organisations have considerable expertise
- they are single-issue/business organisations
- they are not subject to the whims of directors or shareholders.

Any other valid responses should be credited.

**Level 1 (8 – 10 marks)**

- At least 3 points well made that show an awareness of the issues and draw on specific examples, which may include the source
- Two well-made points and at least one other point with some exemplification may feature at the lower end of the mark range.
- Answers will show clear development of the points made and discussion of the issues.

**Level 2 (4 – 7 marks)**

- At least 2 points are competently made with some exemplification
- Specific examples may include the source
- A candidate who addresses more than two points without expansion or examples may feature at the lower end.

**Level 3 (1 – 3 marks)**

- One well-developed point or a list of undeveloped points
- Exemplification may be weak
- It may be totally or heavily reliant on the source.

**(0)** No relevant information.

**(–)** No response.

*Bullet-pointed answers are unlikely to progress beyond the lower end of Level 2, as they are unlikely to include discussion of the issues.*

**2 (b) Argue in favour of the view that private ownership of land is a better way to manage rural land (Source D).**

**(10 marks)**

**Nb:** This answer requires a one-sided argument in favour of the statement.

Points that might be offered could include:

- government ownership and management could be a drain on taxpayers' money
- small-scale management might be more effective
- owners could restrict access to protect farming, flora and fauna from hikers, cyclists and others
- government bodies might not be in touch with local conditions
- the land may have been managed well for generations by the same family
- private ownership could increase land profitability.

Any other valid responses should be credited.

**Level 1 (8 – 10 marks)**

- At least 3 points well made that show an awareness of the issues and draw on specific examples, which may include the source
- Two well-made points and at least one other point with some exemplification may feature at the lower end of the mark range
- Answers will show clear development of the points made and discussion of the issues.

**Level 2 (4 – 7 marks)**

- At least 2 points are competently made with some exemplification
- Specific examples may include the source
- A candidate who addresses more than two points without expansion or examples may feature at the lower end.

**Level 3 (1 – 3 marks)**

- One well-developed point or a range of undeveloped points
- Exemplification may be weak
- It may be totally or heavily reliant on the source.

**(0)** No relevant information.

**(–)** No response.

*Bullet-pointed answers are unlikely to progress beyond the lower end of Level 2, as they are unlikely to include discussion of the issues.*

**2 (c) Discuss the view that people should have the right to roam over all open land.**  
**(10 marks)**

It is anticipated that candidates will make an attempt to present a balanced argument that discusses the relative merits of the two sides of the debate.

Points that might be offered could include:

- a limited 'right to roam' bill already exists in England/Wales; however, in Scotland there are extended rights which work well
- people regard it as a basic freedom
- open land is often not farmed/cultivated
- access to the countryside can help educate people about rural issues
- it would prevent arbitrary restrictions being imposed
- people who own land should have a right to keep it for themselves
- crops/animals could get damaged/harmed/frightened
- what looks like open land may, in fact, be a field of crops
- all people should be able to enjoy the countryside.

Any other valid responses should be credited.

The question requires discussion and this should be evident to reach Level 1.

**Level 1 (8 – 10 marks)**

- At least 3 points well made that show an awareness of the issues and draw on specific examples, which may include the source
- Two well-made points and at least one other point with some exemplification may feature at the lower end of the mark range
- Answers will show clear development of the points made and discussion of the issues.

**Level 2 (4 – 7 marks)**

- At least 2 points are competently made with some exemplification
- Specific examples may include the source
- A candidate who addresses more than two points without expansion or examples may feature at the lower end.

**Level 3 (1 – 3 marks)**

- One well-developed point or a list of undeveloped points
- Exemplification may be weak
- It may be totally or heavily reliant on the source.

**(0)** No relevant information.

**(–)** No response.

*Bullet-pointed answers are unlikely to progress beyond the lower end of Level 2, as they are unlikely to include discussion of the issues.*

**3 (a) Why might some people argue that politicians are not really committed to dealing with green issues?**

**(15 marks)**

Candidates might offer such points as the ones listed below, hopefully with examples to support their arguments. The points listed below are merely illustrative.

- environmental policies are often expensive to implement
- politicians are often influenced by business interests
- politicians do not always accept the advice of experts
- pressure groups are seen to be performing that role
- there may not always be votes in green politics
- green issues are not given a high priority in schools
- other issues may take priority over green issues.

Any other valid responses should be credited.

**Level 1 (12 – 15 marks)**

- A good response showing awareness of the issues, commenting on a range of points related to the source material and perhaps moving beyond that by introducing additional ideas [AO1]
- Examples from beyond the source that illustrate the central issues and their relative importance [AO2]
- An awareness of why some people believe that the issues raised are important; an understanding of relative positions and why these positions are held [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate and the argument is well structured [AO4].

**Level 2 (5 – 11 marks)**

- A competent response showing some awareness of a range of points, perhaps touching on points not offered in the source but giving suitable ideas to support the arguments [AO1]
- Examples may focus on the source only and there may be some reference to reasons why the arguments have validity [AO2]
- References may be made to the positions held by different groups but answers are unlikely to explain why different groups hold different positions [AO3]
- There are errors in the language used, but they do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

**Level 3 (1 – 4 marks)**

- A limited response that shows little awareness of the issues surrounding the subject and almost certainly relying heavily on the source [AO1]
- Reasons are likely to be anecdotal/list-like with little development or are confined to the source [AO2]
- There is little or no understanding of the reasons why some groups may hold different positions [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

**(0)** No relevant information.

**(–)** No response.

**3 (b) Why might some argue that educating people about green issues is crucial to dealing with environmental problems?**

**(15 marks)**

Candidates might offer such points as the ones listed below, hopefully with examples to support their arguments. The points listed below are merely illustrative.

- we have a responsibility to the whole planet
- knowledge about green issues enables us to make better choices about our impact on the environment
- education of individuals means they can put pressure on decision makers
- education can encourage debate
- learning about the issues might encourage people to join environmental pressure groups
- politicians and “experts” do not always tell the whole truth because they have their own motives.

Any other valid responses should be credited.

**Level 1 (12 – 15 marks)**

- A good response showing awareness of the issues, commenting on a range of points related to the source material and perhaps moving beyond that by introducing additional ideas [AO1]
- Examples from beyond the source that illustrate the central issues and their relative importance [AO2]
- An appreciation of why some people believe that the issues raised are important; an understanding of relevant positions and why these positions are held [AO3]
- Communication is clear, accurate and the argument is well structured [AO4].

**Level 2 (5 – 11 marks)**

- A competent response showing some awareness of a range of points, perhaps touching on points not offered in the source but giving suitable ideas to support the arguments [AO1]
- Examples may focus on the source only and there may be some reference to reasons why the arguments have validity [AO2]
- References may be made to the positions held by different groups but answers are unlikely to explain why different groups hold different positions [AO3]
- There are errors in the language used, but they do not impair communication; the response has some structure [AO4].

**Level 3 (1 – 4 marks)**

- A limited response that shows little awareness of the issues surrounding the subject and almost certainly relying heavily on the source [AO1]
- Reasons are likely to be anecdotal/list-like with little development or are confined to the source [AO2]
- There is little or no understanding of the reasons why some groups may hold different positions [AO3]
- Errors of language begin to impair communication; there is little structure in the response and it may be brief [AO4].

**(0)** No relevant information.

**(–)** No response.