



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

## Social Science: Citizenship

### Unit SSC3

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## CRITERIA FOR MARKING

### Introduction

The AQA's revised Social Science: Citizenship specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the "levels of response" type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Citizenship. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. All valid responses will be given credit. Candidates who appropriately refer to European and global dimensions of citizenship will also be given credit.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principals of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

### Using a "levels of response" mark scheme

Good examining is about the application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Citizenship which in part rely upon analyses, evaluation, arguments and explanations. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is what precise mark should be given within a level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:-

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>1 (a)</b>	<i>Explain <b>two</b> reasons why the Cefn Croes group is opposed to further wind turbine developments in their area.</i> <b>(4 marks)</b>		
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers in this band present two appropriate reasons why the Cefn Croes group is opposed to further wind turbine developments in their area. These could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are already many such developments in mid-Wales;</li> <li>• The planned site is in a designated environmentally sensitive area;</li> </ul> <p>The planned development is close to a special scientific interest site.</p>		
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers in this band present an appropriate reason.</p>		

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>1 (b)</b>	<i>Briefly examine some of the tactics which the Cefn Croes group could use to gain media coverage in support of their campaign.</i> <b>(10 marks)</b>		
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>(4 marks)</b> A good range of likely ways to gain media coverage are identified in some depth and detail. These might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• press visits to the area highlighting the natural beauty of the landscape;</li> <li>• use of supportive journalists;</li> <li>• press releases containing ‘good news’ stories;</li> <li>• training of community activists in media presentation;</li> <li>• direct action tactics to raise the media profile of their campaign.</li> </ul> <p>Answers may draw on examples and evidence of media coverage of similar issues.</p>	<p><b>(4 marks)</b> There is an explicit analysis of ways to gain media coverage. This analysis may be based on an appreciation of ‘news values’, the role of journalists as ‘gatekeepers,’ etc. or through a recognition of the approaches taken by different forms of media. Answers explicitly evaluate the potential usefulness of these methods.</p>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b>  Answers are characterised by excellent grammar and expression. There are very few errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed and evidence is presented in fluent English utilising a wide conceptual vocabulary appropriate to the study of citizenship. Identification of ways different types of media could cover this issue might figure in answers at this level.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>(2-3 marks)</b> A fair range of likely ways to gain media coverage identified, possibly including some drawn from the list in Level 3 (above). The methods identified are supported in some cases by examples and evidence, which may not always be well-applied.</p>	<p><b>(2-3 marks)</b> There is a sound analysis of ways to gain media coverage. Answers present a limited evaluation of the potential usefulness of these methods.</p>	

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
<b>1 (b) (cont'd)</b>	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>(1 mark)</b> Answers outline a few likely ways to gain media coverage. These are weakly supported through limited reference to examples or evidence.	<b>(1 mark)</b> There is a limited examination of ways to gain media coverage. Evaluation of the usefulness of these methods is limited or non-existent.	<b>(1 mark)</b> Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are presented using a reasonable conceptual vocabulary. These are developed with some reference to evidence usually appropriate to the study of Citizenship.

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>1 (c)</b>	<i>Assess how far it might be possible to reach a solution that satisfies both the Cefn Croes group and the British Wind Association</i> <b>(16 marks)</b>		
<b>Level 3</b>	<b>(5-6 marks)</b> Answers identify a broad range of arguments drawn from Sources A and B. The likely areas of agreement and disagreement are highlighted and answers suggest some potential solutions. Reference may be made to examples of similar issues with which the candidate is familiar, drawing comparisons with the Plynlimon situation.	<b>(5-6 marks)</b> The differences between the views expressed in each Source are clearly drawn out in an appropriate analytical framework. Evaluation is likely to take the form of noting the different bases of the arguments in each source, and there is an explicit judgement of the extent to which they could be reconciled.	<b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers are characterised by excellent grammar and expression. There are very few errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed and evidence is presented in fluent English utilising a wide conceptual vocabulary appropriate to the study of Citizenship. Identification of ways different types of media could cover this issue might figure in answers at this level.
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers identify some of the arguments drawn from Sources A and B. A more limited range of some of the likely areas of agreement and disagreement are highlighted and answers suggest one or two potential solutions.	<b>(3-4 marks)</b> Some differences between the views expressed in each Source are drawn out in an appropriate analytical framework. Evaluation is likely to take the form of stating the notion that the points of view in each Source are essentially irreconcilable, but without fully developing why this is the case.	
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers identify a very limited range of arguments drawn from Sources A and B or possibly only one of these sources. These tend to be described and there is little or no appreciation of the likely areas of agreement and disagreement.	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> A limited range of differences between the views expressed in each Source are indicated but with limited development. Evaluation is likely to be limited or non-existent.	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are presented using a reasonable conceptual vocabulary. These are developed with some reference to evidence usually appropriate to the study of Citizenship.

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>2 (a)</b>	<i>Examine some of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. (10 marks)</i>		
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a good depth of knowledge and understanding of some of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. There is reference to a range of ways in which the media may be biased such as the processes of labelling and stereotyping, language, selection of issues, images, etc. Answers may focus in some depth on a few of these ways, or identify a wider range in less detail. Examples and evidence used are accurate and relevant.</p>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by detailed and explicit analysis and explanation of some of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. Answers have a clear rationale and analytical structure. This may take the form of an examination of the concepts of labelling, stereotyping, agenda-setting etc., applying examples or applying relevant case studies.</p>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b>  Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed using a reasonable conceptual vocabulary and there is some reference to evidence relating to and appropriate to the study of Citizenship.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a reasonable depth of knowledge and understanding of some of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. Answers may refer to a more limited range of ways in which the media may be biased. Examples and evidence used are broadly accurate and relevant.</p>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a sound analysis and explanation of some of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. Answers have some analytical structure although some elements may not be well-linked to the question.</p>	

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
<b>2(a) (cont'd)</b>	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>(1 mark)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a limited knowledge and understanding of some of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. There is little understanding of the processes and answers tend to be very descriptive. Answers are likely to rely on commonsense knowledge and understanding and lack depth or breadth of relevant knowledge.</p>	<p><b>(1 mark)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a partial analysis and explanation of one or two of the ways in which the content of the mass media may be biased. Answers lack analytical structure or may contain elements that are of little relevance to the question.</p>	<p><b>(1 mark)</b> Answers are characterised by generally poor grammar and expression. There are frequent errors of spelling and punctuation. Although some arguments may be presented, there is little or no evidence of a conceptual vocabulary. There is minimal evidence with points often being unconnected resulting in little attempt to address the question.</p>



	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>2 (b)</b>	<i>Assess the extent of differences in life chances between different social groups.</i> <b>(20 marks)</b>		
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>(6-8 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a good depth of knowledge and understanding of the range of differences in life chances between different social groups. Reference may be made to differences in health, education, and employment opportunities in relation to gender, social class, ethnicity, disability or age. Coverage of these differences and of the processes that create them is supported by appropriate evidence and relevant examples. Answers may focus on a limited range of differences in life chances in detail or offer a broader range in less depth.</p>	<p><b>(6-8 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by detailed explanation, analysis and evaluation of a range of differences in life chances between different social groups. Evaluation is explicit, possibly through an informed estimate of the extent of differences or through a recognition that the extent of differences in life chances varies between social groups.</p>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers are characterised by excellent grammar and expression. There are very few, if any, errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed and evidence is presented in fluent English utilising a wide conceptual vocabulary appropriate to the study of Citizenship.</p>

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
<b>2 (b) (cont'd)</b>	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>(3-5 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a reasonable knowledge and understanding of the range of differences in life chances between different social groups. Evidence presented is broadly relevant and generally accurate although examples and evidence may not always be well-linked to the question.	<b>(3-5 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a reasonable explanation, analysis and evaluation of a range of differences in life chances between different social groups. This is less explicit and probably takes the form of a limited range of examples of differences in life chances. Answers tend to describe rather than apply examples and evidence although these have some links to the question.	<b>(2 marks)</b> Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are presented using a reasonable conceptual vocabulary. These are developed with some reference to evidence usually related and appropriate to the study of Citizenship.
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers demonstrate a limited knowledge of one or two ways of differences in life chances between different social groups. These are described in a simplistic or inaccurate fashion. Evidence tends to be drawn from commonsense and examples are weakly applied to the question or poorly described.	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a limited explanation, analysis and evaluation of the range of differences in life chances between different social groups. Examples and evidence are commonsensical and poorly applied to the question.	<b>(1 mark)</b> Answers are characterised by generally poor grammar and expression. There are frequent errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are presented with little reference to a conceptual vocabulary. Evidence is limited and not well applied to the question.

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>3 (a)</b>	<i>Briefly examine some of the effects of poverty on individuals and families. (10 marks)</i>		
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a good depth of knowledge and understanding of some of the effects of poverty on individuals and families. Answers may draw on issues relating to the effects of poverty such as impact on schooling, employment opportunities, welfare, health, etc. Answers may focus in some depth on a few of these effects or identify a wider range in less detail. Evidence and examples used are accurate and relevant.</p>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a detailed, explicit examination of some of the effects of poverty on individuals and families. Answers have a clear rationale and analytical structure. This may take the form of identifying the links between different consequences or through identifying the likely impact of these consequences.</p>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b>  Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed using a reasonable conceptual vocabulary and there is some reference to evidence relating to, and appropriate to, the study of Citizenship.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a reasonable depth of knowledge and understanding of some of the effects of poverty on individuals and families. Examples and evidence used are broadly accurate although their relevance may not always be made explicit.</p>	<p><b>(2 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a sound examination of some of the effects of poverty on individuals and families. Answers have some analytical structure although some elements may not be well-linked to the question.</p>	

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
<b>3 (a) (cont'd)</b>	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>(1 mark)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of some of the effect of poverty on individuals and families. Answers are likely to rely on common-sense knowledge or they may lack depth or breadth of relevant knowledge.</p>	<p><b>(1 mark)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a partial and, in places, possibly inaccurate presentation of some of the effects of poverty on individuals. Answers lack any analytical structure or may contain elements that are of little relevance to the question.</p>	<p><b>(1 mark)</b> Answers are characterised by generally poor grammar and expression. There are frequent errors of spelling and punctuation. Although some arguments may be presented, there is little or no evidence of a conceptual vocabulary. There is minimal evidence with points often being unconnected resulting in little attempt to address the question.</p>

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>3 (b)</b>	<i>Assess the ways in which governments can attempt to reduce discrimination against particular social groups.</i> <b>(20 marks)</b>		
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>(6-8 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a good depth of knowledge and understanding of a range of ways in which governments can attempt to reduce discrimination against particular social groups. Reference may be made to aspects of anti-discrimination legislation, education, policing, the criminal justice system and other policies relating to gender, ethnicity, age, disability or other bases of discrimination. Answers examine their impact on discriminatory practices relating to employment, health, social inclusion, etc. This may take the form of a broad approach with limited depth or one that examines a narrower range of issues in greater detail. The evidence and examples presented are relevant and accurate.</p>	<p><b>(6-8 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a detailed, explicit analysis of the possible ways in which governments can attempt to reduce discrimination against particular social groups. Answers have a clear rationale and analytical structure. There is an explicit assessment of the likely impact of government policies.</p>	<p><b>(3-4 marks)</b> Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed and evidence is presented in fluent English utilising a wide conceptual vocabulary appropriate to the study of Citizenship.</p>

	<b>Assessment Objective AO1</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO2</b>	<b>Assessment Objective AO3</b>
<b>3 (b) (cont'd)</b>	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Analysis and Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	<b>(3-5 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate a reasonable depth of knowledge and understanding of ways in which governments can attempt to reduce discrimination against particular social groups. There is some, if limited, focus on the impact of policies. Examples and evidence used are broadly accurate although their relevance may not always be made explicit.	<b>(3-5 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a sound examination of some of the ways in which governments can attempt to reduce discrimination against particular social groups. Answers have some analytical structure although some elements may not be well-linked to the question. There is some, if limited, focus on assessing the impact of government policies.	<b>(2 marks)</b> Answers are characterised by reasonably good grammar and expression. There are occasional errors of spelling and punctuation. Arguments are developed using a reasonable conceptual vocabulary and there is some reference to evidence relating to, and appropriate to, the study of Citizenship.
<b>Level 1</b>	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers in this band demonstrate limited knowledge and understanding of appropriate government policies. There is little or no consideration of the impact these may have had. Answers are likely to rely on commonsense knowledge or they may lack depth or breadth of relevant knowledge.	<b>(1-2 marks)</b> Answers in this band are characterised by a partial and, in places, possibly inaccurate analysis of the ways in which governments can attempt to reduce discrimination against particular social groups. Answers lack any analytical structure or may contain elements that are of little relevance to the question. There is little or no focus on assessing the impact of government policies.	<b>(1 mark)</b> Answers are characterised by generally poor grammar and expression. There are frequent errors of spelling and punctuation. Although some arguments may be presented, there is little or no evidence of a conceptual vocabulary. There is minimal evidence with points often being unconnected resulting in little attempt to address the question.