



# Humanities

## GCE HUMANITIES

### CANDIDATE STYLE ANSWERS

### G101 – UNIT 1: HUMAN SOCIETY AND THE NATURAL WORLD

VERSION 1 JULY 2012

# INDEX

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Question 1 (a)</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Question 1 (b)</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Question 1 (c)</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Question 2 (a)</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Question 2 (b)</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Question 2 (c)</b>	<b>41</b>

# INTRODUCTION

These support materials are intended to support teachers in their marking. There are three candidate style responses with accompanying commentary. These exemplars are based on the published Specimen Assessment Materials (SAMs), which can be downloaded from the relevant OCR webpage for the specification.

The exemplars and commentaries should be read alongside the specification which is available from the website.

OCR will update these materials as appropriate.

Centres may wish to use these support materials in a number of ways:

- teacher training in interpretation of the marking criteria
- departmental standardisation meetings
- exemplars for candidates to review.

**QUESTION 1 (a)**

Using Source A and your own knowledge, describe what impact the adoption of the Cancún agreement would have on the lifestyles of individuals in the affluent developed world.

**[5]**

**Source A:** 20th December 2010 – UN climate change chief urges nations to act on Cancún agreements.

The agreements reached at the conference, which concluded in the Mexican city of Cancún on 11 December, include formalizing mitigation pledges\* and ensuring increased accountability for them, as well as taking concrete action to tackle deforestation, which accounts for nearly one-fifth of global carbon emissions.

If all these targets and actions are fully implemented, UN estimates show they could deliver only 60 per cent of the emission reductions that science says will be needed to stay below the agreed two degree rise in average temperatures, and two degrees does not guarantee the survival of the most vulnerable peoples.

“All countries, but particularly industrialized nations, need to deepen their emission reduction efforts and to do so quickly,” said United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres.

UN News Centre 2010

*\*mitigation pledges: promises to reduce or offset carbon emissions*

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p><b>AO1 5 marks</b> <b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• even if emissions are cut, most vulnerable may not survive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Own Knowledge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• impacts on lifestyle of developed countries.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4 (5 marks)</b> Relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge demonstrated. Thorough description with excellent detail.</p> <p>Candidate demonstrates an awareness that implementation would inevitably mean that standards of living in the developed world would have to decline without necessarily guaranteeing the survival of the most vulnerable people.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> Sound knowledge base with convincing description supported by some evidence.</p> <p>Candidate clearly understands that implementation would have major impacts on lifestyle for the developed world. Descriptions are general and lack specific details.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Some basic knowledge leading to limited and/or partial description. e.g. The affluent world would have to reduce their consumption/their standard of living could fall.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Little knowledge presented in a vague way. e.g. Life would change/get worse/no attempt to describe how or why.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant material.</p>	[5]	

## EXEMPLAR AND COMMENTARY

## CANDIDATE A

Many members in the affluent developed world live a highly privileged and convenient life. Many do not realise this, and so do not understand the implications of the Cancun agreement. The reductions in deforestation would not allow the average man to buy a Brazilian wooden bedframe, or a luxury toothpick. Although, initially, this seems harsh, the benefits are great. The carbon emissions of the earth would decrease, which ultimately assists in preserving our precious planet. Despite some individuals in the affluent developed world may feel aggrieved to learn that they no longer have access to ~~the~~ fine-grained Amazonian wooden floor, the bigger picture is more important.

## COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE A

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 2: 2 marks.

The candidate has included some basic knowledge, but the answer does not fully address the 'impacts' that the Cancun Agreement could have on the affluent developed world. Instead it focuses solely on the impacts that deforestation would have "on the average man" not being able to source particular products/goods e.g. "to buy a Brazilian wooden bed-frame, or a luxury toothpick".

To improve the candidate must fully tackle the term 'impacts' in the question. This can be achieved by referring to the methods MEDC's use to reduce carbon emissions. The candidate needs to draw on knowledge and examples of mitigation strategies from G101 Unit 4 regarding carbon footprints, sustainable living, recycling, food miles, consumerism, saving energy and alternative uses of energy.

The question requires the candidate to 'use Source A'. Evidence from Source A has not been used to support the answer. The candidate needs to quote directly from the source: i.e. source A states there is a need for "action to tackle deforestation, which accounts for 1/5th of global carbon emissions" this may lead to..... .

Conclusions need to be drawn from Source A. Reference needs to be made to the 'survival of the most vulnerable peoples'. Who are these people and why would reducing carbon emissions in the developed world not necessarily guarantee their survival? The candidate could make reference to people living and working in the Amazonian rainforest, and the implications on their standards of living if deforestation is reduced. Or, the candidate could refer to the fact that even if affluent countries do fully implement the targets set, it would only reduce them by 60%– so vulnerable people would still remain vulnerable.

## CANDIDATE B

Enforcing actions set out by the Cancun agreements would cause various lifestyle changes for the affluent. For example, "taking concrete action to tackle deforestation" would result in higher pressures to recycle goods and materials such as paper, to help restore habitats and limit environmental abuse. Furthermore, such "mitigation pledges" would primarily include transport via car, <sup>food miles</sup> air miles (~~with~~ ecological footprint), needing to be reduced. Car sharing, public transport systems such as hydrogen fuelled buses, and buying local produce from farmers markets all reduce carbon emissions, thus aiding the only "60% reduction" to help keep temperatures sensible. In day to day habits, turning off lights when you're not in the room, or switching off plugs all help conserve energy. Using energy saving light bulbs and investing in loft/wall insulation reduces heat loss and decreases the energy supply requirement to your home, which is supplied by power stations / factories releasing the CO<sub>2</sub> pollutant. Moreover, for the affluent, manageable expensive schemes such as investment into solar panels, and infrastructural designs providing natural shading, are all eco-friendly methods to provide energy ('zero-impact schemes').

To conclude, many aspects of lifestyle would need to be altered in terms of transport, food, infrastructure and daily habits, in order to "deepen emission reduction effects", and "to do so more quickly".

### COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE B

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 4: 5 marks.

The candidate has reached relevant conclusions from the source that “many aspects of lifestyle would need to be altered” in the affluent developed world. The use of a final conclusion to the answer provides a good structure and summary to the answer. Although, the candidate could have stated that despite these changes in the affluent world, it would still mean that the most vulnerable people, remained vulnerable.

The candidate has fully used Source A as evidence to support their knowledge throughout the answer: “taking concrete action to tackle deforestation” would result in higher pressures to recycle goods and materials such as paper, to help restore habitats and reduce environmental abuse” and such “mitigation pledges” would primarily include transport via car, food miles, air miles (ecological footprint), needing to be reduced.”

The candidate has demonstrated excellent, accurate knowledge and understanding of methods to reduce carbon emissions in the developed world from themes 3 and 4 of G101.

**CANDIDATE C**

1a) It is my belief that if the Cancun Agreement was adopted it would not solve the main problem of carbon emissions. What it would do is make the governments of the very industrialised nations, responsible for most of the world's carbon emissions, look as though they were doing something to stop climate change.

It would also cause the 'usual' standards of living to drop in those industrialised nations, as we would not be able to do all the things we take for granted, such as driving a car. What would happen is that the standard of living would fall for next to no change in the outcome. Source A supports this by stating, "UN estimates show that they could deliver only 60% of the carbon emissions reductions" which shows that maximum change cannot be achieved and people in vulnerable areas still may not be saved, for all that sacrifice.

**COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE C**

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 3: 3 marks.

The candidate has made relevant conclusions to answer the question, but needs to develop their explanations, exemplification and reasoning for those conclusions in order to reach Level 4 of the mark scheme.

The candidate has clearly understood that the implementation of the targets from the Cancun Agreement would have impacts on the lifestyles of the developed world: "it would also cause the "usual" standards of living to drop in those industrialised nations, as we would not be able to do all the things that we take for granted, such as driving a car".

However, there is little exemplification of mitigation strategies that individuals in developed countries would use to reduce these carbon emissions e.g. recycle, reuse, save energy schemes, use renewable energy, improve public transport, guerrilla gardening, reduce food/air miles etc.

The candidate has used and quoted from Source A as evidence to support their answer: "Source A supports this by stating..."; this also needs to be supported by examples from the candidate's own knowledge from themes 3 and 4 of G101.

**QUESTION 1 (b)**

Use Source B and your own knowledge to explain to what extent you agree or disagree with the view expressed in the source, that the issue of population growth may not be as big an environmental challenge as has been predicted.

**[10]****Source B:** Global Population Predictions

At the beginning of the 21st century the earth's population was 6 billion. Up to this time population forecasters were estimating that the population by 2050 would be between 9 and 12 billion.

The calculation was based on the long held view that for each succeeding generation the population had doubled. The rate of population growth during the 20th century, from 1.6 to 6 billion, seemed to provide a sound basis for the prediction.

The United Nations reviews population growth every two years. In 1996 it found that the annual growth rate, from a peak of 2.2% in 1968, was now clearly in decline. This led to a revised estimate that the earth's population by 2050 would be no more than 9 billion.

In the 2002 "Global Population Profile" the annual rate of growth was shown to have dropped to 1.2%. A new estimate predicted a maximum earth population of 7.5 billion by 2050.

Earth's annual population increase at the beginning of the 21st century has slipped to 60 million per year. If this rate continues zero population growth would be attained by 2029 with a global population of no more than 6.9 billion.

However, if the reducing annual rate should drop even more quickly, as is likely, then a maximum population for the earth would be no more than 6.64 billion by 2029.

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(b)	<p><b>AO1 4 marks; AO2 6 marks</b> <b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Source B</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Received view that population doubling every generation.</li> <li>• Predicted to continue.</li> <li>• This prediction now in doubt.</li> <li>• New prediction for 2050.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4 (7–10 marks)</b> Relevant accurate and detailed knowledge demonstrated. Thorough explanations with extensive detail. Discriminating analysis and interpretation of the source with sound evaluation leading to thorough explanations.</p> <p>A detailed explanation of the received wisdom regarding global population predictions. Clear analysis and interpretation of the source to identify the recent evidence that the source suggests are increasingly putting the received view under question. Uses detailed evidence extracted from the source. Good analysis and interpretation of the source leading to a thorough evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the claims. Provides detailed support for agreement and/or disagreement with the thesis the source is advancing.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (4–6 marks)</b> Sound knowledge base with convincing explanations supported by evidence. Sound interpretation and analysis with a sound attempt at evaluation.</p> <p>A convincing explanation of the received wisdom regarding global population predictions supported by evidence. Sound interpretation of the source with a sound attempt to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the claims. Provides support for agreement and/or disagreement of the thesis the source is advancing which is lacking in detail. Max 5 marks if omits explanation of agree/disagree discussion.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2–3 marks)</b> Some basic knowledge leading to limited and/or partial explanation. Limited analysis and interpretation of sources leading to limited evaluation.</p>	[10]	

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(b)	<p>A limited or partial explanation of the received wisdom regarding global population predictions supported by some evidence. Limited interpretation of the source with a little attempt to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the claims. Agreement or disagreement supported with limited attempt to provide evidence. May omit either explanation of agree/disagree discussion.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Little knowledge presented in a vague way. An attempt at analysis and interpretation with very limited evaluation.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant material.</p>		

## EXEMPLAR AND COMMENTARY

## CANDIDATE A

I completely disagree with the source, as it states in conclusion that the earth's population would be no greater than 6.64 billion by 2029, and recently, in 2011, the 7 billionth human was born, thus voiding the argument made by source B.

~~At~~ However, the argument could be considered, as many nations are taking action against uncontrollable population growth, in particular China (the largest <sup>natal</sup> population on earth), where they've limited families to only have one child (but what if they have twins? something to think about).

However, in this day and age, rapid population growth is unavoidable. With modern technological advances such as the powerplate and Reebok EasyTones, ~~women~~ women can easily tone up and look fabulous, thus enhancing their courtship attraction, and inducing sporadic and spontaneous intercourse, which results in many ~~to~~ births.

Furthermore, with a degree being more sought after, graduate jobs are better paid and so people are able to support a child early on, so they have more.

To conclude, I disagree with the source, as I think population growth is a bigger problem, as by 2012 we will already have over 7 billion inhabitants.

### COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE A

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 2: 2 marks

The candidate has not used and quoted sufficient evidence from source B, other than briefly in the opening paragraph by writing: "greater than 6.64 billion by 2029". There has been no 'analysis' of the data from source B to support both an agree and disagree explanation. The Candidate needs to evaluate the data in the source noting the differences in the population growth figures, the predicted world population and the dates.

Although the candidate has written a lot of text, and there is evidence of a basic knowledge regarding the issues of population growth ("nations taking action against uncontrollable population growth", "technological advancement", "degrees being sought after"), the explanations of these issues are not always relevant to the answer and therefore do not meet the requirements of the markscheme; for example, "technological advances such as the powerplate and Reebok Easy Tones, women can easily tone up and look fabulous" is not creditworthy.

When interpreting the data the candidate should be drawing on their knowledge of the challenges population growth will place on the environment. This is not evident in the candidate's answer. Key ideas would include the increasing pressures on land use (balancing the need for more housing, services, infrastructure with the increased demands for food), technological advances (GM foods, Malthus vs Boserup theories), government policies to reduce population (Ante-natalist – China's one child policy, migration).

## CANDIDATE B

Source B shows "decline" in the global population increase (prediction) from 9.12 billion by 2050, to no more than 6.64 billion by 2029. For this reason, I agree that the population growth isn't as huge an environmental issue as predicted. This is because, in the past there have been so many technological advancements and so many ways humans have adapted to the everchanging environment, that even if there were issues with ~~past~~ population growth, human intelligence <sup>(adaptation)</sup> is exponential. An example would be huge irrigation schemes that have allowed growth of food where the population was too large to sustain due to dry/difficult conditions. Furthermore, GM crops are highly resistant to disease, so crops become more likely to survive. The source states that eventually, a "zero - population growth would be <sup>attained</sup> ~~obtained~~ by 2029". At the beginning of the 21st century it was 6 billion. This emphasizes the lack of growth, which is drastically <sup>over-taken</sup> ~~over-taken~~ by human adaptations, thus showing sustainability of the population.

In contrast to this, I disagree that population pressure is over-exaggerated. Due to the constant change in population predictions, this highlights the lack of certainty and stability of scientists findings, as well as showing how quickly the earth can change. This unpredictable & characteristic shouldn't be taken lightly, and stability promoting schemes e.g. Anti-natal policies like China's one child policy should not be completely ruled out. In ~~the~~ many developing countries, e.g. in Africa such as Ghana and Kenya, famine is common and thousands die from malnutrition. According to theories set out by ~~the~~ <sup>specialists</sup> like Malthus,

..population growth is threatening.. Human growth increases geometrically, which is supported by the source "population doubled for every succeeding generation". Contrary to this, food ~~is not~~ availability increases arithmetically (1, 2, 3...). A lack of food /unbalance in the world in terms of access can lead to famine, war and death. Additionally, increases in population inevitably puts pressure on naturally occurring resources, and even if the increase is slowing, high MEDC energy consumption means substances like coal and oil will run out quickly.

~~Conclusion~~ In conclusion, I agree that the issue of population growth is not as big as predicted. This is due to the extensive statistical evidence provided by the source, showing constant and clear reductions in the population growth. Humans are intelligent and adaptable, and are capable of overcoming challenges faced with any slight population increase (which is predicted to halt at 2029 anyway).

**COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE B**

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 4: 9 marks.

The candidate has written a clearly structured answer that is balanced in terms of providing an agree and disagree argument to answer the question. The personal conclusion at the end is a good summary, linking back to the question and providing a relevant explanation for the decision the candidate has made: "In conclusion, I agree that the issue of population growth is not as big as predicted. This is due to the extensive statistical evidence provided in the source..".

The candidate's opening statement "Source B shows 'decline' in the global population increase (prediction) from 9–12 billion by 2050, to no more than 6.64 billion by 2029" is an excellent example of interpretation, understanding and use of source evidence. The candidate continues to use source as evidence throughout their answer: "the source states that eventually a 'zero-population growth' would be attained", "At the beginning of the 21st century it was 6 billion", "human growth increases geometrically which is supported by the source 'population doubled for every succeeding generation'"

The candidate has an excellent knowledge and a thorough explanations of the issues population growth raises for the environment, referring to "technological advancements", "adaption", "irrigation schemes which have allowed growth of food", "GM crops are highly resistant to disease", "anti-natal policies", "famine", "Malthus theory", "pressures on naturally occurring resources" (oil, coal) and "sustainability of the population".

Analytical terms such as "contrary to this", "additionally", "furthermore", have been used to develop explanations and evaluate.

To gain the highest mark in Level 4, the candidate needs to say more about the nature of the sources, for instance the limitations of the data collected such as its accuracy.

## CANDIDATE C

1b) I disagree with the source as it is my view that population growth does present a big environmental challenge. Although I partially agree with source B as the long-held view, for each successive generation the population doubled, is wrong.

While source b states that “the growth rate of 2.2% is in decline”, I feel that there are two simple answers. One is that family sizes are smaller so there will be a decline in the number of new babies being born. Another reason is that parents now are having children much later than they used to so there is another reason for decline as there would be a big downward trend if surveys are taken every two years. A period of about four years for a survey would show a decline compared to other figures.

Modern medicine is also part of the problem as the advances made in medicine allow people to live for longer, so even if there is only a slight increase in population growth now, the advances made in medicine could enable people to live 10 or 15 years beyond what they would have done years ago. Therefore, if population growth i.e. new-born babies, is increasing and the developments in medicine are, as well, the population is going to grow much larger.

## COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE C

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 3: 4 marks.

The candidate has a clear introduction to their answer (which would also do as a final conclusion to the answer): “I disagree with the source as it is my view that population growth does present a big environmental challenge. Although I partially agree with source B as the long-held view, for each successive generation the population doubled, is wrong.”

The candidate has used limited evidence directly from the source to support their answer, only once quoting directly from the source: “the growth rate of 2.2% is in decline”. Quoted source evidence needs to be integrated within the answer to a greater extent.

The candidate is at the bottom of Level 3 in the mark scheme because the candidate has attempted a balanced answer by writing one paragraph of reasons for the reduction in population growth rates (“family sizes are smaller”, “parents having children much later”) and one paragraph that provides reasons for increase in population growth rates (“Advances in medicine allow people to live for longer”). However, though these explanations are relevant, they are not developed enough and do not draw on specific evidence from the source or the candidate’s own knowledge to extend to the upper limits of Level 3. An example of this would be “Another reason is that parents now are having children much later than they used to so there is another reason for decline as there would be a big downward trend if surveys are taken every two years. A period of about four years for a survey would show a decline compared to other figures.” The candidate is making an inference on the nature of the data (collected every two years) but does not explain or develop the point further.

**QUESTION 1 (c)**

Use your own knowledge to assess how far Sources A–C support the proposition that sustainable development is the only realistic way to address environmental challenges.

**[25]****Source C: Developing vs developed**

‘The United Nations Convention on Climate Change recognises that poorer nations have a right to economic development.....It acknowledges the vulnerability of poorer countries to the effects of climate change.’

The argument is simple and difficult to argue against. You cannot fairly stop developing countries from developing. Developed nations have created the problem and they should pay to sort it out, while agreeing developing nations can continue to develop. However because climate change affects the whole world, the whole world needs to tackle it. This is an argument that is difficult to argue against.

One possible solution to this disagreement might be a process of adaptation to climate change where everyone, developed and developing, uses environmentally friendly technologies.

These technologies are much more expensive which could unfairly hold back the development of poorer countries.

The Convention is clear on this problem. It says that countries which created the most greenhouse gases must take the lead to fight against them.

## GENERIC LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	A01 7 marks	A02 10 marks	A03 8 marks
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Apply knowledge and understanding to analyse, interpret and evaluate evidence in a range of forms from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Demonstrate independent research skills, using relevant methods from across the range of humanities and social sciences critically and appropriately to investigate unfamiliar issues, reach evidenced conclusions and communicate findings effectively.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wide range of relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge demonstrated.</li> <li>Thorough explanations with extensive detail.</li> </ul> <p><b>6–7 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough analysis and interpretation of a wide range of evidence.</li> <li>Thorough evaluation linked to thorough explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>8–10 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources competently deployed to support arguments.</li> <li>Valid conclusions reached, supported by evidence.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions accurately and coherently communicated.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar accurate; meaning is very clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>7–8 marks</b></p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate knowledge demonstrated, usually accurate and relevant.</li> <li>Adequate explanations, not highly detailed.</li> </ul> <p><b>4–5 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate analysis and interpretation of a range of evidence.</li> <li>Adequate attempt at evaluation linked to adequate explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>5–7 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources deployed adequately to support arguments.</li> <li>Conclusions generally valid, but not always supported by evidence.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions adequately communicated in a structured way.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar usually accurate and meaning generally clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>5–6 marks</b></p>

## GENERIC LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	AO1 7 marks	AO2 10 marks	AO3 8 marks
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Apply knowledge and understanding to analyse, interpret and evaluate evidence in a range of forms from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Demonstrate independent research skills, using relevant methods from across the range of humanities and social sciences critically and appropriately to investigate unfamiliar issues, reach evidenced conclusions and communicate findings effectively.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited, relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated.</li> <li>Limited or partial explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>2–3 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited analysis and interpretation of a limited range of evidence.</li> <li>Limited evaluation linked to partial explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>2–4 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some sources deployed relevantly to support arguments.</li> <li>Some valid conclusions, but limited and not closely related to evidence.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions broadly related to task, but some vagueness in communication.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar have some inaccuracies and meaning not always clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>3–4 marks</b></p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little knowledge demonstrated, not always relevant or accurate.</li> <li>Vague or largely incoherent explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate attempt at analysis and interpretation.</li> <li>Inadequate evaluation linked to vague or largely incoherent explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources only loosely related to arguments.</li> <li>Conclusions inadequately supported by evidence or asserted with no justification.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions largely unrelated to task and communication vague or largely incoherent.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar inaccurate and meaning obscured.</li> </ul> <p><b>1–2 marks</b></p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant material</li> </ul>

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	<p><b>AO1 7 marks; AO2 10 marks; AO3 8 marks</b></p> <p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Source A</b> supportive as it describes an agreement that seeks deeper and quicker emissions reductions.</p> <p><b>Source B</b> challenges conventional thinking on population predictions, one of the main drivers of rising emissions and climate change, provides a much more optimistic view which could be interpreted as an alternative.</p> <p><b>Source C</b> sees the development of LEDCs as a challenge to reducing emissions with the implication that developed nations need to increase their efforts to compensate for this.</p> <p><b>Own knowledge</b> Candidates might mention the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• natural carrying capacity of systems vs current and future human needs</li> <li>• need to balance current needs with intergenerational justice</li> <li>• moral implications of sustainability</li> <li>• the needs/rights of LEDCs</li> <li>• views of population growth different from those in Source B</li> <li>• specific methods e.g. emissions targets, recycling schemes, carbon footprints</li> <li>• need for specific targets to make policies implementable and measureable in impact</li> <li>• whether developing nations can develop sustainably without the high levels of environmental damage caused by 18th–20th century industrialisation in the developed world.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4</b> Points similar to the above are cogently argued, with detailed references to the sources plus examples from own knowledge which are highly relevant and support the points being made closely. Candidate comes to a clear conclusion on the degree of support offered by the sources, closely related to evidence.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Several points similar to the above are argued, with relevant references to the sources plus examples from own knowledge which support the points being made well. Candidate comes to a clear conclusion on the degree of support offered by the sources, based on evidence.</p>	[25]	

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(c)	<p><b>Level 2</b> Some points similar to the above are made, with some references to sources plus examples from own knowledge which are evaluated and related to the points being made in a limited way. Candidate comes to a conclusion on the degree of support offered by the sources but provides only limited evidence.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Few relevant points are made. Little evidence is offered in support. Sources are not used to support point. Conclusion is superficial, unclear or absent.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant material.</p>	[25]	

## EXEMPLAR AND COMMENTARY

### CANDIDATE A

I disagree that sustainable development is the only way to address environmental challenges, as this is not drastic enough and something extreme must be done to address the environmental challenge. One method could be to put in place laws about population growth, as the ever-growing population is one major cause of natural goods.

### COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE A

The mark awarded for this answer is 1      AO1 Level 1: 1 marks  
AO2 Level 0: 0 marks  
AO3 Level 0: 0 marks

The candidate did not finish this answer, so timing in the exam could be an issue. There are 80 possible marks to awarded in 90 mins. This allows for approximately 1 minute per mark and 10 minutes to read, interpret and make notes about the sources.

## CANDIDATE B

Sources A-C ~~are~~ express points that support and oppose sustainable development to be the only realistic way to address environmental challenges. For example, source A agrees as much emphasis is put onto "mitigation pledges," "tackling deforestation" and reducing "global carbon emissions". These all include using public transport, car sharing, buying local farmers products, and implementing ecofriendly schemes like wind turbines and solar panels. Furthermore, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change executive states a "need to deepen emission reduction quickly" ~~more~~ especially amongst MEDCs who are the highest consumers of around 85% of the world's fuel/resources. No alternative method is suggested, and consequences of not acting sustainably in the future are included; "two degrees does not guarantee the survival of the most vulnerable peoples". This further emphasizes sustainable action needs to be taken. ~~In~~ In addition, source C supports the statement as it mentions one possible solution to be "using environmentally friendly technologies". These include wind farms, geothermal energy, hydro-electric (dams) power, solar energy and tidal energy. Further emphasis is put on it being 'realistic', as any other method would cause conflict between LEDCs and MEDCs due to the divide in development. If development continues ~~at the same rate~~, LEDCs will be happy and willing to reinforce ~~any~~ international plans ~~for~~ regarding sustainability as they're not falling behind. Also, it's a global problem so sustainability <sup>is development</sup> is the only option <sup>or</sup> wide-scale enough to handle a global <sup>issue</sup>.

~~for~~ On the other hand, source B disagrees with the statement. It

states a decrease in population growth, suggesting that environmental impacts will also inevitably reduce as part of a natural and automatic process. Many statistical facts are included as evidence for the decline showing concrete calculations have been carried out to support the point. Furthermore, source C states that sustainable development involves expensive technologies that "poorer countries" cannot afford, so the technologies aren't the most manageable methods of tackling environmental issues.

To conclude, ~~the majority of the~~ A and C (partially) agree, and B objectively yet indirectly disagrees that sustainable development is the most realistic method. Sources A and C state and make emphasis that developed countries should put more effort than those who are less affluent, as we're more to blame (~~the~~ more contribution to CO<sub>2</sub> emissions). Source B states more of a natural decrease in population growth, suggesting ~~that~~ a lack of sustainable methods are needed.



**CANDIDATE C**

1c) Source A is very supportive of the statement as it states that “if all these targets...estimates show they could only deliver 60% of carbon emissions reductions that science says...” From this we can understand that source A infers that environmental challenges can only be addressed if these targets are met, and then new targets can be set. This shows that source A suggests sustainable development is the only realistic way forward.

Source B does not agree with the statement as this source believes that “a maximum population for the Earth would be no more than 6.64 billion by 2029.” Bearing in mind that large population rises are the basis for so many carbon emissions predictions, it is likely that carbon emissions would not increase as much as feared. Moreover, carbon emissions could be reduced over the extra time these smaller population rises would give us, allowing new, more efficient technologies to be developed, thus dealing with carbon emissions better.

Source C, in my opinion, does not express a clear opinion. I do think, however, that it does support the statement as it says, “countries which created the most greenhouse gases must lead the fight against them”. From this I understand that the writer of source C believes that HEDCs must reduce their carbon emissions so that the LEDCs can continue to develop. Source C states, “you cannot fairly stop developing countries from developing”. So the rights of LEDCs to develop must be offset by HEDCs lowering their carbon emissions.

From my own knowledge, I feel sustainable development is the best way to address environmental challenges, though I do not believe that it is the only realistic method. New more efficient technologies could be introduced as opposed to people just turning the light off, etc. Developing technologies such as biodiesels and electric-powered vehicles would be a big help in this.

In conclusion, I believe that, while sustainable development is probably the most realistic method, it is not the only realistic method. Therefore I disagree with the statement.

**COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE C**

The mark awarded for this answer is 11      AO1 Level 2: 3 marks  
AO2 Level 2: 4 marks  
AO3 Level 2: 4 marks

The candidate has used relevant but limited evidence from sources A, B and C to support and interpret the data: "Source A is very supportive of the statement as it states that "if all these targets.... Estimates show they could only deliver 60% of carbon emissions reductions that science says..." from this we can understand that source A infers.....".

"Source B does not agree with the statement as this source believes that "a maximum population for the earth would be no more than 6.64 billion by 2029".

"Source C, in my opinion does not express a clear opinion"

The range of evidence needed to meet the requirements of AO2 is not sufficiently apparent in the answer to reach Level 3.

Even though all three sources are considered they have been interpreted rather than analysed. The candidate needs to develop their explanation and relate to more examples from their own knowledge to extend beyond AO1 Level 2.

The candidate has made an attempt to make conclusions based on their opinions rather than a summary and final assessment of the sources. This is not what the question requires.

**QUESTION 2 (a)**

Using Source D, describe the attitude the author has to wildlife.

**[5]****Source D:**

*Extract from Diary of the Reverend Francis Kilvert written 1870–1875*

The Vicar has in his house a fine collection of stuffed birds. Among them are a pair of peregrine falcons which were shot, of all places in the world, on the spire of Salisbury Cathedral. The workmen shot them when the steeple was being restored. The Cathedral is haunted by peregrines which come in from the sea coast cliffs and sit upon the spire where they think they are safe.

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(a)	<p><b>AO1 5 marks</b> <b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Source D</b> Author describes a collection of stuffed birds as a perfectly natural idea. The conditions under which these birds were killed are shocking to contemporary ideas but were not shocking in Victorian times. Author shows no concern for conserving wildlife. Values very different from today.</p> <p><b>Level 4 (5 marks)</b> Detailed description of the ideas about wildlife and how it should be treated. Candidate comments in detail, quoting relevant lines/phrases from the source and explains how these give a positive view.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> General description of ideas in source referenced to some relevant lines/phrases.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Detailed description of ideas, with some reference/direct quotation from source but little explanation e.g. of how these differ from today.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Simple description of some of the ideas used, little reference to source.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant material.</p>	[5]	

## EXEMPLAR AND COMMENTARY

### CANDIDATE A

The author in source D has a view that wildlife is inferior to man as he outlines the fact that he has many stuffed animals. This old-fashioned view doesn't consider wild life to be important, but this is wrong as all wildlife respire, which shows they are living things.

### COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE A

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 2: 2 marks.

This response opens with a simple statement of attitude – “wildlife is inferior to man”. There is some development of this in “old-fashioned” which implies a contrast with present day attitudes. There is limited explanation of this but there is some relevant knowledge, and sufficient understanding of how wildlife should be treated (in the candidate’s view) to award 2 marks out of five.

## CANDIDATE B

Source D states "the vicar in his house has a fine collection of stuffed birds." This straight away expresses an admiration/admiration for them. This is contradicted by the actions taken, where the peregrines were shot. An annoyance is expressed through the "where they think they are safe", presenting quite a malevolently toned cliff hanger. This signifies the birds collection he has is more to remind him of his success and pride in shooting the bird. The fact the bird was shot "of all places in the world, on the spire of Salisbury Cathedral", signifies a sort of protective attitude towards the cathedral, and therefore a view of infelicity of wildlife.

## COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE B

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 3: 4 marks.

This response has a good focus on attitudes – admiration, annoyance, pride, protectiveness are all mentioned, and the source is used to support these comments. Greater awareness of the difference in attitude between past and present would have gained this full marks.

## CANDIDATE C

2a) The source was written between 1870 and 1875 which means that it can show us how attitudes differed then compared with ours. For example, the stuffed bird collection is called “a fine collection”, which implies it is to be admired, whereas today we might feel that it is ‘creepy’, disgusting or ghoulish. This shows how attitudes have changed since then.

We also can see how values differ by the casual way in which shooting animals is mentioned. In today’s society, people are more sensitive about handling guns, and the restrictions are much tighter. We see them as weapons whose legitimate use must be justified to the police, and licensed accordingly. Many people also feel that the type of casual hunting which is referred to is no longer acceptable in today’s society.

The author also shows what we feel is little concern for conserving wildlife, unlike today’s society which has many charities and pressure groups dedicated to saving endangered species. The author’s behaviour verges on animal cruelty.

## COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE C

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 4: 5 marks.

This candidate makes use of the attribution to the source and begins by comparing attitudes across time. The “fine” collection is now considered to be “ghoulish” or “disgusting” and the “casual way” the animals are treated is also identified. There is also some evidence of the candidate’s own knowledge, and although this is not required by the question, some credit can be given for contextualising the attitudes commented on. This is a detailed answer which just gains 5 marks. Comment on “haunted” would have made this a more secure full marks answer.

**QUESTION 2 (b)**

Using Source F and your own knowledge, explain what qualities people value in the natural world today.

**[10]**

**Source F:**

*From A Walk in the Woods by Bill Bryson published 1997*

There is a painting by Asher Brown Durand called Kindred Spirits. Painted in 1849, it shows two men standing on rock ledge in the Catskills (mountains) in one of those sublime lost world settings that look as if they would take an expedition to reach. Below them, in a shadowy chasm, a stream dashes through a jumble of boulders. Beyond, glimpsed through a canopy of leaves, is a long view of gorgeously forbidding blue mountains.

I can't tell you how much I would like to step into that view. The scene is so manifestly untamed, so full of an impenetrable beyond, as to present a clearly foolhardy temptation. You would die out there for sure. You can see that at a glance. But never mind. Already you are studying the foreground for a way down to that stream over the steep rocks.

Nothing like that view exists now of course. Perhaps it never did. Who knows how much licence these romantic artists took? Who after all is going to struggle with an easel and a campstool and a box of paints to some difficult overlook, on a hot July afternoon, in a wilderness filled with danger, and not paint something exquisite and grand?

But even if the pre-industrialised Appalachians were only half as wild and dramatic as in the paintings of Durand and others like him, they must have been a sight to behold.

Copyright © Bill Bryson, 1998

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(b)	<p><b>AO1 4 marks; AO2 6 marks</b></p> <p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Source F</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural world is a source of excitement and adventure.</li> <li>• Wild and dramatic, untamed.</li> <li>• Dangerous but attractive.</li> </ul> <p>Own knowledge Natural world also valued for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• peaceful place, contemplation</li> <li>• place to be alone</li> <li>• recreation</li> <li>• emotional, spiritual refreshment.</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Level 4 (7–10 marks)</b> Detailed explanation of what people value in the natural world drawing on evidence from source and own knowledge to support points being made. A range of qualities are described and exemplified.</p> <p><b>Level 3 (4–6 marks)</b> Sound interpretation of the source with some detail about the qualities valued, with some relevant extracts from source.</p> <p><b>Level 2 (2–3 marks)</b> Limited interpretation of the source with some additional qualities which are described but not explained.</p> <p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> A limited description of the source, not supported by own knowledge.</p> <p><b>Level 0 (0 marks)</b> No relevant material.</p>	[10]	

## EXEMPLAR AND COMMENTARY

## CANDIDATE A

People value natural beauty, serenity and peace in the world today. The mechanisation & modernisation of our world has resulted in much of our natural beauty being lost in favour of shopping centres, Starbucks and luxury accommodation. The author states their desire to step into the scene, and I agree, as I think that true beauty is not what's around you; it is that you feel within, and to understand these feelings I need to be in somewhere utterly zen.

## COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE A

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 2: 3 marks.

The candidate's own knowledge drives this answer. The response begins with the candidate's view of what is valued today but there is little focus on Source F as required by the question. There is mention made of the "desire to step into the scene" but little analysis or interpretation – there are 6 marks available on this question for AO2 which targets these skills. There is some relevant knowledge (mainly the candidate's own) which lifts this response into Level 2.

## CANDIDATE B

Bill Bryson shows a passionate attitude towards the natural biosphere and naturally existing landscapes. A main theme that attracts him is the ambiguity, and complex mystery that surrounds just a simple ~~scene~~ scene. He shows this through his words; "forbidden blue mountains" and "lost world settings". Additionally, the fact it's so effortless and naturally occurring appeals to people. This is shown by the scene described as "so manifestly untamed". There are so many things of beauty that are considered miracles, and it is these attractions that are objects of admiration. Moreover, nature gives artists inspiration for their drawings/paintings. Clearly, people value the detail and of these "exquisite and grand" art pieces.

## COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE B

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 3: 6 marks.

Details have been selected from the source but the interpretation of these is not as full as it could be. Nevertheless, the interpretation that has been included is sound, and references are relevant. There is a great deal of implicit understanding "ambiguity and complex mystery"; "simple scene". The response finishes strongly by explaining what people value – "the detail", "inspiration for their paintings".

**CANDIDATE C**

2b) Source F would seem to suggest that dramatic and dangerous places were to be admired and looked upon with reverence. The source seems to be glamorising the natural wild beauty of the surroundings even though danger might be inherent in those places. It is worth noting that this painting was done in 1849 so the qualities that people might value in the natural world today might have changed. In European history, 1849 was a time of mass migration to the USA, and people valued the pioneering spirit more. Many people were choosing to travel and set up home in a ‘Wild West’ that was still quite wild, literally.

In today’s society, I believe that people are far more likely to value a place of peace, open for private contemplation and full of serene beauty. This serene beauty can be seen in the picture through the small stream at the bottom of the picture; most people would feel calm and relaxed near a stream such as this, but the rest of the picture is more intimidating.

Another modern value is spiritual fulfilment which you can experience in places such as churches; these are also places of peace which are man-made, not natural. It is not only the natural world that provides us with what we value.

The most important point is that the painting idealises and romanticises the natural world, showing it to be beautiful, exciting and stimulating. It does not show us a realistic view, with dangerous animals and insects, lack of comfort and shelter, far away from other human contact.

**COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE C**

The mark awarded for this answer is Level 4: 8 marks.

There is a great deal of “own knowledge” supporting the points made. Coverage of indicative content is very good – natural world as a source of adventure, dramatic scenery, dangerous, places of peace, serene beauty, private contemplation, calm and relaxed, spiritual fulfilment. The points made about Source E are not asked for in this question but they do support a very detailed explanation of what people value in the natural world today. Analysis and evaluation would need to be in greater evidence for full marks.

**QUESTION 2 (c)**

'Paintings are a good source of evidence of how things were in the past'. Using Sources E and F and your own knowledge, explain the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement.

**[25]****Source E**

*Kindred Spirits* by Asher Brown Durand painted in 1849 and described in Source F



## GENERIC LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	A01 7 marks	A02 10 marks	A03 8 marks
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Apply knowledge and understanding to analyse, interpret and evaluate evidence in a range of forms from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Demonstrate independent research skills, using relevant methods from across the range of humanities and social sciences critically and appropriately to investigate unfamiliar issues, reach evidenced conclusions and communicate findings effectively.
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wide range of relevant, accurate and detailed knowledge demonstrated.</li> <li>Thorough explanations with extensive detail.</li> </ul> <p><b>6–7 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough analysis and interpretation of a wide range of evidence.</li> <li>Thorough evaluation linked to thorough explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>8–10 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources competently deployed to support arguments.</li> <li>Valid conclusions reached, supported by evidence.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions accurately and coherently communicated.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar accurate; meaning is very clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>7–8 marks</b></p>
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate knowledge demonstrated, usually accurate and relevant.</li> <li>Adequate explanations, not highly detailed.</li> </ul> <p><b>4–5 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate analysis and interpretation of a range of evidence.</li> <li>Adequate attempt at evaluation linked to adequate explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>5–7 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources deployed adequately to support arguments.</li> <li>Conclusions generally valid, but not always supported by evidence.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions adequately communicated in a structured way.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar usually accurate and meaning generally clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>5–6 marks</b></p>

## GENERIC LEVELS OF RESPONSE

Level	AO1 7 marks	AO2 10 marks	AO3 8 marks
	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Apply knowledge and understanding to analyse, interpret and evaluate evidence in a range of forms from across the humanities and social sciences disciplines.	Demonstrate independent research skills, using relevant methods from across the range of humanities and social sciences critically and appropriately to investigate unfamiliar issues, reach evidenced conclusions and communicate findings effectively.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited, relevant and accurate knowledge demonstrated.</li> <li>Limited or partial explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>2–3 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited analysis and interpretation of a limited range of evidence.</li> <li>Limited evaluation linked to partial explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>2–4 marks</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some sources deployed relevantly to support arguments.</li> <li>Some valid conclusions, but limited and not closely related to evidence.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions broadly related to task, but some vagueness in communication.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar have some inaccuracies and meaning not always clear.</li> </ul> <p><b>3–4 marks</b></p>
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little knowledge demonstrated, not always relevant or accurate.</li> <li>Vague or largely incoherent explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate attempt at analysis and interpretation.</li> <li>Inadequate evaluation linked to vague or largely incoherent explanations.</li> </ul> <p><b>1 mark</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sources only loosely related to arguments.</li> <li>Conclusions inadequately supported by evidence or asserted with no justification.</li> <li>Analysis and conclusions largely unrelated to task and communication vague or largely incoherent.</li> <li>Spelling, punctuation and grammar inaccurate and meaning obscured.</li> </ul> <p><b>1–2 marks</b></p>
0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant material</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No relevant material</li> </ul>

## MARKING CRITERIA

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
2	(c)	<p><b>AO1 7 marks; AO2 10 marks; AO3 8 marks</b></p> <p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p><b>Source E</b> Picture shows a romanticised view of the landscape – craggy rocks, wild looking scenery, feeling of height – explorers looking out from high place, view into distance is mysterious/enticing.</p> <p><b>Source F</b> This view may never have existed. Artist had vested interest in showing something exciting.</p> <p><b>Own knowledge</b> Candidates may mention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the increasing separation between people and nature led to romanticising of the countryside which provided inspiration for literature and art – a tradition which continues today</li> <li>• may relate this to increasing industrialisation and movement of population to towns. Shift from rural to urban living</li> <li>• may make specific reference to the Romantic movement in England</li> <li>• may refer to specific authors/artists/composers and the values which underlay their work – artistic work is not necessarily a realistic portrayal. It may be sending other messages.</li> </ul> <p><b>Level 4</b> Points similar to the above are cogently argued, with detailed references to the sources plus examples from own knowledge which are highly relevant and support the points being made closely. Paintings as a source of evidence critically evaluated.</p> <p><b>Level 3</b> Several points similar to the above are argued, with relevant references to the sources plus examples from own knowledge which support the points being made well. Some evaluation of paintings as source of evidence.</p> <p><b>Level 2</b> Some points similar to the above are made, with some references to the sources plus examples from own knowledge which are evaluated and related to the points being made in a limited way.</p> <p><b>Level 1</b> Few relevant points are made. Little evidence is offered in support. Sources are not used to support point, and there is no real critical evaluation of paintings as sources.</p> <p><b>Level 0</b> No relevant material.</p>	[25]	

## EXEMPLAR AND COMMENTARY

## CANDIDATE A

I disagree with the statements as paintings are so often untrue and portray an idealistic view rather than a real one. I think the artists feared to paint real life as it would seem inadequate. What they didn't realise is that our deepest fear is not that we are inadequate, our deepest fear is that we are powerful beyond measure. It is our light, not ~~to~~ our darkness that most frightens us. Your playing small does not serve the world. There is nothing enlightening about shrinking so that other people won't feel insecure around you. We are all meant to shine as children do. It's not just in some of us it's in everyone! As we let our own light shine, we unconsciously give other people permission to do the same. As we are liberated from our own fear, our presence automatically liberates others.

**COMMENTARY FOR CANDIDATE A**

The mark awarded for this answer is 8      AO1 Level 2: 3 marks  
AO2 Level 2: 3 marks  
AO3 Level 1: 2 marks

There is a great deal in this which responds to the requirement for “own knowledge” but this is only very loosely linked to the sources. There is an argument in this but the conclusions are not fully evidenced – there is limited support for the views expressed and towards the end this drifts off-topic. AO1 and AO2 are in Level 2 – “limited, relevant knowledge”, “limited explanation” for AO1 and “limited analysis/interpretation”, “limited range of evidence” for AO2. The third AO is more Level 1 – “sources loosely related to arguments”, “conclusions inadequately supported by evidence”.

## CANDIDATE B

- 2 (c) "Paintings are a good source of evidence of how things were in the past." Using Sources E and F and your own knowledge, explain the extent to which you agree or disagree with this statement.

[25]

I agree with this statement because, as shown by source E, paintings provide good visual documentation of what the past looked like. Furthermore, people painting were there at the time, increasing the accuracy of what real life was like. ~~On the contrary,~~ paintings are open to different interpretations so facts drawn from them are opinionated. In addition to this, ~~the~~ the personal interests of both the painter and subject would distort the realism of the picture. This is supported by source F where Bill Bryson says "Nothing like that view exists... perhaps it never did." ~~Painters~~ Painters might want to exaggerate their paintings and glorify ~~what~~ the surroundings to promote buyers and increase their appeal. Moreover, culture can be accurately analysed because painters draw what they personally see, not what is actually there. Paintings are a more poetic, emotive description of the past. This is an advantage because it involves emotions and feelings. Source F supports this as Bryson says "I would like to step into that view." However, it's a disadvantage as it isn't hard, concrete fact. Some paintings might be abstract e.g. surrealism artists who base drawings on hidden meanings. These are difficult to analyse and can't be reliably used to support facts.

Painting  
\* painter  
can show  
opinions  
of social  
class/  
sub-  
culture

To conclude, paintings can be a good account for evidence of what the past was like, depending on the purpose of the





[www.ocr.org.uk/humanities/alevel](http://www.ocr.org.uk/humanities/alevel)

## Contact us

Keep up to date on the latest news by registering to receive e-alerts at [www.ocr.org.uk/2011signup](http://www.ocr.org.uk/2011signup)

Telephone 01223 533998

Facsimile 01223 552627

Email [generalqualifications@ocr.org.co.uk](mailto:generalqualifications@ocr.org.co.uk)

