



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2002

---

## GCE

### Economics

### Unit ECN4

January 2002

EC4W

**AQA Advanced Level Economics****MARK SCHEME****General Instructions**

Marks awarded to candidates should be in accordance with the following mark scheme and examiners should be prepared to use the full range of marks available. Where the candidate's response to a question is such that the mark scheme permits full marks to be awarded, full marks **MUST** be given. A perfect answer is not necessarily required. Conversely, if the candidate's answer does not deserve credit, then no marks should be given.

Occasionally, a candidate may respond to a question in a reasonable way, but the answer may not have been anticipated when the mark scheme was devised. In this situation **OR WHENEVER YOU HAVE ANY DOUBT ABOUT THE INTERPRETATION OF THE MARK SCHEME**, telephone the Senior Examiner to discuss how to proceed.

The marks awarded for **Quality of Written Communication** are included in this mark scheme.

The Case Study paper is marked holistically using the same marking criteria as are used for marking coursework. When marking the report, examiners should **identify evidence of the skills** being assessed by using the following key.

<b>K</b>	Knowledge and Understanding
<b>AP</b>	Application
<b>AN</b>	Analysis
<b>E</b>	Evaluation

**Case Study: The European Union****Requirements of the Report**

You are to write a report which:

- discusses the economic consequences of enlargement for the UK, for countries applying for membership (with special reference to Poland), and for current EU members as a whole;
- discusses whether enlargement is likely to increase or reduce income disparities both between and within countries over time;
- concludes by recommending whether or not the minister should support Poland's application at the forthcoming conference, giving reasons to justify your recommendation.

You will be given credit for demonstrating your ability to analyse and make effective use of the data provided.

**Specific Instructions to Examiners**

Examiners should use the following notes as guidance on what the question-setters expected to elicit from candidates as evidence of particular skills and levels of performance. This guidance should NOT be regarded as a 'straight-jacket' and examiners should approach the work they are marking with an open mind, giving credit where it is justified by the evidence before them. Credit should always be given in circumstances where candidates respond in an unanticipated but economically valid way.

**Knowledge and understanding**

Evidence may be shown by the candidate who considers the general consequences of enlargement. Weaker candidates will merely copy lists of advantages and disadvantages from the data; stronger approaches could demonstrate understanding, for instance by showing that they can see links between some of these consequences and UK policy, or can select consequences that are particularly relevant to Poland. Candidates may be concerned with policy towards enlargement specifically, or might consider impact on other policies, e.g. if EU budget were to rise, UK budget allocations or even UK taxation policy might need to be reviewed.

**Application**

Candidates can supply evidence of this by such means as re-interpreting the data and presenting it to the minister so that enlargement is viewed from the UK angle; or by relating the data to the question (signalled in the instructions) of re-distribution. Candidates who show awareness of relevant linked facts which are not necessarily dealt with at length in the Case Study, and can use them to apply economic principles, should be given due credit. For example, the fact that most applicants are economies in transition from Communism is worthy of comment, since further transition towards the EU is, it can be argued, a means of reinforcing and accelerating a process towards mixed markets, and away from the corruption that the movement from planning towards markets seems to have encouraged in the absence of suitable civic institutions. Please note that 'economic systems' as such are not specifically required in the specification, so do not insist on discussion of 'transition'. However, better answers are likely to show some economic awareness of the special nature of the majority of applicants, with their shared history as planned economies.

**Analysis**

While all aspects of the data can be analysed by candidates, the ‘profile’ of applicant countries (Extract D) provides some particular potential for analysis. Candidates might, for example, comment on the wide variety of country sizes, languages and currencies. A strong approach might be to comment on correlation (or lack of it) between the size of the country (in terms of population and/or area) and GNP per head. There could also be some comparisons between GNP per head and the EU 15 average. Extract E perhaps suggests that there are already strong links between Poland and individual EU countries.

**Evaluation**

A good approach would be to distinguish between short run and long run considerations. Evidence is most likely to be present when candidates start to make their recommendations and support their conclusions. However, if evaluative skills are demonstrated elsewhere in the report the candidate should be rewarded. For example, very strong candidates might realise that Extracts C (news item about Polish agriculture) is open to challenge, for its apparent assumption that the problems of Polish farmers result from Warsaw’s EU application. There are several indications (e.g. references to subsidies under Communism, and influence of multinationals) that suggest that farmers’ problems arise out of changes that were happening anyway (re-structuring, globalisation); candidates should be aware that a switch away from the land is generally part and parcel of economic development; the possibility that membership of a strong EU might actually provide some buffer against these trends is not mentioned.

**General**

Weaker candidates will simply copy chunks out of the data. This approach would suggest lower level performance. However, if the data is appropriately selected and re-ordered to be relevant to an aspect highlighted in the question, this should tend to put a candidate’s work at the middle levels. To move higher, the candidate should go beyond the selection and re-ordering of material from the case. Generally, stronger candidates should be relating enlargement to the single market with its opportunities for economies of scale and specialisation, and to the single currency, with its opportunities for need for long-term investment. Give credit for candidates who attempt to make these linkages.

Note that candidates are directed towards ‘economic’ rather than ‘political’ consequences. Candidates who write at great length about changes to the qualified majority vote procedures are likely to be attempting to hide their lack of economic perspective; however, take care not to be insistent on so-called ‘positive’ economics, since ‘political’ benefits, such as stronger defence, peace, stability and reinforced democracy all have economic consequences (as do their opposites).

Candidates who address the issue of ‘re-distribution’ systematically should move up the levels of response. However, be sceptical of those who assume that applicant countries will receive huge EU grants from the taxpayer, as there are signals in the data that cohesion funds received by Spain, Portugal, Ireland and Greece, are unlikely to be replicated, although there will be some scope for structural funds for regions within applicants. Arguments surrounding ‘trade’ are more convincing than those about ‘aid’.

**Assessment Criteria**

Examiners are to mark the report using the following assessment criteria, which are divided into five sections.

<b>K</b>	Knowledge and Understanding (AO1)	<b>10 marks</b>
<b>AP</b>	Application (AO2)	<b>20 marks</b>
<b>AN</b>	Analysis (AO3)	<b>20 marks</b>
<b>E</b>	Evaluation (AO4)	<b>30 marks</b>
<b>C</b>	Quality of Written Communication	<b><u>4 marks</u></b>
	<b>Total</b>	<b><u>84 marks</u></b>

**Knowledge and Understanding (K)**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of economic concepts and theories which are relevant to the problem/issue being investigated.

<b>Level 5:</b>	<b>8 - 10 marks</b>	An accurate, comprehensive and appropriate use of a range of relevant knowledge and understanding of economic concepts or theories.
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>5 - 7 marks</b>	Use of relevant knowledge and understanding of economic concepts or theories.
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>3 - 4 marks</b>	Some knowledge and understanding of economic concepts or theories but these are used inappropriately or may not be relevant to the problem or issue.
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>1 - 2 marks</b>	Limited knowledge or understanding of economic concepts or theories.
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>0 marks</b>	No knowledge or understanding of economic concepts or theories is demonstrated.

**Application (AP)**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to apply economic concepts and theories to the problem/issue being investigated.

<b>Level 5:</b>	<b>16 - 20 marks</b>	An accurate, clear and sophisticated use of a relevant range of economic concepts and theories which are used to demonstrate an impressive grasp of the problem or issue.
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>11 - 15 marks</b>	Selection of appropriate economic concepts and theories which are appropriately applied to the problem or issue.
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>6 - 10 marks</b>	Some use of economic concepts and theories which are superficially or partially applied to the problem or issue.
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>1 - 5 marks</b>	Limited attempt to apply economic concepts and theories and these are applied inappropriately or may not be relevant to the problem or issue.
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>0 marks</b>	No attempt to apply economic concepts and theories.

---

<b><u>Analysis (AN)</u></b>		Candidates should be able to present and analyse relevant economic data that relate to the problem/issue being investigated.
<b>Level 5:</b>	<b>16 - 20 marks</b>	An appropriate range of relevant economic data is logically analysed to produce outcomes that relate directly to the problem/issue. Results are presented clearly using a range of formats as appropriate.
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>11 - 15 marks</b>	A range of economic data is presented and analysed with some relevance to the problem or issue. Results are presented clearly with a reasonable attempt at using appropriate formats.
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>6 - 10 marks</b>	Some attempt is made to present and analyse economic data which is limited in scope but has some relevance to the problem or issue.
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>1 - 5 marks</b>	A very limited attempt is made to present and analyse economic data which has little relevance to the problem or issue.
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>0 marks</b>	No attempt to present and analyse economic data.
<b><u>Evaluation (E)</u></b>		Candidates should be able to demonstrate a critical approach to economic models and methods of enquiry. They should demonstrate the ability to produce reasoned conclusions clearly and concisely and to assess the strengths and weaknesses of economic arguments and the value and limitations of the data used.
<b>Level 6:</b>	<b>25 - 30 marks</b>	Conclusions are reached with accurate and valid reasoning showing originality and insight, combined with a thorough and critical evaluation of the validity of data, arguments and findings.
<b>Level 5:</b>	<b>19 - 24 marks</b>	Conclusions are reached with accurate reasoning with sound, critical examination of the data, arguments and findings.
<b>Level 4:</b>	<b>13 - 18 marks</b>	Conclusions are reached with reasoned explanation and with some critical examination of the validity of the data, arguments and findings.
<b>Level 3:</b>	<b>7 - 12 marks</b>	Conclusions are reached with some reasoned explanation and with some examination of the validity of data, arguments and findings.
<b>Level 2:</b>	<b>1 - 6 marks</b>	A limited attempt is made to draw conclusions and to make reasoned judgements, but these are largely generalised and unsupported.
<b>Level 1:</b>	<b>0 marks</b>	No attempt is made to draw conclusions.

**Quality of Written Communication Marking Criteria (C)**

The following marks are to be awarded to candidates for the Quality of Written Communication they have demonstrated when writing the report.

<b>4 marks</b>	Complex ideas have been expressed clearly and fluently. Sentences and paragraphs have followed on from one another smoothly and logically. Arguments are consistently relevant and have been well structured. There are few, if any, errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. There is extensive use of specialist vocabulary which is applied adeptly and with precision.
<b>3 marks</b>	Moderately complex ideas have been expressed clearly and reasonably fluently, through well linked sentences and paragraphs. Arguments are generally relevant and have been well structured. There may be occasional errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling. A wide range of specialist vocabulary is used with facility.
<b>2 marks</b>	Straightforward ideas have been expressed clearly, if not always fluently. Sentences and paragraphs may not always be well connected. Arguments have strayed sometimes from the point or have been weakly presented. There may be some errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling, but not such as to suggest a weakness in these areas. There is a good range of specialist vocabulary which is applied appropriately.
<b>1 mark</b>	Simple ideas have been expressed clearly but arguments may be of doubtful relevance or obscurely presented. Errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling may be noticeable and intrusive and may suggest a weakness in these areas. Some use of specialist vocabulary is made but this is not always applied appropriately.
<b>0 marks</b>	Ideas have been expressed poorly and sentences and paragraphs have not been connected. There are errors of grammar, punctuation and spelling, showing a weakness in these areas. There is very limited use of specialist vocabulary.