

Mark Scheme - FINAL
June 2010

GCE

GCE General Studies - 6GS02



Mark Scheme
AS General Studies GSo2/01
The Individual in Society
June 2010
General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response

Section A

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1	A it expresses personal views	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2	D can be verified	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3	C shared characteristics	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	D free insurance for new works of art	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	A form	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6	D citizens and groups have access to official information	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7	C censorship	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8	B there are only parents and dependent children	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9	C a same-sex couple entering into a formal relationship to live together	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10	A an assessment designed to ensure state benefits go to the neediest people	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11	A believing in the importance of work	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12	C the Welfare State	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
13	C 24	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
14	B 4191	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
15	B 838	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
16	D In 2008 Labour won and in 2009 the Conservatives won	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
17	C 37%	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
18	A true	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
19	A true	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
20	C false	1

Section B

Question Number	Answer	Mark
21	<p>1 mark for example: <i>Student Book (p6) says 'arguments from authority... are <u>not</u> about an individual's status, reputation or position but about evidence or opinion offered by an expert on the basis of acknowledged expertise and knowledge of a relevant topic'.</i></p> <p>Example (may be abbreviated) could be: EITHER Press Complaints Commission chairman, Sir Christopher Meyer, advised them that 'legal redress was the way to address the issue' of defamatory stories appearing in the papers. OR Adam Tudor from the McCanns' lawyers told the committee: 'The PCC is regarded as being overly friendly, it lacks teeth. It can't force apologies.' OR He (Adam Tudor) said if the McCanns had gone through the PCC instead of the courts, 'it would have led the Express to thinking they were off the hook....'</p> <p>To be awarded 1 mark for 'example' an expert must be clearly identified AND at least part of the opinion/argument offered must be clearly stated.</p> <p><u>It is not acceptable for the person to be named ONLY in the 'Reason' part of the answer, so no marks should be awarded.</u></p> <p>1 mark for reason It is an argument from authority because the strength of the argument depends on the expertise of either Sir Christopher Meyer or of Adam Tudor or their experience/knowledge of/education in the subject. It would not be enough to gain a mark just to say someone is <u>important</u> or a <u>lawyer</u> or is a <u>reliable source</u></p>	1+1 AO3

Question Number	Answer	Mark
22	<p>Up to 5 marks for correct answer</p> <p>Suitable evidence would be: Gerry McCann’s statement (at the media select committee) in Para 1 that: if he had not taken legal action, the media storm – which he called ‘the Kate and Gerry Show’ – might have ‘resulted in the complete destruction of our family’. OR Gerry McCann’s statement (at the media select committee) in Para 2 that: ‘Our family has been the focus of some of the most sensational, untruthful, irresponsible and damaging reporting in the history of the press’ OR Press Complaints Commission chairman, Sir Christopher Meyer, advising the McCanns that ‘legal redress was the way to address the issue’ of defamatory stories appearing in the papers. OR Adam Tudor from the McCanns’ lawyers, Carter Ruck, told the committee: ‘The PCC is regarded as being overly friendly, it lacks teeth. It can’t force apologies.’ OR He (Adam Tudor) said if the McCanns had gone through the PCC instead of the courts, ‘it would have led the Express to thinking they were off the hook.</p> <p>Argument Systematic assessment of the arguments used needs to be attempted. OR Candidates may refer to argument from authority or inductive argument to demonstrate effectiveness</p> <p>Award marks according to these instructions:</p> <p>If ‘evidence’ is mentioned and an example given OR at least one strong example is given and discussed <p style="text-align: right;">Award 1 mark</p> <p>If further points are explicitly identified as evidence and discussed <p style="text-align: right;">Award 1 mark</p> <p>If the significance of the evidence is discussed in simple terms (eg references to fact or opinion or bias or assertion) <p style="text-align: right;">Award 1 mark</p> <p>For assessing the strengths and/or weaknesses of arguments used in a simple but systematic manner <p style="text-align: right;">Award 1 mark</p> <p>If the candidate explicitly considers the level of justification provided by the evidence/arguments OR evaluates briefly to reach a simple conclusion <p style="text-align: right;">Award 1 mark</p> <p>To award AO4 marks see grid on next page</p> </p></p></p></p></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5 AO3</p>

Question Number	Mark	<i>AO4: Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.</i> <i>Note - The AO4 marks are NOT dependent upon the AO3 marks.</i>
22	0	The answer is badly expressed, not relevant or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing (6 lines of writing or less) to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, rarely relevant and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.
	2	The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent, mainly relevant and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	3	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, and relevant there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

Question Number	Answer	Mark
23	<p>2 marks for correct answer – eg:</p> <p>Whereas an inductive argument does no more than suggest one of several possible or probable conclusions.... 1 mark</p> <p>.....it is the case with deductive arguments that if the premises are correct, the conclusion will also be correct and cannot be false 1 mark</p> <p>Award 2 marks if both parts (as above - or similar) of the correct answer are present – 1 mark if only one part is clearly stated</p> <p>Credit should not be given to answers which say that deductive arguments include facts and figures so are more reliable.</p> <p>It is also wrong to say deductive arguments are based on facts (or evidence) and inductive arguments are based on assumptions or opinions.</p> <p>Neither general points about the reliability or unreliability of evidence or conclusions in this particular passage nor descriptions or definitions of inductive (specific to general) or deductive (general to specific) are mark worthy unless they are clearly used to explain why a conclusion based on a deductive argument is stronger than one based on an inductive argument</p>	2 AO3

Question Number	Answer	Mark
24(a)	<p>1 mark for each simple point, as below (max 2):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Newspapers run by private companies can publish what they wish/ are under no obligation to be unbiased/may only give one side of the story 2. while the BBC Charter requires its radio and television programmes to be balanced and impartial, covering all viewpoints/giving both sides of the argument 3. Newspapers often reflect the opinions of their owner 4.this cannot apply in BBC programmes since the BBC is a public corporation/funded by licence/taxpayer 5. Often newspapers openly support one particular political party ... 6. ... while BBC have no such allegiances <p>To gain two marks, answers must refer to both newspapers and the BBC. References to other factors such as sensationalism or exaggeration are unlikely to be mark-worthy</p>	2 AO1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
24(b)	<p>1 mark for each point – eg</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The terms 'folk devil' and 'moral panic' refer to campaigns often in the popular press designed to stir up or to scare people or to sensationalise an issue. 2. The terms were first used by Stan Cohen in the 1970s to explain the phenomenon of 'mods and rockers'. 3. A moral panic is a semi-spontaneous or media-generated (and possibly artificial) perception that a particular group or activity is a danger to society (eg 'hoodies', dangerous dogs, asylum seekers) 4. In the context of folk devils, Stan Cohen suggested that society creates a gallery of social types 'to show its members which roles should be avoided and which should be emulated' (eg - the way the media represented social workers as failures after the Baby P case). 5. Folk devils are 'visible reminders of what we should not be'; they are portrayed collectively (not as individuals) in the media as outsiders and deviants who are blamed for crimes or other social problems (eg - drug-takers, child abusers, football hooligans, 'boiler room' organisers). 6. The mass media sometimes attempt to create new folk devils to create controversies (eg over immigration or crime or adoption by gay or lesbian couples) with the result that sometimes such campaigns can influence national politics/legislation <p>GIVE ONE MARK FOR A RELEVANT EXAMPLE OF A MORAL PANIC OR A FOLK DEVIL (so a government information programme about swine flu would not be a relevant example, but if a candidate showed that the public became alarmed over mortality rates as a result of media exaggeration).</p> <p>To gain three marks, answers must refer to both folk devils and moral panics.</p> <p>Candidates do not have to use the same examples as are given above to be awarded credit but they do need to offer some examples to gain more than two marks.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">3 AO1</p>

Question Number	AO2 Answer	Mark
25	<p>1 mark for any two of the points below</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raising skills and reducing welfare payments 2. Makes people more employable/better paid 3. More employment will give government more income tax 4. Contributes to economic growth which benefits the country 	2 AO2

Question Number	AO2 Answer	Mark
26	<p>1 mark for each point (or similar) (max 2):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In Canada, the ban took away the rights of both 16 year olds and 17 year olds but in the UK 16 year olds cannot hold a licence to drive a car anyway. 2. The UK is smaller and mostly less remote than Canada so arguably the need for a car is not so great (except perhaps in rural areas); most UK students can walk or travel cheaply by bus or train. 3. Many students who currently leave school at 16 cannot afford to get a car till they have a job, so withdrawing the right to get a licence to drive a car if they insisted on leaving school or college before they were 18 might make little difference, particularly when jobs for unqualified, unskilled youngsters are in short supply 4. Also some teenagers would not be able to run a vehicle because of the high cost of insurance, car tax and fuel. 5. Someone who leaves education and training aged 16 will not have had a driving licence, so a policy of denying a licence to people who leave education early will not affect them as much as if they had a licence which might then be taken away. 6. Many young people learn to drive when they are 17 but get a licence when they are 18 or 19. 7. Even those who were denied a licence by such a policy would still be able to travel around with older members of their family or members of their peer group who might be slightly older or still in education 8. Young people may be willing to break the law/ignore the ban/joy riding/TWOC/risk prosecution. 	2 AO2

Question Number	AO2 Answer	Mark
27	<p>1 mark for each point (or similar) (max 2) which focuses on why the situation proposed would be 'repellent':</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The idea of a Yr 9 pupil doing a full time job would mean the pupil was being denied their (human) right to education at an artificially early age 2. 14-year-olds are unlikely to have the life experience/maturity to be able to cope with full-time employment and associated rights and responsibilities 3. If someone had left school to enter a full-time job aged 14, they would have no formal qualifications/skills ... 4. ...so there is a real chance they would be exploited or end up with low wages/poor quality of life and/or no prospects 5. To-day a 14 year old in the workplace full-time would go against the expectations of modern society. 6. It would be a reminder of the evils of past times when children were put up chimneys or sent to work dangerous machines in factories (or child labour in some developing countries). 7. This would be a step backwards for the UK. 	<p>2 AO2</p>

Question Number	AO2 Answer	Mark
28	<p>1 mark for each point (or similar) (max 4) about why the government believes young school leavers with few or no qualifications will find it increasingly difficult to find employment in future:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of unskilled jobs in the economy has been shrinking for the past 30 years or so, made worse by the recession. 2. Unemployment among 16 and 17-year-olds was 25.3% in 2007 and by 2009 as the credit crunch took effect this was the age group which seemed to be hit hardest by unemployment. 3. In terms of competition for jobs, any unskilled jobs that remain are likely to go to experienced older workers rather than inexperienced teenagers (or to those who are better qualified but cannot find a better job). 4. By 2020 projections suggest there will be only 600,000 unskilled jobs in the UK and most of those will be held by people with experience 5. Workers will need to accept training and gain relevant qualifications (rather than remain unskilled) since the UK needs a skilled workforce to compete with other G7 and G20 countries - not likely to be much demand for the unskilled. 6. Now the government has set a target of 50% of 18-21 year olds going to university and getting degree level qualifications, the chances of those without even GCSEs getting jobs seems very unlikely since they will have nothing to offer an employer – not even experience 7. Rather than being unskilled, only if qualifications, flexibility and experience in the labour force are improved will UK workers be able to contribute to raising productivity (needed as the birth rate falls and more people become pensioners) - no place for the unskilled. <p>Allow other reasons which clearly link to the idea of skills, qualifications and youth employment/unemployment.</p> <p>But note that a general answer about the evils of (1) the credit crunch, (2) the recession, (3) immigrants competing for jobs or (4) exporting jobs would gain marks only where explicit links are made to the position of unskilled/ unqualified young people.</p>	4 AO2

Question Number 28	Mark	AO4: Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way. Note - The AO4 marks are NOT dependent upon the AO2 marks.
	0	The answer is badly expressed, not relevant or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing (6 lines of writing or less) to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, rarely relevant and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.
	2	The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent, mainly relevant and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	3	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent and well laid out, and relevant there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

Section C

Introduction

Since we are not using a levels mark scheme, we focus on individual points or statements made by candidates, giving a separate mark for each. AO1 involves knowledge and understanding which we shall usually see in the form of a factual statement. For AO2, we are looking for 'so . . .' or 'therefore . . .' or 'because...' or 'so what this means is . . .' statements. If you can put these words (or similar) in front of something the candidate has written then it is probably involving explanation, interpretation, evaluation, integration of ideas, exemplification (selection of suitable materials/examples) so 1 AO2 mark can be awarded for each such point.

Question	Marking Guidance	
29		
After marking the answer for AO1 and AO2, assess it for communication, AO4.		
Q29	Mark	AO1: <i>Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.</i>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point of knowledge/understanding up to a maximum of 8 marks. Answers must focus on the artistic qualities of the works of art.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unconventional or controversial pieces of art are sometimes criticised as being 'rubbish' because the public do not comprehend the insights that the artist intended – perhaps looking at things in an unfamiliar way. 2. According to organisers, Turner Prize exhibits and works such as the Clacton project are intended to promote public discussion of controversial art. Stephen Deuchar, director of London's Tate Britain gallery, said in 2009: 'Whatever people might say about the (Turner) shortlist, it does provide a huge draw to the public. It is the one time of year when people feel empowered to talk about contemporary art'. 3. Often pieces of art greatly valued and highly regarded to-day were criticised or rejected at the time they were first produced – the thought behind the innovation was at first neither understood nor appreciated. 4. Answers do not have to refer to Turner Prize finalists but they should be rewarded if they do – eg winners such as Richard Wright (2009), Mark Leckey (2008), Mark Wallinger (2007), Tomma Abts (2006), Simon Starling (2005) or others such as Grayson Perry, Damien Hirst, Chris Ofili or Roger Hiorns – for details see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Turner_Prize 5. Answers could refer to features of artistic creativity on terms of the application of imagination and skill to bring into existence something which did not previously exist... 6.or be innovative – ie being different to what has been done previously, possibly embracing new ideas, using new or different materials or techniques, perhaps offering new insights into old problems 7. Or they may question whether art has meaning. If arts try to reflect or challenge the values as society (as perhaps the Clacton work aimed to do) 8. Artistic works (especially literature) can shape values as well as reflect them. If a work of art raises awareness of issues, it can provoke people to do something about them (eg television programme Cathy Come Home) <p><i>The above points are illustrative only and not exhaustive. Any other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list above.</i></p> <p>Some of these issues will be explored further and awarded marks for AO2 (see next page). Examiners' assessments here should reward the knowledge and understanding demonstrated in outlining artistic qualities.</p>

Q29	Mark	AO2: <i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions</i>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point, up to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to outline artistic qualities and to build an argument about their significance in terms of controversial works of art (including, perhaps, why the work of art is controversial). Points should be used to demonstrate how evidence is marshalled by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting: identifying and applying relevant evidence • Interpreting: showing how evidence helps to answer the question • Evaluating: assessing the strength of the evidence in support of the question • Integrating: using evidence to develop a coherent argument/conclusion as set out in the Introduction to Section C in this mark scheme. <p><i>Note – evidence can be information, data, concepts or opinions</i></p> <p>The points made will depend on the examples answers introduce – better ones may see a style or symbolism or sense of innovation in the work. They can argue as they please – in AO2 we are trying to value fairly their selecting, interpreting, evaluating, integrating, as above. They could (but are certainly not required to) follow the comments of</p> <p>Hugh Pearman (Sunday Times) who says the work '46 Brooklands Gardens is absolutely right for now. Edgy art for edgy times'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But candidates might ask what he is really saying • And what makes it a work of art? • If it is symbolic, what is it a symbol of and how well does the idea work? • Is the significance that it looks so different when inside looking out, rather than being outside looking in? <p>Colin Glen (Art Monthly) says it allows the viewer, through imagined inhabitation, to connect with the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But how would such a statement assuage the doubter and persuade her or him that this genuinely was a work of art? • In connecting with the community, what dialogue is being is being conducted? • Is the work a reflection of or a message to society – and how can we know what we are to learn from looking at it? <p>Mick Masterson (Friends of Brooklands) says 'For me the justification and the legacy for this project has been its investment in my community. It ... dispels the myth that there is a phantom portcullis preventing progress in the Brooklands.'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates could question how this work can be regarded as investment. • And if it is, is it the best form of investment available? • And why do local people appear to doubt and ridicule it? • In what sense does the structure represent 'progress'? <p><i>Whether candidates make these or other points, we are aiming to test their capacity to select appropriate ideas and organise them into a reasoned argument.</i></p> <p>Any other valid points must be credited.</p>

Question 29	Mark	<p>AO₄: <i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.</i></p> <p><i>The AO₄ marks are not dependent upon the AO₁ and AO₂ marks.</i></p>
	0	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing (6 lines of writing or less) to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts and maybe irrelevant, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.
	2	The answer is generally understandable, writing is often in the correct form. Arguments are sometimes coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not seriously inhibit communication.
	3	The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	4	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent, well laid out and relevant, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.

Introduction

Since we are not using a levels mark scheme, we focus on individual points or statements made by candidates, giving a separate mark for each. AO1 involves knowledge and understanding which we shall usually see in the form of a factual statement. For AO2, we are looking for 'so . . .' or 'therefore . . .' or 'because...' or 'so what this means is . . .' statements. If you can put these words (or similar) in front of something the candidate has written then it is probably involving explanation, interpretation, evaluation, integration of ideas, exemplification (selection of suitable materials/examples) so 1 AO2 mark can be awarded for each such point.

Question 30	Marking guidance	
After marking the answer for AO1 and AO2, assess it for communication, AO4.		
	Mark	AO1: <i>Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.</i>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point of knowledge/understanding up to a maximum of 8 marks. Answers must focus on the causes and consequences of changes in family life – eg.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Decline in popularity of marriage 2. Increased cohabitation (as opposed to marriage) 3. Increases in divorce / divorce easier to obtain since 1969 4. Impact of violence on families 5. Falling birth rate 6. Mothers having children later in life once career has been established 7. More people choosing to live single lifestyle 8. More children being brought up by single parents 9. Open gay/lesbian relationships now more accepted, especially since establishment of civil partnerships 10. Government pressure for mothers to go to work may have impact on behaviour of teenage children 11. If candidates choose to refer to their own situation in their own family, - eg in terms of 'dadlessness' such points should be credited <p><i>The above points are illustrative only and not exhaustive. Any other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list above.</i></p> <p>Some of these issues will be explored further and awarded marks for AO2 (see next page). Examiners' assessments here should reward the knowledge and understanding demonstrated in discussing causes/consequences of changes in family life.</p>

Q30	Mark	AO2: <i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions</i>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point, up to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to critically examine causes/consequences of changes in family life – they may choose to do this from different viewpoints – eg: society, locality, parents, children – but do not have to adopt this approach.</p> <p>Points should be used to demonstrate how evidence is marshalled by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting: identifying and applying relevant evidence • Interpreting: showing how evidence helps to answer the question • Evaluating: assessing the strength of the evidence in support of the question • Integrating: using evidence to develop a coherent argument/conclusion as set out in the Introduction to Section C in this mark scheme. <p><i>Note – evidence can be information, data, concepts or opinions</i></p> <p>The following areas are likely to be addressed by a majority of candidates, but candidate responses are not restricted to these areas. Other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Moral judgements on decline of marriage, high proportion of marriages or re-marriages breaking up, including the general idea of 'dadlessness' 2. Some single parents wanting a child for themselves without necessarily considering how a child might feel in a single parent household 3. Short term nature of many cohabiting relationships 4. Why earlier family types – extended families or nuclear families broke up 5. Do modern communications make it possible for more people to become aware of many different lifestyles, thus becoming dissatisfied with their own position – and ultimately ignoring responsibilities? <p>Any other valid points must be credited.</p>

Q30	Mark	<p>AO4: <i>Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.</i></p> <p><i>The AO4 marks are not dependent upon the AO1 and AO2 marks.</i></p>
	0	The answer is badly expressed or fails to treat the question seriously, there are many serious lapses in grammar and spelling or there is too little of the candidate's own writing (6 lines of writing or less) to assess reliably.
	1	The answer is only understandable in parts and maybe irrelevant, writing may be in an inappropriate form, arguments are not clearly expressed, and in places grammar and spelling inhibit communication.
	2	The answer is generally understandable, writing is often in the correct form. Arguments are sometimes coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not seriously inhibit communication.
	3	The answer is broadly understandable, writing is in the correct form. Arguments are on the whole coherent and relevant, and grammar and spelling do not inhibit communication.
	4	The answer is clear and lucid, (writing in correct form is taken as a matter of course) arguments are coherent, well laid out and relevant, there are very few grammatical or spelling errors.