



General Certificate of Education

Spanish 5696

SP02 Aspects of Society

Mark Scheme

2005 examination - June series

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

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

Unit 2

	% of AS	Total marks	Marks per question
AO2 Response to written language	10	36	18
AO3 Knowledge of grammar	5	18	9
AO4 Knowledge of society	30	54	27
TOTAL	30	108	54

Annotation of Scripts

The following conventions will be used by examiners marking scripts:

- C written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from the Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
- © written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from a source other than the current Preliminary Material and relevant to the question set.
- T written in the margin to indicate information generally relevant to the topic.
- Rep written in the margin to indicate repetition of information relevant to AO4 or AO2.
- R written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 when no justification is given.
- ® written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 where this includes reason/justification of opinion.
- | vertical line in the margin = irrelevant/inappropriate material.

The mark for AO4, AO2 and AO3 respectively to be written at the foot of the answer accompanied, where the examiner deems it necessary, by a word or phrase quoted from the criteria for assessment as published in the specification.

Question 1

‘Pocos españoles leen periódicos. Prefieren otros medios de comunicación’ ¿Estás de acuerdo? Da ejemplos para explicar tu opinión.

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

AO2	Reaction/response <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	Amplification
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Clear, consistent focus on both whether Spanish read papers or what other media prefer. Clear statement of why agree (or not) with almost every opinion well illustrated/justified. NB. Main focus must be press. Must not dismiss press & concentrate on other media.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Generally focused on Q set. Perhaps some lack of balance (too much on press or on other media). Not all comments relate clearly to whether Spanish read press or what prefer instead. Not all appropriately justified/illustrated.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Not clearly focused on Q set. Probably ‘all I know’ about press in Spain or emphasis much more on other media. Lacks balance of press v. other media. Comments relate to any aspect of Sp. press. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus. Random facts about press & media not organised to address Q. 1 or 2 opinions about press.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	No focus on Q. ‘Anything I know’ about Sp. media. 1 or 2 comments relating to media but not Spanish attitude to press.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

AO3	Knowledge of Grammar <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	Content/Knowledge of Society <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic. Good use of topic-specific vocabulary Quality of the evidence very good Understanding of the topic very good.	<p>NB Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality & quantity of evidence more important than source. C Press Only sell 105 papers per 1,000 inhabs over 14. -Sales decreasing. -Readers' age increasing. - Govt concerned enough to set up Plan de Fomento de la Lectura to encourage young. (NB. This point must be logically introduced) Other media (TV) Only 68,000 (0.4%) of 38 million don't have TV. ©Press (some recent CIS statistics) 13.2% Sp over 18s hardly ever read paper. 44.9% read paper every day. Prefer revistas (esp. 'de corazón' - 40.3%) BUT reading 3rd most popular pastime after TV & sport. Other media TV – stats on children & TV – previous PM. Internet & Mobiles – info from previous PM.</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material. Makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence good Understanding of the topic good.	<p>23-27 Band. Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to Q set.</p>
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material. Some topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence sufficient Understanding of the topic sufficient.	<p>17-22 Band. Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well. Refs to Plan de Fomento not entirely focused. Refs to other media good but not always relevant.</p>
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p>11-16 Band. Several C points but not always used appropriately to answer question set. Information about Plan de Fomento... not well used. Information about other media may score as UT but is not focused on Q.</p>
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p>5-10 Band. 1 or 2 points about press. A few random facts about other media. Generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about media. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 2

En tu opinión, ¿respetan el medio ambiente en España o no? Da razones y ejemplos.

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

AO2	Reaction/response <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	Amplification
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Clear focus at all times on whether agree or disagree that Spain respects environment. Can be all for, all against or balanced for & against but reason for each point must be clear. All reasons, opinions and justification relate clearly to whether Spain respects environment or not.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Generally focused on Q set though 1 or 2 points less obviously contributing to argument. Most (but not all) points commented on. 1 or 2 comments may be rather general and not relate clearly to whether Spain respects environment.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Not clearly focused on respect (or not) for environment. Information about environment in Spain but relation to Q not always made clear. Opinions & reaction relate more to topic than Q. Little (or inappropriate) justification
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus. May be refs to Prestige etc or to Seprona, Calviá etc without linking to Q. Some opinion/comment on environmental issues but not clearly related to Q.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	A few random facts about environment in Spain. No clear attempt to link to Q set. 1 or 2 very general comments on environmental issues. No link to respect for environment.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

AO3	Knowledge of Grammar <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	Content/Knowledge of Society <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	<p>The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic. Good use of topic-specific vocabulary Quality of the evidence very good Understanding of the topic very good.</p>	<p>NB Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band, quality & quantity of evidence more important than source. C Solar panels- new buildings in Madrid must have; provides, 60-75% of hot water, help in paying from IDAE & Comunidad de Madrid. Wind power –increased 34% 2000-2001; power at end 2001 avoided 6 million tons CO2 in atmosphere; electricity for 1.7 million families; increase of 34% in a year. Pabellón- educating & encouraging use of renewable energy, recycling, energy saving cultivation etc. Día sin coches- free buses(Málaga,Alcantarilla). Encourages cycling, police check noise levels, info on bus passes etc. © from previous PM; 3 erres, Seprona, Calviá, fines for dumping etc. oso pardo, lince protection etc. Against: Prestige, Aznacollar, forest fires, desertización for crops/golf courses, building for tourism etc.</p>
17-22	<p>The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material. Makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence good Understanding of the topic good.</p>	<p>23-27 Band. Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. All points will relate to respect (or not) for environment.</p>
11-16	<p>The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material. Some topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence sufficient Understanding of the topic sufficient.</p>	<p>17-22 Band. Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well. Projects mentioned but link to respect for environment not always made clear. Info on Día sin coches or Pabellón may digress from Q. Occasional problem/disaster mentioned without clear link to Q.</p>
5-10	<p>The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited. Understanding of the topic limited.</p>	<p>11-16 Band. Several C points but not always used appropriately to answer question set. Information on alternative energy sources, día sin coches etc probably not adapted to answer Q. Other information (probably problems rather than solutions) may score as UT but not as evidence for Q set.</p>
1-4	<p>The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.</p>	<p>5-10 Band. A few random facts about environment in Spain. Little/no attempt to relate to Q set. Or: Generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
0	<p>There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.</p>	<p>May not mention Spain at all. General observations about ozone layer or the like.</p>

Question 3**Los inmigrantes ¿traen problemas o ventajas para España? Explica tu opinión y da ejemplos.**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

AO2	Reaction/response <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	Amplification
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Clear, consistent focus on whether believe immigrants bring problems or advantages for Spain. Can be all for, all against or balanced for & against but reason for each point must be clear. Must clearly refer to Spanish context. All opinions and justification relate clearly to problems and/or advantages of immigration for Spain.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Generally focused on Q set though 1 or 2 points less obviously contributing to argument. Maybe slight confusion of facts relating to gitanos & immigrants from PM. Most (but not all) points commented on. 1 or 2 comments may relate to immigrants themselves rather than to Spain.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Not clearly focused on problems/advantages of immigration for Spain. Probable digressions into problems/advantages for immigrants, general information about pateras, racism etc. Confusion of facts from PM re gitanos and immigrants. Opinions & reaction probably relate more to immigration and immigrants themselves than to problems/advantages for Spain. Little (or inappropriate) justification.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus. May be refs to pateras and immigrants themselves rather than to impact on Spain or complete confusion of gitanos & immigrants. Some opinion/comment, mostly about general immigration issues.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	A few random facts immigrants/immigration in Spain. No clear attempt to link to Q set. 1 or 2 very general comments on immigration. No link to problems/benefits for Spain.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

AO3	Knowledge of Grammar <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	Content/Knowledge of Society <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic. Good use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence very good Understanding of the topic very good.	<p>NB Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks.</p> <p>In general, apart from top band, quality & quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p>C</p> <p>Ventajas: Do jobs Sp. don't want –construction (Romanians, Moroccans) agriculture (Moroccans, Equatorians) domestic work (Equatorian women) –all Text 6</p> <p>-cultural diversity (egs from schools text 5).</p> <p>Problemas: in schools; pupils with many languages (text 5).</p> <p>Illegal workers –Many from sub-Saharan Africa (12%).</p> <p>Pateras- 3,924 drowned in last 5 years.</p> <p>© Ventajas: Redress falling birthrate & ageing working population (2-3 mill needed in next 20 years). Facts & figures needed.</p> <p>More detail on cultural diversity/enrichment (previous PM re Ecuatorianos).</p> <p>Problemas- Racial tension (Ejido etc).</p> <p>Pateras- strain on resources of authorities (specific egs from Canarias/Andalucia etc).</p> <p>Crime etc?? from illegal immigrants.</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material. Makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence good Understanding of the topic good.	<p>23-27 Band- Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way.</p> <p>Several points both for & against needed (unlikely can claim all good or bad).</p> <p>All points relate clearly to problems/advantages of immigration. No mention of gitanos.</p> <p>17-22 Band. Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.</p> <p>Quite good balance problems/disadvantages OR extremely good argument in favour of one or other. May be 1 or 2 points that lack clear link to Q.</p>
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material Some topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence sufficient Understanding of the topic sufficient.	<p>11-16 Band. Several C points but not always about problems/advantages.</p> <p>Other information about immigrant/immigration may score as UT but not as evidence for Q set.</p>
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p>5-10 Band. A few random facts about immigration. Little/no attempt to relate to Q set.</p> <p>Or:</p> <p>Generalisations with little mention of Spain.</p>
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p>May not mention Spain at all.</p> <p>General observations about immigration.</p>
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole	

Question 4

¿Crees que los jóvenes españoles conocen bien Europa? Explica por qué piensas así y da ejemplos.

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

AO2	Reaction/response <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	Amplification
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Clear, consistent focus whether young Spaniards know much about Europe. All points and opinions relate to this. Reasons for opinions must explain why young Spaniards do/don't know about Europe. NB Answers must focus not on young & Europe but on whether they know about Europe & what can offer.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Generally focused on whether young Spaniards know about Europe. 1 or 2 less relevant points (eg less focused remarks about Erasmus). Most (but not all) points commented on. 1 or 2 comments may not relate clearly to why believe young know about Europe.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	Not clearly focused on what know. Probably 'all I know' about young Sps. & Europe. Opinions/reasons relate to young & Europe in general not to why believe know about Europe.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus. A few points from PM; little attempt to adapt to answer Q. Any opinion/comment probably relates to wider issues on Spain & Europe.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	May not mention young people or what they know about Europe at all. 1 or 2 random points & opinions about Spain & Europe.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

AO3	Knowledge of Grammar <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	<p align="center">Content/Knowledge of Society <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i></p>
23-27	<p>The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic.</p> <p>Good use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence very good Understanding of the topic very good.</p>
17-22	<p>The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material. Makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence good understanding of the topic good.</p>
11-16	<p>The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material. Some use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence sufficient. Understanding of the topic sufficient.</p>
5-10	<p>The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.</p>
1-4	<p>The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.</p>
0	<p>There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.</p>

Possible Content Points
<p><i>NB Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks.</i></p> <p>In general, apart from top band, quality & quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p>C Text 7 shows do know about: Projects, ideas can share (Alejandra) Overall, gained economic benefits (Ma José) Economic hello, subsidies available (Dácil) Greater mobility for workers/students gives greater experience (Vicente). BUT could mean loss of identity (Elena) Erasmus/Leonardo da Vinci (Text 8) NB If use other info from text 8 must give focus on young knowing.</p> <p>© Previous PM re failing exam on Europe proves don't know. Previous PM about how many feel European must be given young focus Extra info about Erasmus, Socrates etc.</p>
<p>23-27 Band. Must give (almost) all C points and/or extra points, all with very clear focus on young. Inclusion of points that are not made to relate to young people cannot be considered 'logical & coherent'.</p>
<p>17-22 Band. uses most of C points well. Less well related throughout to young people.</p>
<p>11-16 Band. PM material less well manipulated. Probably little attempt to relate examples to young. Points from text 8 may be worth crediting under Understanding of topic but not good evidence for Q.</p>
<p>5-10 Band. A few random points little evidence of trying to relate to what young know about EU, or 'all I know' about Erasmus or similar projects with no attempt at focus on Q.</p>
<p>1-4 Band. May be 1 or 2 points about Spain and EU but no focus on young or whether Spaniards know about EU.</p>

Question 5**Desde tu punto de vista, ¿ cómo se compara la vida en España con la vida en Hispanoamérica?**

C =	AO4 content from PM	T =	generally relevant to topic area	R =	good AO2 point, no justification
© =	AO4 content not from PM	Rep =	repeated point (AO4/AO2)	® =	justified AO2 point
=	irrelevant/inappropriate material				

AO2	Reaction/response <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	Amplification
15-18	The answer is clearly focused on the question and displays a logical and coherent personal reaction to the question which is well justified by clearly stated opinions.	Clear, consistent focus on Spain & more than one Spanish American country. Clear comparison of several aspects (3 at least) of life. Clear opinions on /reasons for differences (or similarities). NB. Can decide similar provided justify.
11-14	There is clear evidence of personal reaction to the question, but this is not consistently maintained. There is some justification, but the consistency of the opinions is variable.	Generally focused on comparisons between Spain & SA. Not consistent because comparisons not always clearly stated. Opinions/reasons not given for every point and/or not always clearly related to comparisons/similarities.
7-10	The answer lacks focus and ideas are not clearly organised. Some personal reaction to the question is evident, but justification is weak.	7-10 Not clearly focused on comparisons. Probably only 1 or 2 clear comparisons. Opinions relate more to topic than to comparisons. Reasons rarely given (once?) or too general.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	3-6 Poor focus on Q. Little/no attempt to compare. Generalisations/random facts about poverty, work etc. Inconsistent Hispanic focus. Opinions/reaction rarely given or rarely relate clearly to comparisons/similarities.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	1-2 No focus on comparisons. Limited (1/2) facts. No comment on comparison/similarity. 1 or 2 random comments on life in Spain or SA.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

AO3	Knowledge of Grammar <i>(These marks are awarded based on the degree to which the candidate uses structures and grammar as outlined in the specification)</i>
8-9	The manipulation of most structures is good. There are still some inaccuracies, but these tend to occur in attempts at more complex structures.
6-7	The manipulation of basic structures is generally sound. There are attempts to use more complex structures, often successfully.
4-5	There is some awareness of structure but basic errors are still frequent. Communication is generally maintained.
2-3	The level of manipulation of structures and the number of errors make comprehension difficult.
0-1	Shows little or no grasp of grammatical structure. Errors are such that communication is seriously impaired.

AO4	Content/Knowledge of Society <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	Possible Content Points
23-27	The answer is well illustrated with descriptions which are logically and coherently developed and do not depend exclusively on the preliminary material. Relevant points are clearly stated and there is definite evidence of reading around the topic. Good use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence very good Understanding of the topic very good.	<p>NB Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks</p> <p>In general, apart from top band, quality & quantity of evidence more important than source</p> <p>C. Work & unemployment SA: Cases histories from text 9 Spain: 'Paro' main worry 40% Sp youngsters Work low down (40%) as source of satisfaction Money/economic situation/poverty SA: 220 mill (43.4%) hardly enough to live on. 95 mill. (18.8%) without basics to live. Spain: low on list of worries (27%) Family SA: Yolanda, Paula worked as street sellers to raise families Spain: most imp (97%) to young Sps. persons most like to be often a relative. © Work etc. Spain: unemployment stats etc. SA: previous PM re Ecuatorianos coming to Spain for work Economic situation: SA: Argentina, street children etc Spain: good since joined EU etc. Family: Spain, - changes in modern Spain; youngsters at home till 30 SA: children work to help family; large families still common etc</p>
17-22	The answer makes a number of points relevant to specific issues. It shows some independence from, or clear manipulation of, the preliminary material. Makes use of topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence good understanding of the topic good.	<p>NB. Valid to consider & decide very similar 23-27 Band. Good balance of valid points (including some from ©) from Spain and at least 2 SA countries. At least 3 sub areas (work, family etc) covered. Clear comparison throughout</p> <p>17-22 Band. Still clear comparison between Spain and SA. Fewer points than for top band. Maybe only 2 sub areas but well covered</p>
11-16	The answer relies heavily on the preliminary material, but there is an attempt made to manipulate this material. Some topic-specific vocabulary. Quality of the evidence sufficient understanding of the topic sufficient.	<p>11-16 Band. Comparison becoming less clear. Valid points about situation in Spain and SA (credit for understanding of topic) but not used to answer Q 'How does life compare....?' Some generalisations about Spain or Latin America</p>
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p>5-10 Band. Random points from PM with little/no attempt to adapt to answer Q. Generalisations frequent</p>
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p>1-4 Band. Little/no specific information about situation in either Spain or Latin America. Perhaps generalisations about poverty, breakdown of family etc.</p>
0	There is absolutely nothing of relevance either to the topic area or to the question set. A zero score will automatically result in zero for the question as a whole.	