



General Certificate of Education

Spanish 5696

SP02 Aspects of Society

Mark Scheme

2006 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	Marks
AO2 Response to written language	10	18
AO3 Knowledge of grammar	5	9
AO4 Knowledge of society	30	27
TOTAL	30	54

Annotation of Scripts

The following conventions will be used by examiners marking scripts:

AO2 (Reaction and Response)	AO4 (Content)
Ⓐ written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 where this includes reason/justification of opinion.	Ⓒ 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.
R written in the margin to indicate reaction/response relevant to AO2 when no justification is given.	C written in the margin to indicate information relevant to AO4, derived from the 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.	
Irr vertical line in the margin = irrelevant/inappropriate material.	

The mark for AO4, AO2 and AO3 respectively written at the foot of an 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(a)

¿Cómo prefieren informarse los españoles? 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 how Spanish prefer to get information . For this band need balanced consideration of several means of communication with justified decision as to which is preferred and why. (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why prove Spanish prefer one means of communication rather than another.
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 how Spanish prefer to get information . Not all comments relate clearly to which means of communication preferred and why. 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 how Spanish prefer to get information . Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why one particular medium preferred by Spaniards.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on how Spanish prefer to get information . 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focussed on why one particular medium preferred by Spaniards.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on why one particular medium preferred by Spaniards.
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>
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.
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.
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.
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited. Understanding of the topic limited.
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.
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.

Possible Content Points
<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.</p> <p>C TV preferred Only 0.8%, (68,000 of 38 million) have no TV, 99.2% homes have TV 60.4% in main room;54.9% in dining room, 30% in bedroom Watch most in Europe</p> <p>Press not preferred Only 105 per 1000 over 14s read papers Govt feels need for Plan de Fomento. © Press: specific references to papers. TV: facts previous PM- No. of hours watched, No. of sets per household etc Radio/Mobiles/Internet: relevant up to date Sp statistics on use, number per household etc. NB facts must relate to getting information not just to use (eg must be getting news or headlines not contacting friends)</p>
<p>23-27 Band Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Examples will compare several media. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to why Spaniards use to get information</p>
<p>17-22 Band Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well, clearly relating to several media & why Spaniards use to get information</p>
<p>11-16 Band Several points (C and/or ©) but covering no more than 2 media and/or not always used to illustrate why Spaniards prefer for getting information.</p>
<p>5-10 Band 1 or 2 points about media in Spain. Random facts rather than proving why Spaniards prefer to use to get information. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about media. Little/no reference to Spaniards' preference as way of getting information. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 1(b)

¿Qué papel tienen los medios de comunicación en la vida de los españoles? Explica tu opinión y da ejemplos de al menos tres medios.

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 role of media in Spaniards' lives . For this band need balanced consideration of 3 means of communication with justified opinions as to why consider role important or not (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why felt chosen media important 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 role of media in Spaniards' lives . Probably not 3 clearly covered. Not all comments relate clearly to why consider role important or not. 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 role of media in Spaniards' lives . Probably only 2 covered clearly. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why feel have important role for Spaniards.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on role of media for Spaniards . Perhaps only 1 mentioned. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on role media plays for Spaniards .
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on role in Spaniards' lives .
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.</p> <p>C Role of TV 99.2% homes have TV Only 0.8%, 68,000 of 38 million no TV, Watch most in Europe (T not C:60.4% in main room;54.9% in dining room, 30% in bedroom)</p> <p>Press –little influence Only 105 per 1000 over 14s read papers Average age of readers increasing readership less than half that of European average ©TV: facts previous PM- No. of hours watched, No. of sets per household etc Radio/Mobiles/Internet relevant up to date Sp statistics on use, number per household etc. NB facts must focus on importance of role.</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. Examples from at least 3 media. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to role in Spaniards' lives.</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, relating not quite as clearly to 3 media & role in Spaniards' lives.</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 points (C and/or ©) but covering only 2 media and/or not always used to illustrate role/importance in Spaniards' lives.</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 media in Spain. Random facts rather than showing role in Spaniards' lives. And/or 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 role in Spaniards' lives. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 2(a)

Describe *dos* maneras en las que los españoles tratan de ayudar al medio ambiente. En tu opinión, ¿los resultados son buenos? 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 2 ways Spaniards try to help environment. Clearly stated opinions as to whether considered good result or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why felt initiatives successful 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 2 ways Spaniards try to help environment. Both not covered as clearly as for 15-18 band. Not all comments relate clearly to whether considered good results or not. 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 2 ways Spaniards try to help environment. Probably only 1 covered clearly or unclear opinion of whether good result . Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think good.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on initiatives or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on whether good results .
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on results .
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 to, band, quality & quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p>C Día sin coches/reducing car use Free buses-Málaga & Alcantarilla Málaga- use of bikes or walked Alcantarilla- free parking if use bus 5,00 leaflets to raise awareness Police checks to advise if vehicle noisy etc</p> <p>Use of Renewable Energy Madrid- comunidad & IDAE give grants for solar panels New houses must use solar energy for 60-75% of hot water. Wind power- 34% increase in 2001 (saves 6 mill tons CO2) produces electricity 1.7million families Pabellón info on renewable energy, ‘cultivos sin suelo’ etc NB. Must be used to show idea of Pabellón to inform is good initiative © Any other Sp. facts on reducing use of cars or renewable energy. 3 erres ,leyes del guante verde, Calviá, ecotasa</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. Good examples of 2 initiatives. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly helping environment.</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.- relating not quite as clearly to helping environment.</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 points (C and/or ©) but either covering only 1 way of helping environment and/or not always show clear link to helping environment.</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 environment in Spain. Random facts rather than showing how help environment. And/or 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 environment. Little/no reference to helping. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 2(b)

“El medio ambiente está en peligro en España.” ¿Estás de acuerdo o no? 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 danger to environment in Spain . If choose to disagree must show clearly why not a danger but a help. Clearly stated opinions as to whether agree in danger or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified with examples that show danger (or not) to environment in 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 danger to environment in Spain . Not all comments relate clearly to whether agree in danger or not. Not all appropriately justified/illustrated with examples that show danger (or not) to environment in 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 danger to environment in Spain . Unclear opinions on whether environment in Spain in danger or not. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of whether environment in Spain in danger .
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on dangers to environment or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on whether environment in Spain in danger .
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on danger to 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	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.</p> <p>C No. Trying to help: Día sin coches/reducing car use Free buses-Málaga & Alcantarilla Málaga- use of bikes or walked Alcantarilla- free parking if use bus 5,00 leaflets to raise awareness Police checks to advise if vehicle noisy etc</p> <p>Use of Renewable Energy Madrid- comunidad & IDAE give grants for solar panels New houses: solar energy for 60/75% of hot water. Wind power- 34% increase in 2001 (saves 6 mill tons CO2, produces electricity 1.7million families Pabellón info on renewable energy, ‘cultivos sin suelo’ etc NB. Must show information is helpful to environment.</p> <p>© Yes, endangering. Forest fires, overuse of water, Prestige, lynx/oso pardo etc, noise & other pollution No, trying to help: other Sp. facts on reducing use of cars or renewable energy. Also:3 erres, leyes del guante verde, Calviá, ecotasa, Seprona 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>23-27 Band Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Best candidates will probably argue for and against. Good examples of dangers and/or initiatives. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to endangering or helping environment.</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, relating not quite as clearly to endangering or helping environment.</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 points (C and/or ©) but not always show clear link to endangering or helping environment.</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 environment in Spain. Random facts rather than showing how endanger/help environment. And/or 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 environment. Little/no reference to endangering/ helping. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 3(a)

En tu opinión, ¿España acepta a la gente de otros países y culturas? 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 Spain accepts (in all senses) people of different cultures/countries or not. (Best answers will include gypsies). NB must be acceptance, not just whether Spain needs immigrants. Clearly stated opinions as to whether accepted or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why felt do/don't accept.
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 Spain accepts people of different cultures/countries. Gypsies not distinguished as clearly as for 15-18 band. Not all comments relate clearly to whether consider accepted or not. 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 whether Spain accepts people of different cultures/countries or not. Probably confusion gypsies/immigrants or unclear opinion on whether accepted or not. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think accepted or not.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on acceptance or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on whether accepted.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on acceptance .
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.</p> <p>C : trying to accept C.P. San Francisco open 8am-1.30pm showers, food as well as lessons children & adult –gypsies, tinkers & immigrants. C.Garcia Morente: Engánchate al tren –so gypsies will attend school Articles like text 6 try to teach Spaniards</p> <p>Not bothering to accept Text 6 – don’t know religion of Rumanians or where Ecuador is Can’t pronounce <i>djembe</i></p> <p>© accept British and others who retire there</p> <p>© not accepted Ejido & other racist incidents Hard facts about exploitation of immigrants, prejudice against gypsies 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>23-27 Band Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Good examples covering both immigrants & gypsies & clearly distinguishing the two. Every example relates very clearly whether other peoples/cultures accepted or not in Spain.</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, relating not quite as clearly to acceptance or not of other peoples/cultures.</p> <p>11-16 Band Several points (C and/or ©) but distinction between gypsies/immigrants blurred and/or not always show clear link to acceptance or not.</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. 1 or 2 points about immigration/racism in Spain. Random facts rather than showing whether acceptance or not. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.	<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about immigrants/racism. Little/no reference to acceptance or not. Little/no reference to Spain.</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 3(b)

los españoles solo quieren explotar a la gente de otras culturas” ¿Estás de acuerdo o no? 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 Spain does/does not exploit people of other cultures. (Can include gypsies but not essential). Opinions relate clearly to whether exploit or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why felt exploit 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 whether Spain does/ does not exploit people of other cultures. Not all comments relate clearly to whether considered exploit or not. 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 whether Spain exploits people of other cultures or not. Probably general list of problems of immigrants and opinions not relating clearly to whether exploited or not. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think accepted or not.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on exploitation or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on whether exploited.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on exploitation .
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>
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.
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.
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.
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited. Understanding of the topic limited.
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.
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.

Possible Content Points
<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.</p> <p>C : exploit Text 6: Rumanians educated but work in construction. Ecuatorian women work as domestics, Marrocans in agriculture & construction (NB no proof here underpaid etc so hard facts & stats would be ©)</p> <p>Don't exploit C.P. San Francisco open 8am-1.30pm showers, food as well as lessons children & adult –gypsies, tinkers & immigrants. C.Garcia Morente: Engánchate al tren –so gypsies will attend school</p> <p>© exploit Any hard facts about exploitation of immigrants, (details of wages, living & working conditions etc)</p> <p>don't exploit: Ley de extranjería giving papers & rights specific details of associations to help immigrants</p>
<p>23-27 Band Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Good examples of exploitation (or help/aid). Every example relates very clearly whether people of other cultures exploited or not.</p>
<p>17-22 Band Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well - not relating so clearly to exploitation or not.</p>
<p>11-16 Band Several points (C and/or ©); perhaps list of problems of immigrants rather than clear examples of exploitation and/or not always show clear link to exploitation or not.</p>
<p>5-10 Band 1 or 2 points about immigration/racism in Spain. Random facts rather than showing whether exploited or not. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about immigrants/racism. Little/no reference to exploitation or not. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 4(a)

“La Unión Europea ofrece mucho a los españoles.” ¿Estás de acuerdo o no? 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 what EU offers Spain. If choose to disagree must show clearly why does not offer much. Clearly stated opinions as to whether EU offers a lot or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified with examples that show advantages (or not) of EU to 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 what EU offers Spain. Not all comments relate clearly to whether agree offers a lot or not. Not all appropriately justified/illustrated with examples that show advantages (or not) of EU for 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 what EU offers Spain. Unclear opinions on whether EU membership has advantages for Spain or not. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of whether EU offers advantages or not.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on what EU offers or on Spain. Generalisations about EU. 1 or 2 opinions but probably about EU generally and not focused on whether EU membership advantage.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on EU advantages.
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.</p> <p>C Advantages. Text 7: Can share in projects & ideas (Alejandra) Beneficial – less isolated. Lets participate in global economy. (Ma José) Lack of frontiers- more opportunities (Vicente) More powerful in Europe (Roberto et al) Text 8: Socrates, Leonardo da Vinci EU organisations give protection to consumers, workers etc (need specific organisations)</p> <p>Disadvantages: Canaries no longer free port Loss of culture with globalisation (Elena Text 7)</p> <p>© Advantages (If not specific Sp.egs. only T) Funds for roads, railways agriculture etc Larger markets More Sp.egs. of free movement of students, workers & goods.</p> <p>Disadvantages (need specific Sp. egss) Price rises with Euro Quotas bad for fishing industry Immigrants use Spain as means of entry to EU</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. Most able candidates will probably argue for and against. Good examples of advantages/disadvantages. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to benefits or not of EU membership</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 - relating not quite as clearly to (dis)advantages of EU membership</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 points (C and/or ©) but not always showing clear link to advantages (or not) of EU membership. Probably just ‘all I know about EU and Spain’. Maybe too much about general info about Euro.</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 EU. Random facts rather than showing any advantages/disadvantages. And/or 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 EU. Little/no reference to advantages or not. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 4(b)

En tu opinión, ¿saben los españoles bastante sobre la Unión Europea? 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 Spaniards know enough about EU (& what can offer). Focus must be on having/obtaining info not on seeing evidence thro new roads etc. Clearly stated opinions as to why think Spaniards know enough about EU or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why believe Spaniards know enough 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 whether Spaniards know enough about EU & what can offer. Focus on knowing enough/in detail not as clear as for 15-18 band. Not all comments relate clearly to whether consider know enough or not. 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 whether Spaniards know enough about EU & what can offer. More likely to be lists of benefits Spaniards know they can access (Socrates EU funds etc). Unclear opinion on whether really know about EU. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think Spaniards do/do not know enough about EU.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on knowing EU or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably general comments about benefits of EU.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on Q set.
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>
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.
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.
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.
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited. Understanding of the topic limited.
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.
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.

Possible Content Points
<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 : text 7 : older people know more & accept EU better (lines 6-7) Text 8 Can find out what EU offers through EU offices in Madrid & Barcelona EU Health & Safety at work HQ in Bilbao 16 Carrefours for info on rural& agricultural affairs Euro Info Centres for small businesses Consumer protection offices Barcelona & Vitoria © Previous PM: young don't know enough; would fail exam on EU Specific egs of autonomous govts & town councils running projects to inform citizens</p>
<p>23-27 Band Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Good examples of info have or how could find out not egs of what EU done. Every example relates very clearly if Spaniards know enough about EU & what offers.</p>
<p>17-22 Band. Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well - not relating quite as clearly to info Spaniards have or could get</p>
<p>11-16 Band Several points (C and/or ©) but probably more about what EU done and/or not always showing clear link to whether know enough about EU.</p>
<p>5-10 Band 1 or 2 points about EU and Spain Random facts rather than showing whether know enough about EU or not. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about EU. Little/no reference to whether Spaniards know enough about EU. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

Question 5(a)

¿Crees que la vida es más fácil en España que en Hispanoamérica? Explica tu opinión y da ejemplos de España y de 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 comparisons to decide whether life is easier in Spain than Hispanoamerica or not. NB Focus must be on a clear comparison, not list of what happens in Spain then list for SA. Clearly stated opinions as to why think life easier for Spaniards or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified with reasons why Spaniards have easier life 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 whether life is easier in Spain than Hispanoamerica or not. Not all comments relate clearly to why think life easier for Spaniards or not. 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 whether life is easier in Spain than Hispanoamerica or not. More likely to be list of good aspects of Spain & bad aspects of SA. Unclear whether opinions relate to why think life easier for Spaniards or not. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think life easier for Spaniards or not.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on any idea of comparison between Spain and SA. 1 or 2 opinions but probably general comments about Spain and/or SA.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on Q set.
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. <i>Most likely categories are, money, education, work/unemployment, home/family</i></p> <p>C Money In Spain: only 27% worried by economic situation Money only 5th in list of what most important In SA: 43,4% poor, 18,8% (95 mill) destitute Education: Spain: 55% happy with education SA: Paula worked as tamalera, to give children chance of education Work/unemployment: Spain: Unemployment main cause of worry (40%) but 40% satisfied with work SA: 3 case histories of having to come to city, sell in street because no other work (details needed) Yolanda unemployed 2 years Home/family: Spain: 83% (in text) (or 97% in table!) happy with family SA: Difficult – Yolanda had to sell in street – desperate, 3 children Paula – widow, 8 children (1 died because living conditions), others became ill etc. Sex, Drugs etc: Eggs from Spain in text 10 but need © points from SA to use effectively © Poverty/Work/family SA egs ‘niños de la calle’ from previous PM Sex/Drugs etc: specific facts on situation I Spain or SA</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. Good balance of egs from both Spain & SA & covering at least 3 headings. Every example relates very clearly to comparing situation in Spain & SA.</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, not relating quite as clearly to comparing situation in Spain & SA.</p> <p>11-16 Band Several points (C and/or ©) but probably not showing clear comparison between Spain & SA and/or limited to only 1 or 2 headings. Maybe lack of balance (more on Spain than SA or vice versa).</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 1 or 2 points about Spain and/or SA. Random facts rather than showing whether live better in Spain. And/or generalisations with little Spanish/SA evidence.</p>
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.	<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about Spain and/or SA. Little/no reference to quality of life in these countries. Little/no reference to Spain/SA.</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 5(b)

Los españoles y los hispanoamericanos, ¿ quieren lo mismo de la vida? Explica tu opinión y da ejemplos de España y de 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 comparing what Spanish and Spanish Americans want from life NB Best answers must have clear comparison & not just list of what want Spain then list for SA. Clearly stated explanations as to why made decisions on what Sp and SAs want from life & whether the same. (Almost) all points clearly justified with reasons why decided what both want & whether the same.
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 comparing what Spanish and Spanish Americans want from life. Not all comments relate clearly as to why made decisions on what Sp and SAs want from life & whether the same. 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 comparing what Spanish and Spanish Americans want from life. More likely to be list of good & bad aspects of life in Spain & SA. Unclear whether opinions relate to what Sp and SAs want from life & whether the same. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of what Sp and SAs want from life & whether the same.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on any idea of comparison between Spain and SA. 1 or 2 opinions but probably general comments about Spain and/or SA.
1-2	There is virtually no personal reaction to the question, but there is a little reaction to the topic.	Little/No focus on Q. 1 or 2 random points – probably no attempt to comment on Q set.
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>
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.
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.
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.
5-10	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited. Understanding of the topic limited.
1-4	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.
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.

Possible Content Points
<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. <i>Most likely categories are, job, money, education, stable home & family life</i></p> <p>C Job/work: Both want job security SA: Street vendors because little other work: 3 case histories (text 9) –details needed Spain: Situation better :Unemployment main cause of worry (40%) but 40% satisfied with work Money; In SA: Widespread poverty: 43,4% poor,18,8% (95 mill) destitute In Spain: only 27% worried by economic situation Money only 5th in list of what most important Education: Spain: 55% happy with education SA:Paula worked as tamalera , to give children chance of education Good Home/family: Mostly the norm in Spain: :83%(in text) (or 97% in table!) happy with family SA: Difficult – Yolanda had to sell in street –desperate , 3 children Paula –widow, 8 children (1 died because living conditions), others became ill etc. © Poverty/Work SA egs ‘niños de la calle’from previous PM. Any other specific facts (probably re SA) – economic crisis Argentina. Wetbacks going to US for work Home/family SA – niños de la calle; chabolas (specific detail) from Lima or other cities</p>
<p>23-27 Band Will use (almost) all C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Good balance of egs from both Spain & SA covering at least 3 headings & never losing sight of what Sp and SAs want from life & whether the same. Every example relates very clearly to comparing what Spanish & SAs want.</p>
<p>17-22 Band Almost all C points (or equally relevant ©) used well - not relating quite as clearly to comparing what Sp and SAs want from life & whether the same.</p>
<p>11-16 Band. Several points (C and/or ©) but probably not used to show what Sp and SAs want from life and/or limited to only 1 or 2 headings. Maybe lack of balance (more on Spain than SA or vice versa).</p>
<p>5-10 Band. 1 or 2 points about Spain and/or SA. Random facts rather than showing what want from life. And/or generalisations with little Spanish/SA evidence.</p>
<p>1-4 Band Generalisations about Spain and/or SA. Little/no reference to what want from life in these countries. Little/no reference to Spain/SA.</p>