



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Spanish 5696**

## **SP02          Aspects of Society**

# **Mark Scheme**

*2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

**Unit 2**

	<b>% of AS</b>	<b>Marks</b>
AO2 Response to written language	10	18
AO3 Knowledge of grammar	5	9
AO4 Knowledge of society	15	27
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>54</b>

**Annotation of Scripts**

The following conventions will be used by examiners marking scripts:

<b>AO2</b> (Reaction and Response)	<b>AO4</b> (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)**

**'Los medios de comunicación tienen poca importancia para los españoles.' ¿Estás de acuerdo? 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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 media important or not to Spanish. (Almost) all opinions are clearly illustrated to show why agree/disagree that media has little importance to Spaniards
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 media important or not to Spanish. (Almost) all opinions are clearly illustrated though not all comments relate clearly to question
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 media important or not to Spanish. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why /whether this the case
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on whether media important or not to Spanish. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on the question set
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 importance or not of media.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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.	<b>NB</b> 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. <b>Media are important:</b> <b>TV: C</b> 99.2% homes have TV Watch most in Europe. Only 0.8%,68,000 of 38 million no TV. ©: facts previous PM- No. of hours watched, No. of sets per household etc <b>Not important:</b> <b>Press: C</b> Only 105 per 1000 over 14s read papers Govt feels need for Plan de Fomento... <b>Arguing either way</b> ©Radio/Mobiles/Internet relevant up to date Sp statistics on use, number per household etc.
<b>17-22</b>	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.	<b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Examples will cover several media. Every example Spanish & relates very clearly to situation in Spain <b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- still mentioning several media. Not as many points and/or not related quite as clearly to the question
<b>11-16</b>	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.	<b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points ( C and/or ©) but covering no more than 2 media and/or not always used illustrate importance or not of media in Spain
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about media in Spain. Random facts rather than proving importance or not of media. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.	<b>1-4 Band</b> generalisations about media. Little/no reference to Spain or importance of media there.
<b>0</b>	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 1(b)**

**¿Qué influencia tienen los medios de comunicación en los jóvenes 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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 influence of media on young Spaniards. For this band will need consideration of several media (Almost) all points well illustrated and opinions explained with relevant examples.
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 influence of media on young Spaniards but not all comments relate clearly to influence or to young rather than all Spaniards. 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 influence of media on young Spaniards. Probably as much about Spaniards in general as about young. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why feel influences.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on influence of media on young Spaniards. 1 or 2 opinions about media but probably not focused much on Spain or influence
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 importance of press in modern Spain.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> (These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>Press</b>  <b>C</b> Only 105 per 1000 over 14s read papers  Average age of readers increasing  readership less than half that of European average.  Plan de Fomento to encourage interest in reading  © Young Sps.read more than adults. Only 25.83% never read a book. (45% of adults)  Only 4.27% read in free time but not much less popular than surfing net (4.78%) &amp; TV (5.34%).  <b>TV.</b>  <b>C.</b> Views of <i>los sin tele</i>  <b>Internet/mobiles:</b> © points from previous PM and other sources</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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.	<b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to <b>influence on young Spaniards</b>
<b>11-16</b>	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.	<b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- relating not quite as clearly to <b>influence on young Spaniards</b>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) about media in Spain but influence on young Spaniards not the main reason for choice of examples.
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points only about media in Spain. Probably not related to influence on young Spaniards.  And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.
<b>0</b>	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.	<b>1-4 Band</b> generalisations about media. Little/no reference to young people. Little/no reference to Spain.

**Question 2(a)**

**¿Cómo intentan los españoles reducir la contaminación del medio ambiente?  
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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 attempts to reduce pollution in Spain. (Almost) all points clearly justified and reasons feel Spain is (not) doing enough to tackle pollution clearly stated.
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 attempts to reduce pollution in Spain. Argument not as clear as for 15-18 band. Not all comments relate clearly to why feel Spain is (not) doing enough to tackle pollution. 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 do enough to tackle pollution. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why feel Spain is (not) doing enough.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on reducing pollution or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on reducing pollution
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 question set.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.



<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>C</b> For: Día sin coches: free buses etc, Number taking part Renewable energy Madrid 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 CO<sub>2</sub>, produces electricity 1.7million families Pabellón educating about renewable energy, © Any other Sp. attempts to reduce traffic pollution (carriles bici , ecobuses etc) 3 erres ,leyes del guante verde, Calviá, ecotasa Against: Día sin coches; more cars in Madrid, fewer cities taking part recently Prestige, not meeting Kyoto targets etc</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Clear arguments about whether trying to reduce pollution. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to tackling pollution</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used .- relating not quite as clearly to attempts to reduce pollution</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) but not clearly related to pollution and/or Spain</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about environment in Spain. Random facts with little about attempts to reduce pollution. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<b>0</b>	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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about environment. Little/no reference to reducing pollution Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

**Question (2b)**

**¿Piensas que los españoles hacen lo suficiente para proteger el medio ambiente?  
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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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/how Spaniards protect environment. (Almost) all points clearly justified and reasons feel Spain is (not) doing enough to protect environment clearly stated.
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/how Spaniards protect environment. Argument not as clear as for 15-18 band. Not all comments relate clearly to why feel Spain is (not) doing enough. 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/how Spaniards protect environment Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why feel Spain is (not) doing enough.
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on protecting environment or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably not focused on whether doing enough to protect environment
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 question set.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>C</b> Día sin coches: free buses etc, Number taking part Renewable energy: Madrid 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 educating about renewable energy, © Other Sp. attempts to reduce traffic pollution (carriles bici , ecobuses etc) 3 erres ,leyes del guante verde, Calviá, ecotasa Against: Día sin coches; more cars in Madrid, fewer cities taking part recently Clear up after Prestige, not meeting Kyoto targets etc</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Clear arguments about whether trying to protect environment .Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to protecting environment</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used .- relating not quite as clearly to protecting environment</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points ( C and/or ©) but not clearly related to protecting environment</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about environment in Spain. Random facts with little about whether doing enough to protect And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<b>0</b>	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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about environment. Little/no reference to attempts at protection Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

**Question 3(a)**

**En tu opinión, ¿cómo reaccionan los españoles a la gente de otras 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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 Spaniards react to people from other cultures. Best answers may well consider gypsies, foreign residents/tourists. Clearly stated opinions relating to how Spaniards view immigrants and/or those from other cultures (Almost) all points clearly illustrated to support the opinion being given
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 Spaniards react to people from other cultures Not all comments relate clearly how Spaniards react to such people. 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 Spaniards react to people from other cultures. Probably some opinions not clearly related to view of those of other cultures and/or some generalisations about immigrants. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on how Spaniards react to people from other cultures 1 or 2 opinions but almost certainly about immigration in general
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 question set.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> (These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks</p> <p><i>In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</i></p> <p><b>C</b> : React positively; try to help them/integrate them C.P. San Francisco open 8am-1.30pm showers, food as well as lessons children &amp; adult –gypsies, tinkers &amp; immigrants. C.Garcia Morente: Engánchate al tren’ –to educate gypsies © other eggs of Sp. organisations helping immigrants. Humanitarian aid to survivors of pateras Ley de Extranjería &amp; allowing to become legal © React positively : other ways try to help. SOS Racismo etc etc . Dislike/see as scroungers/cheap labour Hard Sp facts about denying immigrants/gypsies decent work, education, housing Aspects of Ley de Extranjería that make difficult to get job etc. Racist incidents, El Ejido etc</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Good examples relating to Spaniards view of immigrants etc.. Every example relates very clearly to how react to people of other cultures</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- relating not quite as clearly to how react to other peoples/cultures</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) but not always showing clear link to how react to those of other cultures. Probably some general information about immigration not linked clearly to the question.</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about immigration/racism in Spain. Random facts rather than showing how react to those of other cultures. And/or Generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<b>0</b>	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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about immigrants/racism. Little/no reference to Spaniards view of immigrants etc Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

**Question 3(b)**

**¿Crees que España es un buen ejemplo de un país multicultural?  
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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 multicultural aspects of Spain. (Very best answers may well include consider gypsies, foreign residents or Basques/Catalans but good consideration of immigrant cultures sufficient). Clearly stated opinions on whether Spain good eg. of multicultural society or not (Almost) all points and opinions clearly illustrated with egs referring to multiculturalism
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 multicultural aspects of Spain. Not all comments relate clearly to multiculturalism. 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 multicultural aspects of Spain. Probably some opinions not clearly related to multiculturalism and/or some generalisations about immigrants. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on multicultural aspects of Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but almost certainly about immigration in general
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 question set.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.



<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> (These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks .In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>C</b> : Yes and try to encourage: C.P. San Francisco feel immigrant cultures will enrich pupils' experience C.Garcia Morente: works with gypsies etc Lot to learn but willing Egs from text 6 about need to know more about religion ,lang., traditions of others © what immigrants can bring – eg Ecuatorian fiesta from previous PM, foreign foods, music etc Acceptance of/opposition to religion etc – specific egs re mosques, wearing of veil etc Ley de Extranjería &amp; making immigrants legal SOS Racismo etc etc .</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Good examples relating to Spaniards' view of multicultural society. Every example relates very clearly to how view people/aspects of other cultures</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- relating not quite as clearly to how view people/aspects of other cultures</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) but not always showing clear link to how view people/aspects of other cultures. Probably some general information about immigration not linked clearly to the question.</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about immigration/racism in Spain. Random facts rather than showing how view people/aspects of other cultures. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<b>0</b>	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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about immigrants/racism. Little/no reference to Spaniards view of other cultures etc Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

**Question 4(a)**

**'La Unión Europea ha tenido mucho impacto en España.'**  
**¿Estás de acuerdo? 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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 EU had much impact on Spain. (If choose to disagree must show clearly why disagree). Clearly stated opinions as to whether EU had much impact or not (Almost) all points clearly justified with examples that prove the impact (or not) of EU
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 EU had much impact on Spain. Not all comments relate clearly to effects of EU. Not all appropriately justified/illustrated with examples to show effects (or not) of EU
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 EU had much impact on Spain. Unclear opinions on what impact EU had Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of impact
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on effect of EU membership Generalisations about EU 1 or 2 opinions but probably about 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 question set.
0	There is no evidence of any personal reaction/response.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.



<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>C</b> Text 7: Can share in projects &amp; 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) Disadvantages: Canaries no longer free port Loss of culture with globalisation (Elena Text.7) © Funds for roads, railways agriculture etc Larger markets More Sp.egs. of free movement of students, workers &amp; goods. Bad effects: (need specific Sp. eggs) Price rises with Euro Quotas bad for fishing industry Immigrants use Spain as means of entry to EU etc</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Every example is Spanish and relates very clearly to effects of EU membership</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- relating not quite as clearly to effects of EU membership</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) but not always showing clear link to effects of EU membership. Probably just 'all I know about EU and Spain. Maybe too much about general info about Euro</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about EU. Random facts rather than showing any clear effects And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<b>0</b>	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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about EU. Little/no reference to effects on Spain. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>

**Question 4(b)**

**¿Piensas que los españoles están bien informados sobre sus derechos y oportunidades como europeos? 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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 Spaniards can find out about EU & what offers. NB. Focus must be on obtaining info <b>not</b> on seeing evidence thro new roads etc. Clearly stated opinions as to why think Spaniards are well informed about what EU offers or not. (Almost) all points clearly justified as to why believe Spaniards well informed about what EU offers them.
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 Spaniards can find out about EU & what offers. Focus not as clear as for 15-18 band. Not all comments relate clearly to Spaniards well informed about EU 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 how Spaniards can find out about EU & what offers. Opinion not clearly focused on to whether Spaniards well informed about EU or not Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think well informed or not about EU
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on knowing about EU or on Spain. 1 or 2 opinions but probably general comments about 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.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>C</b> : Egs of what young people in text 7 aware of (greater study, work opportunities etc. Specific egs needed) Almost all info from Text 8 egs. Should know what EU offers through EU offices in Madrid &amp; Barcelona HQs of EU Health &amp; Safety at work in Bilbao, Satellite centre Madrid 16 Carrefours for info on rural &amp; agricultural affairs Euro Info Centres for small businesses Consumer protection offices Barcelona &amp; Vitoria © Specific egs of autonomous govts &amp; town councils running projects to inform citizens. Instituto de la Juventud –info for young re becas etc</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Good examples of what know/where could find out. Every example relates very clearly to having or getting info on rights &amp; opportunities</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- not relating quite as clearly to being well informed.</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material. Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) but probably more about what EU done <b>and/or</b> not always showing clear link to how well informed Spaniards are about EU &amp; what offers</p> <p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about EU and Spain Random facts rather than showing whether know about EU &amp; what offers. And/or generalisations with little Spanish evidence.</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence. Quality of the evidence poor Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about EU. Little/no reference to what Spaniards know about EU. Little/no reference to Spain.</p>
<b>0</b>	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(a)**

**Los problemas de España e Hispanoamérica son muy diferentes.'**

**¿Estás de acuerdo? Explica tu opinión y da ejemplos de España y de al menos un país hispanoamericano.**

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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 same/different problems in Spain & Spanish America. <b>NB</b> Focus must be on a clear comparison, not list of what happens in Spain then list for SA. Clearly stated opinions as to why agree (or not) consider have same/different problems. (Almost) all points clearly justified with reasons as to why these problems are common (or not) to Spain & Spanish America.
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 same/different problems in Spain & Spanish America. Not all comments relate clearly to why consider have same/different problems. 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 same/different problems in Spain & Spanish America. More likely to be list of good aspects of Spain & bad aspects of SA. Opinions do not relate clearly to why consider have same/different problems. Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why think problems same/different
3-6	This is a limited personal reaction to the question, but no justification for points made.	Poor focus on any idea of same/different problems in Spain & Spanish America 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.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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.

<b>AO4</b>	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
<b>23-27</b>	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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p>Most likely 'problem areas' are home, family, work/unemployment, money, education,</p> <p><b>C Home/family:</b> Spain:83% (in text) (or 97% in table!) happy with family SA: Yolanda had to sell in street –desperate , 3 children Paula –widow, 8 children (1 died because living conditions)</p> <p><b>Work/unemployment:</b> Spain: Unemployment main cause of worry (40%) in text 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 © Education , Drugs, street children/homelessness are possible areas. (specific eggs needed from both Spain and SA)</p>
<b>17-22</b>	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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well and/or equally relevant © in same way. Good balance of eggs from both Spain &amp; SA. Every example relates very clearly to comparing situation in Spain &amp; SA</p>
<b>11-16</b>	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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- not relating quite as clearly to comparing situation in Spain &amp; SA</p>
<b>5-10</b>	The answer relies almost exclusively on the preliminary material.  Quality of evidence limited Understanding of the topic limited.	<p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points ( C and/or ©) but probably not showing clear comparison between Spain &amp; SA. Maybe lack of balance (more on Spain than SA or vice versa)</p>
<b>1-4</b>	The answer includes very little factual evidence.  Quality of the evidence poor. Understanding of the topic poor.	<p><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about Spain and/or SA Random facts rather than showing whether problems same or different in Spain &amp; Sp.A And/or generalisations with little Spanish/SA evidence.</p>
<b>0</b>	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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about Spain and/or SA. Little/no reference to problems in these countries. Little/no reference to Spain/SA.</p>

**Question 5(b)**

**¿Es la familia lo más importante en la vida de los españoles y los hispanoamericanos?  
Explica tu opinión y da ejemplos de España y de a menos un país hispanoamericano.**

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				

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Reaction/response</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the extent to which the candidate answers the question set)</i>	<b>Amplification</b>
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 importance (or not) of family in Spain and Sp.A. NB. Best answers must have clear comparison & not just some points about Spain then some for SA. Clearly stated explanations as to why feel family most important aspect of life (or not) in Spain & Sp.A (Almost) all points clearly justified with reasons why decided family most 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 importance (or not) of family in Spain and Sp.A Not all comments relate clearly as to why feel family most important aspect of life (or not) in Spain & Sp.A. 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 importance (or not) of family in Spain and Sp.A More likely to be 'all I know' about life in Spain & SA. Unclear whether opinions relate to importance of family Little (or inappropriate) explanation/justification of why decided that family most important (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 family in Spain & Sp.A 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.	

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Knowledge of Grammar</b> <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	<b>Content/Knowledge of Society</b> <i>(These marks are awarded based on the quality of the evidence that the candidate uses to support the argument in AO2)</i>	<b>Possible Content Points</b>
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><b>NB</b> Not essential to use PM but other sources do not necessarily score higher marks. In general, apart from top band quality &amp; quantity of evidence more important than source.</p> <p><b>C</b> <b>SA:</b> Determined to support children: Yolanda &amp; Paula's work as street vendors <b>Spain:</b> Family greatest source of satisfaction to young (97%) –text 10; parents people would most like to be like © SA Yes: Ecuatorianos to Spain to earn money to send back to family No: 'niños de la calle' from previous PM. Abandoned by families. So not important? Sp: Yes: support grown up children- at home till late 20s.etc No: Increasing breakdown of family; divorce, same sex partnerships etc now legal</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><b>23-27 Band.</b> Will use many C points very well <b>and/or</b> equally relevant © in same way. Good balance of eggs from both Spain &amp; SA Every example relates very clearly to importance(or not) of family in both societies</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><b>17-22 Band.</b> Almost as many C points (or equally relevant ©) used well.- not relating quite as clearly to situation in both Spain and Sp.A</p> <p><b>11-16 Band.</b> Several points (C and/or ©) but probably not compare/contrast importance of family in Spain &amp; Sp.A. 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><b>5-10 Band.</b> 1 or 2 points about Spain and/or SA Random facts rather than showing importance of family 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><b>1-4 Band</b> Generalisations about Spain and/or SA. Little/no reference to family in these societies. 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.	