

# Mark Scheme (Results)

## January 2009

GCE

### GCE General Studies (Unit 6GS02/Paper 01)

## General Marking Guidance

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

Question Number	Answer	Mark
1	A A higher percentage of employees in England have journeys which take more than an hour than in any other area of the UK.	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
2	C Scotland	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
3	D Northern Ireland	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
4	A 43%	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
5	C 999 000	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
6	A elite	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
7	A a teenage gang	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
8	B fellow students at school or college	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
9	B because fewer people have chosen to get married	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
10	C increasing prices	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
11	D a situation in which some people are considered to be 'outside society'	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
12	A ignorance	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
13	D represents an invisible barrier which prevents women from being promoted at work	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
14	C individuals moving from a lower social class to a higher social class	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
15	B letter-writing	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
16	B frictional unemployment	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
17	C statements (ii) and (iv) only	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
18	C primary socialisation	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
19	D positive discrimination	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
20	D is a cohesive society with one set of cultural values	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
21(a)	<p><b>1 mark for each simple explanation (max 3):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A person or party winning an election on a very low turnout has effectively been ignored/rejected by everyone who failed to vote <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>2. If only a small minority vote this means many people have ignored their democratic duty as citizens <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>3. A high turnout suggests democracy is working well - people have interest/confidence in 'the system' <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>4. High turnouts provide better/more accurate representation for area as a whole <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>5. Although only 45% turned out to vote in the London Mayor election in 2008, this figure was more than in previous contests and therefore an improvement, meaning more people wanted the successful candidate to win <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>6. If there is a high turnout, extremists such as BNP candidates are likely to find it more difficult to win <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>7. The higher the number of people voting, the more likely it is that voters have understood the disagreements between candidates and therefore backed the person they support <b>AND/OR</b></li> <li>8. A low turnout can indicate alienation and rejection of the choices on offer e.g. some would say that there is virtually no difference between the three main parties, so what is the point?</li> </ol> <p><b>AWARD SECOND MARK FOR A POINT IF THERE IS SIGNIFICANT RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT</b></p>	3

Question Number	Answer	Mark
21(b)	<p>1 mark for each simple explanation (max 3) e.g.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No Conservative in 2008 was a minister in government, so Boris Johnson - as Mayor in the <b>capital city</b> - was the most important/powerful/ high-ranking Conservative in the country AND/OR</li> <li>2. Boris Johnson controls an <b>enormous budget</b> as Mayor of London, (something even party leader David Cameron does not do at present) AND/OR</li> <li>3. Equally no Conservatives held <b>ministerial posts</b> in the devolved governments of Scotland and Wales AND/OR</li> <li>4. Although Conservatives provide leadership of many Councils none remotely approach the size or importance of London AND/OR</li> <li>5. After Labour's series of election wins, Johnson's victory makes him the 'most important Conservative'</li> </ol> <p><b>Max mark:3</b></p> <p><b>AWARD SECOND MARK FOR A POINT IF THERE IS SIGNIFICANT RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT</b></p>	3

Question Number	Answer	Mark
22(a)	<p>1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• argument from analogy.</li> </ul>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
22(b)	<p>1 mark for a simple explanation as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• But the weakness of such an approach can be that there may be no real closeness (parallel) between the two cases which are being compared.</li> </ul>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
23(a)	<p>1 mark for simple answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Argument from cause</li> </ul>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
23(b)	<p>1 mark for a simple recognition of weakness as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While a cause does often lead to an effect, it isn't always the case that some event which occurs before another is in fact its cause OR</li> <li>• Often people mistake correlations for causes when in fact there is no element of cause/effect between the two variables OR</li> <li>• So, yes, the Evening Standard did criticise Mayor Livingstone before the election and subsequently he did lose but the writer needs to recognise that the Mayoralty may have moved from Ken Livingstone to Boris Johnston for quite different reasons.</li> </ul> <p>N.B. There always needs to be a reference to the nature of the <b>relationship</b> between event A and event B.</p>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
24(a)	<p><b>1 mark for each simple point, e.g.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An opinion is a moral or value judgement (unlike a fact)</li> <li>• An opinion is subjective (i.e. personal beliefs, feelings or reflections)</li> <li>• An opinion is often not verifiable</li> <li>• An opinion cannot be proved as a fact could be</li> <li>• An opinion will not be agreed by everyone</li> <li>• An opinion may not be true</li> </ul> <p>Max 2</p>	1+1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
24(b)	<p><b>1 mark for identifying a fact:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guardian columnist, Polly Toynbee....</li> <li>• Polly Toynbee told us ...</li> </ul> <p>NB - if a statement is offered containing <b>both</b> fact and opinion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Polly Toynbee told us ...we ... were a Tory campaign-sheet then <b>0 marks</b> should be awarded since it contains opinion as well as fact, <b>UNLESS</b> the candidate puts inverted commas around "Tory campaign sheet"</li> </ul> <p>To gain the one mark available, candidates must <u>also</u> give an acceptable reason - eg:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it actually happened</li> <li>• it is objective/truth</li> <li>• it can be proved</li> <li>• it can be tested/verified</li> </ul>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
25	<p><b>1 mark for simple extract, as below:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As his own former leader, Neil Kinnock, argued, 'everyone likes Ken, except those who know him'.</li> </ul>	1

Question Number	Answer	Mark
26	<p><b>1 mark for each simple point offered - eg:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An 'empirical' report is a report based on observation or past experience, not theory.</li> <li>So the paper is claiming to have evidence to back up the claims it made.</li> <li>Given the focus on 'observation' an empirical approach is sometimes likened to an inductive approach because it is leading a reader towards a conclusion.</li> </ul>	1+1

Q27		Marking Guidance:
	After marking the answer for AO2, assess it for communication, AO4.	
A02:	<i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.</i>	
	<p><b>Award 1 mark for any of the following points</b> (slightly different wording with the same or similar meaning is acceptable). (max 4 marks)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will be recognised that some <b>popular papers</b> mix up news and opinions and sometimes demonstrate massive bias.</li> <li>• It is often suggested that such papers are purchased for sport or screaming headlines - ie entertainment value, yet in a democracy they can also have a powerful pull on public opinion.</li> <li>• Popular newspapers aiming to achieve high circulation figures may openly proclaim opinions based on very odd <b>news values</b> which more serious newspapers would reject.</li> <li>• Popular papers often take a particular line as a result of editor or owner opinions.</li> <li>• Quality newspapers (previously often described as broadsheet newspapers until many of them changed their format to tabloid size) aim to offer more objective analysis and generally do not to combine news and opinions.</li> <li>• That is not to say quality papers do not have their preferred standpoints - eg: <i>The Guardian's</i> views are consistently to the left of the opinions expressed in <i>The Times</i> or <i>Daily Telegraph</i>.</li> <li>• Terrestrial television is probably the least biased of UK media since the BBC is required by its Charter to be impartial and a similar requirement exists of ITV in the Television Acts.</li> <li>• In recent months the Office of Communications (Ofcom) has brought its regulatory powers to bear on internet providers and television companies - eg 'swindle' phone-ins. - to ensure they do not abuse their power in the media market.</li> </ul> <p>N.B. Max mark 3 if only one form of media is discussed.</p>	4

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

Question 28	Marking Guidance and Indicative Content
	<p>The key words in the question which a successful answer must address are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ examine the evidence used by the writer....</li> <li>○ consider how objectively it supports the arguments and conclusion....</li> </ul> <p>So once candidates have looked at the passage they are likely to find some evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>In the highest turnout yet for a London Mayoral election (about 45%)</i></li> <li>○ <i>Boris Johnson (Con) defeated Ken Livingstone (Lab) by 140,000 votes in May 2008</i></li> <li>○ <i>The Guardian's</i> writers saw Boris Johnson as a 'sociopath', a 'moneyed creep... from postcode Posh', a 'racist', a snob', 'loathsome' and a 'moron'</li> <li>○ They said the <i>Evening Standard</i> was like 'a virus poisoning London'.</li> <li>○ Guardian columnist, Polly Toynbee, told us at the <i>Evening Standard</i> that we were 'a Tory campaign-sheet' ... media bias and peddled 'spurious scandal after scandal'.</li> <li>○ Had our news stories been 'spurious' or 'Tory campaigns' they would not have mattered....they were factual and measured. We gave Ken Livingstone six days to answer our questions before publishing. Five months on, there are still no answers. Instead, his abuse against me and the paper confirmed not just our stories, but the fears about him.</li> <li>○ The Standard's comment pages were hostile to Ken. But we used arguments, based on the facts we discovered, not insults. We separated news and comment. My commentary made no secret of my views.</li> </ul> <p>but they may well get distracted by a substantial amount of opinion - this may suggest to them that the writer's arguments and conclusion are not as effective or objective as perhaps they needed to be.</p> <p>Mark AO3 by asking yourself the following questions and awarding a mark where appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are either evidence or argument mentioned and linked to specific bits of the passage albeit simply? If YES award one mark</li> <li>▪ Are fact and opinion differentiated and is the distinction used to reach a simple judgement? If YES award one mark</li> <li>• Are different forms of argument (<b>inductive, deductive, authority, etc</b>) correctly identified and commented on? If YES award one mark</li> <li>▪ Does the candidate clearly indicate how objectively the evidence supports the conclusion? If YES award one mark</li> </ul> <p>After marking the answer for AO3, assess it for communication, AO4.</p>

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

Question 29	Context			
	<p>This question is in some ways more open-ended than most because the specification emphasises that we want students to focus on the areas of music, photography, film, literature, painting (or whatever) in which they are most interested. So we cannot prescribe particular works of art for them to consider. We cannot require that they refer to recent competitors for the Booker or Turner prizes, though we hope they will. What we can expect and require is that they demonstrate a clear knowledge of some specific works of art from a chosen discipline and period. In discussing concepts such as style, innovation and rarity we are entitled to expect that they can exemplify the judgements they offer with good evidence from a chosen, informed and well understood area of study.</p>			
Marking Guidance				
After marking the answer for AO1 and AO2, assess it for communication, AO4.				
	Mark	Descriptor		
		<p><b>AO1:</b>  <i>Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.</i></p>		
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point, up to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>Answers must focus on VALUE of works of art. This may be discussed in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• artistic/historical value/quality</li> <li>• aesthetic/inherent value/quality</li> <li>• social/cultural value/quality</li> <li>• financial value</li> <li>• one style being replaced by another in terms of fashion - innovation</li> <li>• popularity (among general population or elite) affecting demand</li> <li>• volume of work produced by given artist/rarity</li> <li>• reasons for changes in fashion/popularity/value</li> <li>• whether the artist is alive or dead</li> <li>• recommendations of critics v personal 'likes and dislikes'</li> <li>• new sources of funding (eg lottery funds)</li> <li>• new style becoming more popular/accepted</li> <li>• rarity - age of the work</li> <li>• discovery of new technologies (eg CD/DVD)</li> <li>• impact of media</li> </ul> <p>The above points are illustrative only and not exhaustive. Any other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list above.</p>		

	Mark	<p><b>AO2:</b>  <i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions</i></p>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point, up to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to critically examine conflicting views/alternative viewpoints. Candidates who give consideration solely to one aspect of the question (eg value in the context of quality OR style OR innovation OR rarity ONLY) are limited to a maximum of 6 marks.</p> <p>Points should be used to demonstrate how evidence is marshalled by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Selecting:</b> identifying and applying relevant evidence</li> <li>• <b>Interpreting:</b> showing how evidence helps to answer the question</li> <li>• <b>Evaluating:</b> assessing the strength of the evidence in support of the question</li> <li>• <b>Integrating:</b> using evidence to develop a coherent argument/conclusion</li> </ul> <p>Note - evidence can be information, data, concepts or opinions</p> <p>The following areas are likely to be addressed by a majority of candidates, but candidate responses are not restricted to these areas. Other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list below.</p> <p>Answers must focus on VALUE in the context of quality, style, innovation or rarity. This may involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Value - to whom?</li> <li>• Is value inherent/intrinsic or all relative?</li> <li>• Is value linked to fashion as prescribed by competitions or opinion leaders?</li> <li>• What causes tastes or values to change?</li> <li>• Does monetary value depend on rarity?</li> <li>• Is it true an artist has to be dead to be valued?</li> </ul> <p>The discussion of value will be in the context of:</p> <p>1: QUALITY - This could involve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do we judge the 'quality' of a work?</li> <li>• Is it a technical matter or 'personal likes and dislikes'? AND/OR</li> </ul> <p>2: STYLE - This could involve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is 'style'? - ie how things are categorised or how they are presented</li> <li>• Is it reasonable to think of 'style' in terms of specific periods? AND/OR</li> </ul> <p>3: INNOVATION - This could involve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What makes innovation happen?</li> <li>• Does innovation occur because society changes?</li> <li>• Or because new technologies become available?</li> <li>• Or because new composers, musicians, painters, photographers, writers arrive on the scene with works to show or things to say? AND/OR</li> </ul> <p>4: RARITY - This could involve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is an artist's work rare because there is little work or because what there is rarely comes on the market?</li> <li>• Is scarcity alone the reason for high prices?</li> <li>• Is rarity achieved by artists sometimes destroying their own work?</li> </ul> <p>Any other valid points must be credited.</p>

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

Question 30	Context	
		Whether or not UK citizens are able to exercise sufficient democratic control over British policy towards Europe is a major focus of the political part of the specification. Examiners must recognize that this isn't a Government and Politics paper so while good knowledge about democratic considerations, political elements and European institutions are very important, we must also allow students to talk about changing Europe if they want to - some will have travelled to Europe for work or leisure and others will have friends at school or college from other European countries or with whom they are in touch via Facebook, etc. Within the parameters set by the question, there is a possible sub-theme about how far Europe is developing in ways people in the UK hope and wish - answers which adopt such an approach are to be welcomed
After marking the answer for AO1 and AO2, assess it for communication, AO4.		
	Mark	<i><b>AO1:</b> Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.</i>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point, up to the maximum of 8 marks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27 member-countries make EU a <b>large and complex</b> organisation - would be more so if Turkey or Croatia joined</li> <li>• 23 languages add to EU complexity</li> <li>• The EU is the only international organisation to which the UK belongs which has <b>direct democratic inputs</b></li> <li>• The UK has 78 of the 732 members of the <b>European Parliament</b>.</li> <li>• European Parliament is influenced by political parties each with agendas set by their members in the respective countries.</li> <li>• The UK's 78 members sit in <b>party groups</b>, so of those elected in 2004 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the 19 Labour members sit in the Socialist group of 215 MEPs and</li> <li>- the 12 Liberal Democrats sit in the European Liberals and Reform group of 103 MEPs.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The UK Conservatives may become part of a new party grouping after 2009.</li> <li>• Most legislation for the EU comes from the Council of Ministers - here a <b>member of the UK govt</b> will take part in discussions about making new law</li> <li>• If the law is to be about finance, it will probably be the Chancellor of the Exchequer who attends; if it is an environmental matter then the Secretary of State for Environment (DEFRA) will be the relevant minister.</li> <li>• Many British citizens are interested in international organisations and seek to mobilise support for initiatives they support through bodies such as the European Movement</li> <li>• There are procedures for reporting back - when the Foreign Secretary or other ministers go to an EU or NATO meeting, they report back on the event to the House of Commons</li> <li>• Either or both of them are likely to be summoned to the Select Committee for Foreign Affairs of Defence to respond to detailed questioning by MPs</li> <li>• MPs on select committees generally have expert knowledge of their respective policy areas;</li> <li>• the committees subsequently issue reports which are publicly available and sometimes (but by no means always) commented on quite fully in the press.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 1975 UK citizens voted in a referendum to confirm the UK's membership of what is now the EU</li> <li>• In 2008 Lib Dems urged there should be another such referendum though Conservatives under David Cameron favoured a more narrowly focused referendum on the Lisbon Treaty</li> <li>• Also, <b>pressure groups</b> add to democracy</li> </ul> <p>Any other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list above.</p>
--	--	--

	Mark	<p><b><i>AO2:</i></b>  <b><i>Marshall evidence and draw conclusions: select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions</i></b></p>
	0-8	<p>Award 1 mark for each valid point, up to a maximum of 8 marks.</p> <p>The question requires candidates to critically examine conflicting views/alternative viewpoints. Candidates who give consideration solely to one aspect of the question (eg democratic control in terms of parliaments OR parties OR pressure groups OR referendums ONLY) are limited to a maximum of 6 marks.</p> <p>Points should be used to demonstrate how evidence is marshalled by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selecting: identifying and applying relevant evidence</li> <li>• Interpreting: showing how evidence helps to answer the question</li> <li>• Evaluating: assessing the strength of the evidence in support of the question</li> <li>• Integrating: using evidence to develop a coherent argument/conclusion</li> </ul> <p>Note - evidence can be information, data, concepts or opinions</p> <p>The following areas are likely to be addressed by a majority of candidates, but candidate responses are not restricted to these areas. Other valid points must be credited, even if they don't appear in the list below.</p> <p>Points made must link to EU size and/or 'sufficient democratic control'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• with <b>27 countries</b> and <b>23 languages</b> one national voice may find difficulty in getting heard</li> <li>• availability of information to UK citizens</li> <li>• extent of accountability/ scrutiny.</li> <li>• <b>roles of MPs and MEPs</b> - generally very receptive to questions and ideas - in supporting 'sufficient democratic control'</li> <li>• impact of <b>direct elections</b> to the European - whether such elections are more about domestic opinion in UK rather than an explicitly European agenda.</li> <li>• <b>pressure groups</b> are a channel through which many people press their views - as over former Yugoslavia or in terms of humanitarian aid in times of disaster</li> <li>• pressure groups also press policy issues relating to anything from animal rights to the single market.</li> <li>• but marching or protesting didn't deter the UK government from joining in the war in Iraq</li> <li>• some commentators suggest the same intransigence may be true of UK engagement in European issues.</li> <li>• Also <b>power of referendums</b> (as in Ireland re Reform (Lisbon) Treaty)</li> <li>• whether <b>media coverage</b> of EU matters helps or hinders democracy</li> <li>• The role of the unelected Commission makes democratic control more difficult</li> <li>• those who have travelled or worked or have friends in Europe or those who have come from other European countries may legitimately comment on the whole idea of how far Europe is moving in directions desired by its peoples rather than, necessarily, its governments</li> </ul> <p>Any other valid points must be credited.</p>

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