**Mock Generic Feedback**

* **ATQ – Answer the question**. In this case ‘political’ and ‘necessity’ both needed addressing. ‘Political’ – i.e. in relation to politics, ‘necessity’ – i.e. required. Many of you argued rights would be better protected, but actually this could be a **bad thing** for politics as government would be less able to break rights to protect the majority (‘political’). In an age of terror, this is particularly important (‘necessity’). Therefore, it might be a positive thing for citizens, but it is not a ‘political necessity’.
* Exam board guidance:
* *Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.*
* *Candidates who do not undertake any comparative analysis of the source and/or have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.*
* *Marks for analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) should only be awarded where they relate to information in the source.*

i.e. If you did not OPEN your paragraph with reference to the source, it made it difficult to award AO2/AO3 marks

* Comparative analysis – compare pieces of the source e.g. how can a written constitution be both “a symbol…of national identity” and yet be “un-British”? And/or compare a point negatively and positively e.g. a written constitution would limit government – why is this both a ‘political necessity’ and not?
* The source – USE QUOTES but only SHORT ones – integrate them into your sentences. E.g. It is clear that the unwritten nature of the UK constitution has made it ‘impenetrable’ for UK citizens, hindering their political knowledge.
* Timing – far too many of you spending too long on the source reading. You need a highlight and to learn to skim read. The second essay many of you completed was barely longer than two sides. **Only you can sort out your timing**.
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