

Mark Scheme (Results) January 2010

GCE

GCE Government & Politics (6GP03) Paper 3D Structures of Global Politics

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **Government & Politics** telephone line: **0844 576 0025**

January 2010

Publications Code UA022847

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

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.

| | |
|---|---|
| No. 1 | How does global governance differ from world government? |
| Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance, broadly, refers to the various ways in which social life is co-ordinated, of which government is merely one. Global governance refers to the various processes through which decision-making and co-operation at a global level is facilitated, operating through multilateral systems of regulation. At the heart of the emerging system of global governance is the UN and its various bodies, together with the institutions of global economic governance, notably the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF. Rather than imposing their will on individual states, the processes provide the framework for the development of intergovernmental relationships, reflecting a growing acceptance of global interdependence. Global governance does not only involve intergovernmental bodies, but also the participation of non-governmental actors such as NGOs, national corporations, global capital markets, citizens' movements and so on. • World government, by contrast, refers to the idea of centralised authority operating through a single, supranational body. Strictly speaking, such a government would involve the establishment of a monopoly of the use of force worldwide, as well as the surrendering of sovereignty by individual states. However, the most versions of world government are based on the idea of world federalism, in which the central authority is vested with supreme authority in relation to certain functions, while state governments continue to have jurisdiction in relation to other functions. While global governance aims to containing the pressures generated by anarchy, world government would banish anarchy altogether by establishing and enforcing an international rule of law, sometimes seen as world law. Although the League of Nations and the United Nations were often presented as early prototypes of world government, neither has come close to realising this goal. | |
| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|--|---|
| No. 2 | Why do realists believe that global politics is characterised by conflict? |
| Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Realists argue that global politics is biased in favour of conflict both because of the nature of states (or other global actors) and because of the implications of the international system. For realists, states are the principal actors in international or world politics, and, being sovereign, they act as autonomous entities. The primary motive driving state action is the pursuit of power and self-interest, usually explained by reference to human nature (human beings are viewed as selfish, greedy and power-seeking creatures). International relations are therefore inevitably characterised by power politics, with power usually understood in terms of military capacity or force, the ability to impose their will on others or to resist aggression of fellow states. Realists believe that all states are motivated by such power-seeking tendencies, regardless of their constitutional character. A tendency towards conflict also stems from the dynamics of the international system itself. Anarchy reigns in the international system because there is no authority higher than the sovereign state. However, anarchy forces states to adopt a strategy of self-help. As no other body or actor can ensure their security, states are forced to ensure their own security. The international system is therefore characterised by suspicion, fear and insecurity, creating an irresistible tendency towards conflict and competition. This is made worse by the security dilemma, in which a defensive military build-up by one state is depicted as potentially or actually aggressive by another state, leading to an arms race, growing hostility and the likelihood of war. | |
| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |
|---------------------------------------|---|

| | |
|--------------|---|
| No. 3 | Explain the driving forces behind regional integration and co-operation. |
|--------------|---|

Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points)

- A tendency towards regional integration and co-operation has been increasingly evident since the 1990's, with the EU serving as the most advanced example worldwide, but with other examples including regional economic blocs such as NAFTA and ASEAN and regional political blocs such as the African Union. The types of regional organisation range from loose and non-binding agreements amongst states to complex institutional arrangements, as found in the EU.
- Although the driving forces for more regional integration and co-operation vary across different continents, regionalism as a global phenomenon has been a response to a number of wider developments. The deepest of these is a recognition of growing interdependence and the rise of globalisation. The most significant impetus towards international regionalism has undoubtedly been economic, reflecting the declining effectiveness of the nation-state as an independent economic entity. Regional economic blocs facilitate trade and economic specialisation amongst states, also giving them access to larger markets. Most such blocs have come into existence since 1990 and have been a response to economic globalisation. Usually, regional blocs help to manage the integration of their regions into the global economy, while also fostering internal co-operation. In cases such as the Council of Europe, the African Union and the Organisation of American States, regional bodies provide a looser foundation for political co-operation, having little or no economic role.

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|--------|-------------|
|--------|-------------|

| | |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
|---|---|

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>No. 4</p> | <p>What is 'soft' power, and why has it become more important in recent years?</p> |
| <p>Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points)</p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft power is the ability to influence other actors by persuading them to follow or agree to norms and aspirations that produce the desired behaviour. It contrasts with 'hard' power, in which power is exercised through threats or rewards, typically involving the use of military 'sticks' or economic 'carrots'. Soft power operates through intangible factors such as the popularity of a state's values and institutions and its moral standing in the world. • Although there is debate about the relative significance of 'soft' and 'hard' power, it is often argued that soft power has generally become more important in the modern world. This is seen as a consequence of the growth of global interdependence and freer flows of communication and information. Interdependence encourages states to achieve goals by working together, 'soft' power being particularly effective in facilitating co-operation. 'soft' power is most often associated with the rise of globalisation and the establishment of 'complex interdependence'. The limits of 'hard' power are evident in the 'war on terror', in which an emphasis on military force and unilateralism weakened the USA's 'soft' power in terms of its ability to build a wider coalition of support within and beyond the Moslem world. | |

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|---|---|
| No. 5 | Explain the main criticisms that have been made of the World Trade Organisation. |
| Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points) | |
| <p>Key criticisms of the WTO include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The WTO has been criticised in terms of its aims and underlying philosophy. In particular, global free trade has been seen to widen economic inequalities by giving dominant powers access to the markets of weak states while having little to fear themselves from foreign competition. Free trade, moreover, gives economies global markets rather than local needs, and tends to place profit before considerations of community, stability and workers' rights. • Environmentalists have made particular criticisms of the WTO, arguing that free trade and economic deregulation tend to weaken environmental protection and preservation. The WTO's principles fail to take into account the environmental impact of free trade and economic restructuring. | |

- The WTO is often criticised for being undemocratic and for favouring the interests of rich and powerful state. This is evident in a lack of even-handedness, in that protectionist practices in the developed North, particularly in agriculture, have often been tolerated while they have been fiercely criticised in the developing South.
- The WTO has also been criticised for being ineffective, in that the task of decision-making in the area of trade practices has often been frustratingly slow. This is evident in the faltering progress of the Doha Round of negotiations, which has been hampered by tensions between Northern and Southern states in particular.

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|---|---|
| No. 6 | To what extent has globalisation reshaped international politics? |
| Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Globalisation refers to the emergence of a complex web of interconnectedness that means that our lives are increasingly shaped by decisions that are made a great distance away. Distinctions are commonly drawn between economic, cultural and political forms of globalisation. The impact of globalisation on politics has been the subject of considerable debate, however. Liberals tend to argue that globalisation has had dramatic and far-reaching impact on international politics, while realists and others claim that the international system remains substantially unchanged. • Liberals and especially so-called ‘hyperglobalisers’ portray globalisation as a profound, even revolutionary, shifts in international politics that have intensified since the 1980s. The impact of globalisation has been greatest on the state and on sovereignty. Traditionally, international politics operated through a system of sovereign and autonomous states. However, the interconnectedness that globalisation has fostered makes state borders increasingly ‘porous’, meaning that states are penetrated by external influences to a much greater extent than previously occurred. This can certainly be seen in the case of global capital markets and an increasingly interlocking global capitalist system (‘borderless world’). Modern state are thus ‘post-sovereign’ states. This has been particularly evident in economic affairs through the impact of global capital markets and the creation of an interlocking capitalist economy, sometimes seen as creating a ‘borderless world’. The decline of the state is also reflected in the greater importance of non-state actors, including transnational corporations, NGOs, terrorist organisations, transnational criminal organisations and so forth. Furthermore, the interconnectedness and interdependence that globalisation has spawned has changed relations between and amongst states, creating stronger pressure towards co-operation and integration. Growing interdependence has shifted the focus of global politics away from a concern with issues of war and peace, and forced other issues onto the foreign-policy agenda, notably the environment, poverty and development, and human rights. It has also led to a shift in policy-making responsibility from states to international or intergovernmental bodies. The trend towards regional integration and to the strengthening of global governance can therefore be seen as a clear consequence of globalisation. • However, globalisation sceptics, who include realists and some on the traditional or ‘old’ left, argue that the impact of globalisation has been greatly exaggerated. Sceptics point out, for example, that the overwhelming bulk of economic activity still takes place within, not across, national boundaries. National economies, in other words, are not as irrelevant as globalisation theorists usually suggest. States therefore remain the principal actors on the world stage. Only a tiny proportion of states (‘weak’ or ‘failed’ states) are unable to control what happens within their borders. Furthermore, the trend towards regional and global governance does not spell the demise of the nation-state. In the first place, intergovernmental institutions may have grown in number but they remain weak and usually ineffective because control continues to reside with individual states. Second, the growth of regional and international organisations does not necessary imply the decline of state power, as these tend to be instruments through which states, and especially prominent states, seek to achieve their interests. | |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Poor knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| AO2 | Intellectual skills |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| AO2 | Synoptic skills |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |

| | |
|---|--|
| AO3 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as ... | |
| <i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks) | Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| <i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks) | Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks) | Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary |

| | |
|---|--|
| No. 7 | 'The USA is a power in decline.' Discuss. |
| Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two contrasting images of global order have emerged since the end of the Cold War. One suggests that a unipolar world order has emerged in which the USA operates as a 'global hegemon'. Alternatively, the end of the Cold War bipolarity is seen to be giving way to the rise of a multipolar world order, in which, for a number of reasons, the USA no longer functions as the world's sole superpower. • The view that the USA has emerged as an unchallengeable power, no longer merely a superpower but a 'hyperpower', can be defended in a number of ways, including the following. The strongest basis for arguing that a unipolar world order has come into existence is the USA's huge and increasing military lead over the rest of the world. For example, the USA's military spending in 2007 was nine times greater than China's, the second largest. The USA's technological lead over other countries is also almost unassailable, accounting for about 40 per cent of world spending on research and development. US power is also underpinned by its growing population, expected to rise from 305 million to 439 million by 2050, and by the highly educated and skilled nature of the US population, particularly in areas such as science and high technology. The USA, furthermore, retains enormous structural power, reflected in the considerable influence it exerts over institutions such as the WTO, IMF and World Bank, and in the role of the dollar as the world's leading currency. • However, the USA has also been viewed as a power in decline. Perhaps the most important factor has been the rise of emerging powers, notably China, India and Russia. The USA's relative importance on the world stage, has undoubtedly been affected by the dramatic growth of the Chinese economy, which is widely predicted to outstrip the US economy by 2020 if not before. Some, indeed, argue that the centre of gravity of world | |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>politics and the global economy is in the process of shifting from a US-dominated West to a Chinese-dominated East. This was dramatically demonstrated by the global economic crisis that emerged in 2008. This crisis has affected the standing of the US dollar and, arguably, hastened the relative economic decline of the USA. US decline can also be seen in its loss of 'soft' power, partly resulting from the damage done to its moral authority by the 'war on terror' generally, and the Iraq war in particular. Prolonged involvement in counter-insurgency wars in Iraq and Afghanistan has revived concerns about the USA's 'imperial-overreach'. The Obama administration has confronted major challenges in trying to address both the USA's economic and foreign-policy problems.</p> | |
| A01 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Poor knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| A02 | Synoptic skills |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as ... | |
| <i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks) | Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| <i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks) | Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks) | Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary |

| | |
|--|---|
| No. 8 | To what extent has the EU established a 'federal' Europe? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A 'federal' Europe would consist of a Europe in which sovereignty is shared between EU institutions and member states, each of them enjoying a sphere of autonomous policy jurisdiction. Early dreams of an integrated Europe undoubtedly had a federalist dimension, in that people such as Monnet and Schuman looked to the creation of an association in which the sovereignty of European nations would be 'pooled'. However, the extent to which this dream has been realised has been a matter of considerable debate. • Those who argue that the EU has significant federalist features often point out that the Treaty of Rome (1957) looked to make countries relate to one another on the basis of supranationalism, suggesting that member states should hand over sovereignty on certain issues, allowing European bodies to impose their will on member states. The supranational character of the EU is more evident in certain bodies than in others. It is particularly evident in the European Commission and the European Court of Justice. Federal features were also built into the EEC/EC/EU through the introduction of qualified majority voting (QMV), which, as it allows member states to be outvoted on issues, has implications for sovereignty. Many also argue that the process of European integration has gradually transformed the EC/EU from being a confederation of independent states to becoming an organisation with federal-type features. The phases in this process include the progressive extension of QMV and restrictions on the national veto over a range of issues due to the passage of the Single European Act (1986), the Maastricht Treaty (1992), the Treaty of Amsterdam (1997) and the Treaty of Nice (2001). A further expansion of QMV is proposed in the Lisbon Treaty. It has been clearly established since the 1980s that EU law has precedence over the law of member states, a position established in the UK by the Factortame cases. European integration has gone furthest in those countries that are participating in monetary union, which have effectively ceded economic sovereignty to the EU in certain areas. • However, others argue that the EU has an essentially intergovernmental character in that interaction usually takes place on the basis of sovereign independence. From this perspective, a 'federal' Europe has remained but a dream. Such a view is underpinned by the fact that member states retain power through the European Council. The EU is therefore not a form of supranational government, but a cross between supranationalism and intergovernmentalism, something like the UN in which sovereign states agree to do things in the same way but not by abandoning sovereignty. The idea of a European 'super-state' is therefore a myth. Although the national veto has been reduced in scope, it continues to be applied to important areas of policy-making, such as taxation, foreign and defence policy. The flexibility of decision-making within the EU has also been maintained through 'opt-outs', which some member states have successfully negotiated in relation to policy areas that affect vital national interests. This has allowed, for example, members states such as the UK to opt-out from monetary union. | |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Poor knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| AO2 | Intellectual skills |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| AO2 | Synoptic skills |
| <i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks) | Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks) | Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks) | Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |

| | |
|---|--|
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as ... | |
| <i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks) | Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| <i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks) | Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks) | Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary |

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA022847
January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH