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Summary of Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in Politics SAMs Issue 2 changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of changes made between previous issue and this current issue</th>
<th>Page number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question Paper 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas and</strong></td>
<td>6, 7, 53 and 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question Paper 2: UK Government and Non-core Political Ideas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have updated the wording for the responses to make it clearer.

In your response you must:

- compare the different opinions in the source
- consider the view and the alternative view in a balanced way
- use a balance of knowledge and understanding both arising from the source and beyond the source to help you to analyse and evaluate.

**Amended to:**

In your response you must:

- compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
- examine and debate these views in a balanced way
- analyse and evaluate only the information presented in the source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Paper 2: UK Government and Non-core Political Ideas</th>
<th>63</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

We have updated the wording and included the words 'you must' to the actions for question 2a and 2b, it now reads:

**Question 2a:** Evaluate how far Parliament retains sole sovereignty within the UK political system and **2b:** Evaluate the extent to which the UK government’s control over Parliament has reduced in recent years.

In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK politics and core political ideas. **You must** consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Paper 3A and 3B Mark schemes</th>
<th>148, 150, 186 and 188</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

On the Level 4 mark scheme descriptors when drawing on the similarities we have added the word 'or' so it now reads 'and/or' to give better clarification that it can be either.

If you need further information on these changes or what they mean, contact us via our website at: qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/contact-us.html.
## Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General marking guidance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 – Question Paper</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 1 – Mark scheme</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 – Question Paper</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 2 – Mark scheme</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3A – Question Paper</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3A – Mark scheme</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3B – Question Paper</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper 3B – Mark scheme</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The Pearson Edexcel Level 3 GCE in Politics is designed for use in schools and colleges. It is part of a suite of GCE qualifications offered by Pearson.

These sample assessment materials have been developed to support this qualification and will be used as the benchmark to develop the assessment students will take.
General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than be penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme – not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- 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/indicative content will not be exhaustive. However different examples of responses will be provided at standardisation.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate’s response, a senior examiner must be consulted before a mark is given.
- Crossed-out work should be marked unless the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Marking guidance for levels based mark schemes

How to award marks
The indicative content provides examples of how students will meet each skill assessed in the question. The levels descriptors and indicative content reflect the relative weighting of each skill within each mark band. Confirmation of the marks assigned to Assessment Objectives is provided at the top of each mark scheme. This has been provided to further reflect the balance between the assessment objectives as described in the relevant level descriptors.

Capping Statements
Where applicable and to ensure that candidates are awarded marks for fully meeting the requirements of the question, additional capping statements have been indicated in the mark schemes. Such statements indicate where and how candidates will be limited in their achievement if they fail to fully address the requirements of the question. For instance, where questions require candidates to refer to 'thinkers' or 'engaging with sources'.

Finding the right level
The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing a mark within a level
After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance. Statements relating to the treatment of students who do not fully
meet the requirements of the question are also shown in the indicative content section of each levels based mark scheme. These statements should be considered alongside the levels descriptors.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- if it meets the requirements fully, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- if it only barely meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- the middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a reasonable match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

When a candidate has produced an answer that displays characteristics from more than one level, examiners must use their professional judgement to decide what level should be awarded.
Instructions

• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• There are two sections you must answer three questions:
  – in Section A answer either 1(a) or 1(b) and then either 2(a) or 2(b)
  – in Section B answer either 3(a) or 3(b).
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – there may be more space than you need.

Information

• The total mark for this paper is 84.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets
  – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.

Advice

• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
SECTION A: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) on page 2 OR Question 1(b) on page 3 and then answer ONE question from EITHER Question 2(a) OR Question 2(b) on page 11.

EITHER

1 (a) **This source is adapted from a report produced in 2014 by The University of London Constitutional unit, called ‘Is Britain Facing a Crisis of Democracy?’ The report was based on a four-year research project on this issue.**

‘On certain measures, Britain does, indeed, appear to be facing something of a participation crisis in its political system. Levels of trust in government and confidence in the political system are lower than they were little more than a decade ago. Electoral turnout has fallen sharply, most noticeably at the 2001 general election. Meanwhile, the introduction of new political institutions since 1997, designed in part to restore people’s trust and confidence, appears to have had little impact.

On the other hand, people do not seem more disengaged from the political system. Participation outside the ballot box has increased somewhat over the last fifteen or so years. Levels of political interest have not fallen, and people remain confident in their own ability to engage with the political process and to believe in the importance of voting at elections.

Perhaps the most reassuring evidence from our research is that which suggests the decline in trust and turnout is not due to long-term social forces, but to short-term political ones. The most plausible explanation for the decline in trust is the public reaction to allegations of misconduct and ‘sleaze’ on the part of politicians.

These conclusions suggest that the remedies for any ‘crisis’ largely lie in the hands of politicians themselves. Trust is acquired when words and actions accord with one another. And only a closely fought and clear competition between the parties appears to prompt many citizens to cast their vote. Meanwhile constitutional change should not be regarded as a quick fix. However it would be wise to look to measures to both reform and improve democracy in the UK. Hence, British democracy – and especially its politicians – certainly face a ‘challenge’. But talk of a ‘crisis’ is premature.’

(Source: by Catherine Bromley, John Curtice, and Ben Seyd – https://www.ucl.ac.uk/spp/publications/unit-publications/112.pdf)

Using the source, evaluate the view that UK democracy is in crisis.

In your response you must:

- compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
- examine and debate these views in a balanced way
- analyse and evaluate only the information presented in the source.

(30)
Do not answer Question 1(b) if you have answered Question 1(a)

**OR**

1 (b) This source is adapted from information on the Parliament website about the party system and information on the ‘Vice magazine’ UK website focused on minority parties.

**The party system**

Political parties have existed in one form or another since at least the 18th century, they are an essential element of UK politics. Since the Second World War, all the Governments in the UK have been formed by either the Labour Party or the Conservative Party. This did differ in 2010 when the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats formed a coalition government. The major parties capture the main issues of the day and present choice. Furthermore, the current electoral system favours few parties in the race to govern.

**Minority parties**

‘Minority parties’ are those that sit outside the traditional big three (Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat Parties) and have had power over Parliament for over a century. A significant shift has taken place in politics in recent years, with more people questioning the ‘Establishment of Westminster’ and looking to parties like the SNP, Plaid Cymru, the Green Party and UKIP.

In 2015, UKIP and the Greens obtained 5 million votes between them, also the SNP reached 56 seats of the 59 available in Scotland, becoming the third largest party in the House of Commons. Minority parties are enjoying success and recognition. A secure victory is now not the expected norm for either Labour or Conservative Parties, they now have much to fear and much to lose from a range of minority parties who are gaining ground.

The voter has little to choose between when looking to the major parties. In terms of policy, there is little that separates the major parties and all the policy they produce is similar, with battles over style as opposed to substance. By contrast, many of the minority parties present a fresh approach to politics.


Using the source, evaluate the view that the major parties still remain the dominant force in UK politics.

*In your response you must:*

- compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
- examine and debate these views in a balanced way
- analyse and evaluate only the information presented in the source.

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)
Indicate the first question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen question number:  Question 1(a) ☐  Question 1(b) ☐
AND EITHER

(a) Evaluate the extent to which general elections in the UK are lost by the government rather than won by the opposition.
You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.
(30)

OR

(b) Evaluate the extent to which social factors determine voting behaviour.
You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.
(30)

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)
AND EITHER

2 (a) Evaluate the extent to which general elections in the UK are lost by the
government rather than won by the opposition.

You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way. (30)

OR

(b) Evaluate the extent to which social factors determine voting behaviour.

You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way. (30)

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)
Indicate the second question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑️. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☐️ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑️.

Chosen question number:  
Question 2(a) ☐️  Question 2(b) ☐️
SECTION B: CORE POLITICAL IDEAS

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 3(a) OR Question 3(b).

EITHER

3 (a) To what extent do modern and classical liberals agree over the role of the state?
You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

3 (b) To what extent are different socialists committed to ‘equality of outcome’?
You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 3 = 24 marks)
SECTION B: CORE POLITICAL IDEAS

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 3(a) OR Question 3(b).

EITHER

3 (a) To what extent do modern and classical liberals agree over the role of the state?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent are different socialists committed to ‘equality of outcome’?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 3 = 24 marks)
Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☑️ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen question number:  Question 3(a) ☐  Question 3(b) ☐
AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their comparative analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) of the source. AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing comparative analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source in terms of similarities and differences. They should look at the different approaches and views that arise from political information and show how these can form the basis for differing opinions.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding from the source and their own knowledge (AO1) in relation to the claim that democracy in the UK may or may not be in crisis:

**Agreement**
- the source shows that UK citizens are not engaging with politics at many levels, with poor engagement and identification with politicians, low turnout and limited awareness of political issues
- the source identifies an issue with new constitutional institutions and how they work: devolved assemblies and elected mayors, which use new proportional voting systems, have not delivered greater political engagement of citizens as was hoped
- it is clear from the source that trust and faith in politicians has declined: for instance the sleaze allegations and incidents in recent decades has seen politicians from the major parties imprisoned for criminal actions
- confidence is falling in politicians and the established parties as they seemed powerless to prevent economic crisis and continued austerity, all undermining citizens’ faith in the political process, for example the fact that the three major UK political parties along with the then current Prime Ministers (PMs) and past PMs supported remaining in the European Union (EU) – but still the electorate did not trust that formidable bank of opinion.

**Disagreement**
- the source prompts the view that it is too simplistic to look only at turnout levels to understand political participation: people are still engaged in politics, for instance there is a great deal of political engagement and activity on social media
- the source leads to the view that there is a range of other ways in which people can participate in politics: from demonstrating, signing petitions and joining pressure groups. In addition, the growth of other political parties presents more means of participation for citizens
- turnout at general elections is on the increase – increasing to 66.1% in 2015, turnout in the June 2016 EU referendum was 72.2% – showing a huge interest in the current political debate
- the public outcry after the episodes of sleaze has resulted in tighter controls on politicians’ allowances,; reforms such as the Freedom of Information (FOI) requests  and an active investigative media are serving to restore trust in politicians.
Paper 1: UK Politics mark scheme

Section A: Political participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their comparative analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) of the source. AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing comparative analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source in terms of similarities and differences. They should look at the different approaches and views that arise from political information and show how these can form the basis for differing opinions.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding from the source and their own knowledge (AO1) in relation to the claim that democracy in the UK may or may not be in crisis:

Agreement
- the source shows that UK citizens are not engaging with politics at many levels, with poor engagement and identification with politicians, low turnout and limited awareness of political issues
- the source identifies an issue with new constitutional institutions and how they work: devolved assemblies and elected mayors, which use new proportional voting systems, have not delivered greater political engagement of citizens as was hoped
- it is clear from the source that trust and faith in politicians has declined: for instance the sleaze allegations and incidents in recent decades has seen politicians from the major parties imprisoned for criminal actions
- confidence is falling in politicians and the established parties as they seemed powerless to prevent economic crisis and continued austerity, all undermining citizens’ faith in the political process, for example the fact that the three major UK political parties along with the then current Prime Ministers (PMs) and past PMs supported remaining in the European Union (EU) – but still the electorate did not trust that formidable bank of opinion.

Disagreement
- the source prompts the view that it is too simplistic to look only at turnout levels to understand political participation: people are still engaged in politics, for instance there is a great deal of political engagement and activity on social media
- the source leads to the view that there is a range of other ways in which people can participate in politics: from demonstrating, signing petitions and joining pressure groups. In addition, the growth of other political parties presents more means of participation for citizens
- turnout at general elections is on the increase – increasing to 66.1% in 2015, turnout in the June 2016 EU referendum was 72.2% – showing a huge interest in the current political debate
- the public outcry after the episodes of sleaze has resulted in tighter controls on politicians’ allowances; reforms such as the Freedom of Information (FOI) requests and an active investigative media are serving to restore trust in politicians.
### 1(a) (contd.)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:

- the lack of participation will serve to fuel a crisis in UK democracy as politicians and institutions will lack legitimacy and accountability (AO2), this creates long-term damage to the political system with generational political inertia (AO3)
- the 1997 constitutional reforms have not solved the participation crisis and the source makes the suggestion that it is people, not institutions, that need to change (AO2), this view can be reached when we look at the turnout of elections since these reforms, where, despite proportional representation (PR), the turnout level is decreasing, if this continues their legitimacy will be brought into question (AO3)
- the source states strongly that the major fault is the politicians themselves and the fact that poor behaviour destroys the public's trust and confidence (AO2), there seems a reticence to solve this issue by placing higher moral and professional standards on politicians so that trust returns and that there is confidence in the political system, therefore the crisis is deep rooted and likely to worsen until effective reform is undertaken (AO3)
- as trust in politicians has declined, confidence in the political system has waned, which undermines the whole process of democracy (AO2), thus it was hoped that trust may be injected with the new institutions mentioned in the source – but these appear to be suffering from the same malaise as the older ones – so these solutions to avoid crisis have not been effective (AO3).

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- modern technology and a growing social media platform means that new and more direct forms of political engagement and participation can be created (AO2), this means that any crisis can be averted and the decline reversed (AO3).
- the source leads to a consideration of the current resurgence in political engagement, for example the referendum in 2016 re-energised the political debate in the UK with a high turnout (AO2), this therefore was a rejection of established politics and politicians, as all the main parties and the Government backed the Remain campaign, but the public ignored their advice (AO3)
- general election turnout did decline in 2001 but has been on the rise since and shows that voters are engaged (AO2), however some view lower levels as an indication of contentment or ‘hapathy’ or a culture of contentment, not dissatisfaction (AO3)
- an active media constantly probes and tests the integrity of politicians and political processes, there has been visible redress with politicians being ‘punished’ for their actions (AO2), this shows that the system has the energy and capability to deal with sleaze and corruption and does not need further reform (AO3).

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.

Accept any other valid responses.
In AO2 and AO3, political information means source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0–6</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 7–12 | **Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).**  
**Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).**  
**Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).** |
| Level 2 | 13–18 | **Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).**  
**Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).**  
**Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).** |
| Level 3 | 19–24 | **Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).**  
**Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).**  
**Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).** |
| Level 4 | 25–30 | **Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).**  
**Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).**  
**Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(b)</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their comparative analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) of the views in the source. AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing comparative analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source in terms of similarities and differences. They should look at the different approaches and views that arise from political information and show how these can form the basis for differing opinions.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding from the source and their own knowledge (AO1) in relation to the claim that major parties are or are not a dominant force:**

**Agreement**
- the source leads to the view that it would be difficult to operate our current system of representative democracy without the major political parties, they dominate both the process and ideas of mainstream politics
- other parties have always existed but the sheer dominance of the major parties ensures their continued supremacy
- the hard facts of the first past the post electoral system is that smaller parties stand no real chance of getting enough seats to make a difference, for example when the Conservative opposition had their vote radically reduced (1997) they still easily formed the official opposition. A minor party has to get 30% of the vote nationally or have a strong concentration of votes in certain regions (heartlands) to make any impact and this is a formidable task
- the source draws out that the major parties capture and have polices on all the main issues of the day – from the economy to the environment. This means that minor parties have few unique selling points or different policies for them to stand out.

**Disagreement**
- traditional voting patterns for the major UK parties are changing, with a shift towards minor parties
- the major parties are now not even attaining a sizeable minority of the eligible vote. They are gaining 100% of the power on the basis of less than a quarter of the votes – this shift shows no sign of reverse in recent elections and calls into question the validity of their mandate and the fairness of the electoral system that gives them power
- the coalition, which was the outcome of the 2010 election, is now just as likely an outcome at a general election as is single-party government
- the source shows that the minor parties are becoming an increasingly important feature of UK politics, if not a dominant presence at Westminster. They are significant in regional and local politics and the policy options they present do differ from the major parties.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**
- major parties operate all the main functions of government at local and national level, they are established and experienced with the infrastructure to dominate the political process (AO2), their capacity to develop new ideas and cover new ground means that they are always evolving to capture the majority of public opinion (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1(b)** (contd) | • minor parties, such as UKIP will fade away, largely because they are constructed on a single issue and once that issue has been decided they lose their cause to exist. Minor parties tend to have vague policy in other areas not connected to their protest and they do not represent a clear, cohesive political vision (AO2), this shows that only the major parties can offer voters cohesive policies on governing the UK and that minor parties tend to ‘come and go’ depending on political trends of the time; the major parties are established and permanent (AO3)  
• FPPT system means that major parties have numerous safe seats and heartlands, where other parties cannot have an impact. Minor parties will never dominate Westminster (AO2), therefore the pattern of two-party domination will be likely to continue unless the FPPT voting system is reformed, but there seems little appetite for this (AO3)  
• the major parties command such widespread ground on all policy areas which makes it difficult for the minor parties to appear unique and effective (AO2), history has shown that the large parties will always dominate and that they are there for the long run, whereas minor parties exist only on the fringes and never have a significant impact (AO3).  

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:  
• from the 1970s, fatigue started to affect the popularity of the two main parties, which gave rise in the regions to nationalist parties. The Liberals witnessed a huge surge in support in by-elections. In 2015, as the source says, UKIP increased in popularity at the expense of the major parties (AO2), consequently this trend of support for minor parties is likely to continue, as the electorate has broken away from its normal voting pattern and the political climate allows for this divergence (AO3)  
• no party since before the Second World War has gained at least 50% support from the electorate. In the 1970s the figure dropped to below 40% and continues to fall well below half of all votes cast (AO2), major political parties cannot claim a mandate or legitimacy for the power which they wield (AO3)  
• the major parties can no longer assure themselves that they will take turns in holding power as a hung Parliament is a more likely outcome (AO2), this means that the majority parties may have to broker power with minority parties in order to form a government (AO3)  
• minor parties have made a difference to political policy, for instance the call by UKIP to leave the EU is now government policy. Similarly minor parties control many regional councils and are building up bases of support (AO2), collectively this shows that the minor parties are making policy and electoral progress (AO3).  

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.  

Accept any other valid responses.
## In AO2 and AO3, political information means source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1  1–6</td>
<td>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2  7–12</td>
<td>Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some of which are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3  13–18</td>
<td>Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4  19–24</td>
<td>Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5  25–30</td>
<td>Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question number</td>
<td>Indicative content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to whether general elections are lost by the government or won by the opposition:**

**Agreement**
- at times, the public tires of the personalities and policies of the government
- government management of the economy is key and this relates to personal financial security
- a government that is not united and has internal divisions is prone to defeat
- elections are won on the basis of the leader’s credibility, whether in government or in opposition

**Disagreement**
- oppositions can and do win general elections and run effective campaigns that undermine the government
- oppositions can win by winning over the media in a general election contest, this can have a huge bearing on who wins the election
- governments make mistakes in office and lose the credibility of the electorate
- governments can be seen to run out of ideas and momentum, and the impetus falls to the opposition.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**
- the electorate has been known to ‘punish’ failure or misconduct, in 1992 and 1997 there were a series of sleaze allegations against MPs (AO2), this is clear evidence that governments lose elections if they fail to deliver or if their conduct and behaviour places them out of step with the ordinary voter, voters want governments to be trustworthy and moral (AO3)
- in the run up to the 1997 election, the Conservatives gained a poor reputation for economic competence, as did Labour before the 2010 election, and voters reacted to this mismanagement of a key area of policy (AO2), this is a vital area that needs the public’s backing, poor performance can be costly, as the voter’s wealth and the country’s economic welfare is such an important factor (AO3)
- disunity in political parties is damaging, for example the Conservative split over Europe in the 1990s, the Labour split between the Blairite and Brownite factions (AO2), a governing party at war with itself cannot win general elections and as splits seem to be prevalent in large parties these issues will continue to have an impact (AO3)
- the opposition often has less experience and its policies are alternatives, whereas the government holds the experience of office (AO2), the government is a tried and tested brand whereas the opposition is a leap into the unknown, this will always have a significant effect on voters and there is little the opposition can do to remedy it (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:**
- the evidence of success of New Labour in the 1997 general election and that of Thatcher in 1979, shows that these parties had learned lessons from their period in opposition, this enabled them to run slick campaigns to become elected (AO2), this shows that being in opposition can work in a party’s favour and is not necessarily a weakness (AO3)
opposition leaders perceived as ‘strong’ and ‘fresh’, such as Blair in 1997, win votes. In an age of personalities and image – it is how charismatic the leaders are that determines the outcome, or it is how well they win over the media and gain their backing, some have claimed that whoever The Sun newspaper supports will determine who holds office (AO2), therefore oppositions have the potential to win elections and overthrow an existing government, particularly if the leadership is strong and they can win over the media. This trend is likely to continue as media influence grows (AO3).

in the early 1990s, the Conservatives failed to produce a radical or visionary agenda for the future and instead the initiative passed to New Labour under Blair (AO2), consequently brand fatigue happens frequently in UK politics and governing parties are likely to make mistakes and be exposed for them, losing credibility with voters (AO3).

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 have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
  • Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
  • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
  • Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
  • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
  • Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
  • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
  • Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
  • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
  • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
  • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2(b)</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by using their knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent to which social factors determine voting behaviour:**

**Agreement**
- class is seen as a major social factor in determining how people vote, this can be linked to their region and locality, which also carries a strong correlation as to the way in which an individual will cast their vote
- age is another social factor that has a strong bearing on how people vote
- a citizens ethnic background is another social factor with a strong bearing on voting preferences
- gender is another social variant that indicates likely voting behaviour

**Disagreement**
- social factors used to be relevant but they no longer provide a clear indication of voting patterns, partisan dealignment and class dealignment have changed this
- a person can cast their vote influenced by issues that have a direct impact on them – issue voting
- people cast their vote on the basis of financial benefits, as such they are making a choice based on economic perception
- the importance of personality is now seen as a crucial factor in understanding the way in which people vote – and leaders of parties, as the brand image, carry a major bearing on voting patterns.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) point when agreeing with the view:**
- class and partisan alignment are crucial factors by which a person sees their political identity, this starts very early on in life and becomes a dominant force in exercising political choice. Regionally, voting patterns have followed the north of England and large urban areas having a clear preference for Labour and the South of England and rural areas tending to vote Conservative (AO2), this is evidenced by the number of safe seats throughout the UK that follow socially constructed patterns. The number of seats changing hands at general elections is minimal and bears testimony to this (AO3)
- evidence shows that younger people vote Labour and that older people vote Conservative – these age characteristics are important for parties to develop as they are key to electoral success (AO2), therefore it is often seen that parties target age cohorts in their appeal and their turnout is crucial for party success. The changing age demographic in the UK, with a large ageing population, will have a greater impact on voting (AO3)
- ethnic groupings have become more important in terms of voting behaviours in recent years, they are highly important in urban areas. In the main, the Labour Party fares better in garnering the ethnic vote than does the Conservative Party (AO2), however the Iraq war and the relevance of other social factors alongside ethnicity, make this a less secure pattern in explaining voting behaviour (AO3)
- gender has some general patterns in reflecting voting behaviour. In the main, female voters tend to vote Conservative more than men, with men being slightly more likely to vote Labour (AO2), however with gender there is the cross-cutting link of age and this does distort the picture but it does show clearly that social factors linked together can have an impact on voting behaviour (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2(b) (contd.)   | **Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:**  
|                 | - social factors have been significant in the past but the landscape seems to be changing. Social mobility has meant that class identity is more fluid and that class barriers are diminishing (AO2), the relevance of class has been brought into question since the 1970s, in 2015 the Labour Party, once dominant in Scotland, was routed by the SNP and in May 2016 the Conservatives became the main opposition party in Scotland, so these are no longer fully reliable models for determining voting behaviour (AO3)  
|                 | - issue voting sees voters making decisions on a range of issues, these issues are communicated through media and party manifestos and voters make an informed choice on the issues that benefit their needs most (AO2), therefore the electorate is better informed and is willing to cast votes for issues pertinent to them, rather than subscribing to a full party package (AO3)  
|                 | - economic voting models attempt to explain voting behaviour based on the state of the economy – this includes employment and wage earnings in that field (AO2); economic prosperity will deliver support for the incumbent government; economic turmoil will spell disaster for the incumbent party because the vast majority of voters are affected by economic policies, which is particularly important during a recession or economic recovery (AO3)  
|                 | - charisma and personality of party leaders are now seen to make a pivotal difference in voting behaviour, this arises as leaders are seen as the brand image of their party (AO2), in essence this is more about image than substance and is associated with ‘political spin’ more than anything, but it has been promoted by the emergence of TV leader debates before general elections (AO3).  

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 *have not* considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.  

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6    | - Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12   | - Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18  | - Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24  | - Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30  | - Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
### Question 3(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by using their knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that modern and classical liberals agree over the role of the state:**

**Agreement**
- liberals believe a state is necessary to guarantee freedom (Mill)
- liberals believe states must emerge via consent (Locke)
- liberals support a state to maintain order (Locke).

**Disagreement**
- there are clear ideological differences between the two on the role of state
- classical liberals support a minimal 'nightwatchman' state, which is also shown in their commitment to free-market economics
- modern liberals support an enabling state to help individuals to become free (Rawls) and believe a Keynesian economy helps individuals achieve greater freedom.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:**
- liberals agree that preventing harm to others (Mill) is a key role for the state, as it ensures that individuals have as much freedom as possible (AO2), therefore this can justifiably be seen as a unifying feature of liberalism, showing that preventing harm is an essential role for the state (AO3)
- liberals support social contract theory as a core principle of liberalism, which shows the state as a voluntary contract between the state and citizens (AO2), consequently this is crucial for all liberals as the commitment to social contract is at the heart of the liberal view of state (AO3)
- liberals agree that society needs a state in order to uphold order and ensure maximum freedom, this is a core principle for all liberals as, at the heart of liberalism, is a commitment to individual freedom (AO2), thus this leads to deep agreement amongst liberals over their commitment to the state, which they agree is the only way that individual freedom can be guaranteed (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:**
- classical liberals disagree with modern liberals, believing the sole purpose of the state is to ‘prevent harm to others’ (Mill) and to create order, as they believe the state has great potential for evil, whereas modern liberals believe the state has more potential for good, seeking to extend it beyond its basic function of ensuring order and preventing harm (Rawls) (AO2), this shows, therefore, fundamental differences in their view of the state’s purpose based on differing interpretations of freedom and the benign nature of the state in its reach (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(a) (contd.)   | • classical liberals disagree with modern liberals over the role of the state in the economy, believing free-market economics to be the best way to guarantee freedom, whereas modern liberals support Keynesian economics requiring state intervention (AO2), consequently showing a clear, irreconcilable conflict between them as their different views on how to run the economy are directly related to their different views on the role of state (AO3)  
• modern liberals disagree with classical liberals about the state’s ability to enhance individual freedom, arguing that a larger, enabling state can help people to be free (Rawls), whereas classical liberals believe that any increase in the state automatically limits an individual’s freedom (AO2), therefore modern and classical liberals are diametrically opposed with regard to whether the state enhances freedom or diminishes it (AO3).  
Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question. The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.  
Candidates who do not refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.  
Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification. |
• Classical liberals disagree with modern liberals over the role of the state in the economy, believing free-market economics to be the best way to guarantee freedom, whereas modern liberals support Keynesian economics requiring state intervention (AO2), consequently showing a clear, irreconcilable conflict between them as their different views on how to run the economy are directly related to their different views on the role of state (AO3).

• Modern liberals disagree with classical liberals about the state’s ability to enhance individual freedom, arguing that a larger, enabling state can help people to be free (Rawls), whereas classical liberals believe that any increase in the state automatically limits an individual’s freedom (AO2), therefore modern and classical liberals are diametrically opposed with regard to whether the state enhances freedom or diminishes it (AO3).

Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question. The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.

Candidates who do not refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 5 | 20–24| • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
3(b) AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that different socialists are committed to ‘equality of outcome’:

Showing commitment
- most socialists support equality of outcome
- most socialists believe that inequality creates social conflict and instability
- most socialists believe equality of outcome promotes cooperation, sociability and rationality.

Limited commitment/different levels of commitment
- Marxist absolute social equality can be delivered only via the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism (Marx and Engels)
- social democrats support equality of outcome delivered by humanising capitalism via the state and believe equality of outcome can be delivered peacefully at the ballot box (Crosland)
- The Third Way is committed to equality of opportunity to promote social mobility (A. Giddens).

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the commitment level:
- most socialists agree on equality of outcome rather than just formal equality or equality of opportunity as it is critical to creating social cohesion, justice and satisfying basic needs to increase freedom (AO2), therefore this can justifiably be seen as the unifying feature of socialism in its opposition to inequality and class divides (AO3)
- most socialists believe that inequality is driven by unequal treatment by society not by unequal talents, which creates social conflict and instability (AO2), consequently this leads to deep agreement among socialists about their opposition to the inequality driven by capitalism and the need for a more humane approach to organising society, the state and the economy (AO3)
- most socialists agree that equality of outcome promotes cooperation, sociability and rationality as they believe that human behaviour is socially determined (AO2), this is crucial for all socialists as it allows the inherent good in humanity that they see to be expressed and will unleash their huge potential for personal development and growth (AO3).

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the limited/different commitment level:
- Marxists disagree with social democrats as they support absolute social equality (Marx and Engels) whereas social democrats (Crosland) support relative social equality (AO2), this, therefore, represents fundamental and irreconcilable differences in their view of how far equality should extend (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(b) (contd.)   | • social democrats would disagree with Marxists as they would deliver absolute social equality by replacing private property with common ownership and ending the class system in a revolution (Marx and Engels), while social democrats (Crosland) would deliver relative social equality via welfare and the redistribution of wealth by humanising capitalism via the ballot box, revealing differences over method (AO2), consequently this reveals clear and unresolvable differences, as to whether equality can be delivered from within capitalism, and these differences continue to divide socialists (AO3).  
• The Third Way (Giddens) disagrees with Marxists and social democrats on equality of outcome as it dismisses equality of outcome in favour of equality of opportunity to allow individuals to fulfil their potential and achieve social mobility (AO2), therefore this has led to criticisms by other socialist traditions that it legitimises wide social inequality and has raised questions as to whether The Third Way is even a strand of socialism at all (AO3). |

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some of which are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
Instructions

• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• There are two sections and you must answer three questions:
  – in Section A answer either 1(a) or 1(b) and then either 2(a) or 2(b)
  – in Section B answer either 3(a) or 3(b), 4(a) or 4(b), 5(a) or 5(b), 6(a) or 6(b), 7(a) or 7(b).
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – there may be more space than you need.

Information

• The total mark for this paper is 84.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets
  – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.

Advice

• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
SECTION A: UK GOVERNMENT

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) on page X OR Question 1(b) on page X and then answer ONE question from EITHER Question 2(a) OR Question 2(b) on page X.

EITHER

1 (a) This source contains adapted extracts from a Political and Constitutional Reform Committee report called ‘Do we need a constitutional convention for the UK?’ and adapted data from the Office of National Statistics (ONS). The report considered the implications of devolution on the UK, and in particular on England, while the data relates to the number of representatives in each part of the UK.

- Many witnesses stated that a key issue with a UK-wide constitutional convention was that the people of England, outside of London, are governed by Westminster, with little authority to propose local solutions that benefit their own communities.
- Some argued that regional government was rejected because the English do not want devolution. However, evidence suggested that the failure of regional government was less because the English do not want devolution but in part because the Government of the day had imposed an arbitrary regional structure, with few or no law-making powers. There is clearly still disagreement on what form devolution would take.
- Dr Robin Wilson, an academic, suggested that an English Parliament would still not solve the tensions caused by the asymmetrical nature of devolution:
  - I don’t think you can solve the English question without regional devolution. If you had an English Parliament it would hugely dominate UK governance, and that doesn’t seem to me to be a feasible prospect.
  - However, he added that it may be possible to find a model that allowed English local authorities to devolve a range of powers, or not, according to local wishes:
  - It is our view that allowing councils to choose, or not choose, devolved powers from a menu of options agreed between Councils in England and Government, would be the preferred option for English devolution.
**ONS: Electoral Statistics for UK: 2015**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of UK</th>
<th>Electors</th>
<th>MPs</th>
<th>Devolved</th>
<th>Total Representatives</th>
<th>Population per Rep (total inc MPs + devolved)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>37,399,9000</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>67,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>2,181,800</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>3,896,900</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>20,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>1,243,400</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>9,799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Using the source, evaluate the view that the logical next step after devolution to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland is the devolution of further power to England.

*In your response you must:*

- compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
- examine and debate these views in a balanced way
- analyse and evaluate only the information presented in the source.

(30)
Do not answer Question 1(b) if you have answered Question 1(a)

OR

1 (b) This source contains adapted extracts from a report by the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee called ‘The UK Constitution: a summary, with options for reforms’. The report considered a variety of options for future constitutional reform. Also included is a critical commentary on the report, which is an expert viewpoint on the effectiveness of the report.

CHAIR’S FOREWORD

The Political and Constitutional Reform Select Committee of the House of Commons, has spent the 2010-2015 Parliament looking at the path to possible codification of the United Kingdom’s constitution.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS

Possible alternative 1: The Second Chamber shall be subordinate to the First Chamber. It shall have [500] voting members, directly elected to represent in proportion the nations and regions of the United Kingdom. Members shall be elected for a period of [fifteen] years and [shall/shall not] be re-elected

DEVOLVED GOVERNMENT OF THE NATIONS, REGIONS AND LOCALITIES

Possible alternative: The United Kingdom shall operate on the joint basis of union and devolution. Devolution in England shall be to independent local government, which shall be assigned a proportion of national income tax.

THE JUDICIARY

Possible alternative: The judiciary shall have the power to strike down laws that are inconsistent with the Constitution.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Possible alternatives

1: There shall be a Bill of Rights which sets out the rights to be protected and enforced within the United Kingdom.

2: The following rights shall be available to all persons within the United Kingdom. These rights may not be enforced by the courts, but instead shall be principles to guide the work of the Governments and Parliaments of the United Kingdom and of the devolved assemblies.

Critical commentary

The report focuses on options for change without giving sufficient weight to the arguments that significant reform has already been completed, providing a balance between change and continuity. For example, the Human Rights Act allows for a declaration of incompatibility without harming parliamentary sovereignty, whilst the reformed House of Lords retains its traditional non-elected role but with a substantially reduced hereditary element. To argue that more should be done, simply because it could be, fails to respect this appropriate balance.

(Source: taken from www.publications.parliament.uk – used under Open Parliament Licence v3.0 and critical commentary adapted by Adam Killeya)
Critical commentary

The report focuses on options for change without giving sufficient weight to the arguments that significant reform has already been completed, providing a balance between change and continuity. For example, the Human Rights Act allows for a declaration of incompatibility without harming parliamentary sovereignty, whilst the reformed House of Lords retains its traditional non-elected role but with a substantially reduced hereditary element. To argue that more should be done, simply because it could be, fails to respect this appropriate balance.

(Source: taken from www.publications.parliament.uk – used under Open Parliament Licence v3.0 and critical commentary adapted by Adam Killeya)

Using the source, evaluate the view that Constitutional reforms in the UK since 1997 have been weak, incomplete and require further change.

In your response you must:

• compare and contrast the different opinions in the source
• examine and debate these views in a balanced way
• analyse and evaluate only the information presented in the source.

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)
Indicate the first question you are answering by marking a cross in the box 🍀. If you change your mind, put a line through the box 🍀 and then indicate your new question with a cross 🍀.

Chosen question number:  Question 1(a) ☐  Question 1(b) ☐
(a) Evaluate how far Parliament retains sole sovereignty within the UK political system.
In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas and consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(b) Evaluate the extent to which the UK government’s control over Parliament has reduced in recent years.
In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK politics and core political ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)
AND EITHER

2  (a) Evaluate how far Parliament retains sole sovereignty within the UK political system.

   In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK politics and core political ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

   (30)

OR

(b) Evaluate the extent to which the UK government’s control over Parliament has reduced in recent years.

   In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK politics and core political ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

   (30)

   (Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)
Indicate the second question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number:  Question 2(a) ☒  Question 2(b) ☒
SECTION B: NON-CORE POLITICAL IDEAS

Answer ONE question EITHER (a) OR (b) from the political idea that you have studied.

Anarchism

EITHER

3

(a) To what extent do individualist and collectivist anarchists disagree about the economy?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do individualist and collectivist anarchists agree about human nature?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 3 = 24 marks)

Ecologism

EITHER

4

(a) To what extent do deep green ecologists and shallow green ecologists agree over the economy?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do ecologists agree over environmental ethics?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 4 = 24 marks)
SECTION B: NON-CORE POLITICAL IDEAS

Answer ONE question EITHER (a) OR (b) from the political idea that you have studied.

Anarchism

EITHER

3 (a) To what extent do individualist and collectivist anarchists disagree about the economy?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do individualist and collectivist anarchists agree about human nature?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 3 = 24 marks)

Ecologism

EITHER

4 (a) To what extent do deep green ecologists and shallow green ecologists agree over the economy?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent do ecologists agree over environmental ethics?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 4 = 24 marks)
### Feminism

**EITHER**

5 (a) To what extent is the disagreement within feminism about the nature of men and women significant to this political idea?

*You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.*

_OR_

(b) To what extent do feminists disagree about the role of the state?

*You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.*

*(Total for Question 5 = 24 marks)*

### Multiculturalism

**EITHER**

6 (a) To what extent do multiculturalists support diversity?

*You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.*

_OR_

(b) To what extent do multiculturalists’ views of minority rights support integration?

*You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.*

*(Total for Question 6 = 24 marks)*
Nationalism

EITHER

7 (a) To what extent is nationalism progressive?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

(b) To what extent does nationalism support self-determination for all nations?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider any differing views in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 7 = 24 marks)
Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen question number:  Question 3(a) ☐  Question 3(b) ☐  
Question 4(a) ☐  Question 4(b) ☐  
Question 5(a) ☐  Question 5(b) ☐  
Question 6(a) ☐  Question 6(b) ☐  
Question 7(a) ☐  Question 7(b) ☐
Question 1(a):

**Section A: UK Government**

**Paper 2: UK Government mark scheme**

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that devolution should be contested.

- Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative evidence that supports the view that devolution should be contested.

  - The source refers to 'asymmetric devolution'. This is evidenced by the data, which shows clear evidence of under-representation in England and over-representation in other parts of the UK.
  - This is supported by the 'rejection' of regional devolution, for example, when studying democracy and participation, and liberalism.
  - England (AO3).

- When studying democracy and participation, and liberalism, there is strong regional identity in various un-devolved parts of the UK such as Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland.
- In many areas of England shown in the 'rejection' of regional devolution, for example, when studying democracy and participation, and liberalism.
- English devolution would inevitably exacerbate not reduce the asymmetry in practice, which is implied by the different solutions discussed in the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and evaluation (AO3).

- AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that devolution should be contested.

Disagreement

- Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that devolution should be uncontested.

  - Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative evidence that supports the view that devolution should be uncontested.

  - Disagreement.

- AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that devolution should be uncontested.

TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 24 MARKS

TOTAL FOR PAPER = 84 MARKS
### Section A: UK Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their comparative analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing comparative analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source in terms of similarities and differences. They should look at the different approaches and views that arise from political information and show how these can form the basis for differing opinions.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that devolution should be extended to England:**

**Agreement**
- the source refers to ‘asymmetric devolution’. This is evidenced by the data, which shows clear evidence of under-representation in England and over-representation in Northern Ireland – this links with the West Lothian question
- devolution in general moves power to the people, giving them more ‘authority to propose local solutions’, this connects to the ideas discussed when studying democracy and participation, and liberalism
- there is strong regional identity in various un-devolved parts of the UK such as Yorkshire or Cornwall, as well as some city regions such as Manchester and Birmingham
- Wilson argues that giving greater power to English local authorities would be an effective way of achieving devolution in England.

**Disagreement**
- lack of demand, partly based on the relative weakness of regional identities in many areas of England shown in the ‘rejection’ of regional devolution, for example, in the North East
- English devolution would inevitably exacerbate not reduce the asymmetry of devolved powers referred to in the source
- there is a lack of agreement on what English devolution would look like in practice, which is implied by the different solutions discussed in the source
- local councils are not equipped to handle extensive powers and the proposal could be seen as predominantly an exercise in cost cutting.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**
- asymmetric devolution, evidenced by the West Lothian question is seen as challenging the legitimacy of Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish MPs having a say in English affairs, and English devolution would reduce or remove this (AO2), therefore this strengthens the case for only English MPs having a say in their own country’s affairs, as it would lead to a fairer system of government (AO3)
- the statistical part of the source demonstrates that devolution could correct the democratic deficit in England, where people are relatively under-represented (AO2), thus it would seem that this supports a case for greater devolution and there is a clear evidence based on lack of representation in England (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a) (contd)</td>
<td>• the source is a report from a cross-party committee with a particular focus on constitutional reform, which arguably gives its views strong weight (AO2), if, therefore, there is strong support from experts across parties then this would support the view that devolution could be extended and that it would be a successful move and gain parliamentary support (AO3) • Wilson’s suggestion is a good compromise between allowing for more devolution whilst avoiding the problem of an English Parliament which would dominate the UK political system (AO2), this is a more pragmatic and realistic way of achieving English devolution by using and evolving the existing political system in local government (AO3). Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view: • contrary to the argument in the source, devolution was rejected due to the English not wanting devolution because they lack of regional identity (AO2), this goes against the view that further devolution is needed and shows that it would not gain enough support and is, therefore, not worth undertaking (AO3) • the potential dominance of England over the rest of the UK, if there is an English Parliament, particularly given the population imbalance highlighted in the statistical data, could threaten the existing consensus on devolution, which could, in turn, lead to the destabilising of the current system (AO2), so therefore further devolution would be a negative thing to happen in terms of the current UK constitutional settlement and should not be taken forward by the government (AO3) • the source’s view on why regional devolution in England failed could be seen as politically biased, since it is not universally accepted that it was due to a lack of power, as opposed to just lack of demand, but it was still a failure (AO2), so therefore further devolution could not be seen as a sensible thing to undertake, as it is fundamentally flawed and lacks any basis for success (AO3) • the source does not give a clear justification for supporting one model of English devolution – to existing councils – over another and therefore is arguably not evidence based (AO2), thus this lack of clarity supports the view that further devolution is problematic and should not be taken forward (AO3). 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. Accept any other valid responses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In AO2 and AO3 political information means source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6  | - Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
|       |      | - Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
|       |      | - Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | - Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
|       |      | - Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
|       |      | - Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | - Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
|       |      | - Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
|       |      | - Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | - Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
|       |      | - Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
<p>|       |      | - Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 5 | 25–30 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their comparative analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing comparative analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source in terms of similarities and differences. They should look at the different approaches and views that arise from political information and show how these can form the basis for differing opinions.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that constitutional reforms in the UK since 1997 have been weak, incomplete and require further change:**

**Agreement**
- House of Lords reform reduced the number of hereditary peers but no peers are publicly elected: it could be extended to remove all hereditary peers and create a wholly or mostly elected second chamber.
- the Human Rights Act is currently un-entrenched and cannot be used to strike down statute laws: it could be strengthened to further limit the power of Parliament and the UK government.
- there is no UK Bill of Rights: which sets out the rights to be protected and enforced, only the Human Rights Act does this (which is not entrenched)
- the source leads to the view that devolution is currently uneven throughout the UK and does not include England, it could be strengthened in the currently devolved areas and/or extended to England to create a more federal UK

**Disagreement**
- House of Lords reform retained the traditional role of the House of Lords while removing the hereditary element.
- the source shows that the Human Rights Act clarifies the rights of citizens and allows for declarations of incompatibility.
- an entrenched Bill of Rights is not necessary as the UK has managed without one for a long period of time – the Human Rights Act provides sufficient protection
- devolution has distributed substantial powers to those areas where there was demand

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**
- the lack of election to the House of Lords limits the amount of democracy in the UK in comparison to other modern political systems, while the lack of universal electoral reform contributes to the same democratic deficit (AO2), this therefore promotes the need for further stronger reform as this is an updated institution that does not represent 21st-century society adequately (AO3)
- the Human Rights Act does little to limit parliamentary sovereignty, and therefore by extension, government control. This connects to the liberal doctrine of the separation of powers, under which a strong division of control would be preferable (AO2), thus a strong division of control promotes the view that further reform is needed in order to curb parliament as it is better to have a mechanism to control power (AO3)
- the lack of entrenchment makes the executive too powerful in that they can remove all protection for human rights through an ordinary Act of Parliament (AO2), this demonstrates that little has changed in terms of parliamentary sovereignty and the degree of government control, so that
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(b) (contd.)</td>
<td>• devolution has created imbalance and unfairness for some citizens by granting more control of local affairs to others, which cannot reasonably be justified (AO2), this therefore supports the view for further reform as the current system is unfair and the country needs reform in order to be properly and equitably represented (AO3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:
- constitutional reform has gone as far as people want it to and has struck a balance between tradition and modernisation – demonstrated, for example, by the public rejection of the Alternative Vote. This connects to the concept of direct democracy for constitutional reform (AO2), thus to push for stronger or more reform would go against public opinion, meaning that the balance achieved already would be lost and this would cause problems for the country (AO3)
- the Human Rights Act strikes a balance between parliamentary sovereignty and individual rights, which could both be seen as key aspects of the British Constitution (AO2), this consequently supports the view that further reform may not necessarily be needed and that strong reforms are not required, as this balance needs to be maintained (AO3)
- a Bill of Rights goes against the traditional evolutionary nature of the British Constitution (AO2), this is why Britain has proved more stable than other countries with a written Bill of Rights (AO3)
- the sources lead to the fact that devolution, including the different electoral systems, has been appropriate to the needs of different parts of the UK, which is preferable to a ‘one size fits all’ system (AO2), therefore calling for such an approach is not suitable while the current reforms are appropriate and have worked (AO3).

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.

Accept any other valid responses.
In AO2 and AO3 political information means source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6 | - Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | - Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | - Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | - Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).&lt;br&gt;• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).&lt;br&gt;• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question number</td>
<td>Indicative content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2(a)            | **AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)**  
This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of UK politics and relevant knowledge and understanding of UK politics and core political ideas (AO1), candidates will use this to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.  
**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that Parliament retains sole sovereignty within the UK political system:**  
**Agreement**  
- Parliament retains legal sovereignty, giving it the ability to reclaim any of the powers given away to other institutions  
- Parliament was able to hold a referendum on the UK’s withdrawal from the EU  
- All removal of power from Parliament has been set out and approved by Parliament, with clearly-defined limits such as the inability of the Welsh Assembly to determine taxation, of Supreme Court judges to strike down laws, or of the electorate to initiate national referendums  
- There was no question of Parliament implementing a more federal system of government by granting legal sovereignty to other bodies or entrenching their existence  
**Disagreement**  
- Britain’s current membership of the European Union, under which EU law takes precedence over UK law  
- The devolution of power from Parliament to Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland  
- The introduction of The Human Rights Act, interpreted by the Supreme Court, which is able to declare that laws are incompatible  
- The increased use of referendums rather than parliamentary decision on constitutional matters.  
**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**  
- Legal sovereignty has never been seriously challenged and is more significant than political sovereignty, since it cannot be given away by Parliament. (AO2), therefore Parliament clearly retains sole sovereignty and will continue to do so, as there is no serious threat (AO3)  
- The EU referendum emphasises this point, since it was called by Parliament and could in theory be overruled by Parliament (AO2), therefore this is a clear demonstration in practice that sovereignty power rests with Parliament rather than with the people (AO3)  
- The specific and limited nature of all devolution of power, as well as its reversibility, sets a clearly-defined limit to any loss of sovereignty (AO2), clearly, therefore, Parliament has retained its power despite regional devolution (AO3)  
- The intention of retaining the unitary nature of the UK constitution leads to the conclusion that it emphasises Parliament’s ultimate sovereignty (AO2), as there is little support for reform of this aspect or a real threat to removing Parliament’s sovereignty, which supports the case that it has retained it (AO3).  

---

**Pearson Edexcel Level 3 Advanced GCE in Politics – Sample Assessment Materials**  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2(a) (contd.)   | **Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:**  
|                 | • the difficulties posed by Britain’s membership of the EU, and its potential departure, showcase the limitations on Parliament’s political sovereignty. (AO2), thus it can be concluded that Parliamentary sovereignty can be threatened politically and that external factors can affect it considerably (AO3)  
|                 | • devolution gives away large and significant areas of law making, and attempting to exercise sovereignty by reclaiming these powers would cause huge political controversy (AO2), therefore this is evidence that sovereignty can be lost politically to other institutions and that it does not lie solely with Parliament in the UK (AO3)  
|                 | • the political difficulty of resisting the pressure of a declaration of incompatibility of the Supreme Court is a significant restriction on Parliament’s ability to exercise sovereignty in practice (AO2), so this shows that their sovereignty can be restricted and that there are other institutions, such as the judiciary, that can exercise power over Parliament (AO3)  
|                 | • the political difficulty of Parliament overruling a referendum vote reduces its sole sovereignty, although arguably the EU referendum result is leading to this idea being challenged (AO2), this confirms the view that Parliament does not have sole sovereignty, as it has not overruled the referendum results, and that the people have effectively exercised sovereignty on this issue (AO3).  
|                 | **Candidates may refer to the following synoptic points:**  
|                 | • the shift in sovereignty from Parliament to devolved institutions links to the adoption of a more pluralistic democracy, particularly as it allows pressure groups more access points to exercise influence [UK Politics: Democracy and participation 1.3]  
|                 | • the increasing use of referendums links to a shift from a wholly or predominantly representative democracy where Parliament is sovereign to a more direct democracy and where the people are sovereign [UK Politics: Democracy and participation 1.1 and Electoral systems 3.2]  
|                 | • Britain’s perceived loss of sovereignty to the EU is reflected in the growth of UKIP [UK Politics Political Parties 2.3]  
|                 | • the changes could be seen as representing a more limited government: devolution, for example, is close to the principle of ‘consent from below’ [Core Political Ideas: Liberalism 1 Core ideas and principles’].  
|                 | Candidates may also credibly discuss the extent to which a shifting balance of power between the UK government and Parliament affects parliamentary sovereignty, although this should not be the main focus of the response.  
|                 | 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 *have not* considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.  
|                 | Candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 5.  
<p>|                 | Accept any other valid responses. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6 | - Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation. Makes limited synoptic points (AO1).  
- Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | - Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes some relevant synoptic points (AO1).  
- Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | - Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes generally relevant synoptic points (AO1).  
- Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | - Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes relevant and focused synoptic points (AO1).  
- Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30 | - Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes convincing and cohesive synoptic points (AO1).  
- Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2(b)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of UK government and relevant knowledge and understanding of UK politics and core political ideas (AO1), candidates will use this to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that the Government’s control over Parliament has reduced in recent years:**

**Agreement**
- the chairs of select committees being chosen directly by MPs rather than by government whips
- the consultation of Parliament on military action, for example in Syria
- the introduction of the Backbench Business Committee of which the chair must be a member of the opposition
- the increased willingness of the House of Lords, which lacks a government majority, to delay government business, for example over proposed cuts to tax credits

**Disagreement**
- the small number of government defeats in recent years
- there is little legislation not sponsored or supported by government that has become law
- the increasing ‘payroll vote’ of ministers plus Parliamentary Private Secretaries
- the imbalance of resources between government and Parliament in terms of staff and finances, and recent proposals, albeit abandoned, to reduce ‘Short money’.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**

- select committees are becoming increasingly independent of government, and the prominence given to select committee reports make this significant since negative publicity could force the government to act (AO2), therefore the government’s control is reducing and other factors are affecting power and control, such as media attention (AO3)
- the war in Syria represents increased consultation of Parliament over prerogative powers, which represent a significant source of government power (AO2), therefore proving that the government does not always have full control and control can be reduced as Parliament can play a greater role in deciding what the government does and provides an ultimate check on their policies and actions (AO3)
- the Backbench Business Committee represents an increased ability of backbenchers to set parliamentary business and this reduces the extent to which government controls the parliamentary agenda (AO2), consequently this represents a clear reduction in control/power and points to the fact that backbenchers can exert power and control, and can influence decision making (AO3)
- the increased proactivity of the House of Lords in amending or delaying legislation provides an extra parliamentary check on government and so limits their ability to push legislation through (AO2), therefore this is clear evidence that control has been reduced, that it does not rest solely with government and that the other House can affect their policies (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2(b) (contd.)   | Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:  
- the small number of government defeats highlights the continued power of the whips, which is the cornerstone of their control of the House of Commons and also links to the fact that the electoral system usually delivers a clear government majority (AO2), thus it would be wrong to say that there has been a reduction as there is still a strong case for the government being in control and for them to resist attempts to reduce their control (AO3)  
- the small proportion of non-government legislation demonstrates the government’s continuing large degree of control over the parliamentary agenda, linking to the Conservative notions of hierarchy and authority (AO2), therefore this is a clear case for the government retaining its control over Parliament and links to the fact that power comes from the main source of authority, which in this case can still be said to be the government (AO3)  
- the size of the payroll vote, giving incentives to individual members of Parliament to co-operate with government, highlights the government’s power of patronage as a means of controlling individual members of parliament (AO2), consequently this demonstrates that, ultimately, government will always be able to limit any Parliamentary attempt to curb its control as the government has the ability to control MPs and to limit their role as representatives (AO3)  
- the imbalance of resources makes it harder for Parliament to scrutinise government and therefore be independent of its control. Recent proposals, albeit abandoned, to reduce ‘Short money’ emphasise the significance of this point (AO2), thus it would be unfair to say that government control has reduced as it still retains a great deal of power and control over Parliament, and the system supports the continuation of this fact (AO3).  

Candidates may refer to the following synoptic points:  
- the usual government majority in the House of Commons, and its impact on government control of Parliament, is reflected in the rarity of election results that do not produce a government with an overall majority [UK Politics: Voting behaviour and the media 4.2]  
- the level of media scrutiny of both Parliament and government, which is shown not only in the continued focus on Prime Minister’s Questions as a form of scrutiny but also increasingly on the work of select committees, acts to limit government control [UK Politics: Voting behaviour and the media 4.3]  
- the extent of the increase in parliamentary scrutiny and the reduction in government control can be seen in a shift towards a model of ‘limited government’ with greater separation of powers [Core Political Ideas: Liberalism 1 Core ideas and principles]  
- conversely relatively little has changed in the traditional relationship between government and parliament that has developed organically over several centuries, in that the government retains an inbuilt majority and control over the parliamentary programme. [Core Political Ideas: Conservatism 1 Core ideas and principles].  

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 have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.  
Candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 5.  
Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation. Makes limited synoptic points (AO1).  
• Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes some relevant synoptic points (AO1).  
• Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some of which are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes generally relevant synoptic points (AO1).  
• Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes relevant and focused synoptic points (AO1).  
• Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes convincing and cohesive synoptic points (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
Section B: Non-core Political Ideas

Anarchism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that individualist and collectivist anarchists disagree about the economy:

Disagreement
- collectivists would abolish private property and replace it with collective ownership and cooperation (Bakunin) or mutualism (Proudhon) and this view is different to that of individualists
- collectivists identify private property and exploitation as restricting freedom (Proudhon), while individualists see monopolies and state intervention in the market as restricting freedom
- individualists argue for an unfettered, free market, based on the principle of private property, which is different to the view of collectivists.

Agreement
- anarchists oppose the main economic systems of the 20th and 21st century,
- both state socialism and capitalism
- anarchists see the need for a future economic system where free individuals can manage their own affairs
- anarchists would abolish existing economic systems to create economic freedom.

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:

- collectivist anarchists identify private property and exploitation as the core issues in the economy as they encourage selfishness, conflict and social disharmony (Proudhon), while the individualists see monopolies and state intervention in the market as the core issue as they restrict the reason and responsibility of the individual(AO2), this therefore highlights a core difference between the two strands in their analysis of the failures of existing economic models, leading to radically different views of economic freedom (AO3)
- collectivists envisage the abolition of private property to be replaced by collective ownership and cooperation (Bakunin) or ownership based on use or possession under mutualism (Proudhon), while individualists envisage an unfettered, free market, based on the principle of private property (AO2), consequently both believe only their own vision will create economic freedom and this therefore shows a clear and irreconcilable difference over their views on economic arrangements in the future society (AO3)
- collectivisation and cooperation will nurture the rational, cooperative and altruistic aspects of human nature (Bakunin), while the free market will nurture the rational, self-interested and autonomous aspects of human nature, leading to natural order, which is the underlying principle of the peaceful, stateless society (AO2), thus these two views are irreconcilable because of their fundamentally different viewpoints on the universal qualities of human nature (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(a) (contd.)   | Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:  
|                 | • anarchists agree on their opposition to current economic systems, both socialism and capitalism, as economic freedom is a core principle for all anarchists, reflected by their role in the anti-capitalist movements since Seattle (AO2), so therefore this is a justifiable argument that anarchists’ rejection of the state in any form remains fundamental to their analysis of the failure of economic systems today (AO3)  
|                 | • anarchists agree on the need for a future economic system where free individuals can manage their own affairs, which entails no state regulation or intervention in economic life, as the rejection of the state is the core principle of anarchism (AO2), thus there is a common goal in anarchist thinking to remove the state from its role in the economy by abolishing it (AO3)  
|                 | • anarchists agree that abolition of existing economic systems is needed to create economic freedom, which is essential to nurturing the positive aspects of human nature in order to realise the core principle of liberty (AO2), this, therefore, will allow a peaceful, stateless society to develop, which is the agreed goal of all anarchist thought (AO3).  
|                 | Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question. The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.  
|                 | Candidates who do not refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.  
|                 | Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification. |
Anarchists agree on their opposition to current economic systems, both because of their belief in the need for liberty and because of the failure of economic systems today. Anarchists agree that abolition of existing economic systems is needed to create economic freedom, which is essential to nurturing the positive aspects of human nature in order to realise the core principle of liberty. Anarchists agree on the need for a future economic system where free individuals can manage their own affairs, which entails no state regulation or intervention in economic life, as the rejection of the state is the core principle of anarchism (AO2), thus there is a common goal in anarchist thinking to remove the state from its role in the economy by abolishing it. Anarchists agree that unless the state is removed, all other reforms are ultimately futile, as the principles of liberty and freedom are impossible to uphold with a state present (AO3). The principle of anarchism (AO2), this, therefore, will allow a peaceful, stateless society to develop, as the rejection of the state in any form remains fundamental to their analysis of socialism and capitalism, as economic freedom is a core principle for all anarchists and is one side that could not be achieved beyond Level 2.

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:

- Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
- Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
- Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
- Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
- Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
- Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
### 3(b) AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that individualist and collectivist anarchists disagree about human nature:**

**Agreement**
- anarchists argue that human nature is plastic and moulded by society
- anarchists hold an essentially positive view of human nature
- anarchists believe in the universal potential for development of humanity and they believe that humans have universal qualities.

**Disagreement**
- collective anarchists believe that humans are altruistic and cooperative (Kropoktin)
- individualist anarchists see humans as self-interested and competitive (M. Stirner)
- anarchists disagree over how human universal qualities should be nurtured.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:**
- human nature is plastic, and the state and society have corrupted and tainted the nature of the ruled and rulers (Kropotkin), and this can explain human nature as it appears today (AO2), so consequently there is deep agreement in their opposition to the state in any form, which forms their key criticism of all current political systems (AO3)
- anarchists’ common belief in the universal potential for development, underpins their belief in spontaneous harmony and natural order, and this leads to the conclusion that the machinery of the state is not needed (AO2), therefore there is a unifying belief that a future peaceful, stateless society is not only desirable but possible (AO3)
- anarchists believe that humans have universal qualities and the rejection of the existing state and societal structures will lead to a clear picture of what the universal qualities of human nature are (Goldman) (AO2), this shows clearly, therefore, that anarchists can agree on an optimistic/utopian view of human nature that humans are not perfect but are perfectible (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:**
- collective anarchists believe that humans are altruistic and cooperative (Kropoktin) in contrast to individualist anarchists, who see humans as self-interested and competitive (M. Stirner), and the clash over whether humans are cooperative or competitive is the key division over human nature (AO2), consequently this level of disagreement, therefore, is the key debate that splits the two strands in their ideas about the state, economy and society (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(b) (contd.)   | • collectivist anarchists believe that our altruism is tainted by the competitive, capitalist state (Kropotkin), while individualist anarchists see the power of state and society as unjustifiable as it limits autonomy (M. Stirner), which emerges from the core disagreement over the universal qualities of human nature (AO2), therefore their fundamental divide on human nature defines their differing analyses of existing states and societies (AO3)  
• for collectivists, common ownership (Kropotkin) or mutualism (Proudhon) will nurture humanity’s altruism and cooperative qualities, while for anarcho-capitalists, the unfettered free market, and for egoists, the Union of Egos (M. Stirner), will allow autonomy to develop, and this emerges from the core disagreement over the universal qualities of human nature (AO2), thus this key division over human nature defines their differing views of the future, stateless, peaceful society (AO3). |

Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question. The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.

Candidates who do not refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
## Ecologism

### Question number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(a)</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the agreement of views on the economy of deep- and shallow-green ecologists:**

**Agreement**
- many greens have concerns about consumerism, which is constantly generating new material desires
- many greens are concerned about industrialism with its emphasis on large-scale production, relentless growth and accumulation of capital
- greens support sustainability to protect the capacity of the ecological system to maintain its health over time.

**Disagreement**
- shallow greens endorse reduced economic growth and weak sustainability, and tackle the issue of the environment from within capitalism
- shallow greens believe that material prosperity can be achieved and balanced with environmental costs
- deep greens support the limits to growth thesis, based on the finite capacity of the Earth.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:**

- most greens agree that industrialism in its relentless pursuit of relentless growth (R Carson) will destroy the fragile ecosystem that maintains all life (AO2), this therefore unites all shallow- and deep greens in their criticism of the idea that there are unlimited possibilities for growth and wealth, endorsed by the core ideologies of socialism, conservatism and liberalism (AO3)
- many greens agree that consumerism generates excess demand in the economy, which drives the desire for material wealth and production (AO2), thus shallow- and deep greens are united in opposition to placing short-term economic goals above ecological concerns and viewing nature as a resource just to be exploited (R Carson), which represents strong common ground of agreement (AO3)
- many greens agree that the capacity of the ecological system to maintain its health over time must be protected, so human desires must be limited and the link between material consumption and happiness must be broken (E. F. Schumacher) (AO2), and consequently this unites all greens in placing sustainability as their core economic principle, which cannot be compromised (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4(a) (contd.)   | Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:  
- shallow greens believe limited economic growth will not threaten long-term sustainability (meet the needs of the present without compromising future generations) while deep greens reject outright the growth-based economic model as destructive of natural capital and sustainability (E. F. Schumacher) (AO2), thus leading to an irreconcilable division over whether any form of economic growth is sustainable, and this drives deep greens to question whether shallow greens are a strand of ecologism and are, in fact, just an add on to conventional ideologies (AO3)  
- shallow greens advocate that weak sustainability allows for the depletion of natural resources as long as general production is maintained, and there is a belief in technological solutions to issues of energy and natural resources, while deep greens believe in strong sustainability and that natural capital must be preserved and enhanced, as natural capital is crucial to the wellbeing of the ecosystem and human beings (AO2), therefore this highlights that while sustainability is the core principle of the greens, they fundamentally disagree as to what it means and how it is to be achieved (AO3)  
- shallow greens believe in sustainable economic growth, where material wealth can be balanced with environmental protection through modified or green capitalism while deep greens believe there are finite limits to growth that mean a transformation of society and the economy is needed (AO2), therefore leading to a fundamental difference in their view of the economic future, with deep greens promoting a post-industrial, zero-growth world of small-scale, decentralised and self-sufficient communes based on a radical transformation to environmental consciousness, which shallow greens see as politically impractical and unpalatable(AO3).  

Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question. The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.  

Candidates who do not refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.  

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14| • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19| • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24| • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
## AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the views of ecologists over environmental ethics:**

### Agreement
- most ecologists view existing ethics as anthropocentric
- most ecologists see the actions of humans as having wider environmental impacts, on future generations, other species or the entire ecosystem
- most ecologists agree on the need to move ethics beyond traditional ethical thinking and communities to protect the environment.

### Disagreement
- shallow greens extend human values to those yet to be born or animals
- deep greens argue for an ecocentric approach based on intrinsic value
- deep greens argue for biocentric equality/land ethic that broadens the community to include the Land (A. Leopold).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:**

- many greens agree that existing ethics are anthropocentric in that they are built around the pleasure, needs and interests of humans while human actions may be felt by future generations, other species or by the biotic community (AO2), and this creates a deep commitment among ecologists to extend ethics to the wider community in order to protect the environment and, consequently, this desire unifies them (AO3)
- some greens endorse intergenerational equity because they will experience the impact of our present actions, such as the impact of fossil-fuel consumption on climate in the future (AO2), therefore leading to a new form of ethics, a key aim for all ecologists, by extending rights to future generations although there is still debate among ecologists as to whether it goes far enough (AO3)
- some shallow greens extend rights to animals, as they are sentient beings, and see attempts to place human interests over those of animals as speciesism, which is a form of prejudice like any other (AO2), thus this broadens the ethical community, a key aim for all ecologists, however this agreement is weak as some may see the ethical community as too broad and some as not broad enough, so the support is not as strong as for other areas (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4(b) (contd.)</td>
<td>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• shallow greens adopt new environmental ethics based on enriching anthropocentrism to extend human values to future generations or other species in order to protect the environment, while deep greens adopt an ecocentric approach based on the intrinsic value of all nature (Leopold), rather than a human instrumental value, as the only way to protect the biosphere (AO2), this therefore represents a fundamental and irreconcilable disagreement as deep greens refuse to accept any anthropocentric reasons for giving the environment value (AO3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• deep greens, going well beyond the ethics of shallow greens, argue for the transformation to an environmental consciousness where boundaries of the community are extended to the non-human world in the land ethic (Leopold) as the basis of new ethical thinking (AO2), while social ecologists regard this as utterly impractical, spiritual nonsense that will never be adopted, representing an irreconcilable split in ecologism (M. Bookchin)(AO3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• deep greens establish the idea of biocentric equality/land ethic where all beings in the biotic community have equal intrinsic value (Leopold), leading to a new form of ethics that extends to the non-human world such as soil, water and plants (AO2), consequently this represents deep disagreement, with many shallow greens arguing that intrinsic value is unrealistic, as it views humans as having no more rights than any other member of this broader community (AO3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0–4</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 5–9 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
### Question number 5(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that feminists disagree about the differing natures of men and women:**

**Agreement**
- feminists agree that nature is a key factor in the oppression of women
- feminists agree that this gender oppression can and should be overthrown
- all feminists seek to advance the role of women based on their true nature

**Disagreement**
- equality feminists believe that human nature is androgynous and see gender as a social construct (Simone de Beauvoir) and seek a society that is gender neutral (bell hooks)
- difference feminists disagree with equality feminists over how female emancipation can be achieved
- difference feminists believe that men and women have different natures and believe that women should allow their female nature to flourish.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:**

- equality feminists disagree with difference feminists as they reject the idea that men and women have different natures, believing that women’s biology should not determine their social position (De Beauvoir) whereas difference feminists believe that men and women are essentially different, stemming from biology (AO2), these two views are fundamentally different and therefore any agreement over the differing natures of men and women is unlikely as both come from different ideological positions (AO3)
- difference feminists disagree with equality feminists over how patriarchy can be overthrown, difference feminists believe that liberation is achieved through difference whereas equality feminists believe gender stereotypes must be challenged (Millett) (AO2), this highlights the fundamental difference between the two strands and leads to different approaches as equality feminists see equality as the solution, whereas difference feminists see it as the problem, which does not lend itself to a common view or the two strands agreeing (AO3)
- difference feminists reject the central premise of equality feminists, believing that equality feminism encourages women to be ‘male identified’ and perpetuates ‘otherness’ (De Beauvoir), whereas equality feminists believe society should be ‘gender blind’ (AO2), this difference in how women can be emancipated is stark and links back to their differing views on the nature of men and women, it clearly shows that the level of agreement is low and that there is a wide gap in their ideological perspectives on human nature (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:**

- feminists agree that the gender roles imposed on women by society ignore their true nature and that this imposes huge restrictions on women in many ways in society (AO2), this is an area of commonality, showing that feminists can agree on the significance of the nature of men and women and reject stereotypical gender roles imposed by society (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5(a) (contd.)   | • all feminists agree on the need for a society where women are free to determine their own gender roles without society prejudging their nature and whereby women are free to take up any position in society (AO2), this shows a unifying belief within feminism that a gender-free society is not only desirable but possible (AO3)  
• feminists agree that only when women are encouraged to allow their true nature to evolve can they be truly emancipated and that it is essential for women to develop a positive relationship with their true nature (AO2), this clearly shows that there is agreement within feminism to encourage women to connect with their true nature (AO3). |

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
• all feminists agree on the need for a society where women are free to determine their own gender roles without society prejudging their nature and whereby women are free to take up any position in society (AO2), this shows a unifying belief within feminism that a gender-free society is not only desirable but possible (AO3).

• feminists agree that only when women are encouraged to allow their true nature to evolve can they be truly emancipated and that it is essential for women to develop a positive relationship with their true nature (AO2), this clearly shows that there is agreement within feminism to encourage women to connect with their true nature (AO3).

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that feminists agree about the role of the state:**

**Disagreement**
- liberal feminists believe that the state can play a role in promoting female emancipation (Friedan)
- radical feminists believe that the state currently promotes the interests of patriarchy (Millett) and that the state could play a role in eradicating patriarchy in the public and private spheres
- socialist feminists see the state as working in the interest of capitalism and patriarchy (Rowbotham).

**Agreement**
- all feminists recognise that the state does serve some useful purpose for women
- socialist and radical feminists agree that the state does not primarily have the interests of women at heart
- feminists believe that the state could be used more to enhance women’s position in society.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:**
- liberal feminists disagree with other feminists, believing the state is key to female emancipation (Friedan), whereas radical feminists believe that an equal, legal framework is insufficient (Millett) (AO2), showing that there are clear differences between liberal and radical feminists over the role of the state in society, which does not seem to lend itself to any likely agreement in the future (AO3)
- radical feminists disagree with other feminists over how the state serves women, believing that primarily it promotes patriarchy (Kate Millett), whereas socialist feminists believe it serves capitalism first and then patriarchy (Rowbotham) (AO2), therefore there are clear differences in socialist and radical feminists’ views of the primary focus of the state, these are different enough that it is unlikely that their views will ever be similar, so there will always be disagreement (AO3)
- radical feminists disagree with liberal feminists, believing that the state has a role to play in both public and private spheres by outlawing pornography, ensuring harsher punishment for domestic violence, rape and other crimes against women (Millett), whereas liberal feminists believe the state should concern itself only with discrimination in the public sphere (Friedan) (AO2), showing that this level of disagreement is fundamental and that it is an important distinction between the two about the way they see the role of the state (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:**
- feminists agree that the state does protect women’s interests to an extent by outlawing discrimination and banning some practices that are harmful to women (AO2), therefore this unifying belief draws the strands together as feminists have a common desire to improve the role of women with the help of the state (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5(b) (contd.)   | • socialist and radical feminists agree that, although the state serves some useful purpose for women, it is not structured to eradicate patriarchy from society, seeing it instead as providing minimal protection for women while allowing their unequal position to be maintained (AO2), this clearly shows agreement between feminists that the state does not serve the interests of women but instead serves patriarchy (AO3)
|                 | • feminists agree that the state could be useful by enhancing women’s position, showing that an improved role for women is at the heart of all feminism (AO2), this is a significant belief and shows agreement between the two, therefore proving that there are elements of harmony in their views on the state (AO3). |

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0–0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some of which are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
### Question 6(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</strong></td>
<td>A01 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). A02 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent to which multiculturalists support diversity:**

- **Clear support**
  - liberal multiculturalists would argue that diversity is valuable by bringing to society a life and vitality that is good for everyone, and they endorse shallow diversity
  - pluralist multiculturalists see individual identity as embedded in cultural context and they endorse deep diversity
  - cosmopolitan multiculturalists view diversity as important in providing multiple identities.

- **Limited support/different level of support**
  - there are different approaches to diversity because of different views of whether liberal democracy can support diversity
  - there is a lack of agreement as to how far diversity should extend between liberal and pluralist multiculturalists
  - cosmopolitan multiculturalists support diversity but do not regard it as a value in itself.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of clear support:**

- many liberal multiculturalists support diversity as it brings society more life and vitality as it creates cross-cultural dialogue and embeds a willingness to respect difference (AO2), however this support for diversity is limited to cultural practices, views and values that are compatible with liberal democracy and individual rights (AO3)
- many pluralist multiculturalists support diversity as individual identity is embedded in cultural context so respect for the individual must entail respect for their cultures and values (AO2), and consequently this is the basis for deep diversity as argued by Parekh, which extends far beyond the shallow diversity of liberal multiculturalists (AO3)
- cosmopolitan multiculturalists support diversity as it provides multiple cultural identities, from which individuals can mix and match in cultural hybridisation and become global citizens (AO2), thus this support for diversity is weaker as it is more about providing identities to choose from as a lifestyle choice rather than as a fundamental principle rooted in society and history (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of limited/different support:**

- liberal multiculturalists are supportive of diversity but are unwilling to compromise the principles of liberal democracy, whereas pluralists argue that liberal democracy provides a framework that restricts diversity and difference (AO2), this therefore creates a fundamental, ongoing disagreement over the extent of diversity and whether liberal values and liberal democratic structures should have priority over its rivals (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6(a) (contd)    | • many pluralists argue that the shallow diversity is confined by the acceptance of certain liberal values regarded as universal, which leads to the position of value pluralism advocated by Berlin, where all ideological stances and cultural positions are of equal merit (AO2), consequently, this creates a deep disagreement over whether different values and cultures should be protected if they are illiberal or oppressive (AO3)  
• cosmopolitan multiculturalists support diversity for a very different reason, as it strengthens hybridity (multiple identities), which promotes a wider awareness of other peoples and the wider world(AO2), therefore although it can be justifiably argued that this may lead to the weakening of cultural distinctiveness and undermine diversity, which is seen as valuable by both liberal and pluralist multiculturalists(AO3). |

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6(b)</td>
<td>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to how multiculturalist views of minority rights support integration:

**Clear support**
- multiculturalists endorse positive discrimination
- multiculturalists support polyethnic rights
- multiculturalists believe that minority rights are crucial to integration into society.

**Limited support/different level of support**
- some conservatives have criticised minority rights
- some conservatives have criticised positive discrimination
- minority rights are sometimes seen by liberal multiculturalists as clashing with individual rights.

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of clear support:

- some multiculturalists endorse positive discrimination to tackle the social injustice of unfair disadvantages and under-representation in public life (W. Kymlicka), which can block integration into society (AO2), therefore minority rights can ensure the full and equal participation of all cultures in society and decision making, which is essential for integration (AO3)
- some multiculturalists support polyethnic rights for immigrant minority communities, where they are religious or ethnic minorities, which may include legal exemptions from generally applicable law or bilingual education (AO2), consequently this will maintain their cultural identity and will provide fairer terms for integration in liberal democracies (W. Kymlicka) (AO3)
- some multiculturalists enthusiastically endorse minority rights to promote integration as the liberal state, by promoting universal rights which do not recognise difference, marginalise or subordinate the minority culture(s) (C. Taylor), thus making minority cultures unable to integrate into society (AO2), so minority rights provide the protection for minority cultures, which enables individuals to have their identity recognised and fully integrate into society (AO3).

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of limited/different support:

- some conservatives have criticised minority rights, arguing that they block integration into wider society, such as the right of Muslim women to wear the veil marking Muslims out as separate (AO2), this therefore shows that minority rights become a symbol of separateness, marking minorities out as different, thus leading to ghettoisation and segregation, not integration (AO3)
- some conservatives have criticised positive discrimination, such as affirmative action in the USA, as unfair to the majority or demeaning to the minority (AO2), thus minority rights create a sense of inferiority in minorities and anger in the majority, which blocks integration (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6(b) (contd.)   | • minority rights are sometimes seen as clashing with individual rights, as in the case of the right of Muslim women to wear the veil, which some claim discriminates against women, directly reducing their integration into society (AO2), therefore this clash between universal rights, liberal rights and group rights remains a key source of tension in the debate over whether minority rights support integration (AO3).  

C Candidates must consider differing 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* refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.  

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14| • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19| • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24| • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
Nationalism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by using their knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that nationalism is progressive:**
Is progressive
- Liberal- and anti/post-colonial nationalism promotes mutual respect for nations and seeks independence for all (Rousseau)
- Liberal- and anti-colonial nationalism sees nations as civic entities
- Liberal nationalism and anti/post-colonialism both seek international harmony (Garvey), believing nation-states should be regulated by international law.

Is not progressive
- some types of expansionist nationalism breed feelings of intense patriotism, often leading to war (Maurras)
- conservative and expansionist nationalism believes that nations are forged by having a shared history
- conservative nationalism sees nations as ethnic entities (Herder), and expansionist nationalism as biologically distinct ‘races’, showing that they are not progressive.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of progressiveness:**
- liberal- and anti-colonial nationalism agree that all nations are of equal worth and must have the right to self-determination and self-governance, seeking a future world of independent nation-states (AO2), therefore showing strong support in both strands for these progressive values and a desire to enable all nations to be autonomous entities (Mazzini), which is at the heart of both strands and unlikely to change (AO3)
- civic forms of nationalism see nations in rational and inclusive terms seeking to break boundaries down and encouraging people to join nations that they seek to be a part of (AO2), consequently showing that within civic, inclusive forms of nationalism there is a desire to agree on the basic fundamentals of nationhood and that strands can work together to agree on this common progressive goal (AO3)
- liberal nationalism and anti/post-colonialism seek international harmony by promoting a rational understanding of nationalism, whereby nations respect each other and their right to self-determination (AO2), therefore this unifying belief draws the two strands together as they have a common understanding of nationalism, showing huge areas of agreement between them both as a liberating, progressive force (AO3).

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of lack of progressiveness:**
- some forms of expansionist nationalism, e.g. integral nationalism, promote an irrational view of nationhood, encouraging the view that not all nations have the right to self-determination, which often leads to war (Maurras) (AO2), thus a core principle of these forms of nationalism is the desire to go to war against other nations, they cannot be seen as progressive as their main aim seeks to repress others (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **7(a)** (contd.) | • conservative nationalism is based on a nostalgic view of the past, seeking to hold on to traditions and learning from the past, and expansionist nationalism is based on the re-establishment of past national greatness, often seeking to emulate regressive practices (AO2), therefore showing that they do not seek to look forward and work with other nations, and cannot be seen as progressive (AO3)  
• ethnic forms of nationalism, like conservative and expansionist nationalism, see nations in irrational, more exclusive terms, believing each nation to have its own spiritual uniqueness (Herder), some expansionists see nations as biologically distinct 'races' leading to a hierarchy of races (AO2), thus showing that within ethnic, exclusive forms of nationalism there is a lack of desire to recognise other views of nationhood, and in some cases a desire to subjugate some nations, showing no interest in working towards a better future for all nations, this cannot be seen as progressive in any way (AO3). |

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
  • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
  • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
### 7(b)

**Indicative content**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers, showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by using their knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that nationalism supports self-determination for all:**

**In support**

- Liberal nationalism supports self-determination as a universal right for all nations (Mazzini) and supports self-determination for nations, to ensure peace and international order (Rousseau)
- Conservative nationalists believe self-determination provides stability and continuity within the nation (Herder)
- Anti/post-colonialist nationalists see self-determination as the way to break free from imperialist domination (Garvey)

**Does not support**

- Expansionist nationalism does not support self-determination for all nations, believing that only some nations warrant it
- Conservative nationalism recognises the importance of self-determination as a way of binding the nation together without seeing it as necessary for all nations
- Expansionist nationalism sees society as an unending struggle between nations as survival of the fittest.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the support:**

- Liberal nationalism and anti/post-colonial nationalists agree that self-determination is crucial for nation states to develop and form their own identity (AO2), therefore this shows that there is a desire to agree on the basic fundamentals of self-determination and that both strands can work together to support this common goal (AO3)
- Conservative and liberal nationalists agree that self-determination promotes peace and order by allowing nations to decide what is in their own best interest, which avoids conflicts with other nations as independent nation states tend to respect other nation-states (AO2), this clearly shows that both strands can agree on fundamental aspects of self-determination and that independent nation-states have a positive aspect on society (AO3)
- Anti/post-colonialist nationalists and liberal nationalists agree that self-determination is the way to break free from imperialist domination, (Garvey) believing self-determination advances freedom by rejecting the right of colonial powers to oppress their colonies for selfish advantage (AO2), consequently this unifying belief draws the two strands together and they have a common understanding of self-determination and what nation-states can achieve when they are free (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7(b) (contd.)</td>
<td>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the lack of support:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• expansionist nationalism, because of its chauvinist views, is the only form of nationalism that rejects self-determination for all nations and is usually the perpetrator of imperialism (AO2), thus expansionist nationalists fundamentally disagree with other nationalists on the notion of self-determination for all, both sides believing that their own vision will create a better world, and shows a clear difference in the type of future society they want, which does not seem to lend itself to any likely agreement (AO3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• conservative nationalists’ support for self-determination is more limited than liberal and anti/post-colonial nationalists as they are less concerned with the rights of other nations and more concerned with the cohesion of their own nation-state (AO2), therefore there is some justification in saying that on an important level there is disagreement in the extent to which, and reasons why, they support self-determination and this is likely to continue (AO3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• expansionist nationalism rejects the right of universal self-determination, as it sees society as a struggle between stronger nations and weaker nations; usually leading to war (AO2), consequently this level of disagreement is fundamental, showing that expansionist nationalists have totally different attitudes to self-determination (Maurras), that this is an important distinction between them and that disagreement is wide (AO3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must consider differing 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 refer to specific thinkers from the specification and/or only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–4  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 5–9  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 10–14 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 15–19 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 20–24 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
No rewardable material.

Level 1

– 4

• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).

Level 2

5 – 9

• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).

Level 3

10 – 14

• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).

Level 4

15 – 19

• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).

Level 5

20 – 24

• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Instructions

• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• There are three sections and you must answer four questions:
  – in Section A answer either Question 1(a) or 1(b)
  – in Section B answer Question 2
  – in Section C answer two questions from 3(a) or 3(b) or 3(c).
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – there may be more space than you need.

Information

• The total mark for this paper is 84.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets
  – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.

Advice

• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
SECTION A

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) OR Question 1(b).

EITHER

1 (a) Examine the ways in which the US and the UK Constitutions are similar. (12)

OR

(b) Examine the factors that create a two-party dominance both in the US and in the UK. (12)

(Total for Question 1 = 12 marks)
Examine the factors that create a two-party dominance both in the US and in the UK.

EITHER

1. Examine the ways in which the US and the UK Constitutions are similar.

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) OR Question 1(b).

Chosen question number:  Question 1(a)  Question 1(b)
SECTION B

Answer Question 2.

2 Analyse the differences in party unity in the US and in the UK.

*In your answer you must consider the relevance of at least one comparative theory.*

(12)
Answer Question 2.

(Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 12 MARKS
SECTION C

Answer TWO questions from EITHER 3(a) OR 3(b) OR 3(c).

In your answer you should make connections between relevant areas of politics studied from Government and Politics of the USA.

EITHER

3   (a) Evaluate the extent to which the Supreme Court is now an ‘imperial judiciary’.

   You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

AND/OR

(b) Evaluate the extent to which Congressional oversight of the President is ineffective.

   You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

AND/OR

(c) Evaluate the extent to which racial equality has been advanced in the 21st century.

   You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

(Total for Question 3 = 60 marks)
Indicate the first question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ⬜️. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ⬛️ and then indicate your new question with a cross ⬜️.

Chosen question number:  

- Question 3(a) ⬜️  
- Question 3(b) ⬛️  
- Question 3(c) ⬜️  

...
Indicate the second question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ❌ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen question number:  

Question 3(a) ☑ 
Question 3(b) ☑ 
Question 3(c) ☑
Section A

Question number

Indicative content

1(a)

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of the USA and UK politics (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining similarities between the two Constitutions:

- Federalism in the USA ensures states’ rights, for example Amendment X.
- Devolution in the UK has given considerable power to countries within the Union, for example Scotland and tax.
- The USA has strict separation of powers between Congress, President and Supreme Court, for example Obama resigning as a Senator to take on the presidency. The UK has increasing separation of powers in recent years, for example the formation of the Supreme Court in 2005.
- The USA’s Constitution is written in 7,000 words in one document. The UK is written across a range of sources such as Statute Law, for example the Constitutional Reform Act.
- The US protects rights through the Bill of Rights and the role of the Supreme Court, for example the case of Obergefell vs Hodges. The UK protects rights through statute law, for example the Human Rights Act, and membership of the Council of Europe.
- The USA’s Constitution can be amended through the Article 5 amendment process or the Supreme Court’s interpretive amendments. The UK Constitution can be amended through new statute law or new convention, for example the Fixed Term Parliament Act 2011.

Candidates are may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the similarities between the two Constitutions:

- Both Constitutions have some dispersal of power from the central government to more local levels of politics, which allow regions to decide on issues that affect them directly, rather than directives from central government.
- Both Constitutions have some level of separation of powers of the three branches of government, executive, legislative and judiciary, which allows for greater checks and balances across branches of government.
- Both Constitutions are largely written down and therefore accessible to lawmakers and the courts, providing some level of clarity over the operation and powers of government and citizens’ rights.
- Both Constitutions have a level of protection of the civil rights of citizens of their country and both are judiciable by courts in order to ensure these rights are upheld.
- Both Constitutions can be amended/changed, which allows them to adapt and evolve with the modern times, ensuring it remains relevant to each country.

Candidates who refer to only one Constitution cannot achieve beyond Level 1. Accept any other valid responses.
**Paper 3A: Comparative Politics: USA mark scheme**

**Section A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a)</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of the USA and UK politics (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining similarities between the two Constitutions:**

- Federalism in the USA ensures states’ rights, for example Amendment X. Devolution in the UK has given considerable power to countries within the Union, for example Scotland and tax.
- The USA has strict separation of powers between Congress, President and Supreme Court, for example Obama resigning as a Senator to take on the presidency. The UK has increasing separation of powers in recent years, for example the formation of the Supreme Court in 2005.
- The USA’s Constitution is written in 7,000 words in one document. The UK is written across a range of sources such as Statute Law, for example the Constitutional Reform Act.
- The US protects rights through the Bill of Rights and the role of the Supreme Court, for example the case of *Obergefell vs Hodges*. The UK protects rights through statute law, for example the Human Rights Act, and membership of the Council of Europe.
- The USA’s Constitution can be amended through the Article 5 amendment process or the Supreme Court’s interpretive amendments. The UK Constitution can be amended through new statute law or new convention, for example the Fixed Term Parliament Act 2011.

**Candidates are may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the similarities between the two Constitutions:**

- Both Constitutions have some dispersal of power from the central government to more local levels of politics, which allow regions to decide on issues that affect them directly, rather than directives from central government.
- Both Constitutions have some level of separation of powers of the three branches of government, executive, legislative and judiciary, which allows for greater checks and balances across branches of government.
- Both Constitutions are largely written down and therefore accessible to lawmakers and the courts, providing some level of clarity over the operation and powers of government and citizens’ rights.
- Both Constitutions have a level of protection of the civil rights of citizens of their country and both are judiciable by courts in order to ensure these rights are upheld.
- Both Constitutions can be amended/changed, which allows them to adapt and evolve with the modern times, ensuring it remains relevant to each country.

Candidates who refer to only one Constitution cannot achieve beyond Level 1. Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–3  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 2 | 4–6  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 3 | 7–9  | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis(AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 4 | 10–12| • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(b)</td>
<td>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of the USA and UK politics (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining factors that create two-party dominance:**

- third parties have only limited success as they fail to gain the necessary support from the electorate in the long term – for example UKIP in the UK and the Tea Party in the USA
- competing ideologies do co-exist within the main parties: in the UK there are both Euro-sceptics and Europhiles in parties, and in the USA there are both pro- and anti-gun Democrats
- the threat posed by third parties often provokes a reaction in the main parties – the Republican Party in the USA responded to the threat of the Tea Party by moving right, as seen with the rebellion against Boehner, and the Conservatives in the UK promised an EU referendum in response to the threat of UKIP
- many MPs/Congressmen are simply re-elected, which limits the chances of any other parties. In the USA, 95% of the House of Representatives was re-elected in 2014, and in the UK, where the MP Ken Clarke has served his constituency since 1970
- the expense of elections is difficult for third parties – in the USA the 2008 election topped $1bn for the first time and the UK 2015 election cost approximately £46m.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining factors that create two-party dominance:**

- both countries use first past the post which lends itself to a two-party system because of the need to have a plurality of votes and a majority of seats to form government. Third parties struggle to gain the level of necessary support to gain even a chance of forming government or gaining power
- both have parties that are wide ranging in beliefs, and ideologies that retain largely mass appeal, meaning that third parties often struggle to create policy that offers something different to the electorate
- the main parties in both countries tend to co-opt policies where a third party has gained popularity, meaning that any support they did gain often drifts back to the major parties once they adopt similar policies
- the incumbent candidate has a large advantage over competitors, their name recognition and the funding opportunities this brings makes it difficult for third parties to compete effectively
- in order to run an effective election, it remains necessary to have considerable finances and only the major parties can manage this level of funding.

Candidates who refer to only one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–3 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1).  
• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 2 | 4–6 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 3 | 7–9 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 4 | 10–12 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
### Question 2

**AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)**

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of the USA, including comparative theories and UK politics (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining party unity in the US and UK:**
- in the UK, the party controls the career of an individual MP through selection and deselection; in the USA the state has a greater control over the career of a Congressman due to primaries and caucuses
- the US has far greater diversity than the UK, meaning the parties have more varied points of view
- the US parties have more clearly identified factions than the UK parties, representing different ideological wings of the party
- the role of the whips in UK parties is much stronger in ensuring party unification than the whips in US parties.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining party unity in the US and UK:**
- party unity is stronger in the UK because for those politicians who wish to retain their seat, loyalty to their party is crucial to selection and for career advancement. In the USA, politicians are more loyal to their state than their party, diminishing party unity
- in representing a larger and more diverse nation, US politicians have a far greater range of views to advance, resulting in a less ideologically coherent party; the smaller size and limited diversity of the UK allows for greater party unity in voting
- the existence of factions in both countries suggests a lack of unity, however the voting alignment of US party factions is much more reliable than the UK factions
- for MPs who wish to rebel against their party, the role and power of the whips allow for enforced party unity. However, in the USA, the lack of power the whips have allows for members to freely represent their constituency with little fear of repercussion.

**Candidates may refer to the following when analysing rational theory:**
- USA – self-interested members serve constituencies more than the party because of state powers over elections, therefore they can rebel against their party but retain their place in Congress
- UK – self-interested members serve the party as it controls their career and therefore they support their party if they wish to gain advancement.

**Candidates may refer to the following when analysing cultural theory:**
- USA – parties are ‘broad churches’ and therefore there is likely to be a wide range of views within them, especially given the diversity of the USA
- UK – the parties have a much clearer identity and MPs are often elected on a party basis rather than a personal basis, they are therefore expected to vote with their party.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 (contd)       | Candidates may refer to the following when analysing structural theory:  
                   • USA – the whips in the USA are much weaker and have little power to control members, therefore allowing for more rebellion  
                   • UK – the whips in the UK hold a great deal of power to enforce party discipline and therefore rebellion is less common.  
                   
                   Candidates who refer to one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.  
                   Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3.  
                   
                   Accept any other valid responses. |
Candidates may refer to the following when analysing structural theory:

- USA – the whips in the USA are much weaker and have little power to control members, therefore allowing for more rebellion.
- UK – the whips in the UK hold a great deal of power to enforce party discipline and therefore rebellion is less common.

Candidates who refer to one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1. Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3. Accept any other valid responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>1–3</td>
<td>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis. Makes limited comparative theory points (AO1). Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>4–6</td>
<td>Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis. Makes some relevant comparative theory points (AO1). Some comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>7–9</td>
<td>Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis. Makes relevant comparative theory points (AO1). Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis. Makes cohesive comparative theory points (AO1). Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that the Supreme Court is an imperial judiciary:**

**Agreement**
- Judicial Review remains politically accepted
- the Court is willing to overrule elected branches of government
- Constitutional Amendments are rare but are the only way of overturning a Supreme Court decision
- some recent cases have only a tenuous basis in the Constitution
- the only way to remove a judge abusing this power is impeachment.

**Disagreement**
- there has been a decline in the number of cases heard in recent years
- an increasingly conservative Court since 2005 has acted with greater deference to elected branches
- the Constitution still restrains their rulings
- there is usually only a handful of landmark cases each year
- *stare decisis* remains a principle of the Court, which limits their power.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**

- Judicial review grants the Court power to overrule any state or federal law without effective checks, even those with widespread public support (AO2), therefore the Court’s power is imperial in nature and there is not another institution that can affect this, they are all powerful in how they act and not even the voters can influence their decisions (AO3)
- the Supreme Court is unelected and yet can overrule Congress or the President striking down the laws made by these branches and in doing so the Supreme Court is overruling those with a democratic and popular mandate (AO2), this is clear evidence of how it behaves in an imperial way as there seem to be no checks and balances, and the other institutions are powerless to curb the actions of the Court (AO3)
- the amendments process requires such bipartisanship and large majorities that it has happened only once in the Court’s history and so the lack of checks allows the Court to exercise vast power with few restrictions (AO2), therefore the Court is clearly imperial as the mechanism for control is so cumbersome it is ineffective and there are no moves to reform this process and make the Court more accountable (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(a) (contd.)   | - judicial activism often goes beyond the literal wording, which places considerable power over 300 million people in the hands of just nine unelected justices (AO2), consequently this is clear evidence that the Court is acting imperially by creating more power for itself and that there is not any restriction to this power (AO3)  
- impeachment is difficult to do and seldom used, therefore allowing judges to act without fear of repercussion (AO2), thus representing a clear signal that the Court is imperial in nature as this mechanism of control is ineffective and means that they can exert their power without any real consequences (AO3).  
**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:**  
- the decline in the number of cases restricts their impact on US politics at both state and national level, meaning their power is limited in its actual impact (AO2), therefore the Court is not really imperial in nature as their power is diminishing and is reliant on the cases coming to them and they have no control over that (AO3)  
- the Court relies on the elected branches to enforce its rulings and this upholds the democratic mandate of the American people, as well as allowing elected branches the choice over enforcement (AO2), consequently this is clearly not imperial in nature as beyond the rulings they have no power of enforcement and are relying on other factors and the American people have power over them (AO3)  
- the Court is able to interpret from the Constitution only, regardless of their personal or political opinion and this restricts the ability of the Court to act with judicial activism (AO2), these factors, therefore, ultimately limit their impact so the Court cannot be imperial as there are clear restrictions on their power to act freely (AO3)  
- there has been no increase in the number of landmark cases compared to previous Courts, which were equally willing to overturn government, decisions (AO2), thus the Court is not as powerful as before and therefore they cannot be considered as imperial because the current Court has been less influential (AO3)  
- as they are largely bound to follow previous Court decisions so this acts as an unofficial check on the Court’s power, restricting their ability to become quasi-legislative (AO2), therefore this is a factor that shows they cannot be imperial as there are checks and restrictions on their power, that previous case law means that their future decisions are bound and that they do not have total freedom to act (AO3).  

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 have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.  

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6  | - Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | - Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18| - Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24| - Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30| - Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
- Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
- Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(b)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that Congressional oversight is ineffective:**

**Agreement**
- Congress’s legislative power can be overturned by a presidential veto
- Congressional oversight is often reactive
- Congressional oversight is dependent on party control
- in foreign policy, Congress has limited powers to oversee the President
- approval ratings reduce the impact that Congress can have.

**Disagreement**
- the Constitution still grants considerable checks to Congress
- during divided government, scrutiny is often better
- Congress is especially effective when a President is weaker, or towards the end of their presidency
- Congress retains control over the budget
- in domestic policy, Congress is much more effective as they control the legislative process.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**

- the Constitution allows a President to overturn Congress even if they have a more recent mandate and yet Congress has displayed only a minimal ability to use the veto override (AO2), this shows, therefore, weaknesses in the exercise of their power, shows that the President is more powerful and that Congress power is restricted and cannot be wholly effective (AO3)
- Congress reacts with enumerated powers, such as investigations and veto override, which need the President to act first, these powers of Congress restrict their ability to act proactively (AO2), therefore this has allowed the President to dominate so that the oversight is ineffective as the balance of power still remains with the President and Congress is not in control (AO3)
- in times of unified government there is often reduced scrutiny of the President, increasing their power, yet in times of divided government, Presidents often rely on more imperial powers to bypass Congress (AO2), consequently in both cases, Congress fails to appropriately check the President and they cannot effectively act as a check or balance on Presidential power whatever the political landscape of the time and the mechanisms in place fail (AO3)
the power to ratify treaties, control the budget and the vagueness of Article II has allowed the dominance of the President in foreign policy and to circumvent congressional powers (AO2), therefore all these elements ensure that Congress cannot be effective in limiting the power of the President and that the system needs reviewing in order for Congress to be more effective (AO3)

higher approval ratings for a President than Congress are normal and give the President more freedom for manoeuvre, which means it can be difficult for Congress to utilise the media in order to scrutinise the President (AO2), thus it is clear evidence that Congressional oversight is ineffective, as the President has better access to influencing the voting public and the media, which in the 21st century is a crucial way of gaining and maintaining power and Congress is always going to be less able to affect change this way (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- Congress has proven it is capable of thwarting Presidents’ demands with Constitutional checks and where Presidents have tried to circumvent them, they have been found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court or suffered in the media (AO2), consequently reducing his power and showing themselves to be effective in how they check presidential power and also how they use the other mechanisms to aid this checking (AO3)

- in divided government, the opposition party is more willing to exercise their powers and directly challenge the President (AO2), therefore the resulting gridlock could be considered an effective check on the President preventing them from acting alone (AO3)

- Congress is especially effective when a President is weaker, or towards the end of their presidency when their mandate is weaker and elections are looming, as challenging the President will not lose them votes (AO2), therefore they are able to utilise public opinion in order to prevent unpopular presidential actions, which is clearly an effective check on presidential power (AO3)

- through the legislative process, Congress can decide on which presidential policies pass into law. Executive actions can be overruled and amended in this manner, preventing the President’s will becoming law (AO2), therefore they are clearly effective in stopping the actions of the President and have power to intervene, these actions are a highly effective way to curb presidential actions and are used (AO3)

- by controlling the budget, Congress has the ability to defund wars and retain some control over foreign policy, even in times of government shutdown (AO2), thus this has prevented unilateral action from the President and therefore is clear evidence that Congress is effective in overseeing the actions of the President and can have a huge impact on what happens both in the country and abroad (AO3).

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 have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6 | - Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
- Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | - Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
- Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | - Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
- Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | - Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
- Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30 | - Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).
- Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
- Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(c)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that racial equality has advanced in the 21st century:

**Agreement**
- Obama introduced the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) policy in June 2012
- Obama’s Executive Orders of 2014 introduced the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans policy and expanded of DACA
- affirmative action has been upheld by the Supreme Court
- action against illegal immigrants has been struck down by the Supreme Court
- the 114th Congress is the most diverse ever.

**Disagreement**
- the lack of DREAM Act passage, despite electoral promises
- the bipartisan ‘immigration bill’ compiled by the Gang of 8 came to nothing
- the Supreme Court has struck down executive orders on DAPA and DACA
- states continue to introduce legislation to disadvantage racial minorities
- high-profile national tragedies and protests such as Trayvon Martin, the Charlestown shooting and the Ferguson unrest, suggest a perceived lack of advancement.

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:
- of the successful DACA applicants, over half have found it easier to get a job and open a bank account, which is a considerable step forward for the 5 million illegal immigrants in the USA (AO2), therefore this clearly shows that the country has moved forward in a positive way to affect racial equality in the country as it has a more tolerant approach to immigration, racial and cultural diversity (AO3)
- the 2014 executive orders further expanded those eligible for relief from deportation and work authorisation, which should increase their income and raise them out of poverty (AO2), consequently poverty is a clear marker in race equality, this change signals that this century has made huge steps forward in ensuring that equality can be achieved despite coming from impoverished circumstances (AO3)
- rulings such as *Fisher vs. Texas* have meant any remaining inequality can continue to be addressed by the Supreme Court, which recognises the importance of the programme even after the election of a black President (AO2), therefore this change shows the clear shift in thinking about racial equality and the intention to continue to improve the situation and build on the positive fact of Obama’s election (AO3)
- in *Arizona vs US*, SB1070 was struck down, which went some way to prevent racial profiling, ensuring that states could not discriminate against minority groups within state legislation, therefore protecting their rights (AO2), thus this is clear evidence that racial equality has advanced greatly this century and that the country has embedded some crucial steps to ensuring that positive advances continue (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(c) (contd)</td>
<td>• with 1 in 5 members in Congress from an ethnic minority, including a substantial growth in Hispanics, this gives power to minority caucuses and allows members to bring bills and issues forward that are relevant to their minority communities (AO2), therefore this represents a substantial advance in the ethnic make up of Congress that should positively affect how this institution operates, it heralds that a kind of better representation in respect of race will continue in the future (AO3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

• the failure of this central plank of immigration policy has meant reliance on executive orders, which are easily overturned by Congress or the Supreme Court (AO2), this therefore is a failure to protect minorities in the USA and clearly shows that advancement this century has been limited and is ineffective (AO3).

• Boehner refused to hear the immigration bill in the House of Representatives and subsequent gridlock has ensued. In trying to court Congress on this matter, Obama has deported more illegal immigrants than George W Bush (AO2), consequently this is arguably a step backwards for racial equality and if a black President cannot support racial equality then this does not bode well for future positive advancements (AO3).

• in striking down DAPA and DACA, states will be able to institute some deportation policies against illegal immigrations. Any substantive advances must come through Congress, which has been reticent to pass immigration legislation (AO2), thus leaving minorities with ineffective protection or advancement and shows that change has been minimal and that Congress is still reluctant to fully embrace racial equality (AO3).

• federalism and the size of the US have prevented full implementation of rulings such as Brown vs Topeka (for example in Mississippi, 2016) and a lack of federal political will, coupled with gridlock, is unlikely to prevent this (AO2), therefore any advancement seems unlikely as the system is against true racial equality and there are too many issues in the way for advancement to be truly effective (AO3).

• minorities still appear to suffer at the hands of white Americans and the failure to achieve substantive change to, for example, racial profiling or gun control remains an ongoing issue (AO2), therefore this is a major factor in ensuring that advancement in racial equality will never go far, as the country is not able to embrace it fully and it would require a huge cultural and political shift, which does not look likely to happen significantly in the 21st century (AO3).

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 have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0–6</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>7–12</td>
<td>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>13–18</td>
<td>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>19–24</td>
<td>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td>25–30</td>
<td>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You do not need any other materials, including calculators which are not permitted.

Instructions

• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• There are three sections and you must answer four questions:
  – in Section A answer either Question 1(a) or 1(b)
  – in Section B answer Question 2
  – in Section C answer two questions from 3(a) or 3(b) or 3(c).
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided
  – there may be more space than you need.

Information

• The total mark for this paper is 84.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets
  – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.

Advice

• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
SECTION A

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) OR Question 1(b).

EITHER

1 (a) Examine the criticisms that have been made of both the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank.  

(12)

OR

(b) Examine the effectiveness of both the international courts and tribunals in protecting human rights.  

(12)

(Total for Question 1 = 12 marks)
Examine the effectiveness of both the international courts and tribunals in protecting human rights.

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) OR Question 1(b).

Chosen question number:  Question 1(a)  

Question 1(b)
TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 12 MARKS
SECTION B

Answer Question 2.

2 Analyse the divisions regarding human nature that exist between realists and liberals.

*In your answer you must discuss any relevant core political ideas.*

(12)
Answer Question 2.

**SECTION B**

(Total for Question 2 = 12 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 12 MARKS
SECTION C

Answer TWO questions from EITHER Question 3(a) OR Question 3(b) OR Question 3(c).

In your answer you should make connections between relevant areas of politics studied from Global Politics.

EITHER

3 (a) Evaluate the extent to which cultural globalisation has had a greater impact on the world than any other form of globalisation.

You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

AND/OR

(b) Evaluate the extent to which the European Union (EU) has been a model for regionalism around the world.

You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

AND/OR

(b) Evaluate the extent to which the rise of other states has diminished the US as the global hegemonic power.

You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

(Total for Question 3 = 60 marks)
Indicate the first question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑️. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒️ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑️.

Chosen question number:  

Question 3(a) ☐  Question 3(b) ☐  Question 3(c) ☐
Indicate the second question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ✗ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen question number:  Question 3(a) ☐  Question 3(b) ☐  Question 3(c) ☐
**TOTAL FOR SECTION C = 60 MARKS**

**TOTAL FOR PAPER = 84 MARKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.**

Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of criticisms of the IMF and World Bank:

- The headquarters of both institutions are in Washington, D.C., United States
- The president of the World Bank is traditionally a United States citizen nominated by the United States, the largest shareholder in the bank
- The leader of the IMF is traditionally a European and the US has approximately 17% of share votes
- The commitment of these bodies to economic liberalism has been reflected in the use of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) as part of the ‘Washington Consensus’
- There has been a primary emphasis on economic reform.

Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the criticisms of the two institutions and may refer to the following:

- Location of HQ and share control etc. leads to accusations that the organisations are structurally dominated by certain states
- SAPs, it is alleged, inflict more harm than good on developing countries and increase their dependency on powerful northern economies, with an emphasis on deregulation and privatisation and stress on export-led growth
- Pressure to accept SAPs undermines state sovereignty
- Emphasis on economic reform means that little attention has been given to human rights or to environmental considerations
- The ability of the President of the United States to select the World Bank leader leads to allegations of political control and manipulation.

Candidates who refer to only one institution cannot achieve beyond Level 1. Accept any other valid responses.
**Paper 3B: Comparative Politics: Global mark scheme**

**Section A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of criticisms of the IMF and World Bank:**
- the headquarters of both institutions are in Washington, D.C., United States
- the president of the World Bank is traditionally a United States citizen nominated by the United States, the largest shareholder in the bank
- the leader of the IMF is traditionally a European and the US has approximately 17% of share votes
- the commitment of these bodies to economic liberalism has been reflected in the use of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) as part of the ‘Washington Consensus’
- there has been a primary emphasis on economic reform.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the criticisms of the two institutions and may refer to the following:**
- location of HQ and share control etc. leads to accusations that the organisations are structurally dominated by certain states
- SAPs, it is alleged, inflict more harm than good on developing countries and increase their dependency on powerful northern economies, with an emphasis on deregulation and privatisation and stress on export-led growth
- pressure to accept SAPs undermines state sovereignty
- emphasis on economic reform means that little attention has been given to human rights or to environmental considerations
- the ability of the President of the United States to select the World Bank leader leads to allegations of political control and manipulation.

Candidates who refer to only one institution cannot achieve beyond Level 1. Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–3  | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 2 | 4–6  | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 3 | 7–9  | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 4 | 10–12| • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
<p>|        |      | • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1(b)</td>
<td>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of international courts and tribunals in regard to human rights protection:**

- there are a number of international courts and tribunals that have been set up to prosecute individuals rather than states
- the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) was created in 1993 to prosecute for crimes against humanity and genocide committed in the Yugoslav wars
- the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) was established in 1994
- the Sierra Leone Tribunal has also operated in prosecution of individuals
- the International Criminal Court (ICC) was established in 2002 and the European Court of Human Rights was established in 1959.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the effectiveness of the two institutions in protecting human rights:**

- effectiveness in promoting human rights can be judged through indictments and prosecutions and also through the deterrent effect, though this is harder to judge
- the ICTY has had a significant number of prosecutions, including high-profile cases against individuals like Milosovic, Mladic and Karadzic
- the ICTR has had notable successes include the conviction of former Prime Minister Kambanda
- the Sierra Leone Tribunal has successfully prosecuted the former Liberian president, Charles Taylor
- the ICC has seen a number of significant indictments but support for the institution ranges widely across the most significant states.

Candidates who refer to only one institution cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–3 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 2 | 4–6 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 3 | 7–9 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 4 | 10–12 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1).  
|        |      | • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
Section B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of Global comparative theories and relevant core politics ideas (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the divisions in relation to human nature between realists and liberals:**

Realists believe that:
- human nature is fixed and fashioned by nature
- instinct, rather than reason, drives human beings and human beings are considered to be selfish and predisposed to aggressive acts
- the pursuit of power is primary.

Liberals believe that:
- it is possible to be more optimistic about human nature
- human beings, like states, are capable of self-development
- conflict, and war in particular, will be a last resort when reason and argument has failed – this links to core ideas and principles of liberalism and rationalism.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) to examine the divisions between realists and liberals:**

- realists differ because they believe that humans desire personal gain and advancement, which will result in conflict
- realists believe that international cooperation is unlikely with states, reflecting human nature, pursuing the national interest, which inevitably leads to rivalry and conflict – links to conservatism and human imperfection (Hobbes)
- liberals believe there is a moral dimension to human nature, based on reason and an awareness of the value in treating others with respect
- liberals therefore will seek to resolve conflict through cooperation, discussion and negotiation – links to liberalism and developmental individualism
- consequently, liberals believe that international cooperation is likely, with states forging links with each other in a number of ways, which makes rivalry and conflict less likely.

Candidates who refer to only one named theory cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve beyond Level 3.

Accept any other valid responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No rewardable material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–3   | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis. Makes limited synoptic points (AO1).  
        |       | • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 2 | 4–6   | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis. Makes some relevant synoptic points (AO1).  
        |       | • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 3 | 7–9   | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis. Makes relevant synoptic points (AO1).  
        |       | • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
| Level 4 | 10–12 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis. Makes cohesive synoptic points (AO1).  
        |       | • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). |
Section C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(a)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the greater impact of cultural globalisation than other forms of globalisation:**

Support for cultural globalisation
- liberals see cultural globalisation as creating shared norms and values among people on a global scale, which is a powerful tool of change
- cultural globalisation may have impacted more because of its cultural flattening of differences among nations, regions and individuals
- cultural globalisation is more significant because it can be linked to homogenisation, with a shrinking world of shared television programmes, sport, commodities, food etc.
- we have seen the growth of huge media corporations, spanning the globe.

Support against cultural globalisation and for other forms of globalisation
- homogenisation may have led to cultural backlash so this has an impact on the significance of cultural globalisation
- economic globalisation (the process whereby all national economies have, to a greater or lesser extent, been absorbed into an interlocking global economy) is also significant
- political globalisation (the growing importance of international organisations) is also significant as these organisations are transnational in that they exercise jurisdiction not within a single state but within an international area comprising several states
- there is evidence that all other forms of globalisation combined are continuing to develop in terms of their impact and that cultural globalisation is no more significant than other forms or there is the realist view that international systems remain substantially unchanged.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the support for cultural globalisation:**

- Liberals tend to argue that cultural globalisation has had dramatic and far-reaching impact on international politics because of its impact in developing of shared values and norms in areas such as human rights (AO2), this therefore proves that the traditional concept of state sovereignty is being weakened and that we are losing distinct national, and even regional, cultures (AO3)
- cultural flattening may be associated with western values and the western economic model and therefore gives a reason for it being so attractive to nations, regions and individuals as it is perceived as successful and attractive (AO2), thus this is strong evidence that cultural globalisation will continue, as western dominance does not seem to be waning in the 21st century and therefore cultural globalisation will continue to have a significant effect in the future (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(a) (contd)    | • homogenisation has become a hugely significant factor in society and seems an unstoppable trend in terms of how society is developing, with shared experiences across many cultural platforms (AO2), this, therefore, supports the idea of the huge impact that cultural globalisation can have and that there seems to be little that can be done to stop or minimise homogenisation (AO3)  
• media corporations have grown with a western dominance, which has supported homogenisation and monoculture, this trend seems to be growing rather than diminishing, with the world turning into a ‘global village’ (AO2), consequently it is a very dominant trend globally and may be considered even more important than cultural globalisation, as there seems to be little to stop the growth of huge global media corporations (AO3).  
Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the other significant forms of globalisation:  
• homogenisation may have led to cultural backlash, ethnic nationalism, religious fundamentalism and opposition to a perceived US dominance. Also, non-western products are spreading globally (AO2), therefore this represents there is a resistance to homogenisation and that it may be stemmed or at least pushed back, there is hope that cultural globalisation may not be totally dominant and that it can be countered if there is a coordinated effort against it (AO3)  
• economic globalisation has impact as there is a view that a western dominance exists through emphasis on economic liberalism, and this has a clear stronghold on the thinking of many powerful countries that affects global issues (AO2), consequently, this may be considered the most significant form of globalisation as a driving force for other forms, as money is a highly significant factor in all countries and societies, and is ultimately more powerful than cultural elements, its power does not seem likely to diminish (AO3)  
• political globalisation may be seen as the most significant form of globalisation as it impacts on state sovereignty, with the creation of many new intergovernmental, and even supranational, institutions such as the EU and the ECJ (AO2), this, therefore, goes against cultural globalisation having the greatest impact as such institutions do have a considerable amount of power in shaping the global agenda and in impacting on state sovereignty, i.e. through cases such as the UK court case Factortame vs the ECJ (AO3)  
• there is evidence that all forms of globalisation are continuing to develop in terms of their impact, so it is hard to judge which has more impact. Also, the realist viewpoint that globalisation is insignificant in any form – therefore cultural is as insignificant as any other type (AO2), thus the backlash against cultural globalisation would suggest that other forms are more likely to have a greater significance. While there is resistance to cultural globalisation, political and economic globalisation seem to be far better received and are accepted almost universally (AO3).  
Candidates may also evaluate that all forms of globalisation are so interlinked as to form a single process, with no dominant form of globalisation.  
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(a) (contd)</td>
<td>Candidates who <em>have not</em> considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accept any other valid responses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 1–6 |      | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 7–12 |      | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 13–18 |      | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 19–24 |      | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 25–30 |      | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(b)</td>
<td><strong>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to view that the EU is a model for regionalism:**

**Agreement**
- awareness of the transformation of the European Coal and Steel Community (Treaty 1951) to European Economic Community (Treaty 1957) to European Union (Treaty 1993)
- awareness of the features of the EU, such as acceptance of pooled sovereignty, elements of supranationalism, single currency and establishment of the European Court of Justice
- the EU has had to respond to the onset of the process of globalisation
- the EU, like other regional economic blocs, serves as a free-trade area, giving member states access to a larger internal market.

**Disagreement**
- the EEC/EC/EU stemmed from particular historical circumstances of the time that make it unique in structure
- the EU is unlike other economic blocs in that it has developed a significant dimension of political union
- other regional bodies have not used the EU as a model and are operational and effective
- there is no one perfect model of regionalism as regional bodies are very different.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**

- the transformative effects of the treaties have ensured that there has been an inevitable movement from loose economic arrangement to more formal political agreement, this has been attractive in terms of a post-war landscape and into the 21st century (AO2), as the EU can be seen as a successful model it is therefore reasonable that other regional bodies will follow in its footsteps, particularly as it has been established for such a long period (AO3)
- the features of the EU have been copied in other regional bodies such as the African Union, NAFTA and ASEAN (AO2), this is clear evidence that it is the go-to model in terms of regionalism and is the gold standard in regionalism, so can be seen as an effective model that has been copied successfully (AO3)
- the EU model has transformed with globalisation to include monetary union, the creation of an economic single market, social and political union, economic growth and prosperity have accompanied this (AO2), this therefore suggests that the EU model has been a superior model/response to globalisation, has a far-reaching and important role and is the best model to follow in terms of success for regionalism (AO3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **3(b)** **(contd)** | • like most regional economic blocs, the EU establishes common tariffs that enable it to protect member states from competitive pressures beyond their borders and this is very appealing in terms of a regionalism model (AO2), these factors can seem, therefore, to support the conclusion that the EU is a model that others will inevitably follow as it protects its members well (AO3).  
**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:**  
• the EU’s unique historical position means that it has particular features such as pooled sovereignty, elements of supranationalism, single currency and the ECJ (AO2), this means that it is not the best model to replicate as its historical circumstances and development have shaped its existence and structure, and may not be appropriate for other forms of regionalism to adopt wholesale (AO3)  
• the EU has had increased pressure for political union, meaning that it is advanced in terms of playing a global role through membership of bodies such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) (AO2), therefore the range and scale of areas that the EU has developed can be used to prove that the EU is an unlikely model for others to replicate as it developed under unique circumstances (AO3)  
• the particular features of the EU do not appear to be replicated in other regional bodies such as the African Union, NAFTA and ASEAN, as they are such different bodies to the EU, they have adopted features that meet their own needs rather than using the EU as a model. They appear to value the retention of individual state decision making in political areas rather than allowing a loss or pooling of sovereignty (AO2), therefore the lack of such developments is clear evidence that the EU is not a model that has been used by other bodies and therefore does not represent the better model and that there are other ways to approach regionalism that can be just as effective (AO3)  
• regional bodies vary from loose and non-binding agreements among states to complex institutional arrangements, as found in the EU (AO2), therefore there are arguably lots of other models of regionalism and it is too simplistic to look at the EU as the only model for regionalism as there are many factors that can influence how bodies are organised and what makes them effective (AO3). |

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 *have not* considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.  

Accept any other valid points.
Candidates who reflected in their conclusion. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. Accept any indicative content evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view: Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and regional bodies vary from loose and non-binding agreements among the particular features of the EU do not appear to be replicated in other states to complex institutional arrangements, as found in the EU (AO2), can be just as effective (AO3) better model and that there are other ways to approach regionalism that has been used by other bodies and therefore does not represent the lack of such developments is clear evidence that the EU is not a model rather than allowing a loss or pooling of sovereignty (AO2), therefore the value the retention of individual state decision making in political areas such different bodies to the EU, they have adopted features that meet the EU is an unlikely model for others to replicate as it developed under and scale of areas that the EU has advanced in terms of playing a global role through membership of bodies and the ECJ (AO2), this means that it is not the best model to replicate as it protected its members well (AO3). the EU is a model that others will inevitably follow as it protects its their borders and this is very appealing in terms of a regionalism model like most regional economic blocs, the EU establishes common tariffs Mark • Descriptor Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).

Level 2 7–12
• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).

Level 3 13–18
• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).

Level 4 19–24
• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).

Level 5 25–30
• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(c)</td>
<td>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3). AO2 and AO3 require candidates to develop their answers showing analytical and evaluative skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that the US is a diminishing global hegemonic power:**

**Agreement**
- the USA has faced difficulties in wars such as Iraq and Afghanistan, and US soft power has also been weakened by the ‘war on terror’ and the extraordinary rendition and Guantanamo Bay incidents
- the economic model of the USA has been challenged by the global financial crisis. China, in particular, has grown at a remarkable rate and is expected to overtake the US economy within a decade or so. There has been a rise of the BRIC states
- there have been a number of areas where the USA has been unable to exert significant political influence, such as the Russian invasion of Ukraine, Russian support for Assad in Syria, Chinese ambitions in Asia
- the actions of North Korea and Iranian nuclear ambitions mean that the US has faced new challengers, including the EU, as a collection of states, a resurgent Russia and a growing China.

**Disagreement**
- the USA has a global military reach and accounts for approximately 50% of world military spending
- the USA has structural power in most major international organisations, from the Security Council to G7, the IMF and the World Bank
- the USA remains the world’s largest economy and has established the dominant economic model globally
- the US has influence and global reach, which impacts on most countries and global issues, for example nuclear proliferation.

**Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:**
- a counter-argument to the dominance of US military power could be built on the reduced significance of hard power in global politics, this may be judged as showing diminished hegemony (AO2), therefore US hard power was discredited in Iraq and Afghanistan and there is a growing view that soft power is becoming more significant and as this is not an approach adopted by the US, if it continues to grow it could signal a weakening of its hegemony (AO3)
- the rise of BRIC states seems to challenge economic, and even structural, dominance and the USA has found that it is unable to tackle the global financial crisis alone. Economic competitors have seen significant growth, suggesting that US economic dominance may be weakening (AO2), therefore this may be judged to indicate diminished hegemony, and the fact that China is continuing to grow in importance and that the financial crisis is still not totally resolved, this may lead to further weakening of the US grip on power (AO3)
### Question 3(c) (contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3(c)            | • failure of the USA to exert influence in numerous areas appears to challenge the idea of US influence, as US hard power failed against opponents using guerrilla tactics in asymmetric war in Afghanistan and Iraq. Global criticism of US tactics increased as did a wider criticism of the tactics used in the ‘War on Terror’, including extraordinary rendition and Guantanamo Bay (AO2), this therefore may be judged to indicate diminished hegemony as the US has been fundamentally weakened and discredited by the actions in Iraq and Afghanistan and will find it far harder to successfully engage in similar military action in the future (AO3).  
• Chinese military expenditure and economic growth alongside soft power development means that it is becoming a significant challenge to US hegemony. The EU has a growing involvement in foreign policy areas, as well as an economic strength and soft power ability, and also challenges US hegemony. A resurgent Russia, able to resist US pressure in areas such as Crimea and Syria also suggests a weakening US position (AO2), consequently long-term US hegemony, measured in a number of ways has been questioned on several occasions and will, inevitably, remain a topic of debate. Loss of military, economic and structural dominance may be judged to signify lost or, at least, diminished hegemony (AO3). |

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

• military power may be central in defining hegemony and the US has had a dominant role in intervention in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria etc. (AO2), therefore this is a clear indication that the US remains the global hegemon, despite challengers that do not have the same power to effectively challenge, and so the US will continue to be major force in deciding on foreign military intervention (AO3)  
• structural power may be central in defining hegemony and the US has clearly been influential in effective change in these major international institutions. The US is a permanent member of the Security Council with a veto power, member of the elite G7 organisation and has share dominance in the IMF and the World Bank, as well as the ability to select the World Bank leader (AO2), consequently structural challengers may not be deemed significant enough to challenge hegemony and the US has had significant influence in these major structural institutions for a considerable number of years, it seems unlikely that this will change (AO3)  
• economic power may be central in defining hegemony and the US has a clear hold on global affairs as the global economic system is based on a US model, and as the US dominates the IMF and the World Bank, which make key decisions on lending policy etc., and the US has a number of powerful multinational companies globally (AO2), therefore economic challengers may not be deemed significant enough to challenge hegemony (AO3)  
• influence and reach may be assessed to be central in hegemonic dominance and it is clear that the US does not have any significant challengers to its power base as the leader of the free world. The US is at the heart of numerous global issues such as nuclear proliferation (Iran and North Korea), global warming and conflict in areas such as Syria (AO2), thus the rise of other states may not be deemed significant enough to have diminished US dominance in any of these areas (AO3). |

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question number</th>
<th>Indicative content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3(c) (contd.)</td>
<td>Candidates who <em>have not</em> considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2. Accept any other valid points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Level 1 | 1–6 | • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 2 | 7–12 | • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3). |
| Level 3 | 13–18 | • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified that are sometimes justified (AO3). |
| Level 4 | 19–24 | • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3). |
| Level 5 | 25–30 | • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).  
• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).  
• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3). |