

# Edexcel AS and A level **Politics**

Summer 2022  
exemplar student  
answers



## Introduction

This exemplar booklet has been created using student responses from the summer 2022 A level Politics examination series. This booklet is designed to supplement the Examiner Reports published in August 2022, which can be found [here](#).

This booklet includes questions from all four papers: Paper 1 UK Politics, Paper 2 UK Government, Paper 3A USA and Paper 3B Global.

Each type of question across the components is included in this booklet. The mark scheme indicative content is not included in this document, so please refer to the mark schemes, which can also be found at the link above.

For each script an overall final level is given, along with suggested levels for each individual AO, to give a sense of each script's strengths and areas for improvement.

Paper 1 source question (qu.1b)	4
Paper 2 essay question (qu.2b)	7
Paper 1 core ideas question (qu.3a)	10
Paper 2 non-core ideas question (qu.5b)	15
Paper 3A USA comparative theories question (qu.2)	18
Paper 3A USA essay question (qu.3a)	21
Paper 3B Global comparative theories question (qu.2)	26
Paper 3B Global essay question (qu.3b)	28

## Assessment Objectives

AO1 35%	Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues.
AO2 35%	Analyse aspects of politics and political information, including in relation to parallels, connections, similarities and differences.
AO3 30%	Evaluate aspects of politics and political information, including to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions.

## Access to Scripts

Use our free [Access to Scripts](#) service to view your students' marked exam scripts. The service is available from results day until mid-December each year, but remember to get your students' permission to use their scripts in advance.

This [case study](#) with a GCSE History centre suggests how you can use Access to Scripts to understand student performance, gain professional development in your department, give you model answers for use in the classroom, and motivate and encourage students. These general benefits are readily applicable to A level Politics.

## ResultsPlus data

[ResultsPlus](#) and Access to Scripts complement one another. ResultsPlus is a useful free tool for analysing your students' performance. More information on its range of features, including a step-by-step guide, is available [here](#).

After each full exam series, we provide the global data for every question on every paper: average marks overall and also by each grade. The global data is downloaded from ResultsPlus and tidied up.

	A	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	
1	GCE A level Politics June 2022 Results Plus data for each paper												
2							Edexcel averages:						
3	Question	Score	Max score	Percent		A*	A	B	C	D	E	U	
4	01 UK POLITICS												
5	Q01a	14.50	30	48.3%		20.63	18.41	15.87	13.16	11.08	9.04	6.59	
6	Q01b	17.05	30	56.8%		21.20	18.60	16.55	14.49	12.27	10.47	7.36	
8	Q02a	16.39	30	54.6%		21.23	18.64	16.60	14.42	12.67	10.19	6.95	
9	Q02b	18.07	30	60.2%		22.01	19.28	16.81	14.28	11.48	8.94	5.64	
11	Q03a	12.26	24	51.1%		16.97	14.73	12.39	9.89	7.16	4.54	2.62	
12	Q03b	13.36	24	55.7%		17.38	15.08	13.07	10.69	8.12	5.57	3.52	
14	<b>Total (est)</b>	<b>46.24</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>55.0%</b>		<b>59.71</b>	<b>52.28</b>	<b>45.79</b>	<b>38.88</b>	<b>31.96</b>	<b>25.03</b>	<b>16.81</b>	

The spreadsheets can be downloaded from the Edexcel website [here](#): look under the 'Guide' dropdown. You'll need your [Edexcel Online](#) login to access the files – please ask your Exams Officer if you don't have an Edexcel Online account.

## Paper 1 source question (qu.1b)

- 1 (b) *The source depicts the weaknesses and strengths of first-past-the-post (FPTP) and considers that systems of proportional representation in use in the devolved bodies are a much better alternative.*

First-past-the-post (FPTP) has weathered the test of time and proved it works. It has produced governments with working majorities in 18 of the 20 elections since 1945. It keeps extremism at bay and secures close and productive links between MPs and their constituencies. It is simple and quick in operation and allows the voters to rid themselves of governments which have failed, and enables the political system to break into new political ground as in 1979 and 1997. It delivers accountability and provides the basis for a clear mandate to govern.

Twice (1951 and February 1974) FPTP has made the loser the winner. It remains in use at Westminster because it benefits the Labour and Conservative parties. It is the distorting mirror of British politics. In the devolved bodies, methods of proportional representation (PR) such as the additional-member system (AMS) more faithfully reflect how people vote. PR systems allow the voice of other parties into political debate and government. For example, the single-transferable-vote (STV), as used in Northern Ireland, takes power away from political parties and delivers choice to the voters. The devolved bodies would have failed if FPTP had been used; their success depended on PR being used instead.

**Using the source, evaluate the view – with specific reference to at least one devolved region using an alternative electoral system – that the case for PR to replace the Westminster FPTP voting system has now been established.**

First Past the Post (FPTP) has been used in Westminster general elections since parliament's creation and is well established as the main voting system in the United Kingdom. Only since the devolution of powers to regional governments has FPTP been disregarded in favour of use of proportional representation voting systems. Using examples of several different successful devolved bodies in the UK it can be said that the case for proportional representation (PR) to replace the Westminster FPTP voting system has now been established.

Good intro, which covers all the key requirements before ending with a view.

The source states that FPTP "has weathered the test of time and proved it works", referring to the FPTP system's long-standing place in UK general elections without significant threat of replacement or reform. This argument could show that the FPTP system has a positive effect on UK government and politics as if it has not yet been significantly threatened with reform it must work effectively and efficiently. The only attempt to reform the FPTP system as the voting system for UK general elections was the 2011 referendum on replacing it with Alternative Vote (AV), which failed. However, the source also states that "it remains in use at Westminster because it benefits the Labour and Conservative parties", it could be easily argued that FPTP has remained in place as the two largest parties, and the only two parties to hold government majorities in over a century, do not wish for the voting system to be replaced. FPTP trends overtime towards a system dominated by two main political parties which tend to swap office between them, these being the Labour and Conservative parties. Systems such as STV, which can be seen in use in the Northern Ireland Assembly, trend towards a multi-party system, and so replacing FPTP with a more proportional voting system would benefit smaller parties and likely hurt the performance of the two currently dominant parties. As the Labour and

Conservative parties are the only two parties which realistically stand a chance of winning an election under the FPTP system they are unlikely to replace it as it would only benefit their adversaries. The source states that "PR systems allow the voice of other parties into political debate and government", which would likely benefit the UK voter as they are given more choice at elections. We can come to the judgement that FPTP likely only remains in place as it benefits the two dominant parties, and so they do not wish to change it as it could harm their future political success.

This first paragraph proposes the view that FPTP will remain as it best serves the interests of the two main parties. It uses the source effectively to make these arguments.

The additional-member system of AMS, as used in the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly, more faithfully reflect how people vote, as cited in the source. This is likely as the system of AMS has the voters make two votes, the first for a local representative in the exact same fashion as a regular FPTP election and the other for a political party of their choosing. This results in a slightly more proportionally representative result. Results in elections in these two devolved bodies have proven that the Labour and Conservative parties would be slightly disadvantaged, as other parties such as the Scottish National Party have been able to grow and form governments. Many have used the success of AMS in Scotland and Wales as key examples as to why the Labour and Conservative parties do not wish to replace FPTP and to highlight the benefit it could bring to Westminster. We can come to the judgement that the case for PR to replace FPTP in Westminster has been established using the success of devolved bodies as examples for reform.

This is the side of the argument taken in the introduction, but it is not very effectively argued. While it mentions AMS, it uses no evidence to show the points it makes. It also erroneously suggests that SNP gets more seats because of AMS.

The source also states that it works well to "produce governments with working majorities", citing that 18 of the 20 elections since 1945 have produced working government majorities. This outlines a benefit of keeping the FPTP system in Westminster general elections, that as it trends towards two dominant political parties as previously analysed it produces clear government majorities. Clear government majorities allow for a more efficient and effective form of government as the ruling party can easily pass legislation using the mandate given to them by voters and their House of Commons dominance. However, the source states that on two occasions, in 1951 and in February 1974 the FPTP system has "made the loser the winner". This refers to occasions when the party which won the largest number of seats in the House of Commons did not win the popular vote (the losing party obtained more votes). This outlines a potential flaw with the FPTP system in that while it does frequently produce strongly mandated majority governments, the results are often unfair. The source states that "methods of PR such as the additional-member system (AMS) more faithfully reflect how people vote", as analysed earlier. This more reflective result should generate fairer elections as voters have a larger choice of candidates to better choose one that reflects their views. PR systems should also limit the opportunity for 'losers to become winners' as better proportional representation means that the share of seats is more proportionally in line with the share of votes. We can come to the judgement that the use of AMS in Scotland and Wales is a clear case for PR to replace FPTP in Westminster.

Note here the difference between the level of detailed knowledge expressed on FPTP compared to the very generalised knowledge of AMS. Given that this is the side they are arguing, it's not very convincing.

It is argued in the source that FPTP keeps extremism at bay, this is likely due to the two-party nature of the system, which means that extremist parties cannot gain seats due to their thinly spread support. This could benefit the UK political scene as it limits the extent to which extremist parties can damage or sway the political landscape. However, the source alternatively argues that systems of PR delivers 'choice to voters', which implies that it is better to offer a wide range of choices even at the risk of extremist parties gaining seats, rather than to practically eliminate all but two parties as extremism is often weak in support regardless. In the Northern Ireland Assembly where single transferable vote (STV) is used there are upwards of seven political parties which hold seats as of 2022, however, whilst some could be considered extremist, they only hold one or two seats, compared to the 10s of seats held by the largest, less extreme parties. We can come to the judgement that STV in Northern Ireland is a clear case for PR to replace FPTP in Westminster as the extremism is weak in the political landscape.

This is much better knowledge of a devolved system. It's a shame it isn't replicated throughout.

Overall, we can judge that there is a strong and well-established case for FPTP to be replaced by a system of PR such as AMS or STV, despite previous reform failing in 2011. It is easily argued in the source and elsewhere that whilst FPTP can produce strongly mandated majority governments it is democratically weak in choice and limits voter choice compared to systems of PR.

**A top Level 3 answer. It is limited in AO1 by lack of detail on devolved systems, and the evaluation is also not very strong.**

Suggested levels for each AO:

L3/4 for AO1, L3 for AO2, and low L3 for AO3.

## Paper 2 essay question (qu.2b)

### Evaluate the view that the concepts of individual ministerial responsibility and collective ministerial responsibility are both still important.

Collective ministerial responsibility (CM) can be defined as, all ministers are accountable to the actions and policies of government, therefore any disagreement or condemnation should result a resignation because all ministers should be accountable to the governments actions. Individual ministerial responsibility can be defined as all ministers are accountable to the actions of their department and thus, if their department has failed in their actions, ministers should resign, similarly, individual ministerial responsibility also refers to ministers personal misconduct should result in resignation. These ministerial responsibility conventions are important to ensure the government upholds honesty, integrity and accountability. However, both individual ministerial responsibility and collective ministerial responsibility are no longer Important due to ministers undermining the principles of both and ministerial code being undermined by government through curtailing the importance of them, although both no longer are important, collective ministerial responsibility still carries more importance than Individual ministerial responsibility that has been completely undermined.

Very long introduction, which goes into too much detail defining and explaining the concepts. but it does cover all the key elements. It ends with the view that both are no longer important.

Collective ministerial responsibility ensures that the government is united in decision making and policies. Collective ministerial responsibility is important to ensure a united government, where all ministers are accountable to the governments decisions. For example in 2003 Robin Cook resigned due to disagreeing with Blair's involvement in Iraq, thus portraying that collective ministerial importance in showing a united government because it ensures every minister agrees with the governments decisions and if not ministers will resign. This can be seen recently during the Covid 19 pandemic, where Health secretary Sajid Javid and chancellor of the Exchequer Rishi Sunak, reportedly had behind closed door disagreements over the government's polices to end free lateral flow tests, however, both supported the governments Living with Covid' policy when announced to the Commons. This suggests that collective ministerial responsibility is still important because it forces the government to appear united and if there are disagreements, these should happen behind closed doors, so that policy and decisions are unitedly supported by the government to the people. Similarly, Lord Wolfson recently resigned in April 2022 due to disagreeing with the Government over 'partygate' which saw Boris Johnson and members of his cabinet lke Rishi Sunak breaking lockdown rules of no social gatherings. Indeed, this portrays that collective ministerial responsibility is important in ensuring that ministers who disagree with the actions of government can resign and therefore, the government is apparently united over its decision making and policies.

Good range of examples from different governments, and importantly shows up-to-date examples.

This paragraph on CMR makes good use of examples to illustrate and explore the issues raised.

However, this is hyperbolic, because collective ministerial responsibility lacks importance because of its flexibility which undermines it as a properly adhered to convention. During Brexit, collective ministerial responsibility was not followed by ministers, which can be examined under May, where ministers, Including then member of the cabinet Boris Johnson, openly displayed disagreement with the Theresa May's handlings over Brexit. Theresa May's EU agreement was the largest ever government defeat with 118 Tory MPs voting against the policy, however, during May's term, collective ministerial responsibility was undermined as MPs did not adhere to ministerial code and resign. This was mainly

due to the weakness of May's government, however, it portrays that collective ministerial responsibility is deeply dependent on the size of the government's majority and therefore, May did not have a governing majority which meant that the weakness of her government undermined collective ministerial responsibility, thus supporting the view that it is not an important convention.

As it is proposing the view that CMR is too flexible to be effective, discussion of the suspension of CMR, for example, during the Brexit referendum, the Coalition and other times, would add depth to the paragraph which can be seen either as a strength or a weakness.

Therefore, whilst collective ministerial responsibility can be seen during Covid-19 it is evident that it is too flexible to be still important because for ministers to uphold collective ministerial responsibility it deeply depends on the size of the government's majority, and therefore, with a small or no majority, the government is too weak to uphold the principles of CMR, thus supporting the argument that it is no longer important.

An interim judgement.

Individual Ministerial Responsibility (IMR) is vital to the government to ensure accountability. Accountability upholds democracy because it ensures that the government is accountable to the people it governs. IMR ensures accountability is upheld, because ministers are responsible to the performance of their department, thus ministers should resign if their department has made a failure, which ensures the principles of accountability. This was evident with the resignation of Estelle Morris in 2002 who declared that her job as Education secretary was too important for second best and thus resigned with departments mishandling of education policies that led to poor A level performances. Similarly, this was evident with Amber Rudd, as home secretary and resigned as a result of the illegal deportation of Caribbean immigrants, amongst the Windrush scandal. Amber Rudd was investigated by a select committee and was found culpable to this failure of her department and thus subsequently resigned on the basis of Individual ministerial responsibility. Individual ministerial responsibility also refers to personal misconduct of MPs to resign, apparent with the resignation of Matt Hancock after breaking lockdown rules after being captured kissing a lady, following the social distancing rules of two metres apart. This portrays that individual ministerial responsibility has been important in holding ministers to account if with the failings of their department or personal misconduct.

The importance of covering both terms in the question to access the full range of the levels-based mark scheme.

A good paragraph on IMR using some excellent recent examples to suggest that IMR is upheld.

However, this is no longer the case, as it is no longer important to ministers, with many ministers ignoring the convention and it has been completely undermined with the Boris Johnson government. Gavin Williamson highlighted that IMR is not still important by his failure to resign as education secretary regarding the mishandling of A level results following the covid pandemic. Similarly, Priti Patel failed to resign when accused of bullying civil servants and being proved by a select committee investigation. This portrays that IMR is not still important because it has been undermined completely with ministers falling to resign with departmental failures and personal misconduct issues. This is because the IMR is no longer important because the government sees ministerial resignations as portraying the government is weak therefore does not want to implement ministerial code seriously. Similarly, IMR has been completely undermined due to the government at the time, led by Boris Johnson, having their own issues with IMR and therefore deciding not to implement it seriously enough.

This analysis is a bit repetitive and not fully explored.

Boris Johnson has curtailed the importance of IMR by rewording the ministerial code in May 2022, to take out the words of 'honesty, integrity and accountability' and change the code to allow ministers not to resign as a result of personal misconduct or departmental failures, instead they can pay a fine or apologise. This is arguably due to Johnson's himself having his own issues with IMR seen in 'partygate' thus has weakened IMR to save himself from resignation. This portrays that IMR is not still important as it shows that it can be completely undermined through the government deciding how seriously they are too enforce it and with the current government at the time Individual ministerial responsibility carries no weight in accountability because the government themselves do not uphold the principles of the ministerial code, and thus the curtailment of IMR under Johnson epitomizes how IMR is certainly not still important.

Up-to-date knowledge to support analysis.

There is some excellent knowledge here, which is effectively analysed and leads to the conclusion that IMR is not important.

To conclude, it is evident the individual ministerial responsibility and collective ministerial responsibility are not still important. CMR is too flexible to properly be effective at ensuring the government is united and responsible for all its policies, because it is heavily dependent on the size of the governments majority. IMR has been completely undermined at holding ministers to account and has come under curtailment from Johnson's government, thus proving it is completely not still Important.

**Overall, a good Level 4 essay. Synoptic links could have been more clearly identified.**

Suggested levels for each AO:  
L4/L5 for AO1, L4 for AO2, and L3 for AO3.

## Paper 1 core ideas question (qu.3a)

To what extent are conservatives united in their attitude towards the state?

While there are some aspects of the state  
many conservatives agree on due to their shared  
beliefs on human nature, there are significant  
~~or contradictory~~  
differences held by the neoliberal branch due  
to their opposing view of human nature, which  
causes a significant disunity over their view  
of the state.

A simple but effective start which highlights where the differences are and concludes that there are significant differences (more than similarities?) in conservatism.

Traditional <sup>and</sup> One Nation ~~and~~ ~~conservatives~~  
~~all~~ agree that the state should be paternalistic,  
which is a similar belief to the neoconservative  
belief in a state with authority. This similarity  
exists because they share a view of the  
imperfect human nature. For example, Hobbes view  
that without a state 'life would be nasty, brutish  
and short' due to human moral imperfection  
and greed, is similar to the neoconservative view that  
without strict anti-permissiveness policies by the state,  
social conservatism will prevail and eventually  
of chaos and social <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ ~~central~~ ~~part~~ in the 60s, the  
threaten social order. Therefore ~~both~~ ~~cast~~ ~~is~~ ~~also~~  
similar to Burke's writing as a reaction <sup>and opposition</sup> to the  
Government of the state in the French Revolution. Therefore,

all of these branches call for similar solutions  
highlighting a unity - a strong paternalistic state  
with heavy law and order <sup>to secure order</sup>. For example, Hobbes'  
Social Contract is where individuals give up some  
free will in exchange for a state that will bring order,  
and avoid the state of nature, it seems to neoconservative  
policies that restrict free will such as Thatcher's  
'Right to Buy' or Section 28. Restricting the rights  
of homosexuality is a step, in order to retain  
anti-pedestrianism and order. This is significant as it  
shows how a principle of the 17th century in  
Hobbes' Leviathan has been retained to the 20th century  
Conservatism, showing how the core principle of  
order is so integral to the philosophy, and  
conservatives see the state as the tool to deliver it,  
contrary to the view of human nature.

The student has effectively made links between conservatives' view of human nature and their view of the state. They also show a good understanding of the nuances between Traditional and One Nation conservatism and the neoconservative element of the New Right.

However, there is a major divergence between  
neoconservative and these branches over how far the  
state should interfere in people's lives. Traditional  
liberal and social would completely reject  
Hobbes' social contract as an infringement on  
personal freedoms. This is because they differ  
over beliefs in human nature, while Hobbes believed  
it was imperfect (similarly to Dahl that who thought  
humans were too intellectually and psychologically

imperfect to be rational), Nozick and Rawls  
both believe that humans are rational <sup>individuals</sup> ~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>not</sup> ~~irrational~~  
~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~irrational~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~irrational~~  
~~and~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~irrational~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~not~~ <sup>and</sup> ~~irrational~~  
their free will and disadvantage their lives rather  
than improve it. Rawls, 'rationality of the state'  
due to her belief in Objectivism where people are  
rational, is in line with Nozick's meritocratic state  
due to his libertarian beliefs. This new text both  
of these opposed the state enforcing moral codes,  
and believed that abortion or same sex marriage  
should be legal as people should have the complete  
freedom to do as they please to fulfil their goals. This  
directly contradicts the neo-conservative view of  
Christianity which enforces a Judeo-Christian  
morality, creating a huge divide in the ideology.  
New Right conservatism like Thatcher were adopting  
the neo liberal's economic approach, rejecting  
the neo liberal view on social issues in favour of  
the neo conservative one, showing how the neo liberal  
view of the state's interference with private  
lives is rarely implemented by modern conservatism,  
and could even be considered more liberal than  
conservative in its approach because of how different  
it is.

Unfortunately, the first part of this 'Disagree' paragraph is too thinker-driven, showing differences between the thinkers, rather than focusing on strands. It goes back to the strands in the second half of the paragraph.

Another major divergence in conservative views of the state is regarding whether the state should <sup>reversely</sup> correct some of the greatest <sup>economic</sup> inequalities caused by capitalism, or not. While one nation or writer believe the state should, neo-liberals or others opposed to this. Whereas Burke believed 'noblesse oblige' - that those higher up in society had a responsibility to those lower down in the social hierarchy, and so a welfare state should be in place, he would completely reject this idea, seeing society as atomistic - made up of individuals with no responsibility to each other. He directly criticised the welfare state as a form of flawed authoritarianism, as did Nozick similarly, comparing it to <sup>to force the welfare state</sup> forced labor. This is because Burke argued for a need to 'chew to conserve' or Durand accepted to offer a welfare state to prevent the inequalities getting so bad that revolution occurred. Due to the neo-liberals' positive, rational and individualistic view of human nature, they see no problems in the existence of free will, free inequality. Therefore, the welfare state would be an infringement on rights to them, which completely opposes the one nation view that it would improve rights in order to maintain order. This is incredibly significant as it results again in contradictory ideas, with one infringing on the other, showing a huge divide when events in modern policy, like

the one reaction for long were limited by  
the same character <sup>or the real character (Dunell) role</sup> who ~~created the~~ just  
credit reduction in history through the universal  
Credit cut - a new right policy, ~~France~~ is

Again here, the paragraph is focusing on differences between thinkers with only a few references to the strands.

In conclusion, while traditional authors often  
are recommending one story in favor of a  
large authority does state to retain order, national  
agreed this very state would disrupt order as people  
would be unfilled. Therefore, it is a distinct  
contradiction in ideas, seeing although very heavily  
are mixed, some are easily divided.

The conclusion comes back to the judgement, but this clear line was implied but not explicit throughout the answer.

**This answer received Level 4. It was well-structured and made effective comparisons, but was insufficiently focused on strands and not explicit enough on its AO3 judgement.**

Suggested levels for each AO:

L4 for AO1, L4 for AO2, and L3 for AO3

## Paper 2 non-core ideas question (qu.5b)

### To what extent do feminists disagree over their views on patriarchy?

Patriarchy can be defined as inequality between men and women, where women have been oppressed by men. To a large extent feminists disagree on their views of patriarchy, whilst they all agree that patriarchy exists, they have vast differences between where it exists, the extent of it and the best way to combat patriarchy. Therefore, the direction of this essay will argue to a large extent feminists disagree in their views over patriarchy.

This introduction defines patriarchy, frames the debate and ends with a view.

Granted all feminists agree that patriarchy exists. All strands of feminism, liberal, radical, socialist, agree that women have historically and still are oppressed by the male gender. There is consistent agreement over the terms of sex and gender, in that, sex is the biological differences between male and females, whereas gender is an artificially constructed term which has constrained women to act 'feminine' and fit into the female 'mould' therefore perpetuating patriarchy. Indeed, these distinctions between sex and gender, mean that women are confined to a certain role of passivity, domesticity and obedience, and therefore, male dominance is embraced whereas females are oppressed, in result patriarchy exists. Both radical, social and liberal feminists all agree that patriarchy has led to a male dominating role in society, and thus, the patriarchal society we live in serves the best interests of males, as opposed to females. Key thinker Simone de Beauvoir shares this in her work, coining the term 'otherness' in that a patriarchal society sees males as the 'norm' and females as 'deviants' from the norm, thus expressing that 'my uterus has formed some peculiarity for me', implying that females, are treated differently from males, due to their biological differences, which form the basis for patriarchal societal views.

Would have been good to include postmodern feminism when referring to 'ALL' strands of feminism.

Note how SDB is used here without the need to label her within any single stand.

Good 'agree' paragraph which identifies the distinction between sex and gender as at the heart of patriarchy.

Indeed, all feminists share coherent views that the state has not done enough for women, and therefore is a principal institution in reinforcing patriarchy. This is because patriarchy is perpetuated with the little representation of females, a view that Charlotte Perkins Gilman shares when referencing that even from a young age, girls clothes and toys fit reinforce patriarchy. Patriarchy is also seen in high up business roles, politics and for centuries, women's caring nature has fed into patriarchy, because it has constrained females to compete in the same jobs as males, therefore leading to male dominance in the economic world, jobs and politics, because females have been moulded to avoid these roles, because of patriarchal society, this portrays that there is significant agreement amongst feminist strands that patriarchy exists to oppress women.

This paragraph identifies the state as an area of agreement.

However, vast differences about where patriarchy exists, outweigh signs of agreement, these differences are particularly evident when comparing radical and liberal feminists. Radical feminists argue that patriarchy is all pervasive, it exists in every level of society and thus, needs to be combatted at every level. Radical feminists highlight the family, and indeed, this is evident in Kate Millets radical feminists views, that the family is the 'chief institution for patriarchy in a patriarchal whole'. Kate Millet argues that the family is primary in perpetuating patriarchy because it passes gender distinctions from generations to generations, in that females should promote subservience and have

An AO3 judgement.

the primary role in the house and domesticity. This therefore, means that patriarchy is not just confined to the public sphere, instead the personal is political because patriarchy certainly exists in the house, therefore, in Millets words, there needs to be a 'cultural revolution as well as a sexual revolution' to free females from the patriarchal roles that a family emphasises. This is antithetical to Liberal feminists, who argue that patriarchy is mainly found in the public sphere, and thus to combat patriarchy in the public sphere will allow better female representation in politics, leading to important legislation on female issues, and as a result patriarchal views will shift. Liberal feminists were first wave feminists and therefore, primarily focussed on universal suffrage, with the argument being that once females get the votes, they can make choices in politics that will lead to legislative reform, and therefore due to patriarchy primarily existing in the public sphere, patriarchy will gradually trickle out. For liberal feminists, patriarchy may be found in the private sphere, however, the personal is not political, because if the public sphere is reformed to tackle patriarchy, patriarchy does not need to be combatted in female's private lives, as females should have their own choice here. Indeed, radical feminists being 2nd wave feminists, have highly critiqued the liberal feminists view of patriarchy, arguing that patriarchy is all pervasive, therefore reforms in the public sphere, is not enough to free women from oppression, because only a cultural and sexual revolution would free women from the patriarchal institution that is the family. Therefore, this highlights fundamental contrasting views between radical and liberal feminists about where patriarchy exists, and thus the extent of patriarchy, with antithetical arguments, with liberal highlighting patriarchy in the public sphere and thus suggest reform, whereas radical feminists argue patriarchy is pervasive and exists everywhere, thus a cultural and sexual revolution is required; this portrays vast differences between the two strands therefore supporting the argument that feminists disagree to a large extent in their views of patriarchy.

Extensive and accurate use of key terminology.

The use of the word fundamental here shows that the differences are vast and irreconcilable.

This paragraph begins with 'side by side' comparison (where one strand's view on the issue is explained, followed by the other strand's view), but then adds a highly comparative section towards the end of the paragraph which also includes a judgement.

Indeed, there are further disagreements between socialist feminists and post-modern feminists on how to combat patriarchy, showing vast divisions within feminism. Socialist feminists argue that patriarchy is perpetuated by capitalism because capitalism has created male dominance in jobs, and therefore, contributes to the existence of patriarchy in the economic sphere. Sheila Rowbotham notes that capitalism has created females to be a 'reserve army of labour' because, capitalism has exploited women through less pay and therefore contributes to a patriarchal society of male dominance. Marxists feminists propose that the only solution to patriarchy is to overthrow the state, and indeed, socialists feminists highlight that the removal of capitalism will free women from 'slave labour' that capitalism promotes for females. In turn, for socialist and Marxists feminists, they prioritise the economic sphere as palpable in leading to a patriarchal society, because capitalism has promoted male dominance in work and as a result, women are economically dependent on males, due to oppressive and exploitative nature of capitalism. However, post-modern feminists have differing prioritise to combat patriarchy as they note that patriarchy is not equally oppressive for every female, because female's experience different levels of oppression dependent on their socio-economic situations and race. Indeed, post-modern feminists critique 1st and 2nd wave feminists for failing to identify different female struggles and that patriarchy is not a single doctrine for all women. Post-modern feminist bell hooks, notes 'intersectionality, identifying that patriarchy oppresses women in differing ways, highlighting that society is an 'imperialist, white supremacists capitalist patriarchy, therefore, to combat patriarchy all female struggles and experiences

of patriarchy need to be addressed. This is evident in Diane Abbot in 2019 receiving the most death threats on Twitter out of any MPs, highlighting that black females experience different levels of patriarchal oppression. Therefore, for post-modern feminists patriarchy should not be the only thing addressed, and instead in order to properly combat patriarchy the economic situations of females, and their ethnicity all need to be addressed, to properly solve patriarchy. This highlights vast differences between socialists and post-modern feminists on their prioritise to combat patriarchy, as socialist feminists highlight patriarchy in the economic sphere being a priority whereas post-modern highlight patriarchy is different for all women and therefore needs to be addressed equally with racial discrimination and socio-economic improvement.

Some thorough and in-depth knowledge again in this paragraph. Comparison is more side-by side than directly comparative, and the judgements are mostly effective.

To conclude, it is evident that there are fundamental divisions between feminism on their views of patriarchy and therefore, showing that to a large extent feminists disagree over patriarchy. Fundamental divisions lie between liberal and radical strands of feminism on where patriarchy lies and there are deep antithetical views between them on the extent to patriarchy in the public and private sphere. Disagreements also lie between feminists on their prioritise to combat patriarchy, evident between socialists and post-modern feminists.

The view is clear here in the conclusion, which summarises what has been argued.

**This answer achieved Level 4, it has excellent in-depth knowledge, but comparisons could be more direct and the view more explicit.**

Suggested levels for each AO:

L5 for AO1, L4 for AO2, and L3 for AO3

### Paper 3A USA comparative theories question (qu.2)

Analyse how the US President could be considered to be less effective than the UK Prime Minister in achieving their legislative goals.

As per the structural theory, the President is weaker in achieving legislation due to the separation of powers principle enforced by the constitution, in contrast to the fusion of powers in the UK. The US President is unable to sit in the legislative branch, as required by the constitution, to limit the power of one individual. This is seen when Obama was forced to resign his seat in 2008 after winning the Presidential election. In contrast, the UK allows for fusion of powers, meaning the UK PM sits in the parliament, in which he is very dominant over passing legislation, as seen by Boris Johnson who was dominant in regard to Covid policy. Thus, the structural theory shows that the US President is less effective due to the SoP principle, meaning he has far less influence over legislation, while the PM is able to dominate legislation, as he sits in Parliament.

This answer begins and ends the paragraph with a directly comparative sentence and in the middle goes into more detail to explain the point they are making. This is a really good way of ensuring effective comparisons. They also use these two sections to reference and then explain the theory they are applying. There is also good use of examples.

In proposing legislation, the US President is limited by the greater powers of Congress, while the PM enjoys a less autonomous legislature, as per the party whip. The US



codified constitution, means that there is less power of enforcement for the judiciary. As seen by Blair's laws on indefinite imprisonment of suspect terrorists only being restricted to 28 days after the Belmarsh case. Thus, the US Pres is less effective as SCOTUS is more powerful in limiting him than the UK SC is at limiting the Pres's policy.

Although this isn't the strongest point, an example of legislation would have been better than an executive order, to make a more effective comparison. Nonetheless, identifying the role of the courts as a difference is correct.

**Overall, a good Level 4 answer.**

Suggested levels for each AO:  
L4 for AO1, L4 for AO2

### Paper 3A USA essay question (qu.3a)

Evaluate the view that the President is the most powerful branch of government rather than the Supreme Court or Congress.

According to Neustadt, the power of the President is in fact the 'power of persuasion'; although less constitutionally powerful than Congress, the President's popular mandate and role as both head of state and head of government grant him sufficient gravitas to exercise further power. This essay will argue that this power, though significant, does not outweigh the constitutional ~~power~~ enumerated powers of the other branches.

A good introduction which sets out, briefly, all the key features of the essay to come.

One expression of Presidential power is executive actions, those actions deemed within of the executive remit, not requiring the consent of Congress. Successful executive actions include Obama's DACA order, preventing deportation for certain vulnerable immigrants, and Trump's travel ban, ruled constitutionally valid by the Supreme Court in *Trump v Hawaii*. The significance of such action seems almost to create new legislation whilst circumventing entirely the legislative branch. Further expressions of executive power is executive agreements, such as the Iran Nuclear Deal 2015, negotiated by Obama; despite the Senate's constitutional function of ratifying treaties, executive agreements permit extensive foreign policy power to the President regardless of Congress' wishes, part of his representative role as head of state, thus representing the USA globally. This foreign policy function further

encapsulates international summits such as the G20, and the decision of which countries the USA is willing to openly support or work with, such as Obama's recognition of Sudan in 2011. Though not an entrenched and direct power, this expresses the significant international influence of a President as a symbol and representative of the USA. However, these powers are limited by the other branches, demonstrating that, despite the progressive growth of executive influence, the constitutional separation of powers and principle of limited government are maintained; Obama's attempted extension of the DACA executive order, DAPA, was struck down by the Supreme Court, a significant barrier to his endeavours for immigration reform. Further, the powers of executive action are compromised for their want of Congressional approval - not being law, both executive orders and actions can be overturned by subsequent Presidents, as has been the case with the Paris Climate Agreement, initially entered into by Obama, withdrawn by Trump and again pledged to reenter by Biden - this exemplifies the impotency of executive action in comparison to Congressional laws such as Obamacare, which Trump failed to repeal despite extensive effort.

Here the answer is outlining the significant executive powers a President has at his disposal and effectively critiques that view, arguing that the powers of other branches outweigh the President's powers.

Conversely, Congress' legislative function, constitutionally the most valued and powerful, prioritised by the founding fathers, is much more potent. The extensive debate and scrutiny that contributes to the legislative process ensures

not only competent and strong legislation, but a maintenance of the liberal republic freedom principle of the founders; with only 2-3% of bills passing into law, only necessary legislation is passed. Despite outlining legislative requests at the annual State of the Union address, the President has no real constitutional legislative power, as the legislative mandate is determined by Congress; despite his foreign policy influence and successful healthcare reform, Obama failed in his core goal to achieve immigration reform, and even his executive orders were severely undermined by the Supreme Court. The role of the Supreme Court can be argued to have power over the President in its role as interpreter and upholder of the constitution, the sovereign document to which both President and Congress must adhere. The Supreme Court's function of judicial review has ~~been~~ on several occasions triumphed over Presidential power, such as declaring several of Obama's 32 recess appointments unconstitutional, limiting his power of appointment. Perhaps most crucial in the power of Congress is the 'necessary and proper' or 'elastic' clause that grants extensive implied power to Congress as legislators, whilst the President's powers have many checks on them due to the founders' fear of a tyrannical executive. \*

Here the answer focuses on legislation, again arguing very effectively that the President's powers are not as great as the other branches.

However, there are examples of an increase in Presidential power as a result of the vagueness of the Constitution, particularly in cases of national conflict or crisis wherein the other branches may defer to the president's popular mandate and thus sovereignty, due to his symbolic role as Commander in Chief and head of state. Bush, following 9/11, saw a significant increase in his popular mandate in the polls, and due to his proclamation of a national crisis, faced minimal resistance from Congress on related legislation. Moreover, whilst Congress reserves the constitutional power to declare war and passed the War Powers Act to reiterate this, the evolution of modern warfare, requiring quick and decisive action, as well as the introduction of ANMFS, has granted the President significant practical power over military engagement. Despite this, the popular mandate of the President is dependent on approval ratings and election margins, thus fluctuates and cannot be relied on in the way of constitutional enumerated powers; despite polling well after 9/11, Bush's ratings fell after a poor handling of Hurricane Katrina, this power returned to Congress; in an age of ~~rare international conflict~~ soft power, the President's powers as Commander in Chief are rarely and only temporarily existent - power always returns to the other two branches.

In this final section the answer focuses on wider, informal powers the President can wield, and then effectively rejects the view that it makes him more powerful than the other branches.

In conclusion, the President's 'power of pardon' is too dependent on circumstance and consensus to override that of Congress and the Supreme Court, enumerated in the Constitution, therefore cannot be said to be the most powerful branch of government, even if it is the most recognisable.

**This answer achieved Level 5. It is highly effective at addressing the question throughout, has excellent knowledge, perceptive analysis and very effective judgements.**

Suggested levels for each AO:

L5 for AO1, L5 for AO2, L5 for AO3

### Paper 3B Global comparative theories question (qu.2)

**Analyse the differences that exist between realists and liberals in the ways they view human nature and power.**

One difference that exists between realists and liberals is their perspectives on human nature. Realists typically believe that humans - by nature - are self-interested and will therefore go to any lengths that they can for personal gain. A key proponent of this idea was Hobbes who argued that the nature of humans "are more individualistic than social". Since states are run by humans - self interested creatures - states themselves are self-interested, caring only about their own sovereign interests. As a result, the world system is a system of international anarchy, akin to Hobbes's state of nature where "life is war of every man against every man". Liberals, on the other hand, believe that humans are naturally altruistic and able to cooperate. Rather than seeking to constantly gain power over one another with the mentality of simply dominating, liberals argue that the rational human will cooperate. Thus, states have the potential to cooperate for one another's mutual benefit. Woodrow Wilson made this world view clear after WW1, explaining that us rational and cooperative humans can transform our international system from a "jungle" to a "zoo" just as we've done with our own societies. This ideology was what led Wilson to creating the League of Nations. To a realist, this aim is impossible because the individualistic nature of humans will end up dominating. In response, a realist will point to the fact that – regardless of greater international cooperation - wars still exist. Despite the United Nations, Russia still invaded Ukraine for its own interests. Thus, to the realist, the liberal's perspective on human nature is incorrect, overly optimistic and potentially dangerous. This relationship highlights a key difference between the liberal and the realist perspective on human nature: whilst liberals believe humans are altruists who may cooperate, realists believe that this is impossible because we'll always seek domination.

The answer just gets straight on with answering the question, this first paragraph looking at human nature.

Good use of the Core Ideas thinker, Hobbes, to illustrate their point.

Comparative analysis.

A highly comparative paragraph which compares liberal and realist views and uses Hobbes effectively.

A difference which exists between realists and liberals on the ways they view power is their perspective on how power functions. To realists, power is a scarce commodity. It exists but gaining power is a zero-sum game. This means that, as one state gains power, the rest lose power. Realists such as Mearsheimer argue that it is this which results in the security dilemma: a situation whereby states are in an insoluble struggle to gain power over one another as a response to each other's actions. Mearsheimer argues that it is this nature of power which results in war. World War One was an example of this, one state gained power, taking power from another state. Thus, that state increases its power, taking power back from the other. This results in an increasing accumulation of power until - eventually - war breaks out. We have seen this most recently through the relationship between NATO and Russia. As NATO grew closer to Russia, gaining regional power through the membership of ex-Warsaw Pact countries such as Estonia, Poland and Romania, Putin's realist perception of power told him that he must increase his as power is being taken from him. Thus, the Russian president decided to invade Ukraine, resulting in war. To realists, this antagonism between states is impossible to solve simply because this is the way power functions. Liberals, on the other hand, have a far more optimistic view of power, believing that it is a commodity which may be shared. Liberals argue that the realist perception of states as unitary actors against one another is outdated in our globalised world of free trade and important intergovernmental organisations. Instead, power is something we can share. The EU is an institution which holds this ideology strongly through the way its institutions such as the

Like in the first paragraph, the answer just then moves straight on to the next point.

European Parliament seek to pool the sovereignty of member states together, creating what liberals call complex interdependence. Complex interdependence is a realist concept describing the way in which interconnectedness between states allows for war and conflict to be prevented through their economic dependence on one another. Liberals argue that, through pooling power, this may be achieved. If achieved on a large scale, this may result in eventual world peace.

Good use of key terminology.

This paragraph is less comparative than the first one, and there is a dominance of realist ideas over liberal ones. Nonetheless, there are good examples used to illustrate the points made.

**Overall, a L4 answer, which uses excellent knowledge and effective comparison to answer the question.**

Suggested levels for each AO:

L4 for AO1, L4 for AO2

### Paper 3B Global essay question (qu.3b)

**Evaluate the view that the slow rate of progress over climate change results primarily from economic inequalities within and between countries rather than from the actions of particular countries and political institutions.**

Amongst the contemporary issues of our time, none seems more concerning than climate change. Climate change refers to changes in our current ecosystems as a result of global warming. This is a process which is already beginning and will only worsen if we remain inactive. Regardless of this, however, inaction has been consistent amongst nations with few true developments taking place in our current war against climate change. It is argued by some that the inequalities between countries is a key reason behind this. With fewer resources, the transition to net-zero is arguably harder for countries which are less prosperous. Many argue that this is the primary reason as to why our rate of progress has been so slow in addressing the issue. However, when considering the actions of developing countries, this argument seems flawed. This essay will consider both sides of the argument in order to explain why - for the most part –the slow rate of progress on climate change is merely the result of inaction by particular countries, not inequalities within and between countries.

A lengthy introduction which addresses the key functions of an introduction.

Firstly, the alternative view should be considered. It is argued by some that the slow progress of our fight against climate change was the result of the Kyoto Protocol's inaction in addressing equalities between countries. The Kyoto Protocol 1997 was the first legally binding international agreement on the climate, uniting 83 countries. The aims of the Kyoto Protocol were promising: each signee would try to decrease yearly emissions by an average of around 5% between 1990 and 2012. The protocol, however, failed as global emissions rose by 40% between this time span rather than decreasing. It may be argued that inequalities between countries was the result of this. The Kyoto Protocol was an interesting agreement because it excluded all developing countries. Instead, it was primarily the European countries which signed up to the agreement along with other developed countries such as Japan and Australia. This was because developing countries argued that signing the protocol would have hindered economic progress. This, however, proved to be catastrophic. Between the signing of the Kyoto Protocol and 2012, China's emissions increased greatly, becoming the world's largest emitter of CO<sub>2</sub>. Equally, India's development resulted in large increases in greenhouse gas emissions. This mistake was clearly recognised by the international community since, in 2015, the Paris Agreement incorporated 195 countries regardless of their stage of development. If inequality between countries did not exist, the Kyoto Protocol would have never taken this measure, a measure which has greatly shortened the time we have to develop eco-friendly sources of energy. Thus, we can see how inequalities between nations, and the effect this has had on international policy making, has resulted in a slow rate of progress over climate change.

Starting with the view they disagree with, makes it easier for the essay to build towards interim judgements.

Good selection and deployment of knowledge to support analysis.

However, this argument should be rejected. In reality, this was not the only flaw of the Kyoto Protocol. Although the Kyoto Protocol's respect for inequalities between nation states certainly influenced our slow rate of progress over climate change, it was not the deciding factor. Firstly, it must be considered that multiple countries left the Kyoto Protocol. Although the US initially signed the agreement under Bill Clinton, George Bush rejected protocol once coming into office as the US President. This was certainly a decisive factor in the failure of Kyoto: at the time, the US was responsible for 25% of global emissions. Similarly, Canada left the Kyoto Protocol, another large emitter. It may be argued that the

EU - at the time, a body of 28/83 states - was really the only organ which respected the Kyoto Protocol, making some key changes. Thus, it was not just inequalities between nation states which resulted in this slow rate of progress. This argument is furthered when considering responses to climate change from developing countries since the Paris Agreement. Many developing countries, whilst lacking economic resources, have been some of the most progressive countries in the fight against climate change. This is especially true in contrast with developed countries. Consider the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) of different nations. NDCs are a set of policies devised by states in order to meet the standards of the Paris Agreement. Whilst the USA's NDC has been classed as critically insufficient, resulting in a possible temperature increase of 4 degrees above pre-industrial levels, India's NDC has it set to reach the targets of the Paris Agreement. The USA is a country which has fully developed and undoubtedly has far more economic might than India. Despite this, India has been dealing with the climate crisis better despite currently going through economic development. Considering this contrast, it therefore seems clear that the slow rate of progress over climate change does not result from economic inequalities between countries. Instead, it is directly linked to the actions of particular countries.

Excellent selection and deployment of knowledge here.

These two paragraphs review the Kyoto and Paris agreements to argue that it is the actions, or inactions, of particular countries that are the cause, not inequalities between countries.

There are, however, objections. The EU, for example, is wealthy and acts despite not being as directly at risk of climate disaster. Thus, the issue is an issue of wealth rather than an issue of an individual state's will. Since the Kyoto Protocol, the EU has been one of the most active countries in the fight against climate change. The EU Emission Trading Scheme (ETS) has been brought about to create incentives to reduce emissions, in 2021, the body reached its 20, 20, 20 target of reducing emissions by 20%, increasing green energy production by 20% and increasing energy efficiency by 20% in comparison to 1990. This is a target which would have taken a great deal of investment to reach, especially through a scheme such as the EU ETS which depends on firms having the means to save and re-invest money, something which many firms in developing countries - due to savings gaps - cannot do. Consider Angola as an example. Angola will never decrease oil production like the EU has decreased its reliance on fossil fuels. This is because commodity dependency means that Angola must continue producing oil to maintain sustainable growth.

Others, however, debate this claim. Often actions against climate change are influenced by geographical factors. From this standpoint, it is the actions of different countries, resulting from these geographical pressures, which influence action or inaction against climate change. Countries most at risk are commonly far more involved in these efforts. Our previous example of India, for example, has key populated regions such as Mumbai which are under threat from rises in the sea level. The most obvious example of geographical factors influencing action and inaction against climate change is Vietnam. Vietnam is a country in the Indo-Chinese region of the globe, a region highly vulnerable to rises in the sea level (in the top five countries most at risk to climate disaster). Thus, Vietnam has been at the forefront of making progressive reforms in the fight against the world's climate. During COP26, for example, Vietnam was one of the few major coal-dependent countries which agreed to phasing out reliance on coal. Countries such as the USA and China, on the other hand, are less vulnerable to this risk and therefore - despite being some of the largest producers of coal - did not sign the agreement. Considered, we can see how geographical pressures, influencing the actions of particular countries, are far more impactful on the rate of progress over climate change than economic inequalities. Many countries which are vulnerable are relatively poor - Vietnam is an example of this -

yet they take action seriously. Contrarily, rich countries with the resources to change the production process such as modern China and the US do not because they do not have this same level of vulnerability. Thus, we can see that it is not inequality between countries driving inaction, it is how much risk each country feels on a state-by-state basis.

These two paragraphs consider whether wealth of certain countries is the cause, before rejecting this and maintaining the view that it is the inactions of some countries.

Considering the above, it seems plain that the slow rate of progress being made against climate change is far more related to the indifference of particular states rather than inequalities between these states. Whilst this may initially be assumed when considering the failure of Kyoto, the success of certain developing countries in their efforts against climate change supposes otherwise.

**Given the complexity of the question, this answer has effectively unpicked a number of the key themes and, with impressive knowledge, has answered it very effectively. It was awarded L5 overall.**

Suggested levels for each AO:

L5 for AO1, L5 for AO2, L5 for AO3