

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in  
Government & Politics (6GP04/4D)

Paper 4D: Global Political Issues

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6GP04\_4D\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## General Marking Guidance

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



LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	
-----------------	--

2.

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

The clash of civilizations thesis was proposed by political scientist Samuel P. Huntington in a 1992 lecture that was then developed in a 1993 Foreign Affairs article titled "The Clash of Civilizations?". The basic premise of the thesis is that people's cultural and religious identities will be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world.

Huntington argues that conflict will have a civilisation basis rather than ideological (Key feature of the Cold War) or economic and that this will provide the basis for the great divisions of the future. Huntington identifies the central civilisations as well as identifying so called 'cleft' countries, such as India, which contain very large groups of people identifying with separate civilisations.

The thesis also suggests that conflicts are particularly likely between Muslims and non-Muslims and between Islam and Christianity (influencing Western civilisation) as both Islam and Christianity are missionary religions, seeking conversion of others and "all-or-nothing" religions, in the sense that it is believed by both sides that only their faith is the correct one. He also highlights what is termed an 'Islamic Resurgence' and a clash with the values of Western universalism.

Huntington elaborates further on the causes of civilisational conflict as well as introducing concepts such as 'fault line' and 'core state' conflicts.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following

features: A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the

following features:

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	Question
3.	
<b>Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points)</b>	
<p>The 'orthodox' view of development is based on the perspective that poverty is understood as a situation in which people suffer because they do not have the money to satisfy their basic material needs. It is often therefore calculated in terms of GDP per capita, implying that development is closely linked to economic growth. This view suggests that development is a process through which 'backward' traditional societies are transformed into 'modern' ones through a process of industrialisation and a spread of market or capitalist economic structures. This view argues that free market capitalism should be the focus for development and that a 'top-down' reliance on expert knowledge and external intervention can provide the stimulus to growth. This tends to be the view of Global North.</p> <p>Criticism of the 'orthodox' model is associated with the 'alternative' view of development. This view tends to focus on the ideas of Global South and is linked to elements such as self-reliance, social and cultural inclusion and ecological balance. There is a view that global poverty and development are linked to structural disparities in the international trading system. Discussion of the Core/Peripheral model is relevant here.</p> <p>Critics may also argue that economic reforms associated with the 'orthodox' model' can actually be counterproductive. The Washington Consensus, linked to the orthodox model, is seen by some as providing a benefit to the developed rather than the developing world. The structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) have been a central focus of criticism.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p>	



LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	Question
4.	
<p><b>Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points)</b></p> <p>There is disagreement as to how best to deal with climate change. Discussion of any two competing views is required here and a number of different terms may be used.</p>	
<p>Adaptation and mitigation may be discussed with conflicting views as to whether learning to live with climate change is more realistic than trying to moderate or reduce (through reducing greenhouse gases) the impact of climate change.</p> <p>Terms such as reformist and radical or 'light green' and 'dark green' may be used. Discussion of the reformist approaches to dealing with climate change can be described as being 'light green' or 'shallow'. and make up the majority view of mainstream political parties. A belief that environmental concerns can be tackled without a major increase in interventionism at global or even government level but through a responsiveness of capitalism to environmental concerns linked to technological innovations. A careful balance can be achieved through the concept of sustainable development.</p> <p>The Radical approach has a 'dark green' or 'deep' perspective which suggests that significant action will be required. Radicals may consider that global capitalism is the primary cause of environmental degradation and that a major shift will be required towards a tighter regulation of trade and development where currently free trade and neo-liberalism stand. A shift from materialism and consumerism will be a necessity and this will be linked to a need for both a cultural and political change. A reassessment of individual state pursuit of national interest, economic growth and national prosperity over wider global concerns will be required, possibly requiring a strong and supranational body.</p> <p>A North – South divide has developed over the topic of climate change with elements of Global North believing targets should be set in line with current emissions, not historic, whereas Global South may see Global North as having primary responsibility for action.</p>	

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following

features: A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the

following features:

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	Question
5.	
<b>Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points)</b>	
<p data-bbox="250 359 1474 569">Nuclear proliferation is the spread of nuclear weapons, either by their acquisition by more states (horizontal proliferation), or by their accumulation by established nuclear states. The proliferation of nuclear weapons continues despite attempts to stop this and the end of the bipolar balance based on Mutual Assured Destruction adds to this concern. Proliferation may also lead to temporary imbalances and regional instabilities which may be exploited by aggressive states or to arms races.</p> <p data-bbox="250 611 1435 779">Attempts to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons include formal treaties such as the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the actions of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and elements of the international community in states like Iran, North Korea, Iraq and Libya. Israel destroyed the experimental Iraqi Osirak reactor in 1981 and a similar facility in Syria in 2007.</p> <p data-bbox="250 821 1459 1062">Concern has increased because of the nature of those states or actors trying to acquire nuclear weapons. This includes terrorist groups and states with what are perceived to be dictatorial governments involved in regional rivalries. Nuclear weapons use nuclear fission or fusion to destroy targets on a massive scale through the effect of blast, heat and radiation. There are numerous other reasons why nuclear weapons cause so much concern in global politics such as budgets being spent on very expensive weaponry rather than economic development.</p> <p data-bbox="250 1104 1479 1241">The potential huge destructive power of nuclear weapons leads to an obvious concern in global politics and the chances of nuclear weapons being used increases as more states have them. Accidental use or miscalculation in power politics adds to this concern.</p> <p data-bbox="261 1356 1317 1388">A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	Question
6	
<b>Indicative content (this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points)</b>	
<p>The IMF, WTO and World Bank all have their origins in the 1944 Bretton Woods meeting and agreement and are the leading international bodies responsible for promoting development and poverty reduction. However, their performance in these respects has been a matter of considerable controversy.</p> <p>Economic liberalism has been the central focus of these institutions and this has been reflected in the use of Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs) through the IMF and World Bank. Arguably, these SAPs inflict more harm than good on developing countries and increase their dependency on powerful Northern economies. SAPs are considered by critics to have undermined state sovereignty and to provide too much of a focus on economic reform with little attention to the consequences in areas such as the environment. There is a particular criticism that the World Trade Organisation (WTO) continues to fail the developing world. Whilst agriculture was brought into the WTO regime, the agreement has allowed for continued agricultural protection which has helped to stall the Doha Round of negotiations. The EU and USA were unwilling to abandon protectionism despite the WTO ideology having a focus on a philosophy of free trade. Allegations of double standards exist here. Structural dominance of all three institutions by the developed world lead to allegations that the institutions have and will remain focussed on benefitting the developed rather than developing world. Failure of all three institutions to prevent or respond effectively to the global financial crisis of 2007 hurt all states including the developing world.</p> <p>A response to criticism may focus on the view that their has been beneficial to the world's poor for a number of reasons. The market-based approach adopted by the institutions of global economic governance has proved itself to be highly effective in promoting growth and prosperity, as demonstrated by the routes to prosperity adopted by developed societies. There are examples of states, such as South Korea, who have embraced the philosophy of these institutions and have seen significant growth if judged by the 'orthodox' measurement. These institutions have responded to criticism and have attempted to become more flexible in their approach and to adapt to particular needs and circumstances. The IMF and World Bank continue to provide significant development support and assistance to the developing world and no country is obliged to accept IMF and/or World Bank assistance. Countries appear to calculate that, on balance, IMF and World Bank support brings benefit. Although the WTO has been considered a 'rich mans club' it has seen an altering balance with the promise of a shift towards greater influence for emerging economies such as India, Brazil and China. There may be other, arguably more significant causes of global poverty.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p>	

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions



<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 1 (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
7	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>International law is the law that governs states and other international actors. A system of international law and associated judicial bodies has developed over the last few decades. There is controversy over the extent to which these operate effectively. It is important to consider how the effectiveness of these can be measured. Universal acceptance, deterrent value, ability to prosecute etc are all worth considering and discussing. The actions of the International Court of Justice, International Criminal Court and individual Special Tribunals are relevant as well as other judicial institutions such as the European Court of Justice and European Court of Human Rights.</p> <p>The creation of so many judicial bodies in recent years would indicate that a more effective body of international law is possibly developing. The creation of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia provided the first such tribunal since Nuremburg and Tokyo. A number of high profile and other prosecutions have taken place or at least been initiated. Similar tribunals for Rwanda and for Sierra Leone have followed with some notable successes such as the prosecution of Charles Taylor. The International Criminal Court, in particular, has helped to strengthen international law and is argued to have acted as a significant potential deterrent for those political and other leaders considering future atrocities. The longer running UN International Court of Justice may have some high profile failings and flaws but also has a few successes. Any attempt to provide an effective system of international law and judicial bodies is likely to be a lengthy and difficult process as it seeks to tackle long standing issues such as state sovereignty.</p> <p>Much of the criticism of international law is focussed on the extent to which there is a western bias, based on the values and legal traditions of the west. These values and traditions are based on ideas of human rights which are questioned and sometimes rejected in parts of the Muslim World and elsewhere. Despite the claims of universalism there is a lack of a global consensus and a view that the major legal institutions are not only based on western views but structurally dominated by western states. There is a perception that western states use double standards and are selective in the application of International Law in defence of human rights. USA actions in controversial areas such as Guantanamo Bay, extraordinary rendition are relevant here as well as more recent examples. There are numerous examples both that international law and judicial bodies, courts and tribunals have and haven't been effective in upholding human rights, deterring abuses and providing global stability. Sovereignty remains a central obstacle to the effectiveness of international law and judicial bodies.</p>	

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>

<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>AO3</b>	Communication and coherence
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 1 (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
8	

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

There has been a growing focus on efforts to attempt to tackle climate change in recent years as concern and awareness of the potential impact of climate change has developed. There is a great deal of controversy linked to these efforts including the conferences, summits, agreements and actions that have developed. Any progress is progress but whether this is sufficient is open to debate.

For many there is a significant progress to be seen in any progress towards bringing the international community together to attempt to make common agreement. Conferences have dominated the global agenda since the early 1990s and have helped to develop a growing agreement that climate change is happening and that humans are responsible for global warming. There is an acceptance that global warming is connected to industrial development in the developed world initially and that the consequences are likely to be serious. The 1997 Kyoto climate change agreement set binding targets for a limiting or reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2012. The intention was to reduce emissions in the developed world to at least 5.2 per cent below 1990 levels. Kyoto also introduced incentive mechanisms for reducing emissions such as the emissions trading scheme. The Copenhagen Accord set out a range of objectives and mechanisms for reducing emissions including a \$100 billion a year fund from developed countries to help developing countries. Continued conferences, summits, joint and individual commitments to reduce emissions illustrate just how seriously the global community take the issue of climate change.

International efforts may still be considered to be insufficient. Despite development of the concept of 'common but differentiated responsibility' the age old conflict between the collective good and selfish national interests which is apparent in the 'tragedy of the commons' scenario- Garrett Hardin- remains. Ideological and economic obstacles to achieving progress also remain and the tensions between developed and developing states adds to the difficulty in moving forwards. Enforcement of agreements continues to be problematic given the lack of a significant actor in global politics, able to enforce action or to police promises. States continue to disagree over the extent of the problem, the historic and current responsibility for climate change and on the best way to respond. There is a perception that the most significant global summits to tackle climate change have failed. The USA refused to ratify the Kyoto Protocol in 1997 and the 2009 UN Climate Change Conference was criticized roundly for the lack of detail in areas such as the proposal to provide funds through which developed countries would support developing countries in reducing emissions. There has been little to provide any greater level of optimism since and the divide between light and dark greens, shallow and deep ecologists, mitigation and adaptation supporters and their policies continues.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

