



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2019

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 2
assessing

Political Power and Political Ideas

[AGP21]

MONDAY 10 JUNE, AFTERNOON

MARK
SCHEME

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to demonstrate:

- AO1** Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and debates.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and theories; identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences between the political systems studied.
- AO3** Construct and communicate coherent arguments making use of a range of appropriate political vocabulary.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for tasks or questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 5: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Inadequate): The candidate makes only a very limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack any clarity and coherence. There is very little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is consistently unclear.

Level 2 (Limited): The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 3 (Satisfactory): The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (Good): The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 5 (High standard): The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Option A: Political Power

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A: Factors Involved in the Exercise of Power

1 Background

“Coercion” is the use of force or the threatened use of force and is the most direct way to exercise power over a population. A high level of coercion tends to be necessary when political leaders lack legitimacy. Coercion can take many forms including imprisonment or internment; the use of torture; fines and other financial penalties; surveillance; disappearance and many other forms. All states are able to exercise coercive powers but in authoritarian states the degree of coercion tends to be much greater.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “coercion.”

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “coercion”. An example may be included to support the response. If no supporting example is given, a maximum of 3 marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “coercion”. A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: [5])

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [5]

5

2 Background

There are many reasons why a population, or section of a population, may reject the legitimacy of the state. One common reason is that they are excluded from state power and have little opportunity to influence political elites. This is often the case in dictatorships and other authoritarian systems. A section of the population may also feel discriminated against by the state in terms of allocation of employment, education facilities, welfare support or other state services. A section of society that is culturally distinct may feel that their culture is ignored or even suppressed. In some cases, a group within may see themselves as so different from the majority of the population that they seek to secede from the state. An answer that does not include any evidence can be awarded a maximum of [8]. An answer that does not refer to the source can be awarded a maximum of [6].

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid reason with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid reason and offers a more developed explanation.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid reason and provides a full explanation of the feature.

Apply criteria for each valid reason. One feature must come from the item.

(AO1: [5] × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

10

3 Background

The creation and maintenance of legitimacy are crucial issues for all states but, as the Source suggests, particularly for those societies that are emerging from an internal conflict situation. Invariably, this conflict has revolved around issues of legitimacy and building support for the new institutions is crucial. The Source suggests that one way that this can be achieved is through involving all sections of society in the running of the state. How this can be done should be discussed by candidates and many may wish to draw upon the example of Northern Ireland. The state may also create greater legitimacy through its economic, educational, welfare and other policies to ensure that all sections of society feel fairly treated. The state may also seek to recognise cultural differences within society and ensure that such differences are accommodated. Some states have sought to create legitimacy through propaganda or through the creation of an external threat. An answer that refers to only one way can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that does not refer to the source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of how legitimacy can be created and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([5]–[8])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of how legitimacy can be created but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([9]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of how legitimacy can be created but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([13]–[16])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of how legitimacy can be created and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points

made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([17]–[20])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of how legitimacy can be created and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Section A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

35

Section B: Theories of Power

AVAILABLE
MARKS

4 Background

The term “diffusion of political power” is most commonly associated with the Pluralist analysis of political power. The term describes how, within a democratic political system, power is not concentrated in the hands of the few but is held by the population generally. The structures of democracy are what achieve this diffusion: regular, open, fair elections; a choice of political parties; pressure groups are free to operate; criticism of the political system is tolerated. Where these, and other conditions exist, power is in the hands of the mass of the ordinary population.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “diffusion of political power”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “diffusion of political power”.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “diffusion of political power”.

(AO1: [5])

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

5 (a) Background

What marks the statement that is contained in this question as the view of Elite Theory are the views that democracy has never existed and never can. Elite Theory in all its forms, suggests that elite rule is inevitable and that an “Iron Law of Oligarchy” operates in all political structures. There may be a “circulation of elites” but what remains constant is that the few dominate power. Elites frequently disguise their power by claiming to be democratic but this is a sham. Candidates should refer to a range of elite theorists and support their discussion with relevant evidence.

Pluralist critics of Elite Theory argue that democracy is achievable and is in fact the reality in many societies. While not ideal, western liberal democracy has brought popular control over the state and human rights to many nations. Marxists believe that democracy is possible in a socialist society where the inequalities of wealth no longer exist making equal access to power possible. Feminists would accuse Elite Theory of legitimising patriarchal structures and elite male rule by suggesting that it is ‘inevitable’.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Elite and other theories of power and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information,

arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the Elite and other theories of power but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the Elite and other theories of power but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the Elite and other theories of power and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Elite and other theories of power and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[35]

35

(b) Background

This question, in implying that male dominance of political power is no longer true, is an attack upon the Feminist analysis of power. It is Feminists who assert that most, if not all, political systems are patriarchal. By this they mean that they are dominated by men and act largely in the interests of men. Feminists can point to a wealth of evidence to support this conclusion: the make-up of parliaments, of governments, of senior ranks of the state institutions. It is argued by Feminists that men use their control over power to maintain their dominance and to preserve the subordination and oppression of women. Male dominance of power is by no means over. Candidates should examine the contribution of a range of feminist theorists and present evidence that supports the feminist analysis.

Critics of Feminism would argue that they are guilty of ignoring the gender revolution that is underway in many political systems; that Feminism is a conspiracy theory; that female inequality owes something to the decisions and actions of women themselves. Evidence that challenges the Feminist analysis should be discussed.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Feminist analysis of political power and of how it has been criticised and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the Feminist analysis of political power and of how it has been criticised but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the Feminist analysis of political power and of how it has been criticised but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of

political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the Feminist analysis of political power and of how it has been criticised and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Feminist analysis of political power and of how it has been criticised and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[35]

Section B

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

40

Option B: Political Ideas

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A: Texts

1 Background

Mill's statement expresses the idea that the state has no right to intervene in the life of the individual on the basis of the principle that it is good for them. In this way, Mill is arguing that any paternalistic intervention is unjustified. Even if the consensus is that individuals are harming themselves by following a particular course of action, the state is not justified in intervening. The state cannot prohibit behaviour on the basis that this is what is best for individuals. This then allows Mill to assert his own very simple principle as the best guide to state action.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by "his own good ... is not a sufficient reason".

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by "his own good ... is not a sufficient reason". An example may be included to support the response. If no supporting example is given, a maximum of 3 marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by "his own good ... is not a sufficient reason". A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: [5])

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately. [5]

5

2 Background

Mill's "very simple principle" or "Harm Principle" is the basis of his recipe for promoting individual liberty against encroachment by the state or society. The principle establishes two forms of action: "self-regarding" in which the individual's actions only affect themselves and have no consequences for others and "other-regarding" in which actions do have consequences for others. Mill proposes that self-regarding actions should be completely unrestricted by the state and it is only when an action is other-regarding that the state has a right to intervene. If this principle is applied, he believes that individual liberty will be protected from what he sees as the "tyranny of the majority." An answer that does not include any evidence can be awarded a maximum of [8]. An answer that does not refer to the source can be awarded a maximum of [6].

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty. There is limited or no use of the Item or own knowledge.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty. There is some use of the Item or own knowledge. If no reference to the Item is made a maximum of 7 marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([8]–[10])

The candidate provides a full explanation of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty. There is good use of the Item and own knowledge.

(AO1: [10])

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

10

3 Background

Mill's Harm Principle was a very influential idea in his time and continues to influence debate about the proper role of the state today. However, it has been pointed out that the Principle is flawed in some key respects. First, and perhaps most importantly, critics have argued that there really is no such thing as a totally self-regarding action. All actions can be said to have consequences for others, either directly or indirectly. If this is so, then Mill's proposal would provide governments with justification for unlimited intervention in individual's lives: exactly the opposite of what Mill wanted to achieve. Second, Mill controversially excludes the young and races that are not fully "developed" from the Principle: here the state can act as it sees fit. Third, Mill argues that freedom of expression should be absolutely free, something that few Liberals today would agree with. Socialists and Conservatives would also have serious criticisms to make of Mill's principle and candidates may choose to take the approach of explaining their objections. An answer that does not refer to the source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that has only one criticism can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty and how they have been criticised and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([5]–[8])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty and how they have been criticised but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([9]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty and how they have been criticised but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([13]–[16])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of Mill's proposals for protecting individual liberty and how they have been criticised and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence

and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([17]–[20])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of Mill’s proposals for protecting individual liberty and how they have been criticised and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Section A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

35

Section B: Ideologies

AVAILABLE
MARKS

4 Background

The concept of “equality of opportunity” is central to political debate and disagreement. The concept itself is that individuals should be treated fairly and that things such as class, gender, race and sexuality should have no bearing upon an individual’s chances to succeed educationally, politically or in the workplace. An individual’s progress should be determined by their ability and effort only. The idea of meritocracy is invariably linked with equality of opportunity.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “equality of opportunity”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “equality of opportunity”. There will be some supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “equality of opportunity”. Relevant evidence will support the response.

(AO1: [5])

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

5 (a) Background

Traditional, Organic Conservatism is less suspicious of the state than its Libertarian counter-part. Organic Conservatives believe the state has a paternalistic responsibility to look after all members of society. In practice, this means that the state should be involved to a significant degree in regulating society. Modern exponents of the Organic tradition therefore supported the welfare state, state education and a national health system and were willing to fund these through a system of progressive taxation.

On the other hand, Libertarian Conservatives are hostile to the state seeing it as a threat to individual liberty. They generally wish to restrict the role of the state, preferring individual responsibility and private enterprise. They are in favour of much lower levels of taxation, allowing individuals to retain much more of what they earn and to make decisions about how they spend their money. This approach has done much to influence the policies pursued by Tory governments in the UK since the 1980s.

The one area that Organic and Libertarians agree on is that the state needs to be involved in promoting law and order. They share a pessimistic view of human nature and it is therefore essential that the state needs to protect society through strong laws that are effectively enforced.

Candidates should seek to evaluate Conservative views of the state and this may take the form of referring to Liberal and Socialist criticisms. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Conservative view of the role of the state and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation

of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the Conservative view of the role of the state but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the Conservative view of the role of the state but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the Conservative view of the role of the state and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Conservative view of the role of the state and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[35]

35

AVAILABLE
MARKS

(b) Background

There are pre-capitalist forms of socialism but the ideology is most obviously a critique of the capitalist mode of production. Socialists attack capitalism as an unequal and unfair system, based upon the exploitation of the many by the few. Early socialists tended to adopt a Revolutionary Socialist analysis of capitalism, believing that the exploitation and inequality of capitalism means that it cannot be improved upon or reformed. Therefore, the system must be destroyed and replaced by socialism. Private ownership of the means of production cannot be tolerated as this is the basis of capitalist exploitation. Later, Reformist Socialists, are less inclined to advocate the complete destruction of capitalism, arguing instead for a reformed capitalism that combines the benefits of capitalism with state action in the form of welfarism, state health care and redistribution of wealth. Capitalism can be “tamed” and made to serve the needs of the majority, not the few.

The Socialist analysis of capitalism has been attacked by both Liberals and Conservatives and candidates may refer to these alternative views of capitalism as a way of critiquing Socialism. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Socialist analysis of capitalism and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the Socialist analysis of capitalism but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the Socialist analysis of capitalism but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the Socialist analysis of capitalism and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Socialist analysis of capitalism and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[35]

35

Section B

40

Total

75

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**