



ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2023

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 2

assessing

Political Power and Political Ideas

[AGP21]

FRIDAY 16 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

Political stability refers to a situation in which there is widespread acceptance of the legitimacy of the state. The vast majority of citizens, political parties and organisations give their consent to the political structures and there is little support for radical political change. Societies that have political stability are generally peaceful, with political conflict tending to be of a moderate nature.

Alternatively, a candidate may argue that political stability could be the result of extreme repression or ideological control.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term 'political stability'.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term 'political stability'. 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 'political stability'. A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: [5] marks)

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

5

2 Background

The Source identifies that suppression of opposition, including pressure groups, is a form of coercion and candidates should identify and explain this form. Other forms of coercion include imprisonment, financial penalties, execution, exile and torture.

Any other relevant form.

Level 1 ([1])

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

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid form and offers a more developed explanation. The answer may be supported with a relevant example.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid form and provides a full explanation of the form, including supporting evidence.

Apply criteria for each valid form. One form must come from the Source. If there is no reference to the source, a maximum of [8] can be awarded. If there is no reference to evidence, a maximum of [8] can be awarded.

(AO1: [5] marks × 2)

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

10

3 Background

The context of this question is the belief that states that rely solely upon 'might' will be unable to endure unless they manage to achieve the 'right' to rule. Exclusive reliance upon coercive power tends to lead to opposition to the state because of the absence of any legitimate authority. The Source also identifies that the use of coercive power is very expensive and weakens the ability of the state to invest in services that may lead the population to give their assent. The degree of coercion required to hold onto power also tends to escalate over time. Internationally, coercive states may be isolated or face sanctions. The death of a coercive leader can result in major political change.

Any other relevant reason.

If there is no reference to the source, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If there is no reference to evidence, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If there is only one reason, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why coercive states may not survive in the long-term 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 the reasons why coercive states may not survive in the long-term 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 the reasons why coercive states may not survive in the long-term 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 the reasons why coercive states may not survive in the long-term 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 the reasons why coercive states may not survive in the long-term 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 ruling class refers to the social class of a given society that decides upon and sets that society's political policy by mandating that there is one such particular class in the given society, and then appointing itself as that class. Sometimes, there is a ruling class in a particular sector of the upper class that adheres to quite specific circumstances: it has both the most material wealth and the most widespread influence over all the other classes, and it chooses to actively exercise that power to shape the direction of a locality, a country, and/or the world.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term 'ruling class'.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term 'ruling class'. There will be a supporting example.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term 'ruling class'. Relevant evidence will support the response.

(AO1: [5] marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

5 (a) Background

Elite Theory is based on the conviction 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 a clear understanding of the question, contain more detailed knowledge and offer a broader range of evidence.

If there is no supporting evidence, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in terms of evaluation, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of Elite Theory and its critics 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 Elite Theory and its critics 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 Elite Theory and its critics 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 Elite Theory and its critics 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 Elite Theory and its critics 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

It is Pluralist Theorists who are most likely to take a positive view of western liberal democracy and to regard it as the political system that is closest to the ideal of representative democracy. The existence of free and fair elections, open access to and competition for political power, the free operation of pressure groups and respect for civil and political liberties found in liberal democracies are what ensures that they are truly democratic. In practice, liberal democratic systems have many flaws and the diffusion of political power may be far from perfect. For example, some social groups may have much more power than others even though there is open access to power. However, the merits of liberal democracy are so many and compelling that it is a system of government that populations throughout the world aspire to. This is what will lead to the triumph of liberal democracy.

It is Marxists, Elite Theorists and Feminists who are likely to challenge the Pluralist perspective for different reasons. Candidates do not need to discuss all these critical perspectives but should refer to some critical evidence and theory.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display a clear understanding of the question, contain more detailed knowledge and offer a broader range of evidence.

If there is no supporting evidence, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in terms of evaluation, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Pluralist and other theories 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 Pluralist and other theories 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 Pluralist and other theories 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 Pluralist and other theories 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 Pluralist and other theories 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**Total****AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

40**75**

Option B: Political Ideas

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A: Texts

1 Background

Mill identified key freedoms as thought, expression and action but he also included freedom to combine with others to achieve a common purpose. Mill is defending the right of individuals to form trade unions, protest movements and other, to use the contemporary term, pressure groups. This freedom of combination and collective action was, Mill stated, to be subject to the harm principle.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by “the liberty of combination among individuals”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by “the liberty of combination among individuals”.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by “the liberty of combination among individuals”.

(AO1: [5] marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

2 Background

Mill believed in absolute freedom of thought and opinion, not subject to the harm principle. He did recognise that there was an “other-regarding” dimension to expressing and publishing opinions and that freedom of speech could, for example, be used to incite a mob that could lead to violence. However, Mill was of the view that freedom of thought was of no value without freedom to express those thoughts. For this reason, he argued freedom of expression should not be “separated” from freedom of thought: in other words, it too, should be unrestricted and absolute.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of Mill’s argument for liberty of expression and publication. 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 argument for liberty of expression and publication.

Level 3 ([8]–[10])

The candidate provides a full explanation of Mill’s argument for liberty of expression and publication. There is good use of the Item and own knowledge.

(AO1: [10] marks)

An answer that makes no reference to the source can score a maximum of [8].
No reference to evidence, maximum [8].

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

3 Background

Perhaps the most significant criticism of Mill's proposals for maximising liberty is that the 'harm' principle is fundamentally flawed. This is because there is no action that is totally self-regarding with all actions having consequences for others. If this is the case, then Mill is providing an argument for unlimited state interference in the lives of individuals, the opposite of what he was seeking to achieve. Second, Mill excludes young people and races that are not fully 'developed' from the protection of the harm principle. With the young and undeveloped races the state has unlimited power to restrict liberty. Third, Mill argues that freedom of expression is absolute in spite of its obvious other-regarding potential.

Socialists and Conservatives would also challenge Mill's ideas and candidates may legitimately refer to the views of rival ideologies as long as they are applied to criticism of Mill.

Any other valid criticisms.

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of how Mill's proposals for maximising liberty 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 how Mill's proposals for maximising liberty 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 how Mill's proposals for maximising liberty 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 how Mill's proposals for maximising liberty 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 how Mill’s proposals for maximising liberty 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.

No reference to the source, maximum Level 3.

No evidence, maximum Level 3.

Lacks balance, focusing on just one theory, Level 3.

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 that individuals are entitled to equal treatment and that class, race, gender and sexuality should have no bearing upon an individual's chances of success educationally, in work, in politics or any other sphere. Individuals should be judged only on ability and effort. Equality of opportunity would exist in a meritocratic society.

Any other relevant meaning.

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'.

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] marks)

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

5

5 (a) Background

Socialism is a notoriously diverse ideology that had produced an enormous range of movements and 'Socialist' thinkers. The hostility of Socialists towards one another is also legendary and is frequently apparent within the British Labour Party. Perhaps the most significant difference between the varieties of socialism is over capitalism and whether the system is intrinsically evil and in need of total elimination or is a system that can be reformed and improved to benefit all in society. Revolutionary Socialists and reformist Socialists have bitterly disagreed on this issue and candidates should elaborate on their different positions.

The alternative view is that Socialists have much in common that sets them apart from other ideologies. A concern for the disadvantaged, exploited and oppressed is one common element. The need to restructure society both economically and socially is another. Socialists are critical of the Liberal notion of liberty believing it is illusory for those without the resources to be free. Socialists stress the importance of equality although, here again, there are significant differences of opinion on this. Socialists are utopian in that they do believe in the essential goodness of humans and in the possibility of a better society.

No relevant evidence, maximum Level 3.

Lacking balance, maximum Level 4.

Any other valid information.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of varieties of socialism 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 varieties of socialism 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 varieties of socialism 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 varieties of socialism 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 varieties of socialism 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

(b) Background

The idea that Conservatism may not be a coherent ideology owes much to the stated views of some Conservatives. They have argued that the ideology is not some abstract set of principles or utopian goals unlike the ideas of Socialism and Liberalism. Conservatism is merely concerned with 'keeping the ship of state afloat' rather than steering towards some illusory destination. The idea that Conservatism is not an ideology may also result from Conservatism being a remarkably adaptable and flexible ideology, switching from Organic/One-Nation/Tradition to Libertarian Conservatism and back again. As society changes Conservatism seems to change as well. This could explain the longevity and electoral success of the Tory Party in the UK.

On the other hand, others argue that Conservatism does have a clear set of principles. First, Conservatives share a pessimistic view of human nature, believing human beings are, at best, irrational and at worst, positively evil. This leads to the second Conservative principle, the need for strong law and order. Conservatives also tend to support the idea of aristocracy, or rule by the best, although who the best are has changed. Conservatives tend to support traditional institutions and practices on the basis that they have proven their worth. Inequality is regarded by Conservatives as inevitable and potentially positive.

No relevant evidence, maximum Level 3.

Lacking balance, maximum Level 4.

Any other relevant material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of types of Conservatism 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 types of Conservatism 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 types of Conservatism 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 types of Conservatism 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 types of Conservatism 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]

Section B

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

40

75