



Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In Politics (9PL0)

Paper 2: UK Government and Non-core Political Ideas

## **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)

October 2021

Question Paper Log Number P66603A

Publications Code 9PL0\_02\_2111\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## 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.

## Guidelines for Marking Source Question

### **AO1 (10 marks)**

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding.

They can be awarded for using the source and developing separate own knowledge.

When the rubric states that candidates should 'use knowledge and understanding to help you analyse and evaluate' it means that candidates should use only knowledge and understanding from the source. Newly introduced own knowledge cannot form the basis for AO2 and AO3 points/marks.

### **AO2 (10 marks)**

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

### **AO3 (10 marks)**

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments based on the source and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

Marks for analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) should only be awarded where they relate to information in the source

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.

Candidates who do not undertake any comparative analysis of the source and/or have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Other valid responses are acceptable

1(a) Using the source, evaluate the view that the roles and membership of the House of Lords require reform.

**Points in agreement**

AO1	AO2	AO3
Peerages can be offered as part of patronage (for previous service and/or large donations to political parties).	The clear statistical link between large donors and successful nomination to the Lords is evidence that rich donors are being rewarded by becoming peers – i.e. repeated cash for honours scandals, thus distorting the membership of the Lords.	We can conclude that the current system is open to abuse of patronage and therefore the membership of the Lords requires reform.
The House is not representative.	The average age of the Lords is 70; just over a quarter are women and only 6% are from ethnic minorities whilst the educational background and class background of peers is also very skewed.	We can form a judgement that the current system produces a House that is deeply unrepresentative of the wider public so its membership is in need of reform.
The House lacks democratic legitimacy.	The Lords have no democratic connection with the public and are not held accountable by the electorate via elections. The lack of democratic	We can form the conclusion that since the current system produces a chamber which lacks the authority to challenge the elected government, it cannot effectively fulfil its

	legitimacy weakens the House and weakens democracy in the UK.	purpose of scrutiny, and therefore requires reform to its membership.
The chamber is too weak to do its job	The current system lacks the legitimacy of the system of electing MPs and produces a legislature which lacks the authority (and the power) to do its job as a revising chamber that scrutinises legislation and its job of checking and challenging the actions of the government.	We can conclude that the role and membership of the House of Lords needs reform if it is to perform its key functions within UK democracy.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
The appointment system allows for an increased number of experts to be selected.	The independent House of Lords Appointments Commission, established in 2000 vets all nominations to the Lords and has helped to introduce more experts to the chamber. This produces a more expert membership than the Commons, helping the Lords to fulfil its roles.	We can conclude from the independence and impact of the Appointments Commission on membership of the Lords that the current system does not require reform as it enables the Lords to perform its role.

Membership of the Lords has become more representative.	The Appointments Commission has contributed to improving the representativeness of the second chamber. This is likely to further improve in the future.	We can reach a judgement that the improved representativeness of the Lords shows that its membership does not require reform.
The House has become more professional.	The increased number of life peers, often experts in their field and/or with significant political experience has produced a more effective chamber and committee system.	We can form a judgment that the increased professionalism of the Lords shows that it fulfils its role as a second chamber and does not require reform.
The government is regularly defeated by a more assertive Lords.	The fact that the government is regularly defeated in the Lords since the House of Lords Reform Act shows that the second chamber effectively fulfils its purpose. It has the independence and confidence it needs to challenge the executive.	We can come to the judgement that the higher number of government defeats in the Lords shows that the current system produces a chamber that is able to challenge the government and that therefore the current system does not require reform.
<b>Points based on own knowledge:</b>	<b>NO AO2 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</b>	<b>No AO3 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</b>

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Many crossbenchers are less likely to vote or attend than party political peers.</li><li>• Whipping is often effective in the Lords.</li><li>• Peers can be difficult for parties to control as they can't be sacked, e.g. Lord Heseltine favouring a 'People's vote' on Brexit.</li><li>• The House needs reform as it has become super sized and there have been allegations of peers claiming their allowance without voting or speaking in the chamber.</li></ul> |  |  |
|---|--|--|





Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
--	--	--

1(b) Using the source, evaluate the view that the Supreme Court has strengthened parliamentary sovereignty.		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
With no separation of powers or a codified constitution, the Court has helped to rebalance the relationship between Parliament and the executive.	The establishment of the SC has led to a significant re-balancing of the powers between parliament and executive - the Miller/Cherry cases were not about Brexit but about where constitutional powers lie.	We can conclude that this shows that the SC can serve to strengthen and advance parliamentary sovereignty.
Judicial reviews, such as this, often uphold the rights of Parliament.	Judicial reviews are an important way of limiting the powers of governments that act ultra vires, trying to by-pass parliament.	We can form the judgement that the SC therefore has strengthened parliamentary sovereignty.
The SC's defends parliament against an overmighty executive, acting as guardian of democracy.	As the executive has grown in power, it has been seen by some to be aiming to avoid scrutiny and accountability in Parliament for its actions undermining democracy. The Court's decisions have helped to protect Parliament against this.	We can reach the judgment that this significant rebalancing has strengthened parliamentary sovereignty against an over-mighty executive.

The SC upholds the rule of law.	As the SC upholds the rule of law, as legislated by parliament, this in turn strengthens parliamentary sovereignty.	We can conclude that the SC's support for maintaining the rule of law shows that it has strengthened parliamentary sovereignty.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Judges should not make judgements in political areas, such as Brexit.	This judgement shows that the SC has strayed into areas of 'politics' and this undermines parliamentary sovereignty. Politics should be left to the democratically elected House.	We can form the judgement that the SC has not strengthened parliamentary sovereignty.
Judicial reviews lead to unelected judges challenging the will of the government and thus in effect Parliament.	Judicial reviews can lead, in practice, to challenges to decisions taken by an elected government, whose democratic power is based in Parliament and should be held accountable by a democratically elected Parliament rather than an unelected Court.	We can conclude therefore that the use of judicial review by the SC has not strengthened parliamentary sovereignty.
Declarations of incompatibility challenge parliamentary sovereignty.	Where the Courts decide an Act of Parliament is incompatible with human rights, it can make a declaration of incompatibility. i.e. Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act 2001 or Civil Partnerships Act 2004. This is a challenge to parliamentary sovereignty as it implies a	We can form a judgement that parliamentary sovereignty is not strengthened by the introduction of declarations of incompatibility in Section 4 of the HRA.

	higher form of justification of law than parliament.	
The current system lacks clarity.	The effect of this lack of clarity is to undermine parliamentary sovereignty as the SC has taken on additional powers at the expense of parliament.	We can reach a judgement that parliamentary sovereignty has not been strengthened by the lack of clarity of our political system.
<p><b>Own knowledge not in the source which may be considered as AO1 include</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Supreme Court practices judicial activism so is increasingly becoming involved in creating rights – a role that should belong to the elected parliament.</li> <li>• In practice there have been very few declarations of incompatibility and most are uncontroversial.</li> <li>• The Court practices judicial restraint and does not challenge the will of the elected.</li> </ul>	<b>NO AO2 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</b>	<b>No AO3 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</b>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Court is independent and neutral not political.</li> </ul>		
---	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> </ul>

- |  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li><li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li></ul> |
|--|--|---|

### **Guidelines for Marking Essay Question**

#### **AO1 (10 marks)**

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

#### **AO2 (10 marks)**

Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question

#### **AO3 (10 marks)**

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.



Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.

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

Other valid responses are acceptable

2(a) Evaluate the view that devolution has been good for Wales and Scotland but not for England and Northern Ireland.

**Points in agreement**

AO1	AO2	AO3
Scotland and Wales have both gained additional powers.	Scotland has gained additional powers through the Scotland Acts; Wales has also gained additional powers since powers were devolved under Blair. In contrast, England does not have a devolved assembly and NI has not gained additional powers.	We can conclude that since both Scotland and Wales have gained additional powers, devolution has been good for them.
Devolution is generally viewed as a success for both Scotland and Wales.	The Scottish Parliament and the Welsh assembly have both have established themselves, are popular, and have changed laws at national level to suit the needs of the Scottish and Welsh electorate.	We can form the judgement that the establishment of different laws and rules for Scotland and Wales shows that devolution has been good for them.
There has only been very limited devolution within England.	Moves towards more devolved powers for Metro Mayors and the GLA have been piecemeal and insufficient, especially when compared to the changes in Scotland and Wales.	We can reach a judgement that asymmetrical devolution has left England out of the devolution settlement
Stormont has been suspended for long periods, including between January 2017-January 2020.	The suspension of Stormont for an extended period over the 'cash for ash' scandal has meant the suspension of local control over policy, which has undermined devolution for N Ireland.	We can make a judgment that devolution has not been good for Northern Ireland as the main institution of devolved government has been suspended for long periods of time.

<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Devolution has not satisfied demands for Scottish independence and devolution is not entrenched;	The Scottish Nationalist Party remains a strong lobby for a second referendum on Scottish independence and has made electoral gains, including further successes in the 2019 general election. This issue has been compounded by Brexit. The devolution settlement	We can form the judgement that devolution has not satisfied the demand for more independence, whilst Brexit has exaggerated further the divisions between Holyrood and Westminster.
The Welsh parliament has fewer powers than the Scottish parliament and devolution is not entrenched;	It has been a cause of resentment among Welsh nationalists that the Welsh regional body was granted less powers than Scotland to start with, and whilst it has had its powers increased, they remain less than the powers of the Scottish Parliament.	We can conclude that Welsh nationalist support for further devolved powers, and for independence, shows that devolution has not been good for Wales.
England does not need a separate parliament;	English interests are already represented by the UK parliament and so England does not need a separate parliament or assembly and there is limited popular support for it. Metro Mayors are covering an increasing percentage	We can reach a judgement that since English interests are already represented, there is no need for English devolution.

	of the population and are becoming more popular.	
Stormont has normalised peaceful political conflict within Northern Ireland.	Stormont was restored in January 2020 and its track record shows that it has contained conflict within Northern Ireland within a peaceful and political framework.	We can conclude that, despite the suspensions, Stormont has had a very positive effect on politics within Northern Ireland.
<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following synoptic points:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The role and importance of referenda in relation to devolution.</b></li> <li>• <b>The impact of the different electoral systems on the devolved assemblies</b></li> <li>• <b>The link to democracy - bringing the power to make decisions as close the people as possible.</b></li> <li>• <b>The importance of minor and emerging parties - Plaid Cymru and the SNP.</b></li> </ul>		

Level	Mark	

	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

<b>2(b) Evaluate the view that since 2010 we have seen a return to executive dominance over Parliament</b>		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Structurally the nature of UK constitution remains; the executive is drawn from	The lack of a fusion of powers gives the Executive control over the Commons and the	We can form a judgment that the structure of the UK political system

<p>parliament and the second chamber is unelected.</p>	<p>unelected second chamber weakens parliament's ability to hold the executive to account.</p>	<p>tends towards executive dominance over parliament.</p>
<p>The government was elected with a large majority in 2019;</p>	<p>Johnson was elected with a majority of around 80 seats and this means the government is very unlikely to lose a vote in the Commons. The revised 'Brexit' Bill dropped the commitment to consult Parliament.</p>	<p>We can conclude that the Conservative governments large majority means that the executive will dominate parliament.</p>
<p>The Conservative government under Johnson is fairly united</p>	<p>Now that the UK has left the EU, one of the main issues causing divisions within the ruling party has been neutralised enabling far stronger control over the party in Parliament by the Executive. This is in stark contrast to the divisions over Europe in May's government.</p>	<p>We can reach a judgement that the lack of major divisions within the ruling party means that the executive will dominate parliament.</p>
<p>Parliamentary committee structures to oversee the work of the executive remain relatively weak.</p>	<p>Compared to other countries, our parliamentary committees set up to ever-see the work of the executive are weak and lack 'teeth'. For instance, Johnson avoided attending the Liaison Committee three times in 2019.</p>	<p>We can form a judgement that as parliament lacks powerful committee structures, that the executive will dominate parliament.</p>

<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Parliament has become more assertive after the election in 2010	Parliament has become more assertive over recent years, especially during the coalition (2010-15) and small majority/minority governments from 2015-2019 with backbenchers more likely to rebel. Governments have faced defeats in the Commons on key issues such as 'Brexit' and the reformed House of Lords has been more willing to challenge the government.	We can conclude that the greater assertiveness of parliament means that the executive will not dominate parliament.
The coalition and Conservative governments from 2010-2019 faced effective scrutiny and challenge from parliament.	We have experienced almost a decade of a resurgent Parliament. Despite Johnson's large majority, the executive can expect to face scrutiny and challenge from parliament and to be held to account for its actions.	We can form a judgment that fact that parliament will continue to challenge and scrutinise the executive, that it will not dominate parliament.
Divisions within the Conservative Party under Johnson remain - in Parliament	There remain a number of key divisions within the Conservative party, especially over the role of the state in the economy and society, that mean it is hard for the Executive to maintain party discipline in the House.	We can form a conclusion that the likelihood of divisions within the party means that the Executive will not dominate parliament.



<p>The parliamentary committee structure is more effective.</p>	<p>Regardless of the size of majority, the parliamentary committee structure is more effective now since the Wright Reforms. Select committee chairs are more independent and willing to challenge the executive. The Liaison Committee provides additional scrutiny of the PM.</p>	<p>We can reach a judgement that the improved effectiveness of parliamentary committees means that the executive will not dominate parliament.</p>
---	---	--

**Candidates may refer to the following synoptic points:**

- The role and importance of the media in supporting/undermining scrutiny of the executive.
- The effects of FPTP in producing large government majorities.
- The lack of legitimacy of an unelected second chamber.
- Party divisions within the governing party.



Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li><li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li></ul>
--	--	---



## Guidelines for Marking Political Ideas Questions

### AO1 (8 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

### AO2 (8 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question

### AO3 (8 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.

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

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

3a To what extent are anarchists united in their reasons for opposing the state		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
All anarchists wish to see the overthrow of the state as an immoral and coercive body that must be rejected due to its impact on human nature.	Anarchists see the state as immoral (Goldman) and coercive so it must be abolished due to its impact on human nature.	We can make a judgement that anarchists oppose the state and wish to see it overthrown.
All anarchists see the state acting in a way to limit or restrict liberty and economic freedom. If removed human potential soars.	Anarchists see the state as removing the creativity and prospects for liberty (Stirner) and economic freedom (Kropotkin) and only by abolishing the state can liberty be realised.	We can conclude that anarchists are united as they see the removal of the state a step towards greater human progress
Anarchists see the state as a perpetuator of inequality and division in society - government is the creator of disorder not order.	Hence the removal of that state allows social order to occur naturally and spontaneously.	We can reach a verdict that unity among anarchists arises to remove the state and create a better society for all
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Some anarchists feel that a violent removal of the state is the only option – such as Goldman whilst others would see a peaceful process (Proudhon)	Their premise is that the state is evil therefore it has to meet an aggressive termination. This view is not shared by all anarchists.	Whilst anarchists agree the state should be overthrown, they disagree over how.

Whilst all anarchists agree on the removal of the state, they disagree about why the stateless society will be a society of natural order.	Stirner advocates the view that the state limits the autonomy of the individual and that social order will be based on the association of free individuals, collectivist anarchists see the state as protecting private property and inequality and social order will emerge from cooperation and mutual aid (Kropotkin).	There is disagreement over why to remove the state and how natural order will emerge in the stateless society.
Anarchists disagree about the structure of the new stateless society where anarchy is order.	Stirner saw the stateless society as a Union of Egoists, whilst anarcho- capitalists see a society ordered by the market whilst collectivists tend to favour some form of federation of self managing communes.	Thus we can see the structure of society without the state is contentious.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

<b>3b To what extent do anarchists have a common view of an ideal society?</b>		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Anarchists agree that an ideal society will be without a state.	An idea that unites the different strands of anarchism is that a future society must not have a state.	We can conclude that anarchists do have a common view of an ideal stateless society.
Anarchists agree that in an ideal society there will be liberty.	All strands of anarchism argue in favour of liberty in an ideal anarchist society.	We can form a judgement that the consensus on the need for greater freedom in an ideal society shows that anarchists have a common view.
Anarchists agree on to reject existing forms of authority and coercive, hierarchical relationships.	Anarchists reject all forms of coercive relationships, and the ideal society for most anarchists is build on freedom and equality.	We can reach the judgment that anarchists have a common view that an ideal society will be both free and equal.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3

Anarchists disagree on the nature of the economy in an ideal society.	There are wide differences between anarchist traditions on what type of economic system there should be in an ideal society, from free-market capitalism to mutualism (Proudhon) to anarcho-communism (Kropotkin)	We can reach the judgement that the significant differences between anarchists over the economy mean that they do not have a common view on an ideal society.
There is no clear blueprint for the ideal society and anarchists disagree over whether an ideal society should be based on individualism or collectivism.	Although all agreeing that there should be maximum liberty in an ideal society, anarchists are deeply divided over whether this requires a society based on individualism (Stirner) or collectivism (Proudhon, Kropotkin, Bakunin).	We can conclude that the deep divisions between anarchists over individualism or collectivism mean that they do not have a common view of an ideal society.
The key divisions is between individualists and collectivists over the individual and liberty.	Individualists (Stirner) are concerned that the individual will be made a slave to the collective whilst collectivists believe individuals are only free in an ideal society through collective work.	We can form a judgement that the different views anarchists hold towards the importance of the individual and liberty mean that they do not have a common view of an ideal society.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>4(a) To what extent is ecologism a clear rejection of anthropocentrism?</b>		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
Deep ecologists and social ecologists reject anthropocentrism in all its forms.	Deep ecologists (Leopold) and social ecologists (Bookchin) reject anthropocentrism in all its forms.	We can form a judgement that deep ecologism and social ecologism is a clear rejection of anthropocentrism.
All ecologists reject the view that anthropocentric view associated with mainstream ideologies.	Ecologists reject the anthropocentric view that man is outside of and above nature.	We can conclude there is a clear rejection of anthropocentrism associated with mainstream ideas.

All ecologists reject the anthropocentric view that nature is simply a commodity that humanity can exploit for its own purposes.	All ecologists reject this view, opposing the mechanical world view and reductionist that underpins this understanding of nature.	We can reach the judgement ecologists reject the view that nature can be exploited by humanity for its own purposes
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Whilst shallow ecologists support enlightened anthropocentrism, this is rejected outright by deep greens.	Shallow greens (Carson) support an enlightened anthropocentric view that humanity is part of nature and steward of nature, this is rejected by deep ecologists who favour and ecocentric view, as expressed in the Land ethic (Leopold).	We can form a judgment that there is clear disagreement between shallow and deep greens over anthropocentrism.
Social ecology rejects both the anthropocentric view and the ecocentric view, putting it at odds with shallow and deep greens.	Social ecology rejects the anthropocentric view as the domination of nature and ecocentrism as half-baked nonsense that is deeply misanthropic in turn favouring the end of relationship of domination between humans in order to discover humanity's true relationship to nature	We can conclude that social ecologists reject the views of both deep and shallow greens.
Deep greens see nature as having value in its own right, independent of humans whilst the enlightened anthropocentrism of shallow greens gives nature instrumental value.	Deep greens reject any form of anthropocentrism which tries to value nature in terms of its use to humanity favouring the view that nature has intrinsic value. This leads to a radical transformation in humanity' relationship to nature whilst shallow green	We can come to the judgement that there is a clear disagreement over how to allocate value to nature.

	thinking's enlightened anthropocentrism is only reformist.	
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

**4(b)** To what extent does ecologism reject existing social structures



<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
All ecologists recognise the need for a change in the existing social structures.	This is based on the Limits to Growth; ecologism argues that the materialism and consumerism will lead to society overshooting the limits to growth leading to ecological destruction.	As such the unbridled consumerism and materialism endemic in society has to end.
All ecologists take a more holistic view of the world.	Ecologists reject the mechanistic world view and reductionism that underpin society's view that nature is a commodity for human exploitation, favouring the lessons of ecology to build a more holistic approach to nature.	Thus many ecologists move to reject the current set of social structures which has created this problem
All ecologists endorse and support sustainability rejecting the case for the unlimited, exponential growth of business as usual.	Ecologists argue that a new societal framework is needed to ensure sustainability so that the biosphere can maintain its health over time.	We can conclude that all ecologists advance and advocate a change in existing social structure to ensure sustainability.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Disagreement amongst ecologists emerges with the degree of change to existing social structures between the deep and shallow sections in ecologism	Deep greens and social ecology argue for radical social change (Leopold, Bookchin) to replace the existing social structures whereas shallow greens believe in a reformist	Hence we can conclude that there is a divide between those who wish for a new social paradigm and those who wish to adapt the existing one.

	approach (Carson) as opposed to the complete overthrow of the existing system.	
Some ecologists see the nature of capitalism as core to reforming the social structure whereas others are less hostile to the removal of capitalism	The attitude to capitalism throws up amongst ecologists different views on social structure, shallow greens who endorse capitalism in different forms (managerial approach and green capitalism) and deep greens and social ecologists (Bookchin) who seek its downfall and replacement.	We can see differences in their approaches to capitalist society.
Deep and social ecology rejects the view that economic growth is compatible with sustainability whilst shallow greens favour smarter, slower growth.	Deep and shallow greens would reject industrialism in favour of strong sustainability (degrowth in the west and steady state economies) whilst shallow greens believe that technology can allow for smarter growth - weak sustainability.	Thus there is no universal view on which is the most appropriate social structure to replace the current model.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
--	--	---

<b>5(a) To what extent does the state have a key role in securing feminist goals?</b>		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
All feminists recognise that the state does serve some useful purpose for women	Feminists agree that the state protects women's interests to an extent by outlawing discrimination and banning some practices that are harmful to women	Therefore this unifying belief draws the strands together in accepting the useful purpose of the state
Feminists believe that the state could do more to enhance women's position in society.	Feminists agree that the state could be useful by enhancing women's position, showing that an improved role for women is at the heart of all feminism	This is a significant belief and shows agreement within feminism

<p>Socialist and radical feminists agree that the state does not primarily have the interests of women at heart (Rowbotham)</p>	<p>Socialist and radical feminists agree that, although the state serves some useful purpose for women, it is not structured to eradicate patriarchy from society, seeing it instead as providing minimal protection for women while allowing their unequal position to be maintained (Millett)</p>	<p>This clearly shows agreement between two strands of feminism that the state does not serve the interests of women but instead serves patriarchy.</p>
<p><b>Points in disagreement</b></p>		
<p>AO1</p>	<p>AO2</p>	<p>AO3</p>
<p>Liberal feminists believe that the state can play a role in promoting female emancipation which sets them at odds with other feminists,</p>	<p>Liberal feminists believe the state is key to female emancipation, whereas radical feminists believe that the state creating an equal, legal framework is insufficient to remove patriarchy (Millett). Postmodern feminism argues that the state ignores women of colour (bell hooks)</p>	<p>This shows that there are clear differences between liberal and radical feminists over the role of the state in society, which does not seem to lend itself to any likely agreement in the future.</p>
<p>Radical feminists disagree with socialist feminists over the state, arguing that it is patriarchal at its heart</p>	<p>Radical feminists believe that primarily the state promotes patriarchy (Millett), whereas socialist feminists believe it serves capitalism first and then patriarchy (Rowbotham)</p>	<p>Therefore there are clear differences in socialist and radical feminists' views of the primary focus of the state, these differences are fundamental.</p>
<p>Radical feminists disagree with liberal feminists over where the limits are to the role of the state in protecting women</p>	<p>Radical feminists disagree with liberal feminists, believing that the state has a role to play in both public and private spheres by outlawing pornography, ensuring harsher punishment for crimes against women (Millett), whereas liberal feminists believe the state should concern itself only outlawing discrimination in the public sphere.</p>	<p>This shows that this level of disagreement is fundamental and that it is an important distinction between the two about the way they see the role of the state.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

**5(b) To what extent do feminists agree about the nature of the economy in a future society?**

<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Feminists agree that the current economic system discriminates against women in a variety of different ways. (Gilman)	Feminists agree that a future economy must be organised to ensure that women are able to access it on an equal basis to men	We can reach a conclusion that there is widespread agreement among feminists about the nature of the economy in a future society.
Feminists agree that domestic labour is devalued and unpaid and is seen incorrectly as the role of women.	Feminists agree that domestic work is not the responsibility of women and that in a future society women should be able to freely choose work which they find satisfying and financially rewarding.	We can conclude that there is agreement within feminist about women's role in domestic work.
Feminists agree that there are restrictions in women's ability to access well-paid work in comparison to men.	Feminists agree that the economy needs to be organised so women should be motivated and encouraged to access paid economic work in the same way as men. (Gilman)	We can reach a judgement that feminists agree that the economy in a future society will be less exploitative and less hierarchical as it will not be based on patriarchal principles.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Liberal feminists argue that women need equal access and opportunity to the economy whereas radical feminists disagree, arguing that the economy is the embodiment of the patriarchal system	Liberal feminists reject fundamental change to the economy in a future society, arguing for legal and political (rather than economic) equality whereas radical feminists insist upon it.	We can conclude that liberal feminists disagree with other feminists over the form of the economic system in a future society.



which renders women dependent on men		
Socialist feminists argue that patriarchy is promoted by capitalism (Rowbotham) whereas radical feminists (Millet) argue that patriarchy is an independent system of oppression	Socialist feminists (Rowbotham) support the abolition of capitalism in a future society as an essential element of women's liberation whereas radical feminists argue that the abolition of capitalism will not remove patriarchy	We can reach a judgment that the socialist feminist emphasis on the need to abolish capitalism shows that feminists disagree over the nature of the economy in a future society.
Post-modern feminists disagree with both socialist and radical feminists arguing that additional factors like colour, class and religion also affects women's position in the economy (hooks)	Post-modern feminists argue that other forms of feminism focus too narrowly on the experiences of white, middle-class women in the economy, ignoring women of colour and working-class women	We can form a judgement that post-modern feminists disagree with other feminists over the nature of the economy in a future society.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

Level 2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li></ul>
--	--	---

**6(a) To what extent does multiculturalism promote segregated rather than integrated societies?**

**Points in agreement**

AO1	AO2	AO3
Multiculturalism emphasises differences.	Since multiculturalists stress the politics of difference (Taylor) and the politics of identity, rather than on what unites us, they tend to promote segregated rather than integrated societies.	We can therefore form a judgement that multiculturalism promotes segregated societies.
The multiculturalist focus on minority rights undermines integration.	The multiculturalist focus on minority rights (Parekh) promotes segregation within societies, and hostility from the majority community.	We can conclude from this that support for minority rights leads to the promotion of segregated societies.
Conservatives argue that multiculturalism leads to segregation.	Conservatives argue that rather than promoting integration, multiculturalism, in practice, leads to more segregated societies as it rejects the need for assimilation.	We can reach a judgment that the rejection of assimilation leads multiculturalism to promote segregated societies.

**Points in disagreement**

AO1	AO2	AO3
Multiculturalists promote integration through recognising difference.	Societies are already fragmented. It is only by recognising and supporting difference that we can create integrated and diverse societies (Modood, Taylor).	We can reach a judgement that multiculturalism's support for difference promotes integrated societies.

Multiculturalism's support for tolerance promotes integration.	It is multiculturalism's support for tolerance that leads to a more integrated society where all cultures feel recognised and valued (Berlin).	We can conclude that multiculturalism's support for tolerance of different cultures promotes integrated societies.
Multiculturalism promotes cross cultural dialogue.	Multiculturalism promoted cross cultural dialogue which promotes tolerance and understanding, creating a common sense of belonging and respect allow different cultures to coexist peacefully and happily.	We can form a judgement that multiculturalism promoted cross cultural dialogue and integrated, multicultural societies.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

<b>6(b) To what extent are multiculturalists more divided than united?</b>		
<b>Points in agreement</b>		
<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
Multiculturalists are divided in their views on tolerance.	Multiculturalists are divided in their views on the limits of tolerance. Liberal multiculturalists do not extend tolerance to practices which are themselves intolerant or oppressive while other multiculturalists support 'deep' diversity (Parekh).	We can form a judgement that the difference in views towards tolerance shows that multiculturalists are more divided than united.
Multiculturalists are divided in their views over diversity.	Shallow diversity, supported by liberal multiculturalists, is supported as it enhances autonomy (Kymlicka) whilst pluralists view diversity as a good in itself (Parekh) and	We can conclude that the different views on diversity shows that multiculturalists are more divided than united.

	cosmopolitans support diversity to allow for the process of hybridisation.	
Multiculturalists are divided over their views on cosmopolitanism.	Cosmopolitan multiculturalists stress hybridity and cultural mixing, as the basis for a global citizenship. Other multiculturalists reject this (Parekh) stressing of unity at the expense of diversity and cultural belonging.	We can reach a judgement that the different views on cosmopolitanism shows that multiculturalists are more divided than united.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Multiculturalists are united in their opposition to assimilation.	Multiculturalists reject assimilation, in favour of the politics of difference (Taylor) and the politics of identity that allows for multicultural integration.	We can form a judgement that since multiculturalists oppose assimilation, they are more united than divided.
Multiculturalists are united in their recognition of difference. They value the politics of recognition, diversity and tolerance.	Multiculturalists support the recognition and celebration of difference and diversity (Taylor), which creates vibrant societies whilst tolerance allows for real dialogue and the development of a common sense of belonging.	We can reach a judgement that multiculturalist support for the recognition of difference shows that they are more united than divided.
Multiculturalists support minority rights	Multiculturalists support minority rights (Kymlicka), and that the state and society must promote ideas and policies that recognise difference (Taylor).	We can conclude that the widespread support for minority rights within multiculturalism.



Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

**7(a) To what extent do nationalists agree on the core ideas and principles of the state?**

**Points in agreement**

AO1	AO2	AO3
Nationalists argue that the state is built around people identifying as a cohesive group, a nation, with shared values .	These shared or common values can have numerous and differing origins – from language to history, culture or values.	The key judgement which we arrive at is that the state is a focal point for nationalism.
Some Nationalists share a common theme for their own state, as an expression of self-determination.	At its most central is the notion that a nation should be self-governing in a state and able to define its own path and destiny (Mazzini)	We reach a conclusion that statehood is a key aim for nations.
Liberal and anti/post-colonial nationalism argue that a peaceful and stable world will be achieved when the boundaries of the nation equate to the boundaries of a state.	This form of internationalism believes that statehood is the right of all nations, and that international stability will result from this.	We can conclude that statehood is at the heart of some forms of nationalism’s outlook for the world

**Points in disagreement**

AO1	AO2	AO3
While some nationalists support the creation of a world of nation-states, others are expansionist in character, rejecting this vision (Maurras)	So, the state can be a realm of freedom for some nationalists and a force of oppression for others.	This shows clear disagreement within nationalism over the purpose of the state.
Some nationalists are rational in their approach to states (Rousseau), others	Liberal nationalists see the state rationally - built on civic nationalism , whereas Conservative nationalists hold a romantic	This shows clear disagreement within nationalism about the state.

<p>base their belief in a state on a more mystical and emotional basis (Herder)</p>	<p>view of the state to protect the nation and its culture</p>	
<p>Some nationalists base their appeal to create the state on an inclusive basis, others seek to create a state on an exclusive basis for example, on the mistaken notion of racial superiority</p>	<p>Expansionist nationalism is highly exclusive and seeks to use the might and power of the state in an oppressive way whereas Liberal and anti/post-colonial nationalists seek to use the state to create and enhance freedom</p>	<p>We can conclude that nationalists use the state in very different ways.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li><li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li><li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li></ul>
---------	-------	--

**7(b)** To what extent is nationalism expansionist?

<b>Points in agreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Some forms of nationalism are expansionist.	Chauvinistic nationalists are expansionist believing their nation to be superior to other nations (Maurras).	Hence we can conclude that nationalism does have an expansionist character in part.
Expansionist nationalism denies the right of other nationalists to sovereignty and independence (Maurras).	Expansionist nationalism leads to conflict, war and even imperialism and is highly militaristic.	We can conclude that this form of nationalism denies free will and choice of others, placing their nation as superior.
Expansionist forms of nationalism are based on a highly exclusive form of nationalism, with some variants based on racialism.	Expansionist, chauvinistic nationalism seeks to define a nation on exclusive terms, and sees the people as fully subservient to the state. Racialism can place states into a competition with each other in a war of survival.	This form of nationalism is expansionist as part of their exclusive approach.
<b>Points in disagreement</b>		
AO1	AO2	AO3
Expansionism is not a feature shared by most nationalists. Liberal, Anti/post-colonial and Conservative nationalism do not have expansionist tendencies.	Most forms of nationalism are committed to the notion of self-determination, believing that nations have the right to rule themselves (Mazzini).	We can conclude that nationalism is not expansionist in the vast majority of occasions.

Liberal and anti/post-colonial nationalism echo the ideas of liberal values of freedom and self-determination, and reject expansionism (Rousseau)	Anti/post-colonial nationalism seeks to free itself from colonial, expansionist nationalism with self-rule established (Garvey).	We can conclude that these forms of nationalism are fundamentally opposed to expansionism at their very core
Conservative nationalism, while more exclusive and backward looking than Liberal and anti/post-colonial nationalism, has at its core root the desire to forge a cohesive and united society and is not expansionist.	Conservative nationalism tends to value cultural homogeneity within the nation (Herder) but is not concerned with other nations; it is more a preservation of its own nation.	We can form a judgement that although Conservative nationalism can be exclusive, it is not expansionist.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom