



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2015**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 2

Political Power and Political Ideas

[AQ221]

MONDAY 1 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

These mark schemes are intended to ensure that the AS/A2 examinations are marked consistently and fairly. The mark schemes provide examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidate responses likely to be worthy of credit. They also set out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses. The mark scheme should be read in conjunction with these general marking instructions which apply to all papers.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners will be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of 17- and 18-year-olds, which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their AS/A2 examinations.

Flexibility in marking

The mark schemes which accompany the specimen examination papers are not intended to be totally prescriptive. For many questions, there may be a number of equally legitimate responses and different methods by which the candidates may achieve good marks. No mark scheme can cover all the answers which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner for the paper concerned.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for valid responses rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected for 17- and 18-year-old GCE candidates. Conversely, marks should only be awarded for valid responses and not given for an attempt which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark Schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication. These questions are indicated on the cover of the examination paper. Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of Response

Questions requiring extended written answers are marked in terms of levels of response. In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the “best fit” bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement. The following guidance is provided to assist examiners:

Threshold performance: Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.

Intermediate performance: Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.

High performance: Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates’ responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication which is incorporated within the marks awarded for AO3. Where the quality of candidates’ subject knowledge and understanding is not matched by the quality of written communication, marks awarded will not exceed the maximum for Level 4.

Option A: Political Power

AVAILABLE
MARKS

1 Background

The Source represents the Pluralist analysis of political power. In addition to identifying and explaining the significance of pressure and interest groups, candidates should identify and explain two other features of Pluralism. Features that could be referred to include the importance of regular elections; open competition for political power; a state that acts as a neutral 'referee' between competing interests; an independent judiciary; observance of the rule of law; independent media. If there is no reference to relevant evidence/examples a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded. If a candidate fails to make reference to the Source a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 7 marks; AO2: 3 marks)

[10]

10

2 Background

While Pluralists may not be concerned about the decline in party membership, others regard it as evidence of widespread disenchantment with liberal democracy. The mass of the population believe that they are unable to influence the political elite or to shape events. This is one indication of a growing crisis of legitimacy because of the unequal distribution of power in capitalist democracies, as Marxists would see it. Marxists would also reject the rosy view that the mass of the population are able to influence the ruling class through the mechanism of pressure and interest groups. Trade Unions are among the biggest groups but have been politically sidelined over the past twenty years. Feminists would criticise the Pluralist analysis for being blind to the continuation of patriarchy throughout society. If there is no reference to the Source a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If there is reference to no evidence/examples a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If there is no reference to any other theory of power a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Any other relevant criticisms of Pluralism will be accepted.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Pluralist analysis of power and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 2 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Pluralist analysis of power but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information,

arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Pluralist analysis of power but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 4 marks; AO3: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Pluralist analysis of power and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Pluralist analysis of power and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[15]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

15

3 (a) Background

One of the defining characteristics of the state is that it claims the right to use coercive power. The process converting “might into right and obedience into duty” is the process of legitimation. A state may have ‘might’, in the form of coercive power, but it needs to gain the acceptance of the population of its ‘right’ to rule if it is to be legitimate. In the same vein, a state may force citizens to obey but its position will be more secure if it can gain obedience from a sense of duty. A state that continually relies upon a high level of might and obedience is unlikely to survive in the long term. The consistent use of coercive power leads to resistance. The population become accustomed to force and ever greater levels of coercion have to be used. Coercive power is expensive and acts as a drain on resources. Coercive regimes may also find themselves isolated and this may contribute to their demise.

On the other hand, there is much evidence of coercive states surviving for very long periods of time. The simple proposition that they are doomed to fail is not supported by all the evidence, as the examples of Libya, Saudi Arabia and the former Soviet Union demonstrate.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue of the limitations of coercion and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence. An answer that makes no reference to relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that only refers to one political system can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 4 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of coercive power and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of coercive power but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([15]–[21])**AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 6 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of coercive power but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([22]–[28])**AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 16 marks; AO3: 8 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of coercive power and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([29]–[35])**AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 19 marks; AO3: 11 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the strengths and limitations of coercive power and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3). [35]

35

3 (b) Background

The evidence that there is a direct relationship between the level of affluence of a society and the degree of legitimacy of the state is very compelling. The world's wealthiest nations would appear to be the most stable. The reason most frequently put forward for this is that, when the state is able to provide for the economic and social needs of the population, the people are likely to regard it as legitimate. By contrast, in poor countries the state struggles to provide jobs, education, health and welfare services. In such circumstances there is little reason for the people to support the political institutions, leading to regular crises of legitimacy.

Critics would argue that this analysis is too simplistic. It is not the level of wealth in a country but how wealth is distributed. It is when the population see the distribution as unfair or corrupt that they are likely to withhold their support. This can occur just as much in wealthy countries as poor ones. Nigeria derives enormous wealth from oil production but still remains a very volatile society, due to religious and ethnic divisions.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the theories and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed theoretical knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence.

An answer that makes no reference to relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that only refers to one political system can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 4 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the link between societal affluence and legitimacy and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the link between societal affluence and legitimacy but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 6 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the link between societal affluence and legitimacy but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A

structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 16 marks; AO3: 8 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the link between societal affluence and legitimacy and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 19 marks; AO3: 11 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the link between societal affluence and legitimacy and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[35]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

Option B: Political Ideas

AVAILABLE
MARKS

1 Background

The view expressed in the Source is the Conservative perspective. The evidence for this in the Source is the essentially pessimistic view of human beings that makes any possible social utopia an impossibility. In addition to the identification and explanation of this feature, candidates should identify and explain two other relevant features of Conservative thinking. If there is no reference to relevant evidence/examples a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded. If a candidate fails to make reference to the Source a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 7 marks; AO2: 3 marks)

[10]

10

2 Background

Critics of the Conservative pessimistic view of human nature would include the idealistic and utopian Socialists and Liberals implied in the Source. These critics would argue that this pessimism is used by Conservatives to create an ideology that stresses the importance of social inequality, strong law and order and aristocracy. These core Conservative ideas are all predicated on the assertion that the vast mass of the population are, at best, ignorant and, at worst, just bad. Candidates should seek to criticise the Conservative negative view of human beings while also referring to other relevant criticisms of Conservatism. If there is no reference to the Source a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If there is reference to no evidence/examples a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If there is no reference to any other theory of power a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Conservatism and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 2 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Conservatism but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([7]–[9])**AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Conservatism but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([10]–[12])**AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 4 marks; AO3: 4 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Conservatism and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([13]–[15])**AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Conservatism and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[15]

15

3 (a) Background

In the Manifesto, Marx and Engels argued that capitalism is an immensely productive but at the same time unstable system. The dynamics of capitalism are such that capitalism will experience regular cycles of boom and bust. During each of these cycles wealth will become ever more polarised and the misery of the proletariat steadily increased. It is this misery that will drive the proletariat to revolt against the system and against their oppressors. The proletariat would become capitalism's 'gravediggers.'

Marx and Engels found ample justification for this analysis in their lifetimes and their supporters remained true to this view of capitalism. Critics, including those within the socialist tradition, argued that this analysis of capitalism was both outdated and wrong. The capitalism of the 19th century had been replaced with a very different form of social democratic, welfare capitalism. The instability that the Manifesto predicted has largely been eliminated in contemporary capitalism. The result is that inequality and unfairness steadily decreased during the 20th century, as did the prospect of socialist revolution.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the bases of the arguments of the Communist Manifesto and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence.

An answer that makes no reference to relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that only refers to one political system can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 4 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Manifesto's view that capitalism will create the means of its own destruction and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the Manifesto's view that capitalism will create the means of its own destruction but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although

communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 6 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the Manifesto's view that capitalism will create the means of its own destruction but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 16 marks; AO3: 8 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Manifesto's view that capitalism will create the means of its own destruction and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 19 marks; AO3: 11 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the Manifesto's view that capitalism will create the means of its own destruction and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3). [35]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

3 (b) Background

Mill witnessed the beginnings of the extension of the franchise that was to culminate in universal suffrage. While in favour of this process, he was at the same time concerned that it might accentuate a danger that he had already noted: the “tyranny of the majority.” By this he meant that the majority in society might impose its will upon a minority, something he deeply disapproved of. In arguing against this potential tyranny, Mill was breaking with the Utilitarian philosophy that had dominated his life. Utilitarians favoured the greatest happiness of the greatest number but Mill feared this principle could be used to persecute a minority. On Liberty is an attempt to warn against and avert this danger.

Critics of Mill argue that Mill’s real concern was for the intellectual elite (of which he was a member) rather than for minority rights generally. He wanted to minimise the power of the state but conservatives would suggest that this is not possible given sinful human nature, something Mill denied. Critics also point out the flaws in Mill’s harm principle arguing, that it could be used to justify majority tyranny.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the bases of the arguments of On Liberty and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence.

An answer that makes no reference to relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that only refers to one political system can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 4 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the tyranny of the majority and the harm principle and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the tyranny of the majority and the harm principle but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although

communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 6 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the tyranny of the majority and the harm principle but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 16 marks; AO3: 8 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the tyranny of the majority and the harm principle and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 19 marks; AO3: 11 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the tyranny of the majority and the harm principle and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[35]

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

60