

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2010

GCE

## GCE Government & Politics (6GP03) Paper 3B

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Summer 2010  
Publications Code  
UA024034

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

## 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.

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>No. 1</b> | <b>Why has socialism been viewed as a form of class politics?</b> |
|--------------|---|

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

- Socialists have traditionally viewed social class as the deepest and most politically significant of social divisions. A social class is a group of people who share a similar socio-economic position. In the Marxist tradition, class is linked to economic power, as defined by the individual's relationship to the means of production. Social democrats, on the other hand, define social class in terms of income and status differences between non-manual workers (middle class) and manual workers (the working class).
- Socialists use social class as an analytical tool, viewing classes as the principal actors in history and the main source of economic and social change. This is most evident in the Marxist belief that class conflict is the motor of history, capitalist society being doomed because the propertyless proletariat are destined to rise up and overthrow the 'ruling class', the property-owning bourgeoisie.
- All forms of socialism are characterised by the desire to reduce or overthrow class divisions. In the Marxist view, the overthrow of capitalism through a proletarian revolution will lead to the creation of a classless communist society. From a social democratic perspective, socialism is associated with narrowing of divisions between the middle class and the working class brought about through economic and social intervention. This leads to social amelioration and class harmony.

| LEVELS                          | DESCRIPTORS   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(11-15 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul> |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(6-10 marks)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-5 marks)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                       |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>No. 2</b> | <b>How have conservatives justified private property?</b> |
|--------------|---|

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

Traditional conservatives have justified private property in at least three different ways:

- Property has been seen as a source of security in an uncertain and unpredictable world - something to 'fall back on'. Property therefore provides individuals with a source of protection - hence the importance of thrift.
- Property ownership also promotes a range of important social values. Those who possess their own property are more likely to respect the property of others, which means that they will be law-abiding and support authority. Property therefore gives people a 'stake' in society.
- Property can be seen as an extension of an individual's personality. People 'realise' themselves, even see themselves, in what they own. Possessions are not merely external objects, valued because they are useful, but also reflect something of the owner's personality and character.
- However, libertarian conservatives and supporters of the liberal New Right have embraced an essentially liberal view of property as something that is 'earned'. In this view, property represents individual merit (ability and hard work), meaning that property is an absolute right. Such a position contrasts with the traditional conservative belief that property also entails duties.

| LEVELS                          | DESCRIPTORS   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(11-15 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul> |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(6-10 marks)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-5 marks)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> </ul> <p>Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</p>                           |



| No. 3  | Why and how have liberals supported the fragmentation of political power?   |
|--|---|
| Indicative content ( <i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )   |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liberals have supported the fragmentation of political power because of concerns about power itself and, in particular, deep concerns about the implications of concentrated power. In the liberal view, power tends to corrupt because human beings are essentially self-seeking and so are likely to use any position of power to pursue their own interests, probably at the expense of others. The greater the concentration of power, the greater the incentive people have to both benefit themselves and use others to this end. This is why absolute power leads to absolute corruption.</li> <li>• The fragmentation of power has two advantages. In the first place, it ensures that those who exercise power have only a limited ability to influence other citizens, thus preventing absolute power. Second, fragmenting political power creates a network of checks and balances, ensuring that power is a check on power. Fragmented government therefore creates internal constraints that prevent government from becoming a tyranny against the individual.</li> <li>• Liberals have supported fragmented government and checks and balances. Examples include the separation of powers, in which the legislature, executive and judiciary act as both independent and inter-dependent bodies. Other examples include federalism, based on the principle of shared sovereignty, devolution, parliamentary government, cabinet government and so on.</li> </ul> |   |
| LEVELS   | DESCRIPTORS   |
| <p><i>Level 3</i><br/>(11-15 marks)</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul> |
| <p><i>Level 2</i><br/>(6-10 marks)</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                     |
| <p><i>Level 1</i><br/>(0-5 marks)</p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                       |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>No. 4</b> | <b>On what grounds do anarchists believe in the possibility of a stateless society?</b> |
|--------------|---|

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

- Anarchists believe that the state is unnecessary because of their faith in natural order or spontaneous social harmony. This derives from their highly optimistic view of human nature and from their similarly optimistic view of certain social institutions.
- Anarchists believe in the natural goodness, or at least potential goodness, of humankind. From this perspective, statelessness is compatible with order and harmony. This, in effect, turns social contract theory, and its justification for the state, on its head. Collectivist anarchists place a particular stress on the human capacity for sociable and co-operative behaviour. Individualist anarchists, for their part, stress the importance of enlightened human reason.
- Anarchists also paid attention to the capacity of social institutions to maintain order in the absence of the state. These institutions serve anarchists ends by helping to regulate society and encouraging development of positive human attributes rather than negative ones. Collectivist anarchists thus endorse common ownership or mutualist institutions. Individualist anarchists support the market believing in its capacity to maintain unregulated economic equilibrium.

| LEVELS                          | DESCRIPTORS   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(11-15 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul> |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(6-10 marks)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-5 marks)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                       |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| No. 5   | Why did Marx believe that capitalism was doomed to collapse?  |
| Indicative content ( <i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Marx explained the inevitability of capitalism's collapse in terms of his philosophy of history. For Marx, the driving force of historical change was the dialectic, a process of interaction between two opposing forces leading to a further or higher historical stage. Whereas Hegel explained dialectical change in terms of ideas or the 'world spirit', Marx gave dialectic a materialist interpretation. Capitalism is doomed to collapse because of its own internal contradictions. In particular, capitalism embodies its own antithesis, the proletariat, seen by Marx as the 'gravedigger' of capitalism. Conflict between capitalism and the proletariat will therefore lead to a higher stage of development in the establishment of a socialist, and eventually a communist, society.</li> <li>Marx believed that the contradictions of capitalism would come to the surface as the proletariat achieved revolutionary class consciousness, an awareness of the fact of its own exploitation. This would occur as capitalism went through a series of deepening crises, leading to the immiseration of the proletariat. This would result in a proletarian revolution which was destined to overthrow capitalism.</li> </ul> |   |
| LEVELS  | DESCRIPTORS   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(11-15 marks)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul> |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(6-10 marks)  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-5 marks)   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>                       |

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| <b>No. 6</b> | <b>To what extent do conservatives believe in tradition and continuity?</b> |
|--------------|---|

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

- Tradition refers to ideas, practices or institutions that have endured through time and have therefore been inherited from earlier periods. Tradition therefore creates continuity between the past, the present and the future. The issues of tradition and continuity have deeply divided conservatives. Traditional conservatives have placed strong stress on the importance of tradition and continuity, while the New Right, particularly the liberal New Right, has often rejected tradition and continuity.
- Traditional conservatives have extolled the virtues of tradition in a number of ways. For some conservatives, tradition reflects religious faith, being fashioned by God the Creator. Traditional institutions and practices therefore constitute 'natural law'. A more widely held view portrays tradition as the accumulated wisdom of the past. The institutions and practices of the past have been 'tested by time', and should be preserved for the benefit of the living and for generations to come. In this view, society consists of a partnership between the living, those who are dead and those who are to be born. It has also been described as a 'democracy of the dead', reflecting the fact that the dead will always outnumber the living. A third advantage of tradition and continuity is that they help to generate, for both society and the individual, a sense of identity. Established customs and practices are ones that individuals can recognise; they are familiar and reassuring. Tradition thus provides people with a feeling of 'rootedness' and belonging. Such an emphasis on tradition has meant that traditional conservatives have usually venerated established institutions and been at least cautious about change. Change is a journey into the unknown: it creates uncertainty and insecurity.
- The New Right has significantly revised the relationship between conservatism and tradition, however. The New Right attempts to fuse economic libertarianism (the liberal New Right or neoliberalism) with state and social authoritarianism (the conservative New Right or neoconservatism). As such, it is a blend of radical, reactionary and traditional features. Its radicalism is evident in its robust efforts to dismantle or 'roll back' interventionist government and liberal social values. This radicalism is clearest in relation to the liberal New Right, which draws on rational theories and abstract principles, and so dismisses tradition. New Right radicalism is nevertheless reactionary in that both the liberal and conservative New Right hark back to a 19<sup>th</sup> century 'golden age' of supposed economic prosperity and moral fortitude. However, the conservative New Right also makes an appeal to tradition, particularly through its emphasis on so-called 'traditional values'.

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>AO1</b>                     | <b>Knowledge and understanding</b>  |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks) | Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)  | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates       |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)  | Poor knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates               |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>A02</b>   | <b>Intellectual skills</b>   |
| <p>The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to analyse and explain conservative ideas about tradition and continuity</li> <li>• Ability to evaluate the extent to which conservative support tradition and continuity</li> </ul> |  |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)   | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations   |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)  | Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations  |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)  | Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations  |
| <b>A02</b>   | <b>Synoptic skills</b>   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)   | Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)  | Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)  | Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions     |
| <b>A03</b>   | <b>Communication and coherence</b>   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(7-9 marks)  | Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary   |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(4-6 marks)  | Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary  |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-3 marks)  | Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary  |

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| <b>No. 7</b> | <b>‘Anarchism is closer to liberalism than it is to socialism.’<br/>Discuss.</b> |
|--------------|--|

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

- Anarchism can be viewed as a point of overlap between liberalism and socialism, the point at which both ideologies reach anti-statist conclusions. Anarchism therefore has a dual character: it can be interpreted as either a form of ‘ultra-liberalism’ or as a form of ‘ultra-socialism’. However, there is disagreement within anarchism about the relative importance of liberalism and socialism, depending on whether the anarchism in question is based on an extreme form of liberal individualism or an extreme form of socialist collectivism.
- Individualist anarchists reach their conclusions by pushing liberal individualism to its logical extreme. This implies individual sovereignty, the idea that absolute and unlimited authority resides in each human being. From this perspective, any constraint on the individual is evil, especially when it is imposed by a sovereign, compulsory and coercive state. Individualist anarchists also draw on economic liberalism in endorsing market economics as a way of bringing about equilibrium within a stateless society. However, significant differences exist between liberalism and individualist anarchism. First, even classical liberals argue that a minimal state is necessary to prevent self-seeking individuals from abusing one another. Law therefore exists to protect freedom, rather than constrain. Modern liberals take this argument further and defend state intervention on the grounds that it enlarges positive freedom. Second, liberals believe that government power can be ‘tamed’ or controlled by the development of constitutional representative institutions. Liberal-democratic states are therefore not viewed as an offence against the individual.
- Anarchist conclusions can also be reached by pushing socialist collectivism to its limits. In that sense, anarchism shares with socialism a view of human beings as essentially social creatures, emphasizing the importance of sympathy, affection and co-operation. This is reflected in parallels between collectivist anarchism and Marxism, which both look to the construction of a stateless society, albeit achieved through different means. Nevertheless, anarchism and socialism diverge at a number of points, for example, Marxists have called for a revolutionary ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’, in effect, a temporary proletarian state that will protect the gains of the revolution. This clashes with the anarchist belief that all states are evil and oppressive. Similarly, anarchism differs from democratic socialism, in that the latter uses the state to reform or ‘humanise’ the capitalist system and to bring about greater equality and social justice.

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>AO1</b>                     | <b>Knowledge and understanding</b>  |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks) | Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)  | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates       |
| <i>Level 1</i>                 | Poor knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes,   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| (0-4 marks)   | political concepts, theories or debates  |
| <b>A02</b>  | <b>Intellectual skills</b>   |
| <p>The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to analyse and explain the relationship between anarchism and liberalism and socialism</li> <li>• Ability to evaluate the extent of the relationship with liberalism and socialism</li> </ul> |  |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)  | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations   |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)   | Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations  |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)   | Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations  |
| <b>A02</b>  | <b>Synoptic skills</b>   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)  | Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)   | Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)   | Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions     |
| <b>A03</b>  | <b>Communication and coherence</b>   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(7-9 marks)   | Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary   |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(4-6 marks)   | Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary  |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-3 marks)   | Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary  |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| No. 8   | To what extent do liberals support the principle of equality?   |
| Indicative content ( <i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )  |   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship between liberalism and equality has been a matter of deep debate. Liberals themselves have placed considerable stress on equality, while their critics, particularly socialists, portray liberalism as essentially inegalitarian. Much of this debate is about the importance of different forms of equality.</li> <li>• The egalitarian credentials of liberalism are based upon a strong belief in foundational and formal equality. Liberals believe that people are ‘born’ equal in the sense that they are of equal moral worth. Foundational equality implies a belief in formal equality, the idea that individuals should enjoy the same formal status in society, particularly in terms of the distribution of rights and entitlements. The most important forms of formal equality are legal and political equality, ensured by ‘equality before the law’ and a system of one person, one vote at election time. In addition, liberals believe in equality of opportunity, the idea that each person should have the same chance to rise or fall in society. The game of life must thus be played on an even playing field.</li> <li>• However, there is disagreement within liberalism about the implications of equality of opportunity. Classical liberals believe that a free-market economy guarantees equality of opportunity, also believing that there are benefits in the resulting social inequality. In particular, unlike individuals who should be rewarded differently and significant levels of social inequality act as an economic incentive, ultimately bringing benefit to all. Modern liberals, on the other hand, favour intervention, through welfare and redistribution, to narrow social inequalities, thereby linking equality of opportunity to a greater measure of equality of outcome. For Rawls, social inequality was only justified if it worked to the advantage of the least well-off.</li> <li>• Liberalism has been criticised by socialists, who believe that it is inadequately committed to equality. The socialist critique of the liberal view of equality emphasises that a commitment to foundational and formal equality is hollow if individuals enjoy very different social circumstances and therefore life chances. Similarly, socialists have criticised the doctrine of equality of opportunity on the grounds that it is used to legitimise sometimes wide social inequalities.</li> </ul> |   |
| A01   | Knowledge and understanding   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)  | Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)   | Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates       |
| <i>Level 1</i>  | Poor knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes,   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| (0-4 marks)   | political concepts, theories or debates  |
| <b>A02</b>  | <b>Intellectual skills</b>   |
| <p>The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to analyse and explain liberal ideas on equality</li> <li>• Ability to evaluate the extent to which liberalism embraces equality</li> </ul> |  |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)  | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations   |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)   | Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations  |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)   | Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations  |
| <b>A02</b>  | <b>Synoptic skills</b>   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(9-12 marks)  | Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(5-8 marks)   | Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions     |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-4 marks)   | Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions     |
| <b>A03</b>  | <b>Communication and coherence</b>   |
| <i>Level 3</i><br>(7-9 marks)   | Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary   |
| <i>Level 2</i><br>(4-6 marks)   | Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary  |
| <i>Level 1</i><br>(0-3 marks)   | Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary  |

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA024034  
Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750  
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH