

# Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2011

GCE Government & Politics 6GP04 4D  
Global Political Issues

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/>

You can also telephone 0844 372 2185 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

June 2011

Publications Code UA028104

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

## 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>1</b>	<b>Why are 'asymmetrical wars', such as those in Iraq and Afghanistan, so difficult to win?</b>
<b>Indicative content</b>	
<p>Asymmetrical wars are wars fought between radically unequal parties. This certainly applies in relation to the party's level of economic and technological development, but also applies in relation to their relative military capabilities. Examples include the Vietnam War, the Iraq War and war in Afghanistan.</p> <p>It is difficult for developed states to win asymmetrical wars for a number of reasons, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developed states are often prevented by diplomatic pressures and global public opinion from using some of the more devastating weapons in their armoury. This particularly applies to 'unusable' nuclear weapons.</li> <li>• Relatively weak states and forces have developed strategies that are appropriate to their limited resources and are very difficult for developed powers to counter. These include guerrilla tactics, the use of popular insurrection and various forms of terrorism.</li> <li>• Insurrectionary wars are particularly difficult to resolve because the mass of the population often support, explicitly or implicitly, insurrectionary forces. Victory can therefore only be achieved by winning 'hearts and minds', not by military means alone.</li> </ul> <p>The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to analyse and explain why the resolution of asymmetrical wars does not follow a simple economic and military logic.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

2	<b>What is humanitarian intervention, and why did it increase during the 1990s?</b>
<b>Indicative content</b>	
<p>Humanitarian intervention is military intervention that is carried out in pursuit of humanitarian rather than strategic objectives. It is sometimes called humanitarian military intervention.</p> <p>The growth in humanitarian intervention in the 1990s reflected various developments, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The end of the Cold War and the fall of the Soviet Union led to greater agreement on the UN Security Council over issues of humanitarian intervention.</li><li>• The growth in humanitarian intervention reflected the wider acceptance of universalist doctrines such as human rights.</li><li>• The trend towards humanitarian intervention followed from the fact that democratic support for warfare can increasingly be mobilised only on the basis of a moral cause.</li><li>• Humanitarian interventions occurred in part through an increase in civil wars and state collapse which stemmed from developments such as an increase in ethnic consciousness and the collapse of communism.</li><li>• An awareness of human rights issues as a consequence of globalisation.</li></ul> <p>The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The ability to analyse and explain the factors leading to the increased use of humanitarian intervention during the 1990s.</li></ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>3</b>	<b>How and why have strictly economic conceptions of development been criticised?</b>
<b>Indicative content</b>	
<p>Concepts of development can be linked not only to economic measurement but to other measurements. Development is often measured in terms of changes in gross national product (GNP) per capita and comparative GNPs between countries. A country can be said to be developing if its GNP is increasing. The World Bank has conventionally used the standard of 'a dollar a day' as a measure of gross under-development or absolute poverty.</p> <p>However, there are problems with measuring development in purely economic terms. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GNP per capital fails to indicate whether wealth disparity in a country is increasing or decreasing. In short, GNP per capita may only arise because the rich are getting richer.</li> <li>• Economic measures of development fail to take account of the level of political freedom and protection for civil liberties. Economic well-being may increase while citizens are politically oppressed.</li> <li>• GNP per capita does not demonstrate whether people's basic needs are being met. From this perspective, poverty and development are better understood in terms of 'human development', which takes account of people's access to education, levels of gender equality and so forth. Development is thus defined in terms of capacity and freedom.</li> </ul> <p>The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ability to analyse and explain the limitations of a purely economic definition of development.</li> </ul>	



LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>4</b>	Distinguish between the competing views of reformists and radicals over tackling global environmental issues.
----------	---

**Indicative content**

Reformist thinking on environmental issues is evident in the views of mainstream politicians and political parties, sometimes seen as 'light' greens or 'modernist' ecologists. Reformist approaches to global environmental issues have a number of features. These include the following:

- Industrial capitalism is broadly accepted, in the belief that environmental issues can be adequately dealt with without significant constraints being applied to the capitalist market.
- An emphasis is placed on the idea of sustainable development, which recognises that economic growth is good but merely requires that it be balanced against ecological considerations.
- Environmental degradation can be tackled without a major increase in government intervention at national or global levels; indeed, this may be achieved largely through technological innovations and the responsiveness of capitalism to environmental concerns.

Radical thinking on the environment stems from the views of environmental NGOs and activist pressure groups. Radical approaches to the environment have a number of features, including the following:

- Global capitalism is often seen as the primary cause of environmental degradation, in which case a major shift is needed away from free trade and neoliberalism towards tighter regulation at both national and global levels.
- The ability of states to pursue the national interest, prioritising economic growth and national prosperity over wider global concerns, is seen as a major cause of environmental degradation. Radical thinkers therefore tend to call for the establishment of strong and often legal supranational environmental regulation.
- Materialism and consumerism are seen as major contributors to environmental problems, driving economic growth and state egoism. Radical approaches to the environment therefore often call for cultural change as well as political change.

The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:

- The ability to analyse and explain differences between radical and reformist thinking on environmental issues.

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

5	<b>Why has the idea of universal human rights been criticised?</b>
<b>Indicative content</b>	
<p>Human rights are rights to which people are entitled by virtue of being human. Human rights are universal in the sense that they supposedly belong to all humans rather than to members of any particular country, religion, race, gender or other group.</p> <p>The idea of universal human rights has been criticised on a number of grounds. These include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Realists have argued that the doctrine of universal human rights should not guide state policy because states should prioritise the well-being of their own citizens over others, their primary concern being to pursue the national interest.</li><li>• The doctrine of human rights has been criticised as being culturally biased, reflecting an essentially western, liberal model of human nature that emphasises rights and entitlements over obligations and social belonging. Post-colonialism portrays universal human rights as a form of cultural imperialism. Such views have been advanced most clearly by Muslim thinkers who believe that human well-being is divinely ordained, and by some Asian politicians who champion the notion of 'Asian values'.</li></ul> <p>The intellectual skills that relevant to this question are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The ability to analyse and explain criticisms that have been made of the idea of universal human rights.</li></ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

6

**To what extent was the 2009 Copenhagen conference on climate change a success?**

**Indicative content**

The 2009 Copenhagen conference on climate change was called to formulate a successor to the Kyoto Protocol. Views about its success and failure have diverged dramatically, however. The conference has been viewed as a success for a number of reasons, including the following:

- The so-called Copenhagen Accord, through which the USA, China and other major developing countries committed themselves to cutting greenhouse gas emissions marked a significant advance over Kyoto, which imposed no obligations on developing countries to curb the growth of their emissions.
- Similarly, the USA's support for the Copenhagen Accord was an advance in the sense that the USA remained outside the Kyoto Protocol.
- Many argued that Copenhagen was a 'meaningful agreement' in that it was a step on the road to more concerted action on the issue of climate change. It should be judged in terms of preparing the ground for subsequent action, not in terms of its own specific achievements.

However, the Copenhagen conference has widely been considered a failure for a number of reasons. These include the following:

- The conference did not result in a legally binding agreement or any clear commitment to reach one in future.
- The Copenhagen Accord does not set even non-legal targets for states to cut greenhouse gas emissions, and there is no global target for emissions reduction by 2015.
- The Accord is vague as to how the \$100 billion fund for supporting developing countries in reducing emissions will be achieved.
- The Copenhagen conference is widely viewed as having become the victim of both the reluctance of governments generally to take bold action on climate change in the context of a global recession, and of great power politics, with China taking the opportunity to demonstrate its burgeoning influence in the light of the shifting balance of global power.

The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:

- The ability to analyse and explain the decisions and agreements made at the Copenhagen conference.
- The ability to evaluate the effectiveness of the Copenhagen Accord in dealing with the issue of global climate change.

Synopticity in this question refers to the following:

- The ability to recognise rival views about the extent to which Copenhagen marked an advance on Kyoto, reflecting competing positions on its success or failure.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to 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
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak 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>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary



7

**'Globalisation has increased, not reduced, poverty and global inequality'. Discuss.**

### **Indicative content**

Globalisation in its economic form refers to the construction of an interlocking global economy and the declining capacity of states to function as independent economic entities.

The impact of globalisation on poverty and global inequality has been controversial. Globalisation has been seen to increase poverty for a number of reasons. These include the following:

- Globalisation is based on structural inequalities and injustices, notably ones in which 'core' developed states exploit dependent 'peripheral' states that are essentially used to produce primary goods. By its nature, globalisation therefore widens the gap between the North and the South, with sub-Saharan Africa being particularly disadvantaged.
- During the period of accelerated globalisation in the 1980s and 1990s, most evidence suggested a growth in between-country inequality, providing empirical evidence to support the notion that globalisation amounts to a form of neo-colonialism.
- There is evidence that globalisation has promoted widening within-country inequality, both in developed societies and in developing ones.

However, supporters of globalisation argue that it has reduced poverty and global inequality. This has happened for a number of reasons including the following:

- Globalisation stimulates all economies, including those of developing countries because it brings increased entrepreneurialism, inward investment, improved technology and access to foreign markets. Liberals argue that trade and market competition are the primary route to development in all societies.
- Developments in the global South suggest that many societies have benefited from an engagement with globalisation, notably examples include the Asian 'tiger' economies and the dramatic economic emergence of China and India. In such cases, increased growth and prosperity has been closely associated with taking advantage of export opportunities and inward investments that have been provided by globalisation. On the other hand, countries like North Korea, that have remained outside the global economy have suffered from widespread poverty and low growth.

The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:

- The ability to analyse and explain the relationship between globalisation and development.
- The ability to evaluate competing theories about the impact of globalisation on poverty and global inequality.

Synopticity in this question refers to the following:

- The ability to recognise rival pro-globalisation and anti-globalisation viewpoints over the issues of poverty and global equality.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to 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
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak 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>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

<b>8</b>	<b>To what extent is global terrorism a major threat to order and security?</b>
----------	---

**Indicative content**

Terrorism refers to the use of terror for furthering political ends; it seeks to create a climate of fear, apprehension and uncertainty. Global terrorism is terrorism that has a global reach, particularly as demonstrated by the 9/11 attacks on the USA.

The significance of global terrorism as a threat to order and security has been the subject of considerable debate. Those who see it in this light advance a number of arguments, including the following:

- The 9/11 attacks underline the threat of global terrorism because it demonstrates how the world's most powerful state, in military as well as economic terms, can be vulnerable to external attack when it is no longer vulnerable to conventional attacks by rival states.
- These threats are all the greater because of the possibility that terrorist networks may be able to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction, and perhaps even nuclear weapons.
- The threat of global terrorism is so great because it requires few resources and can be carried out by small groups or even lone individuals.
- Increased global flows of peoples, ideas and information also make global terrorism particularly difficult to contain or prevent.
- The USA's 'war on terror' was an appropriate response to the advent of global terrorism, since it recognised that such terrorism has its roots in a transnational ideology that has spread to various parts of the Middle East, North Africa and central Asia.

However, some argue that the threat of global terrorism has been much overstated. This has been for a variety of reasons, including the following:

- Although 3,000 people died in the 9/11 attacks, this is very small by comparison with the scale of death that has occurred as a result of conventional warfare.
- Terrorism, by its nature, consists of a series of sporadic attacks on a variety of targets, and is very different from the concerted, sustained and systematic destruction that is wreaked by mass warfare conducted between states.
- Terrorism, in itself, cannot overthrow a government, unlike revolution and inter-state war.
- Terrorism 'works' only when there is a military overreaction to it that ends up being counter-productive in terms of strengthening support for militant or extremist groups.
- Some argue that the over-reaction to global terrorism through the 'war on terror' has been an attempt to consolidate advanced societies by creating the

image of an external threat in place of the 'communist threat' of old.  
The intellectual skills that are relevant to this question are as follows:

- The ability to analyse and explain the nature and impact of global terrorism.
- The ability to evaluate the extent to which global terrorism threatens order and security.

Synopticity in this question refers to the following:

- The ability to recognise competing viewpoints over the significance of global terrorism, between those who believe it is the primary threat to order and security and those who believe that its significance has been over-stated.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to 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
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak 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>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

## SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

*These grids should be used in conjunction with the fuller Level descriptors.*

### PART A - SHORT QUESTIONS (15 marks)

<b>Level 3</b>	Excellent	15
	Very good	13-14
	Good	11-12
<b>Level 2</b>	Sound	10
	Basic	8-9
	Limited	6-7
<b>Level 1</b>	Weak	4-5
	Poor	2-3
	Very poor	0-1

### PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

<b><i>AO1 / AO2 / Synopticity</i></b>	
<b>Level 3</b> (Good to excellent)	9-12
<b>Level 2</b> (Limited to sound)	5-8
<b>Level 1</b> (Very poor to weak)	0-4

<b><i>AO3</i></b>	
<b>Level 3</b> (good to excellent)	7-9
<b>Level 2</b> (Limited to sound)	4-6
<b>Level 1</b> (Very poor to weak)	0-3

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA028104 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

