Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE Politics (9PL0/3B)

Comparative Politics - Global

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2022
Question Paper Log Number P70941A
Publications Code 9PL0_3B_2206_MS

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Guidelines for Question 1(a)

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one criticism cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the similarities of the G7 and G20 and their impact on global politics (but accept any other valid responses):** • G7 is made up of seven of the most advanced and industrialised states in the world whilst G20 is made up of 20 members which includes the G7 members as well as a number of other politically significant and powerful members • G7 was created in the 1970s with the purpose of responding to the economic downturn following the oil crisis which led to inflation and recession whilst the G20 was created in 1999 with a focus on financial stability. • Neither the G7 or G20 have any formal mechanism to impose decisions on member states • Significant protests took place at the G20 Toronto 2010 and numerous G7 summits have led to mass protests • In recent years the G7 has acted on issues such as climate change, poverty and conflict and the G20	**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the similarities of the G7 and G20 and their impact on global politics (but accept any other valid responses):** • The organisations seem similar in that both organisations appear to allow for the dominance of a narrow and similar section of states in global politics who collectively hold a significant proportion of global wealth • The organisations seem similar in that both organisations appear to have a primary focus on management of the global economy to attempt to ensure economic growth and prosperity which included responding to the 2008 economic downturn • The organisations seem similar in that they appear to operate as intergovernmental rather than supranational institutions and are therefore, arguably, similarly ineffective as a consequence • The organisations seem similar in that they have both been criticised by numerous groups including the political left

	has acted in areas such as Covid 19 pandemic and development aid	who consider that they support globalisation and benefit a global elite • The organisations seem similar in that they both appear to have widened their remit from economic to wider issues which also enhances their impact on global politics

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Guidelines for Question 1(b)

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one role/significance cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences in the characteristics and consequences for global order of democratic and autocratic states (but accept any other valid responses) :** • Democracies provide a system of government in which all people are involved in decision making. Autocratic states tend to lack free and competitive elections • Democracies tend to offer the opportunity for change in government whilst opposition tends to be limited in autocratic states • Democracies tend to value and protect clear rights for citizens often protected by entrenched judiciable rights whereas autocratic states often lack protected rights and independent judicial institutions • Democratic states are considered to have more predictable policies based on the will of the general	**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining differences in the characteristics and consequences for global order of democratic and autocratic states (but accept any other valid responses) :** • Democracies and autocratic states tend to differ significantly on levels of popular political participation with lower levels for autocratic states which is important as it suggests they consequently lack similar levels of legitimacy and can cause global tensions • This is important because it can lead to tensions between democracies and autocratic states which can lead to global disorder • The importance of this is that human rights and the operation of the judiciary can become an area of great tension between democratic and autocratic states with consequences for global order

	public. Autocratic states are considered to have less predictable policy • Democracies tend to embrace and support global governance institutions. Autocratic states tend to have a lower level of support for and participation in global governance institutions	• This is important because less predictable policies in autocratic states can make it difficult for other democratic states to engage effectively and may leave them wary of the intentions of autocratic states, it can enhance the likelihood of war as explained in the Fukuyama 'end of history' thesis which suggests that democracies are less likely to engage in conflict • This is significant because the success of global governance institutions is to an extent dependant on the level of engagement from states and their support for international laws and customs

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Level 2	4-6	• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Section B

Guidelines for Question 2

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of Global comparative theories and relevant core politics ideas (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one point cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 4

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
2	**Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences that exist between realists and liberals in the ways they view human nature and power (but accept any other valid responses) :** • Realists are pessimistic about human nature whereas liberals are more optimistic • Liberals believe that cooperative human nature has allowed for the growth of international cooperative institutions whereas realists believe that human nature is reflected in absolute state dominance in global politics • Realists believe that the nature of government reflects the nature of human beings who are greedy, grasping and self-interested whereas liberals are more optimistic about the likelihood of cooperation between rational governments based on rational decision makers • Liberals believe in complex interdependence as an alternative to pure power politics whereas realists believe in zero sum theory that states are power maximisers, set to take advantage of other states where possible • Realists believe that survival is based on maximising hard power whereas liberals believe in the value of soft power.	**Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) to examine the differences that exist between realists and liberals in the ways they view human nature and power (but accept any other valid responses) :** • This is significant because war is considered inevitable between selfish states reflecting human nature according to realists but liberals are more optimistic about peace based on a positive view of human nature • The importance of this difference is that state dominance would increase the likelihood of war and conflict in global politics whereas international institutions are considered to increase the likelihood of peace, harmony and cooperation • This has consequences for the likelihood of cooperation in many areas of concern such as tackling climate change, poverty, nuclear proliferation and human rights protection • Consequently realists believe that cooperation for power and influence is inevitable between states whereas liberals are more likely to believe that links between states are likely to grow and reduce tensions for the benefit of all • This is important because a realist focus on hard power is likely to lead to arms race with associated expenditure and escalation whereas liberals would see a lessening in the significance of military strength as time passes and an increase in consensus and persuasion

	Synoptic Content -Candidates may refer to the following when analysing core political ideas:	
	Conservatism core ideas and principles and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy	Hobbes-and the consequences of this for the state system and for likelihood of cooperation, his negative view of human nature and the dangers to civil society and likelihood of conflict
	Socialism core ideas and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy.	Greater optimism on human nature linked to the natural relationship among humans being cooperation and work for the common good – Marx - which makes the idea of a global society order and cooperation likely.
	Liberalism core ideas and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy.	Emphasis on the benefits of mutual cooperation and order and avoidance of war from both an economic and practical position – Locke.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Question
AO1 (10 marks) Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)
AO2 (10 marks) Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question
AO3 (10 marks) Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.
Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion. Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2. Other valid responses are acceptable

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(a)	Agreement • The Trump administration imposed a growing number of tariffs on other states, including China, as part of trade war • Euroscepticism has grown in the EU and the UK has completed the process of leaving the European Union in order, many believe, to regain a degree of political sovereignty and abandonment of areas such as the EU Charter of Fundamental Rights. • Regional bodies such as the EU, The African Union and ASEAN were committed to protecting human rights above the sovereign state level through numerous courts and central legislation • Globalisation brought increased awareness of human rights abuses and attempts to create human rights institutions such as the ICC and Special Tribunals	• The significance of this is that it may have signalled a withdrawal by the USA from multilateral cooperation and decision making and could have encouraged other states to consider a similar state centric view whilst simultaneously weakening US moral authority • As regional bodies potentially become smaller and weaker, regionalism and globalisation appear less significant and regional bodies are less able to demand that member states ensure that human rights are protected. • If we see a continued or increased backlash against globalisation and regional bodies then the influence of the courts and legislation connected to these regional bodies will wane • Arguably states have become more willing to criticise the newly	• A focus in the United States on 'America First' policies was a sign of movement away from globalisation to state self- interest which inevitably encouraged states to follow suite, focus on sovereignty and which allowed human rights violations to go unchallenged in other parts of the world • Sovereign states who appear to have withdrawn, to an extent, from regional bodies and globalisation are perceived to have more sovereign decision making power and a greater ability to ignore regional body human rights protection which suggests that human rights will inevitable be weakened. • Reduced influence for the courts associated with regional bodies and for the legislation connected to these regional bodies will inevitably signal a shift towards state centric decision making and an erosion of

		created global and regional human rights bodies with the ICC in particular, subject to a great deal of criticism from states who feel that it threatened their sovereignty and values as did the Special Tribunals	the rights and protection which these bodies had developed over time as seen with the Covid 19 restrictions imposed by sovereign states • Consequently states feel increasingly confident in rejecting universalism in human rights and so-called global courts which they feel infringe on their sovereignty such as the US with Guantanamo Bay or Burma with the plight of the Rohingya people the UK with the ECHR ruling on prisoner votes and this inevitably hinders the promotion of human rights
	Disagreement • Globalisation has absolutely transformed the world since the late 1980s with a continued growth in interconnectedness and number of regional bodies • Even if certain forms of globalisation, such as economic, may decline, other forms such as cultural globalisation would continue with shared customs and values including universal human rights, the Declaration of Human rights and the ICC and tribunals • Cultural, globalisation brought us concepts such as the CNN effect and development of the idea of soft power reputation and influence	• States and people continue to see the value in this process and the Trump move to trade war and Brexit are outliers in the process of globalisation which continues with more and more states wishing to join larger and larger trade blocs • This is important because these long standing institutions are unlikely to lose influence and support given that they are embedded and have gained greater authority • The CNN effect and development of soft power reputation and status appear to be entrenched concepts in global politics whether globalisation was to	• The continued integration of the EU and other regional bodies with human rights protection and concerns suggests that sovereignty and human rights abuse are lessening characteristics of our global system • It would take more than a temporary blip or trend away from globalisation to reverse the authority of these institutions and the embedded promotion and protection that they provide for human rights • Whilst the CNN effect (awareness and global response to human rights abuses), exists and states remain concerned about their soft power

	• States like the UK are integrated into the global community in numerous different ways and at many levels whether they are members of a regional body or not via bodies such as the UN Security Council, UN Human Rights Council and European Court of Human Rights and there are already pressures on the UK, following EU withdrawal, to reverse the Brexit process with the UK being forced to give concessions on issues relating to sovereignty and human rights autonomy	decline or not and regardless of how states feel about state sovereignty • A move away from certain aspects of globalisation and regionalism would still leave states like the UK heavily integrated through and committed to human rights protection via these other organisations	status, human rights will continue to be offered a degree of protection in global politics • States are so heavily integrated in the process of complex interdependence that state sovereignty cannot realistically become more emphasised and the promotion of human rights cannot become weakened

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).

		• Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(b)	Support for the view • Historically the economically developed states including the USA and UK are responsible for the largest share of carbon emissions which allowed for their growth and development • Per capita emissions rates of many economically developing states is a tiny fraction of developed states, particularly when production for overseas consumerism is taken into account • Despite promises of economic support made in conferences such as Copenhagen and Paris, very little money has been provided to help economically developing states adjust to reductions in carbon pollution • There are significant economic inequalities within states, even within the economically more developed world where wealth may not be shared by all in society	• The significance is that, because of historic responsibility, the economically developing world believe that the economically developed world should shoulder the burden of action to counter environmental degradation • This is significant because economically developing states believe that CO2 measurement should be per capita rather than overall which often reduces their current responsibility • This is important because developing states have argued that developed states have a duty to provide economic support to developing states as recognised in the 'Common but differentiated responsibility' idea • This is important because not all citizens within states will feel that they are able or willing to take the suggested action required to make progress on climate change	• In conclusion, disagreements over responsibility between the economically developed and developing worlds is inevitably a major barrier to progress • Consequently, economically developing states argue that responsibility for mitigation should lay with states who have higher per capita emissions in the economically developed world • Consequently, economically developing states may consider that they are not being fairly supported by those states who have historic responsibility for emissions and therefore economic inequalities remain a barrier to progress • Consequently, citizens within states will not act as required and economic inequalities will remain a major obstacle to tackling climate change

	Support against the view • China is a rapidly developing state and has been one of the economically fastest growing and wealthiest in world with emissions levels above that of the economically developed states • Agreements made in international conferences tend to be rather vague with long term commitments such as the 1997 Kyoto targets which were set, at the time, for 2012. • The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change are intergovernmental advisory bodies • There is significant disagreement between states involved in climate meetings and discussions over the severity of climate change and whether it can be tackled by adaptation or mitigation strategies with Donald Trump rejecting the Paris agreement on one hand and the EU committed to meaningful cuts without significant use of carbon trading and sinks	• This is important because Chinese emissions now exceed those of the states who were historically responsible for carbon emissions who feel they have every right to expect China and other developing states to cut their emissions • This is important as it seems to reflect a desire by all states for continued economic growth and development and their focus on protecting their economic interests in political institutions • The importance of this is that the Intergovernmental bodies lack the ability to enforce actions on states to make them adhere to commitments made in conferences which would be possible if they were supranational institutions • This is important because states response to climate change remains subject to the actions of changing leaders, lobby groups and differing perspectives within different states	• Consequently there is opposition to significant mitigation by many developed states in political institutions when they reflect on current carbon emissions in China and other parts of the developing world, believing these states should do more • Political institutions allowing for vague, long term commitments, allowing for continued economic growth, suggests that it is the failure of political institutions that leads to a slow rate of progress over climate change • The inability of the IPCC and UNFCCC to do any more than produce reports for states and encourage them to come together to bring about meaningful commitments suggests that it is the weakness of political institutions that is the cause of slow progress over climate change • Consequently it is challenging for states to consistently find the common ground that is required to make more rapid progress over climate change through effective political institution actions

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.

Level 1	1–6	• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

		• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(c)	Agreement • Regional bodies have been involved in a wide range of contemporary global issues which include conflict, poverty, human rights and the environment • Some regional bodies are represented in key decision making bodies such as the EU which is a WTO member and which attends and negotiates at the G7 and G20 in relation to issues such as the economic downturn in 2008 • The African Union is committed to providing for peace and security and stability on the continent and has deployed forces in Darfur, Somalia, Congo and Burundi as well as elsewhere and is committed to creating a permanent standby force • The European Union has developed a Charter of Fundamental Rights, has funded the International Criminal Court and has led in other areas of human rights development and protection	• This is important because it illustrates the wide reach of regional bodies which contrasts with the IMF, W Bank and WTO which are solely involved in economic issues • This is important because it shows that the EU is authorised to make decisions for all member states in key bodies over global issues which include environmental agreements, trade and in areas such as sanctions against Russia etc • This is important because it shows that regional forces are increasingly willing and able to act in areas of contemporary global issues where the IMF,W Bank and WTO have no remit • This is important because it demonstrates that EU and other regional bodies are widening the areas of involvement in contemporary global issues and have even replaced	• Involvement in a wide range of contemporary global issues would consequently suggest that regional bodies have a more significant impact on contemporary global issues than the focus limited IMF, W Bank and WTO • In conclusion, the wide range of areas that the EU has decision making powers in would suggest that it, as an example of a regional body, has had a significant impact on contemporary global issues beyond the scope of the IMF,W Bank and WTO • In conclusion, the trend in some regional bodies towards development of a military voice and ability is clear evidence that regional bodies are committed to impacting on contemporary global issues over

		state leadership in some key global issues such as human rights and judicial matters	and above their traditional focus on the economic • In conclusion, increased participation and even leadership by regional bodies in areas of growing global concern makes clear that they are now central players in contemporary global issues
	Disagreement • The IMF, W Bank and the forerunner to the WTO were formed towards the close of WW2, bring economic stability to the global community via advice and economic support and trade management • Economic concerns tend to be the main focus of political leaders and the global population with lending of billions of dollars to individual states worldwide such as Mexico, India, Iceland and Argentina via the IMF and W Bank • The World Bank and IMF provided economic support in response to the 2008 World financial crisis to countries such as Greece, Portugal Ireland and Hungary and in support of states in the extended period of recovery whilst the WTO provided leadership and hosted economic summits to consider plans for recovery • The IMF, W Bank and WTO have been able to intervene to provide economic growth and stability for states affected	• This is important because the IMF, W Bank and WTO have continued and continue to provide advice and economic support today by providing a transparency between states on economic policies as well as loans and opportunities for economic growth • This is important because, although regional bodies do sometimes have an economic focus, normally providing for free trade in a single geographical area, they are unable to coordinate economic growth and support at a global level for such a variety of states • This is important because, arguably the 2008 Global Financial crisis was the most significant global issue of recent years and the IMF, W Bank and WTO were central in helping to prop up and support states during the period of recovery which has followed • This is important because it demonstrates how the IMF, W Bank	• In conclusion, the fact that these organisations have been long running and continue to be at the core of economic issues between states, demonstrates that they are vital and that they do have and continue to have a huge impact on contemporary global issues and specifically on the issue that states appear to value highly ie economic growth and prosperity • In conclusion, the IMF, W Bank and WTO are best able to provide for the key area of economic prosperity in global politics and to tackle contemporary global issues globally in this central area of state focus in a way that regional bodies would struggle to match • Without the financial support and advice which the IMF, W Bank and WTO provided during the 2008 crisis

	by numerous contemporary global issues including natural disasters, war and Covid 19 as well as providing aid for climate change adaptation and the Clean Air Initiative	and WTO may have an economic focus but their actions impact beyond the economic and in a wide array of contemporary and particularly, global, issues	and beyond, the global situation could have been far more significant which shows just how crucial the IMF and W Bank are in impacting on contemporary global issues • Economic support and guidance in a growing number of associated areas at a global level shows that the work and the actions of the IMF, W Bank and WTO have an impact beyond the regional and across a wider range of areas than the purely economic which demonstrates how they impact significantly on contemporary global issues

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).

Level 2	7–12	• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).