



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2012

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 2

Political Power/Political Ideas

[AQ221]

FRIDAY 27 JANUARY, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

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

Quality of candidates' responses

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

Flexibility in marking

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

Positive marking

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

Types of mark schemes

Mark Schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication. These questions are indicated on the cover of the examination paper.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

Quality of Written Communication

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

Option A: Political Power

1 Background

The Source represents the Pluralist analysis of the nature and distribution of power. One feature of this theory is the view that many societies have experienced a democratisation process that has resulted in the dispersal of power to the masses. Candidates may also refer to the idea that the state is a neutral arbiter between competing interests; that no interest dominates decision making; that human rights and democratic freedoms are core features of modern liberal democracies; any other relevant feature. If no reference to the feature in the Source, a maximum of [8] may be awarded.

(AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 3 marks)

[10]

10

2 Background

Critics of Pluralism would question the belief that liberal democracies have been democratised. Marxists would assert that the continuing concentration of wealth ensures that the mass of the population remains powerless. Elite Theorists argue that the sort of democratic diffusion of power referred to in the Source is an illusory dream that conceals the inevitability of elite rule. The Pluralist notion of the neutral state is rejected by Marxists who see the state as operating in the interests of the capitalist ruling class. Feminists would challenge the Pluralist analysis for its failure to recognise the patriarchal nature of society and of power. If no reference is made to the Source, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If no reference is made to any evidence a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If only one criticism is made a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

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

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

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of criticisms of Pluralist ideas but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The

quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

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

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

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

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

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

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

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

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

[15]

15

3 (a) Background

It is feminists who assert that all political systems are patriarchal. By this they mean that they are dominated by men and act largely in the interests of men. Feminists can point to a wealth of evidence to support this conclusion: the make-up of parliaments, of governments, of senior ranks of the state institutions. It is argued by Feminists that men use their control over power to maintain their dominance and to preserve the subordination and oppression of women.

Critics of the Feminist view would argue that they are guilty of ignoring the gender revolution that is underway in many political systems; that Feminism is a conspiracy theory; that female inequality owes something to the decisions and actions of women themselves.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence. If there is no reference to any evidence a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If an answer is very unbalanced and contains no evaluation, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

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

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

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[35]

35

(b) Background

One reason why states collapse is that they have lost legitimacy as far as the population is concerned. The people no longer give their willing support to the state because it has failed to deliver on the contract that the ruled make with the rulers – to provide security, prosperity, jobs, education and other services. The loss of legitimacy may lead to a popular uprising such as occurred throughout the Soviet world after 1989. It could also lead to the intervention by the military in their role as “guardians of the nation.” The latter has occurred repeatedly in Pakistan and Argentina and results in the collapse of the civilian state. States may also collapse when ethnic, religious or political divisions within society erupt into conflict. A section of society can demand autonomy leading to conflict and state collapse. This was the case with the former Yugoslavia. Contemporary Sudan is a society torn apart by ethnic division, although the state has survived. Authoritarian states may collapse under the pressure of demands for change from populations seeking democratic freedom and human rights. Or states may, as in the case of Iraq, be overthrown by external forces. Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the reasons why states may collapse and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display more detailed knowledge and offer a broad range of evidence. If there is no reference to any evidence a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If an answer is very unbalanced and contains no evaluation, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

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

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

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[35]

35

Option B: Political Ideas

1 Background

The view expressed in the Source is the conservative perspective. The evidence for this in the Source is the argument that a strong state with an effective leadership is an essential requirement if political stability is to be achieved. In addition to the identification and explanation of this feature, candidates should identify and explain two other features.

(AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 3 marks)

[10]

10

2 Background

Critics of Conservatism would challenge the idea in the Source that a strong state is an essential requirement of a stable and successful political system. Liberals would argue that the state threatens individual liberty and its powers should always be kept to a minimum to prevent the abuse of freedom. Rather than needing guidance by leaders, individuals are rational beings capable of taking their own decisions. Marxists would regard Conservative support for a strong state as an attempt to legitimise the oppression of the masses by a ruling class. The argument for leadership is an attempt to justify the exclusion of the working class from political power.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

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

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

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[15]

15

3 (a) Background

Central to the criticism of capitalism advanced in the Manifesto is the argument that it is an unequal, unfair and exploitive system. The Proletariat, the vast majority of the population, were ruthlessly exploited and abused by the Ruling Class. The logic and dynamics of capitalism were such that this exploitation and the misery of the Proletariat would become ever more acute. Working class standards of living would be driven down and down and it was this that would eventually provoke the Proletariat into rebellion against the capitalist system. The Proletariat would become capitalism's "gravediggers". Marx and Engels found ample justification for this analysis in their lifetimes and their supporters remained true to this view of capitalism. Critics, including those within the socialist tradition, argued that this analysis of capitalism was both outdated and wrong. The capitalism of the 19th century had been replaced with a very different form of social democratic, welfare capitalism. The result was that inequality and unfairness steadily decreased during the 20th century, as did the prospect of socialist revolution.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

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

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

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[35]

35

(b) Background

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

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

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

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

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

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

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

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

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

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

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

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

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

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

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

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

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

[35]

35

Total

60