

# Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2010

GCE

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

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

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

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

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

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

Summer 2010  
Publications Code  
UA024037

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

## General Marking Guidance

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

No. 1	Analyse the significance of mid-term elections.
Indicative content ( <i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-terms are more significant for the House of Representatives, since all 435 seats are up for election, than the Senate, where only a third of seats are involved in any one election.</li> <li>• ‘All politics is local’ - all elections have a local component, and some are dominated by local issues.</li> <li>• Always, as well though, mid-terms are a verdict on the performance of the president, either expressing approval (as in 2002) or more usually disapproval (as in 1994 &amp; 2006)</li> <li>• If a shift of seats leads to loss of party control of either or both houses for the president’s party, as also occurred in 1994 and 2006, this will clearly have a major impact on the president’s ability to pursue his domestic agenda. It reduced President G.W. Bush to lame duck status for his final two years and led President Clinton to triangulation and the budget showdowns with the Republicans in Congress.</li> <li>• Low turnout (often around or below 40%) and the power of incumbency, which especially in the House makes many elections uncompetitive, could both be said to reduce the significance of mid-terms.</li> </ul>	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> <li>• To reach this level, candidates must make extended reference to at least two mid-term elections.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Level 2</i> (5-10 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

--	--

No. 2	Explain what is meant by 'Iron Triangles' and assess their significance.
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

An iron triangle consists of interest groups, congressional committees and executive departments/agencies, which depend on each other in various ways:

- Government departments/agencies are dependent on congressional committees for funding of their programmes and staff.
- Congressional committee members are dependent on government department/agencies for ensuring the delivery of programmes in the way which most benefits their clients and constituents.
- Congressional committee members are dependent on interest groups for campaign donations.
- Interest groups are dependent on both to ensure that the maximum possible expenditure is allocated to programmes which will benefit their members.

There are many examples of iron triangles; some of the best known are in the areas of defence, agriculture and veterans affairs. They are often criticised for distorting the policy-making process in favour of a narrow sectional advantage.

An iron triangle creates bonds of mutual interest which can resist a change of party control in the White House or Congress. Any interest group which becomes part of an iron triangle will gain considerable influence in their area of policy.

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



No. 3	How influential are conservatives in the Democratic Party?
-------	------------------------------------------------------------

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

From the 1960s onwards, the Democratic Party lost progressively more of its traditional Southern conservative base, as it became identified with an increased role for the state in society, and liberal social causes such as minority rights, abortion rights and environmentalism. While there are now almost no 'pure' conservatives left, there are still some in the party who do not subscribe to elements of the liberal economic and social agenda.

Evidence which suggests conservatives are not influential in the Democratic Party includes:

- The history of the Clinton presidency - attempted health care reform, Brady bill, veto of partial birth abortion ban bill, defence of affirmative action ('mend it don't end it')
- 'Six for 06' agenda for the 2006 mid-terms.
- The history so far of the Obama presidency - stimulus package, health care reform, increased regulation of the finance industry.
- The core of the party remains on the left, represented through the current congressional leadership, e.g. Speaker Pelosi, and through the 'blogosphere', e.g. websites such as Mother Jones, Firedoglake and Daily Beast, which was active in the defeat of Joe Lieberman in the Connecticut Senate primary in 2006 & the unsuccessful challenge to Blanche Lincoln in the Arkansas Senate primary in 2010.

Evidence which suggests conservatives are influential includes:

- Conservative elements in the Clinton presidency; Clinton was hostile to some liberal causes as governor, e.g. he supported the death penalty, and as president signed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (reforming welfare) and the Defense of Marriage Act.
- The explicit policy of the recruitment of more conservative candidates for the 2006 mid-terms.
- President Obama has initiated a 'surge' in Afghanistan, alienating liberals, and has so far disappointed liberals on a number of issues, such as immigration reform, gun control, abortion and the environment.
- The role of the 'Blue Dogs' and moderate senators in removing a 'public option' from health care reform.
- The role of pro-life Democrats in promoting the Stupak-Pitts Amendment, banning the use of federal funds for abortion (pitting them against pro-choice groups such as NARAL), which Obama eventually issued an executive order to confirm.
- Many prominent Democrats do not subscribe to elements of the liberal orthodoxy of the party, e.g. senators such as Jim Webb and governors such as Brian Schweitzer.
- Significant elements of the Democratic coalition stereotypically hold some conservative values, e.g. Latinos, who shifted significantly to Obama in 2008, are not generally pro-choice

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<i>Level 3</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> </ul>

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



No. 4	What is affirmative action, and what are the justifications for it?
Indicative content ( <i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )	
<p>Affirmative action is the collective name for a range of programmes designed to extend opportunities, initially for black Americans, but subsequently extended to other groups, primarily in education and employment. It can take a variety of forms; some, such as quotas for minorities on higher education courses, have been ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court (<i>University of California v Bakke</i>), whereas others, which make race a 'plus factor' in applications, for example, have been approved (<i>Grutter v Bollinger</i>).</p> <p>It is justified on at least four grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• compensation - for the deprivation attributable to the legacy of slavery &amp; post Civil War segregation, which continues to leave black Americans worse off than the white population .</li> <li>• continuing discrimination - there is evidence of continuing discrimination in mandatory minimums, disenfranchisement, and racial profiling; even if overt racism (or sexism) has diminished, it is likely that the entrenched white (or male) dominant class will select people like themselves as successors if not coerced.</li> <li>• diversity - there are benefits to society as a whole if every group is proportionately represented in employment &amp; education; organisations like the police need to be seen to represent society to be able to do their job effectively.</li> <li>• efficiency - the economy suffers if the labour market is artificially restricted, and skilled black workers are denied opportunities in favour of less skilled white workers..</li> </ul>	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> <li>• To reach this level, candidates must consider at least two justifications for affirmative action</li> </ul>
<p><i>Level 2</i> (5-10 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> <li>• To reach this level, candidates must offer more than a definition of affirmative action</li> </ul>
<p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

--	--

No. 5	Which types of pressure groups seek to influence the Senate, and why?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Senate is one half of the legislature, and consequently would attract any group seeking to influence the shape of legislation or the allocation of appropriations.</li> <li>• The Senate's exclusive powers, especially the power to ratify treaties and to confirm Presidential nominations (to the Supreme Court in particular), make it attractive to some groups.</li> <li>• The ability of senators to block legislation through the use of the filibuster, its increasingly routine and the consequent need for a 'supermajority' of 60, make it attractive to groups which hope to block legislation.</li> <li>• The over-representation in the Senate of rural states with small populations makes it attractive to groups wanting to promote issues relevant to them, such as agriculture, gun rights and mining.</li> </ul>	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<i>Level 2</i> (5-10 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

No. 6	Does the election of a black president mean that racial divisions in the USA have been overcome?
-------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Reactions to the election of a black president reflect different attitudes to the state of racial divisions in modern day America.

Conservatives would argue that:

- The election of President Obama, as well as the existence of a growing black middle-class, the representation in black Americans in the House of Representatives nearly in proportion to the population, and other high profile black successes such as Oprah Winfrey, shows that racial divisions have become insignificant .
- The fundamental framework for equality is in place through constitutional amendments and civil rights legislation, and even if elements of racial division and prejudice survive, the experience of other minority groups shows they can be overcome.
- In fact, the biggest single obstacle to the eradication of racial divisions is the continuation of affirmative action, and it is impossible to heal them if affirmative action still requires education admissions and employers to discriminate on grounds of race.
- If black economic inequality persists, there is evidence that it is more the product of problems within black culture than any legacy of past discrimination.

Liberals would argue that:

- The election of one exceptional individual does not disguise the enduring economic inequality experienced by black Americans. Almost a third live in poverty, compared to about a tenth of white Americans, they are twice as likely to be unemployed as whites, and just under half own their own homes, compared to just over three-quarters of whites.
- There is ample evidence of continuing racism: the increase in black representation in the House of Representatives has only been achieved through majority-minority districts, and there is very marked black under-representation in the Senate; racial profiling is widespread; and blacks are disproportionately employed in the public sector, when the private sector has been resistant to black employment.
- It is impossible to overcome racial divisions, given the history of black oppression, just through legal equality; continuing economic inequality, despite the gains of recent years, and continuing evidence of racism show affirmative action is still required. The failure of affirmative action to end inequality so far means, if anything, that more radical measures are needed, e.g. earlier intervention and reparations, not abandonment.
- Any comparison with other races is illicit, not least because other races arrived of their own volition.

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

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)	Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)	Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)	Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)	Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)	Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)	Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

AO3	Communication and coherence
<i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)	Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)	Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks)	Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

No. 7

'Moderate conservatism is a declining force in the Republican Party'  
Discuss.

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

The presidency of Ronald Reagan established the identity of the Republican Party as a fiscally and socially conservative party, committed to small government and low taxation, and the advancement of the agenda of the Christian Right.

Moderates within the party typically do not share the zeal of the Christian Right for its goals, and are more pragmatic about the role of the state.

Evidence suggesting that conservative elements are still dominant within the party includes:

- The 'Contract with America' of 1994
- The history of the G.W. Bush presidency - tax cuts, pro-business legislation, 'partial-birth' abortion ban, muscular foreign policy
- The movement of John McCain to the right during the 2008 campaign, and the choice of Sarah Palin as his running mate.
- United Republican opposition in Congress to the Obama stimulus and health care reform.
- The emergence of Sarah Palin as the dominant figure of the party, illustrated by the success of those endorsed by her in the 2010 primaries.
- The candidacy of an independent conservative candidate, endorsed by Sarah Palin and other prominent conservatives, in the New York 23<sup>rd</sup> district special election against the official Republican candidate, Dede Scozzafava, led to her withdrawal.
- The emergence of the Tea Party movement as the dominant element within the party and the victories of some of their standard bearers, e.g. Rand Paul, in the 2010 primaries.
- John McCain's primary battle in Arizona, which led him to deny ever calling himself a maverick; Bob Bennett's defeat at a Utah state party convention.
- The law passed in April 2010 by Republican-controlled Arizona, which made failure to carry immigration papers a criminal offence.
- The defections of Charlie Crist and Arlen Specter

Evidence suggesting that moderate elements are still significant:

- President Reagan himself was arguably more pragmatic and less ideological than his later admirers have claimed.
- Despite their warm words, both Presidents Reagan and G.W. Bush ultimately proved a disappointment to the Christian Right.
- President G.W. Bush campaigned as a 'compassionate conservative'; in government, he added a prescription drug benefit to Medicare, signed McCain-Feingold, promoted the 'No Child Left Behind' legislation and turned the Clinton budget surplus into a \$400+ billion deficit for 2009.
- Several high-profile Republicans are moderates, e.g. Arnold Schwarzenegger (who recently pledged to make the Obama health reforms work in California) Rudy Giuliani, and Scott Brown.
- The defeat of some Tea Party candidates by better funded, more moderate candidates in the 2010 primaries such as Carly Fiorina in the Senate primary in California.

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

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)	Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)	Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)	Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)	Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)	Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)	Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

AO3	Communication and coherence
<i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)	Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)	Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks)	Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary



No. 8	To what extent did the 2008 presidential election prove that campaign finance regulations are effective?
-------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

There are at least three purposes of campaign finance regulations:

- Through limiting the size of donations, preventing candidate becoming beholden to donors.
- Bringing transparency into campaigns by making donors' identities public.
- Through limiting spending, keeping overall expenditure down, and ensuring there is at least approximate parity between candidates.

The existing framework of regulation was created by the legislation of 1971 and 1974, which was significantly amended by Supreme Court cases, especially *Buckley v Valeo*, and the BCRA of 2002, supplemented by later FEC rulings.

Evidence which suggests that the existing regulations were effective in 2008 includes:

- The donation limits to candidates and parties were still largely intact.
- Obama reportedly raised half of his total amount in donations of \$250 or less.
- 527s, which had played a significant role in the 2004 election, only spent about half of what was spent in 2004 and were less active, at least partly because new FEC regulations required 50% of 527 expenditure to be paid for through 'hard money' donations. It was also the case that both Obama and McCain encouraged donations to be directed either to their own campaign or to their political parties.

Evidence which suggests that the existing regulations were ineffective in 2008 includes:

- Overall expenditure was up; \$2.5 billion was spent by twenty candidates over two years, twice the amount spent in 2004, three times 2000 and 25 times the amount spent in 1988.
- The two main parties raised more in 2008 than in 2000 when soft money was legal.
- Obama, Clinton, McCain and Romney all declined matching funds in the primary campaign, and Obama's financial advantage was arguably critical to his caucus wins and hence overall success (although Huckabee, largely through his numerous appearances on talk shows, outlasted the better financed campaign of Romney)
- Obama was the first candidate ever to decline the federal grant for the general election campaign, and raised \$700M+. The McCain campaign was limited in theory to \$84.1M of public funds, although this amount was significantly supplemented by the Republican Party campaign. Nevertheless, he was outspent by Obama at least 2:1, possibly crucially.

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

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)	Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)	Sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)	Limited ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)	Good or better ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)	Sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)	Limited ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

AO3	Communication and coherence
<i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)	Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)	Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks)	Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

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

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481

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

Order Code UA024037  
Summer 2010

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

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