

Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2010

GCE

GCE Government & Politics (6GP04) Paper 4D

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.

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
UA024052

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 | In what ways did 9/11 redefine the nature of terrorism? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrorism, in its broad sense, refers to the use of terror for furthering political ends, by seeking to create a climate of fear, apprehension and uncertainty. However, events such as the 9/11 attacks on the USA and groups such as al-Qaeda threaten to redefine the phenomenon of terrorism. • There has been much debate about whether, and the extent to which, 9/11 altered the nature of terrorism. A number of allegations have been made, including the following. First, 9/11 has often been seen as illustrating the fact that terrorism has become a transnational, if not global, phenomenon, whereas earlier forms of terrorism were often carried out by nationalist groups and were confined to a particular state. Al-Qaeda and the wider Islamist movement, are certainly transnational in terms of their organisation, goals and activities. The 9/11 attacks marked the advent of terrorism with a global reach, dramatically transforming the significance of terrorism. Second, this form of terrorism is motivated by a broad and radical ideology, in the form of Islamism rather than by narrower and more specific political goals. Islamist terrorism aims to inflict damage and humiliation on the USA and transform the global relationship between Islam and the west. Other differences include that the sheer scope and scale of the 9/11 attacks was historically unprecedented, creating the phenomenon of 'catastrophic terrorism', and that the combined use of suicide attacks and coordinated attacks against several targets suggest the advent of new terrorist tactics. | |
| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (5-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|--------------|---|
| No. 2 | What is the North-South divide, and why is it sometimes said to be an outdated idea? |
|--------------|---|

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

- The idea of a North-South divide was popularised through the work of the so-called Brandt Reports (1980, 1983). It highlighted the tendency for industrial development to be concentrated in the northern hemisphere and for poverty and disadvantage to be concentrated in the southern hemisphere, although the terms 'North' and 'South' were always essentially conceptual rather than geographical. The concept of the North-South divide also drew attention to the ways in which aid, developing world debt and the practices of transnational corporations helped to perpetuate structural inequalities between the high-wage, high-investment industrialised North and the low-wage, low-investment, predominantly rural South.
- The idea has been seen as outdated because of development trends in the South and through the emergence of new patterns of poverty and disadvantage. Many Southern countries have made substantial economic and social progress in recent decades, notably China, India, the Asian 'tiger' economies and also parts of Latin America. These emerging economies are no longer seen to be structurally disadvantaged within the global economy. The other trend has been for poverty and disadvantage to be concentrated more narrowly in sub-Saharan Africa in particular. Moreover, the term has sometimes been abandoned through a recognition that poverty and under-development are highly complex phenomena with wide-ranging economic, cultural, social and political causes.

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

| | |
|--------------|---|
| No. 3 | How and why have environmental issues created tensions between developed and developing countries? |
|--------------|---|

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

Environmental issues create tension between developed and developing countries in at least two ways:

- Environmental degradation is often seen as one of the consequences of economic globalization, particularly in the developing world. This occurs because it creates pressure for economic restructuring, industrialisation and urbanisation in states that have little capacity to ensure effective environmental protection. This has led to the almost universal acceptance in the developing world of the idea of 'sustainable development', which links economic to environmental concerns, taking account of the ecological implications of development.
- Concerns about environmental protection and ecological sustainability also appear to deny developing-world states the opportunity to catch up with the West. Western states developed through large-scale industrialisation, the exploitation of finite resources and a willingness to pollute the natural world, practices that they now seek to deny to the developing world. In the politics of climate change, this is acknowledged in the idea that states have 'common but differentiated responsibilities', while developing countries expect developed ones to take the lead in tackling climate change, because they 'caused' the problem, developed countries believe the responsibility should be more broadly spread, reflecting current contribution to climate change rather than past contributions.

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

| | |
|--|--|
| | |
|--|--|

| | |
|--------------|---|
| No. 4 | Distinguish between different types of international human rights. |
|--------------|---|

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

Human rights are rights that supposedly belong to people by virtue of being human human. They are universal, absolute and fundamental rights. Distinctions are nevertheless made between three kinds or 'generations' of human rights:

- The earliest human rights to be established were civil and political rights. These rights are often viewed as 'negative' rights in the sense that they imply restrictions or constraints on government power; many of them are also seen as civil liberties. Civil and political rights are strongly associated with liberal individualism. Articles 2-21 of the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights cover civil and political rights, including the right to life, liberty and the security of the person. These rights nevertheless include 'positive' rights that they may require affirmative government action, such as the right to a fair and public trial and to free elections.
- Economic, social and cultural rights are often based, by contrast on socialist philosophy. These rights are designed to protect people from poverty and economic injustice and they are 'positive' in the sense that they require intervention on the part of government rather than its constraint. Articles 22-27 of the UN Declaration cover a range of economic and social rights, including the right to social security, the right to education and the right to work and to protection against unemployment.
- A third kind of rights are so-called solidarity rights. These are rights that help particular groups to protect their identities, interests or culture. They include the right to political, economic, social and cultural self-determination on the part of national minorities or countries subjected to neo-colonialism. Solidarity rights may also include so-called 'special' rights which belong to particular groups within a society, examples including women's rights and minority rights.

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|---------------------------------|---|
| <i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <i>Level 2</i> (5-10 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little |

or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

No. 5

What was the 'debt crisis' of the 1980s, and how much progress has been made in resolving it?

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

- The 'debt crisis' developed in the 1970s and 1980s, as poorer countries (starting with Mexico in 1982) announced that they could no longer service their debts, meaning that many Northern banks were faced with the possibility of collapse. More seriously, Southern countries due to the size of their debts and their poor economic performance, channelled more and more money into their escalating debt repayments at the expense of building schools and hospitals, investing in the economic infrastructure and helping to alleviate poverty. Even though loans from the World Bank and the IMF were provided on favourable terms, debt escalation in the developing-world was dramatic. The debt crisis has not only been explained in terms of economic backwardness, but also of changed borrowing strategies amongst western banks.
- Attempts to resolve the debt crisis include the provision of loans by the IMF and World Bank, often linked to the implementation of structural adjustment programmes, designed to promote growth and enable debtor countries to pay off their debts, and the righting off of debt through so-called 'debt relief'. For example, in 1989 the USA launched the 'Brady bonds', which underwrote a proportion of Latin America's debt overhang from the 1970s and 1980s. Under the HIPC Initiative, negotiated in 1996, the World Bank and the IMF agreed to extend the opportunity for debt relief to 40 of the world's poorest countries; by 2006, 29 countries were enjoying debt relief. The G8 Gleneagles deal in 2005 significantly accelerated the pace of debt relief, through the agreement to provide 100 per cent cancellation of debt owed to the IMF and the World Bank; by 2006, this covered 21 countries, with plans to include up to 43 countries.

LEVELS

DESCRIPTORS

Level 3
(11-15 marks)

- Full and developed knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
- Good or better ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.
- Sophisticated ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.

Level 2
(5-10 marks)

- Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
- Sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.
- Adequate ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.

Level 1
(0-5 marks)

- Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
- Poor ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.
- Weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

| | |
|-------|---|
| No. 6 | To what extent does nuclear proliferation threaten peace and security? |
|-------|---|

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

- Nuclear proliferation refers to the spread of nuclear weapons, either by their acquisition by more states or other actors (horizontal proliferation) or by their accumulation by established nuclear states (vertical proliferation). The Cold War period was characterised by significant vertical proliferation, as the USA and the Soviet Union each acquired massive nuclear arsenals, while the post-Cold War era has been characterised by a tendency towards horizontal proliferation, with nuclear weapons being acquired by India, North Korea and, covertly, by Israel. However, views differ about the implications of nuclear proliferation for peace and security.
- The argument that nuclear proliferation poses a substantial threat to peace and security derives from the massive destructive capacity of nuclear weapons. This, then, enables nuclear powers to dictate to other powers, as the USA did in using nuclear weapons to bring an end to the war against Japan in 1945. Nuclear proliferation can be seen as inherently unstable on the grounds that it creates at least temporary imbalances, allowing states that seek military advantage to pursue offensive policies. Nuclear arms races therefore tend to increase the likelihood of war. Such fears have intensified in the post-Cold War era as proliferation has made regional conflicts considerably more dangerous. This applies to tension between India and Pakistan as well as to tension between Israel and Iran. Nuclear proliferation is thus more dangerous in the emerging multipolar world order than it was in the relatively stable bipolar 'first' nuclear age. Anxieties about nuclear weapons have been substantially heightened by the belief that recent developments make it more likely that they will be used. This is evident in the development of 'tactical' or 'battlefield' nuclear weapons that are designed to be usable, but it is particularly linked to the fear that nuclear weapons may fall into the hands of military-based dictatorial regimes, or even terrorist groups, which will have fewer scruples about using them. Nuclear terrorism is thought of by some as the ultimate modern security threat.
- However, nuclear proliferation has also been seen to promote peace and security. The most remarkable thing about nuclear weapons is how rarely they have been used. Their massive destructive capacity in fact makes them primarily weapons of deterrence. States thus acquire nuclear weapons and increase the size of their arsenals in order to prevent war. This especially occurs when a nuclear stalemate is established, as both states in a dispute acquire a second-strike capability, creating a 'balance of terror' as occurred during the Cold War. Horizontal proliferation since the end of the Cold War has not been as destabilising as many fear, as the possession of nuclear weapons may engender a sense of responsibility and a bias in favour of caution, even in states that have previously been inclined to adventurism or aggression. In this view, conflict between India and Pakistan is less likely to result in war because both states have a 'nuclear option'. Similarly, the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran may bring greater stability to the Middle East than has occurred through the existence of a single nuclear power, Israel.

| | |
|-----|-----------------------------|
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| | |

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| <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 |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| <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 |
| A02 | Synoptic skills |
| <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 |
| A03 | 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 | Is humanitarian intervention ever justified? |
|--------------|---|

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

- Humanitarian intervention is military intervention that is carried out in pursuit of humanitarian rather than strategic objectives. Examples include northern Iraq (1991), Somalia (1992) and Kosovo (1999). However, the issue of humanitarian intervention has been fiercely debated.
- Supporters of humanitarian intervention advance a number of arguments in its defence. Basic to this is a belief that common humanity, the idea that people's moral responsibilities extend to the whole of humankind, meaning that we have an obligation to 'save strangers'. Humanitarian intervention is therefore associated with an acceptance of human rights as a universal principle. However, those who favour humanitarian intervention tend to argue that it is justified in more specific cases. The ICISS, for example, holds that military intervention in the affairs of another state is justified in order to prevent either a large-scale loss of life, with genocidal intent or not, or a large-scale ethnic cleansing, whether carried out by killing, forcible expulsion or acts of terrorism or rape. The authority of international law for such interventions can be gained through a Security Council mandate, by the UN General Assembly meeting in emergency special session or by the endorsement of a regional or sub-regional body. Humanitarian intervention can also be justified on the grounds that in an interdependent world all states may be affected by slaughter and unrest happening elsewhere, by the desire to maintain regional stability, and by the task of promoting democracy.
- However, humanitarian intervention has been criticised for a variety of reasons. First, it has been ruled out on the basis of international law, notably, that it clashes with the principle of state sovereignty and thereby weakens the established rules of world order. Second, realists warn against the dangers of states failing to prioritise the interests of their own citizens, also often arguing that humanitarian intervention is an example of political mendacity. The humanitarian justification for the use of force is therefore regularly abused by states that are in fact acting in their own interests. This has widely been alleged in relation to the 'war on terror'. Third, the doctrine of humanitarian intervention has been morally confused as it leads to inevitable double standards; for example, however pressing the case for intervention in Tibet may be, it is not a feasible objective. Fourth, some question the very basis for humanitarian intervention, arguing that human rights are not applicable across the world but are, in fact, an example of western cultural imperialism.

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| A01 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <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 |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| <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 |
| A02 | Synoptic skills |
| <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 |
| A03 | 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 | 'The international community has failed to take concerted action over climate change.' Discuss. |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International co-operation over climate change was initiated by the 'Earth Summit' in Rio in 1992. The most significant international conferences on the issue have been at Kyoto in 1997 (which led to the Kyoto Protocol to the UN FCCC) and at Copenhagen in December 2009 (which was convened to frame a successor to the Kyoto Protocol, which runs out in 2012). However, opinions diverge on the effectiveness of these developments. • Environmental groups have been starkly critical of the international community's response to the challenge of climate change. Particular criticisms have focused on the limitations of the Kyoto agreement. The targets set at Kyoto were, arguably, quite inadequate in terms of preventing global warming, and the USA's refusal to ratify the treaty dealt Kyoto a fatal blow, setting back the process of tackling climate change by over a decade. Moreover, the targets set at Kyoto applied only to developed states, thereby excluding emerging economies were fast becoming major emitters. Chinese carbon emissions exceeded those of the USA's for the first time in 2008. The Copenhagen meeting attracted, if anything, even more criticism, being widely considered a failure. In particular, no legally-binding targets emerged from the conference, at either the state or the global level, with tensions between the USA and China supported by other emerging economies widely being credited for this. The main obstacles to concerted international action include the cumulative impact of state self-interest, especially in view of the likely economic impact of implementing tough emissions reductions, great power tensions in a multipolar context, and rivalry between developed and developing states. • The international community's response to climate change can, nevertheless, be defended. For example, Kyoto has always been seen as the first step in a longer process of international co-operation. As such, it made sound progress in terms of establishing the principle of binding emissions targets, and recognised the differentiated responsibilities of developed and developing states by, initially, setting targets for developed states only. Moreover, it is also notable, that international co-operation on the issue has grown, with Russia and Australia, initially non-participants, signing the Kyoto Protocol and the Obama administration in the USA adopting a much more sympathetic stance on environmental policy generally and on climate change in particular. This was evident at Copenhagen, which, for all its limitations, demonstrated a recognition by the USA and China in particular that their participation in this process is essential. As such it marked an important step on the road to more concerted action. | |
| A01 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <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 |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| <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 |
| A02 | Synoptic skills |
| <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 |
| A03 | 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

Order Code UA024052
Summer 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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