

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2013

GCE Government and Politics (6GP03)
Paper 3A UK Political Issues

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

January 2013

Publications Code UA034581

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

No. 1	Explain why the government has found it difficult to control inflation since 2010.
--------------	--

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

Candidates should show awareness that the UK has continued to miss inflation targets since 2010.

Difficulties candidates may refer to include:

- The on-going international economic crisis which has put many economic issues, arguably including inflation, 'out of our hands'.
- Specific pressures on inflation including rising food prices and energy bills, arguably exacerbated by global events such as the Arab Spring.
- There is a direct policy contradiction on interest rates, with economic growth seen as requiring lower rates in contrast to controlling which requires higher rates.
- There is a further policy contradiction with 'quantitative easing', or releasing more money into the economy, which helps growth but can fuel inflation.

Creditable reference may also be made to the fact that the government itself has little direct control of inflation, having delegated responsibility to the Bank of England.

Credit cannot be given for content that does not address 'difficulties' or relates specifically to pre-2010 governments, although credit can be given for addressing 'continuing problems'.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of the on-going difficulties with inflation targets.
- A limited understanding of one problem that the government has encountered in trying to tackle inflation since 2010.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear, and probably explicit, awareness of the on-going difficulties with inflation targets.
- A clear understanding of at least two problems that the government has encountered in trying to tackle inflation since 2010.

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

No. 2	Analyse the advantages and disadvantages of increasing the numbers of students in higher education.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>The former Labour government pursued a policy of aiming for a 50% target for the number of school-leavers going on to University, which has been abandoned by the coalition.</p> <p>Arguments for expansion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments in technology and increasing economic complexity mean that more jobs require the detailed training offered by degrees than was previously the case. • Challenges from developing economies have resulted in low-skill jobs being exported to countries with lower wages, requiring better education to meet this threat. • Higher education should be available to all young people, irrespective of their social background, as part of a programme of equality of opportunity for all. <p>Arguments against expansion include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost, particularly given the continuing economic crisis. Many students will never pay their full debt back leaving the government to pick up the costs. • Suitability: is a degree the most appropriate way to 'skill' workers, as opposed to apprenticeships or other training? • Standards: will so many additional graduates be of the standard traditionally associated with having a degree? The credibility of their degrees has also been questioned and they have arguably led to 'qualification inflation'. • Need: are their jobs available for all these additional graduates, especially given that the 50% target appeared arbitrary and was never specifically justified? <p>Candidates may also make credible reference to the disadvantages the students themselves given the level of debt now involved.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited awareness of the political context of the debate on HE numbers. • Limited arguments largely focused on either advantages OR disadvantages. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear awareness of the political context of the debate on HE numbers. • A degree of balance with at least one clear advantage and one clear disadvantage. 	

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

No. 3	To what extent do the major political parties disagree over how to achieve economic growth?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that the best ways to achieve economic growth, given the UK's recent double dip recession and the continuing global economic crisis, are a key political issue in the UK.</p>	
<p>Ways in which the major parties could be seen to disagree include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relative importance of cutting the deficit to support economic strength and growth in the long run, with the government wishing to cut 'faster, further'. • The impact of tax on growth, with the Conservative Party wishing to cut the top rate of tax, arguing that a high top rate discourages innovation and growth. • The need to invest in major infrastructure projects to boost growth, such as the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme cancelled by the Coalition. 	
<p>Ways in which the major parties could be seen to agree include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All parties ultimately agree on the need to control the deficit to support long-term growth. • The Coalition have recently announced plans to invest more money in infrastructure projects, as called for by Labour, in order to facilitate growth. • Disagreements on tax policy, or indeed economic policy generally, could be argued to be a question of minor points of emphasis within the context of general economic consensus (e.g. that basic rates of income tax should be kept low, that inflation should be controlled). 	
<p>Candidates may also creditably discuss differences and similarities in parties' approach to regulation, and the impact this might have on growth.</p>	
<p>It is not necessary to specifically reference the Liberal Democrats in order to achieve level 3 – reference to labour / the opposition and the then conservative/coalition / government are sufficient. However separate references to Lib Dem policy are still creditable and may be a feature of the strongest answers.</p>	
<p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited arguments largely focused on either agreement or disagreement. • Limited awareness of relevant party policies. 	
<p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A degree of balance with at least one clear area of agreement and one of disagreement. • Clear awareness of relevance and specific party policies. 	

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

No. 4	Explain the arguments for and against airport expansion in the UK.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates are expected to show awareness of current political debate around airport expansion which may include reference to the Heathrow Airport third runway:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emissions from aircraft, while a small percentage of overall emissions, are rising rapidly and are more damaging because they are emitted high in the atmosphere. This may impact on the UK's ability to meet climate change targets. • Airport expansion blights the lives of many communities that are affected by additional flights and new flight paths and destroys whole communities that have to be relocated. • Many flights, especially short-haul, are unnecessary and can easily be replaced by other types of journey including high speed rail. <p>Candidates are also expected to consider specific arguments, mainly economic, in favour of airport expansion including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The economic benefits of expansion, and potential damage, including to the tourist industry, to jobs if the number of flights is restricted. • The cost of building alternative transport provision, such as high-speed rail, is prohibitive. • There will not be fewer flights, just the diversion of flights from the UK to competitor airports on the near continent such as Paris and Amsterdam. <p>Reference may also be made to recent debates as to <i>where</i> expansion should take place, for example Heathrow vs. City Airport. They may also discuss the NIMBY aspect of objections. Both are creditable but are not necessary to achieve Level 3.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited and probably implicit awareness of current political debates around airport expansion. • Limited arguments largely focused on either advantages OR disadvantages. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and probably explicit awareness of current political debates around airport expansion. • A degree of balance with at least one clear advantage and one clear disadvantage. 	

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

No. 5	How far is there disagreement between the government and the opposition over policing?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness that there has been a growing consensus on tackling law and order through targeting the causes of crime as well as punishing criminals between government and opposition, but that differences still exist in specific policies.</p> <p>Ways in which the government and opposition could be seen to disagree include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The election of Police Commissioners: Labour criticised the additional layer of politicians proposed and considered not standing in Police and Crime Commissioner elections, although they did eventually participate. • Labour has criticised the levels of cuts to local policing, as part of the general programme of spending cuts instituted by the Coalition. • Disagreement over the Communications Data Bill, which is controversial as it will greatly increase police power to monitor emails and web activity and is also expensive to implement. <p>Ways in which the government and opposition could be seen to agree include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general approach to policing in terms of community policing, accountability, balance between freedom and tackling crime etc. • Under Labour governments, more powers were given to the police. For example, ASBOs and 'on the- spot' fines were introduced, greater discretion given to inform local communities about sex offenders in the area, anti-terror laws giving the police more surveillance powers etc. These have been retained. • There is general agreement over the need for reform to both Police pay and conditions and Police practice (following various scandals relating to phone hacking, G20 death etc.) <p>Disagreements within either the Coalition or individual parties cannot be credited.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited arguments largely focused on either agreement or disagreement. • Limited awareness of specific party positions of relevance. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least one clear area of agreement and one of disagreement. • Clear awareness of specific party positions of relevance. 	

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

No. 6	'The government's approach to climate change places too much emphasis on renewable energy.' Discuss.
--------------	--

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

Candidates should be able to identify specific elements of the governments' approach to climate change, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments, including those brought forward in the recent energy bill. These could include:

- Commitment to the European Target of 15% renewables by 2020.
- Financial incentives for companies to invest in low Carbon Energy.
- Emissions Performance Standard (EPS) to limit carbon dioxide emissions from new fossil fuel power stations.
- Expansion of various sectors including wind, fracking and potentially nuclear.
- Stronger statutory regulation of the nuclear sector.

Critics of government policy would argue that this is overly focused on renewable energy on a number of grounds:

- Rhetoric on energy policy, particular from the Lib Dem Energy Secretary, is very renewables focused, even though it makes up only a small proportion of our actual energy supply.
- Renewable energy could be seen as expensive and unreliable – wind power for example is a cornerstone of government policy but has been criticised on these grounds.
- Funding is being diverted from areas that are more reliable – like Nuclear - in order to focus on the more politically acceptable renewables.
- Environmentalist critics could argue that the government's policy places too much emphasis on alternative sources of energy of all kinds, rather than focus on reductions in energy use and other more radical policy areas.

Supporters of government policy would argue that it creates a proper 'balance' between renewable and other sources of energy on a number of grounds:

- It is necessary to increase the amount of renewable energy in order to tackle issues such as climate change used because the starting point was so low. As the government is aiming to meet the European target to source 15% of all energy from renewable sources by 2020 85% would still come from other sources.
- The government is committed to particular other sources of energy including ongoing nuclear power, and exploring potential new sources such as shale gas and several provisions of the energy bill relate to these sectors.
- Although considerable money is being invested in renewable energy subsidies, in the long run this kind of energy will be cheaper and a new series of nuclear power stations, for example, will be even more expensive.

Candidates may also creditably discuss the viewpoint that the government's energy policy places an *insufficient* emphasis on renewable energy, citing support for nuclear power, Fracking etc. This is creditworthy, but not necessary or sufficient by itself, to achieve level 3.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- A limited awareness of specific policies pursued.
- Largely one-sided in the arguments presented.
- A focus on general or vague arguments regarding the government's approach.
- Limited awareness of competing political viewpoints.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- A clear awareness of at least two specific energy policies pursued.
- Clear balance with at least two arguments on each side of the question and an evaluative conclusion.
- Specific and detailed arguments with regard to the government's approach.
- Strong awareness of competing political viewpoints.

A01	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
A02	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
A02	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

A03	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

No. 7

Examine the view that the law and order policies of UK governments focus too much on punishment and not enough on rehabilitation.

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

Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that recent UK governments have all espoused a policy akin to 'tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime', utilising both punishment and rehabilitation, but with some on-going debate within and between parties and in the media as to whether the balance has been correct.

Candidates should be able to identify specific elements of the approach of recent governments to law and order and penal policy, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments. These could include:

- An increase in prison population over the last 20 years.
- Changes to sentencing guidelines, for example increasing sentences for knife offences.
- Proposals from former Justice Secretary Ken Clarke to reduce short prison sentences.
- Trials of alternative forms of justice such as restorative justice with Youth Offenders in Northern Ireland and integrated offender management schemes.
- Opposition to calls to give prisoners the vote.

Critics of government policy would argue that this has been overly focused on punishment on a number of grounds:

- The prison population has doubled since the early 1990s to around 80,000 at significant cost and with little positive impact on crime.
- Other countries, particularly in Scandinavia, have a greater emphasis on rehabilitation and reintegration and also have somewhat lower crime and reoffending rates.
- Both government and opposition have resisted calls to grant civil rights such as the vote to prisoners, which could be portrayed as assisting their reintegration into society.
- Clarke, widely seen as a fairly 'liberal' Justice Secretary was criticised by previous Prime Minister Tony Blair for being 'soft' and later moved in the reshuffle, perhaps implying a move back towards punishment after a brief deviation, especially given the views of Home Secretary Teresa May.

Supporters of government policy would argue that it creates a proper 'balance' between punishment and rehabilitation on number of grounds:

- Clarke's policy on short sentences could be seen as signalling a clear understanding of 'less serious' criminals, more able to be rehabilitated without the need for prison, as opposed to 'more serious' criminals for whom punishment is more necessary.
- Restorative justice in Northern Ireland has delivered a reduction in youth crime, a drop in child custody and a 90% victim satisfaction rate. Integrated offender management schemes piloted in parts of England and Wales have also achieved results seen as impressive and are waiting to be rolled out nationally.
- Various arguments may be advanced to suggest that punishment vs. rehabilitation is no longer a significant source of contention within law and order policy, with general consensus on the 'tough on crime, tough on the causes' approach. The involvement of the private sector in prisons, police commissioners, anti-terrorism and civil liberties etc. could all be identified as more pressing political issues.
- Both past and present governments have continued to emphasise and invest in prisoner education.

Candidates may also creditably discuss the premise of the question, as to whether it is legitimate to talk of 'too much focus' on punishment, given the arguable merits of a 'hard-

line' approach. As part of this, or separately, they may also consider the viewpoint that recent governments' law and order policies place an *insufficient* emphasis on punishment. Both are creditworthy but not necessary, or sufficient by themselves, to achieve level 3.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited awareness of specific policies pursued, which may be directed towards one particular government.
- Largely one-sided in the arguments presented, although still with some acknowledgement of the counter-case.
- A focus on general or vague arguments regarding the governments' approaches.
- Limited awareness of competing political viewpoints.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- A clear awareness of at least two specific policies pursued, with reference to governments both pre and post 2010.
- Clear attempts at balance with at least two arguments on each side of the question and an evaluative conclusion.
- Specific and detailed arguments with regard to the governments' approaches.
- Strong awareness of competing political viewpoints.

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

A02	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

A03	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

No. 8	'Limiting state benefits paid to families is politically popular but socially unfair.' Discuss.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that welfare reform is a live political issue, and one on which there is considerable contention (including within the coalition, between government and opposition, and more widely although candidates may not refer to all of these).</p>	
<p>Candidates should be able to identify specific policies with respect to limiting benefits, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments. These <u>could</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cap on housing benefit. • The proposals for a single capped universal credit. • Recent limitations on rises in benefits within the Chancellor's Autumn Statement. • Limitations on child benefit paid to higher tax rate payers. 	
<p>The major focus of debate is likely to be on the 'socially unfair' aspect of the question. Nevertheless candidates should at least briefly consider the 'politically popular' part of the question. Limiting benefits is often seen as politically popular because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It saves taxpayers money allowing it to be spent elsewhere. • Those on benefits are often perceived, fairly or unfairly, as undeserving or lazy. 	
<p>Candidates may however question the popularity of this approach, for example noting that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is controversial and has been questioned by many prominent pressure groups and charities such as Shelter and the Child Poverty Action Group. • Political problems were created by the proposed limits to child benefit. 	
<p>Points that could be made to support the premise that this is socially unfair <u>could</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy proposals will predominantly hit those on low and lower-middle incomes, for example by limiting housing benefit, or capping overall benefits. • The reforms create an artificial distinction between 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor, failing to take proper account of the many and varied reasons why people are on benefits and the limited options that they may have to work in practice. • Even if one accepts the premise that some are 'undeserving' this should not apply to their children, who are likely to be significantly affected by limits to benefits. • The 'cycle of deprivation' suggests that those who begin in poverty, especially as children, are more likely to remain in poverty throughout their lives unless specifically helped by government. 	
<p>Points that could be made to dispute the argument that this is socially unfair <u>could</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The caps proposed will be generous – approximately £350 per week for a single adult with no children and £500 per week for a couple or lone parent - and sufficient to keep families out of poverty. Only a small number of 'extreme cases' of large families on benefits living in big houses will this be affected. • The limits to Child Benefit for higher rate tax payers mark a specific effort to 'spread the pain', and do proposals under consideration to means test some pensioners benefits. • Clear exemptions can be made for particular 'deserving cases' – for example those receiving Working Tax Credit, Disability Living Allowance, or a War Widow(er)'s pension. • Simplifying the system of benefits will be to the benefit of poorer families as it will make it easier to understand and claim their entitlements. 	
<p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p>	

- Limited awareness of specific policies pursued.
- Limited, and perhaps implicit, awareness of why this is politically popular.
- Largely one-sided in the arguments presented as to social fairness.
- Some, limited, awareness of competing political viewpoints.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- A clear awareness of at least two specific policies pursued.
- Clear explicit awareness of why this is politically popular, or some awareness of both why it might be *and* why it might not be politically popular.
- Clear balance with at least two arguments on each side of the question of 'fairness' and an evaluative conclusion.
- Strong awareness of competing political viewpoints.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

A02	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
A03	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

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

PART A - SHORT QUESTIONS (15 marks)

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

PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

A01 / A02 / Synopticity	
Level 3 (Good to excellent)	9-12
Level 2 (Limited to sound)	5-8
Level 1 (Very poor to weak)	0-4

A03	
Level 3 (good to excellent)	7-9
Level 2 (Limited to sound)	4-6
Level 1 (Very poor to weak)	0-3

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA034581 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

