

Mark Scheme (Standardised)

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel in GCE
Government & Politics (6GP03)
Unit 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, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

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

Summer 2014

Publications Code UA039014

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Marking Guidelines

- 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

How and why have environmental concerns affected UK transport policy since 1997?

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

Candidates should show an understanding of changes in transport policy and the reasons for this, beyond a general awareness of 'environmental reasons'. Responses that omit the coalition will not progress beyond level 2.

Both Labour governments and the Coalition have sought to reform transport policy based on a number of environmental concerns which may include:

- The level of CO2 emissions, their impact on climate change and the targets set to reduce them.
- The impact of pollution, particularly from cars and airplanes, on local communities and on wildlife.
- The levels of congestion created by excessive car use, and the further damage that this does in terms of carbon emissions and pollution.
- 'Peak Oil' – the likelihood that supplies of oil will run out in coming decades, and will become more expensive and scarce prior to that.

Ways in which this has impacted on transport policy may include:

- The congestion charge was introduced in London, and proposed in several other cities, to reduce the amount of road traffic and therefore congestion.
- The fuel tax escalator has dramatically increased the cost of petrol, in an effort to reduce consumption and cut 'un-necessary journeys'
- The government is undertaking an expensive and highly ambitious High Speed Rail project (HS2) with the aim of providing a fast and efficient business link that does not rely on road or air.
- The coalition decided not to proceed with the third runway at Heathrow Airport, largely due to concerns about carbon emission and the impact on the local environment, although this decision is now in doubt.

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

- Limited understanding of why environment concerns have affected transport policies.
- Limited understanding of specific transport policy arising from environmental concerns.

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

- Clear understanding of why environment concerns have affected transport policies.
- Clear understanding of specific transport policy arising from environmental concerns.

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	What is quantitative easing and why is it controversial?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Quantitative easing (QE) is a monetary policy used by central banks to stimulate the national economy and increase economic growth when standard monetary policy has become ineffective. The central bank buys financial assets from commercial banks and other private institutions, effectively creating extra money.</p> <p>Areas of controversy <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QE is likely to fuel inflation, by effectively increasing the amount of money chasing the same amount of goods – reference may be made here to the nature of money as ‘not real’. • QE failed to achieve the desired effect, in that the UK continued to experience sluggish growth for some time and ran the risk of a double dip recession. • QE has been misused, essentially to pay of the debts of banks, rather than to encourage investment in business. This could be argued to be rewarding the banks responsible for the economic crisis in the first place. • There are a number of alternative policies to QE that candidates may advance such as credit easing, or providing ‘new money’ direct to consumers to stimulate spending. <p>Credit cannot be given for controversies regarding government economic policies other than quantitative easing.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of the nature of quantitative easing. • Limited understanding of at the ways in which quantitative easing has been criticised <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear and explicit understanding of the nature of quantitative easing. • Clear understanding of the ways in which quantitative easing has been criticised. 	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
Level 3 (11-15 marks)	<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	How and why have governments since 1997 sought to bring the private sector into the NHS?
--------------	--

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

Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of both Labour and Coalition policies with respect to increasing private sector involvement in the NHS. Responses that only cover one government will not progress beyond level 2.

Both the Labour Government and the Coalition have sought to increase private sector involvement in the NHS in a number of ways which may include:

- The Private Finance Initiative was used to improve health infrastructure – building and renovating hospitals.
- The Labour Government greatly expanded the concept of the ‘internal market’ encouraging competition with the NHS to provide supplies and services.
- The Coalition Government has gone further by increasing the involvement of the external market, expanding the use of private providers to deliver state health-care.
- The introduction of GP Commissioning Boards to replace NHS trusts arguably represents a more business oriented management model based on professionals identifying the necessary services and commissioning them from the most cost-effective source.

A number of reasons could be advanced for this trend which may include:

- To extend competition to the state sector, giving it an incentive and impetus to improve and thus driving up overall quality.
- To increase choice of treatment, giving both professionals and patients more control.
- To bring in additional funding, particularly for infrastructure projects, that otherwise could not be generated without increasing taxation and public spending.
- There is also a suspicion in some quarters that the coalition wishes to ultimately reduce state provision on ideological grounds.

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

- Limited understanding of why the government has sought to bring the private sector into the NHS.
- Limited understanding of at the ways in which the private sector has been brought into the NHS since 1997.

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

- Clear understanding of why the government has sought to bring the private sector into the NHS.
- Clear understanding of at the ways in which the private sector has been brought into the NHS since 1997.

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	Why has anti-terror legislation since 2001 been criticised?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should be aware that there have been a number of anti-terrorism laws passed since 2001 including the Anti-Terrorism Crime and Security Act (2001) which allowed seizure of terrorist property and imprisonment without trial, The Prevention of Terrorism Act (2005) – which introduced Control Orders, and the Terrorism Act (2006) which increased detention without trial to 28 (but not 90) days.</p> <p>Candidates need not identify the names of the pieces of legislation, but responses that do not identify specific measures taken cannot progress beyond level 2.</p> <p>These measures have been criticised on a number of grounds, broadly divided into effectiveness and impact on freedoms. These <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They fundamentally undermine civil liberties: including Magna Carta (no imprisonment without trial) and ECHR/HRA, causing repeated conflict with the judiciary. • They place too much power in the hands of the state – e.g. the Home Secretary’s power to impose Control Orders without a trial, and increased police powers. • They cannot succeed because they are purely reactive and do not address the underlying causes of terrorism, such as British Foreign Policy, Globalisation etc. • They are ineffective in practice, in that a number of arrests/trials of terrorist suspects have not led to convictions • They are counter-productive as they serve to marginalise and alienate minority groups, particularly Moslems, fuelling resentment and potentially increasing radicalisation and terrorism. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of government policies aimed at tackling terrorism since 2001. • Limited understanding of the ways in which these policies have been criticised. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of government policies aimed at tackling terrorism since 2001. • Clear understanding of the ways in which these policies have been criticised. 	

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

Explain the arguments for and against the expansion of nuclear power in the UK.

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

Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the on-going debate about Britain's future energy provision and the need to find alternative sources of energy to meet such challenges as Global Warming and Peak Oil.

Specific arguments advanced in favour of nuclear expansion may include:

- It would reduce dependence of foreign energy supplies, which could be seen as particularly important in light of current instability in the middle east.
- It would reduce levels of CO₂, giving a positive impact on tackling climate change and helping the UK to meet its carbon emission targets.
- It is equally sustainable to renewable sources of energy but more reliable and proven on a large scale – candidates might give favourable comparisons with wind, solar or tidal energy.

Specific arguments advanced against nuclear expansion which may include:

- The level of risk in the event of disaster, particularly in comparison to other sources.
- The difficulties associated with the disposal of nuclear waste, and the length of time that nuclear material remains both a safety threat and an environmental hazard.
- The level of investment required to build a new generation of stations, which would detract from investment in other sources of energy.

Examples may be cited to support both sides of the case – such as France's large scale use of nuclear energy on the one hand, and the disasters at Chernobyl and Fukushima on the other hand. These examples must be linked to specific points to be credited.

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

- Limited understanding of the arguments for and against a new generation of nuclear power stations, or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of the arguments for and against a new generation of nuclear power stations including a clear degree of balance.

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	"A fundamental attack on the principles of the welfare state". Discuss this view of the policies of the coalition government.
--------------	---

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

Candidates should show awareness of the principles of the welfare state such as cradle to grave welfare; tackling the 'five giants' that prevent equality of opportunity - disease, want, squalor, ignorance and disease; universality; and the contributory principle. Candidates should also be able to identify specific welfare policies, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments.

Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question may include:

- The range of efforts to cap the amount that claimants can receive for various benefits (the universal credit), alongside the limits to increases in benefits within the Welfare Bill, could be said to weaken the addressing of the 'five giants'.
- The weakening of the principal of universalism, for example with reduction in child benefit for higher rate tax payers.
- Reforms to public sector pensions, coupled with child benefit changes, could be said to weaken the cradle to grave principle 'at both ends'.
- The perceived desire to radically cut the total cost of the welfare state without sufficient reference to need, and the impact that this could have on the most vulnerable, has been particularly criticised by Labour, charities and church leaders. For example the cap on housing benefit and reductions for properties with empty bedrooms – variously called the 'bedroom tax' or the 'spare room subsidy'.
- Cutting the deficit could be argued to be an excuse to drive a Conservative ideological agenda aimed at damaging or destroying the welfare state.

Arguments advanced against the premise of the question may include:

- The principle of universalism remains intact in important areas such as Old Age Pensions (and the NHS).
- The cost and scope of the welfare state has departed far from the original intention, and particularly from the contributory principle, leading to welfare dependency. Therefore the reforms restore rather than damage the key principles.
- The specific caps involved still leave claimants far better off than past claimants, and many non-claimants with minimal absolute poverty, disease etc.
- Labour have also accepted the principle that welfare reform is needed, whilst the Liberal Democrats and moderate Conservatives have limited any 'extreme' proposals.
- Reforms are necessary due to the financial situation: the welfare state is not being attacked but simply trimmed along with all other public spending.

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

- Limited understanding of the principles of the welfare state
- Limited understanding of the ways in which coalition policies have departed from these principles and the ways in which they have not; or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear and probably explicit understanding of the principles of the welfare state.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which coalition policies have departed from these principles and the ways in which they have not.

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
AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or 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/or 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
AO3	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	How successful have governments since 1997 been at tackling crime?
--------------	--

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

Candidates should demonstrate awareness that, whilst crime indicators indicate that crime has fallen steadily since 1995, there is a continuing debate over both whether crime itself is actually falling, and the extent to which governments can take the credit for this. Candidates should also be able to identify specific law and order policies of relevance to this debate, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments.

Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question may include:

- The statistical evidence of falling crime year on year since 1995.
- The political consensus and continuity on crime and policing matters in recent years, with little substantial change after 2010, may suggest that the issue has been 'solved'.
- The impact of the dual approach: tackling underlying socio-economic problems through increased investment in education, jobs etc. coupled with tougher sentences for repeat offenders and knife crime, use of CCTV etc.
- The progress made in tackling anti-social behaviour, with the use of ASBOs, ABCs etc.
- Evidence that the public feel safer, in particular due to the shift of policing back into the streets with an emphasis on 'bobbies on the beat', PCSOs and community policing.

Arguments advanced against the premise of the question may include:

- The view that there has been no reduction of crime, with crime statistics obscuring the fact that the UK has become more dangerous and its people more insecure.
- The increases in certain kinds of crime and the failure to tackle them – such as crimes primarily committed against women like rape and domestic violence.
- The proliferation of 'new crimes' ranging from internet fraud to terrorism, and the failure of governments to react quickly or sufficiently.
- The outbreak of rioting in London and elsewhere in 2011 could be cited an example of large scale lawlessness that contradicts the notion of a general reduction in crime.
- The view that crime has fallen, but that this was not primarily due to government initiatives but to factors like a strong economy and shifting demographics.
- Furthermore the economic situation, and consequent cuts to policing budgets could lead to an upward trend in crime figures in the near future.

Candidates should focus on the political arguments, and credit should not be given for detailed sociological analysis as to the causes of crime.

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

- Limited understanding of specific policies aimed at reducing crime since 1997
- Limited understanding of the evidence that government policy could be seen

as successful in tackling crime and the ways in which this could be challenged, or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of specific policies aimed at reducing crime since 1997.
- Clear understanding of the evidence that government policy could be seen as successful in tackling crime and the ways in which this could be challenged.

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
AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or 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/or 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
<i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

No. 8

'Austerity has been a painful but correct response to the economic situation since 2010.' Discuss.

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

Austerity refers to government policies focused on reducing budget deficits during adverse economic conditions and may include spending cuts, tax increases, or a mixture of the two. The intention is to improve the economy in the long-term, and to demonstrate financial responsibility to government creditors and credit rating agencies by bringing income closer to expenditure. Candidates should be able to identify specific economic policies of relevance to this debate, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments.

Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question may include:

- Recent evidence suggests that austerity was more successful than initially thought, with the UK avoiding a double dip recession and the economy now improving.
- The alternative policy of stimulus in response to the credit crunch of 2008 was largely to blame for the current debt crisis.
- The comparative level of economic crisis seen in those countries that did not make sufficient efforts to reduce spending such as Greece, Italy, Spain and Cyprus.
- The short term pain from cuts will prove to be of benefit in the long run, as the reduction of the structural deficit now will facilitate a much stronger recovery.
- The lack of a coherent alternative or 'Plan B' to tackle the deficit.

Arguments advanced against the premise of the question may include:

- Cuts in public spending and increases in VAT caused the economy to stagnate with sluggish growth. This could be contrasted unfavourably with Germany.
- The evidential basis of austerity has been challenged, following revelations of mistakes in key academic papers that supported austerity.
- Coalition austerity has failed on its own terms of firstly halving the structural deficit by 2015, and secondly retaining the Triple A credit rating.
- Even if austerity is accepted in principle, it was arguably 'too far too fast' with the cuts having a massive impact on services, particularly hurting the most vulnerable.
- Contrasts may be drawn between the rise in living costs and pressures on wages for 'ordinary families' with the higher rate tax cuts and bankers' bonuses etc.
- Some argue that austerity is simply an 'excuse' for an ideologically driven attempt, by the Conservatives in particular, to reduce the size of public sector.

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

- Limited understanding of the recent economic context and policy.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which austerity could be defended and challenged, or a clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of the recent economic context and policy.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which austerity could be defended and challenged.

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
AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or 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/or 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
AO3	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)

<i>AO1 / AO2 / Synopticity</i>	
Level 3 (Good to excellent)	9-12
Level 2 (Limited to sound)	5-8
Level 1 (Very poor to weak)	0-4

<i>AO3</i>	
Level 3 (good to excellent)	7-9
Level 2 (Limited to sound)	4-6
Level 1 (Very poor to weak)	0-3

