

Mark Scheme (Standardisation)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE Government &
Politics

Paper 4D: Global Political Issues
(6GP04)

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 2015

Publications Code UA041726

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

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 | Why has there been controversy over the role of international courts and tribunals in protecting human rights? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>There are a number of international courts and tribunals which have been set up to prosecute individuals rather than states. Effectiveness in promoting human rights can be judged through indictments and prosecutions and also through the deterrent effect, though this is harder to judge. Courts operate in some circumstances but not others.</p> <p>The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia was created in 1993 to prosecute for crimes against humanity and genocide committed in the Yugoslav wars. To date, there have been a significant number of prosecutions including high profile cases against individuals like Milosovic, Mladic and Karadzic. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda was established in 1994 and notable successes include the conviction of the former prime minister Kambanda. The Sierra Leone Tribunal has prosecuted the former Liberian president, Charles Taylor. The International Criminal Court was established in 2002 and there have been a number of significant indictments but support for the institution ranges widely between the most significant states. There are concerns about the impact on sovereignty and some dictators go unpunished and appear able to ignore these institutions.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be limited but accurate explanation of two areas of controversy or a more developed explanation of one. These could be broad controversies such as impact on sovereignty or controversy linked to a specific court or tribunal. Limited use of examples.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be good explanation of three areas of controversy or a more developed explanation of two. These could be broad controversies such as impact on sovereignty or controversy linked to a specific court or tribunal.</p> <p>Good use of examples</p> | |

| 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 | How does dependency theory help to explain global inequality? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>Dependency theory is based on the neo-Marxist perspective, which suggests that traditional imperialism gave way to neo-colonialism or dollar imperialism in the period following the end of World War 2. Dependency theory can be linked to world-system theory in which economically advanced core areas dominate peripheral areas, dependent on agriculture and primary production.</p> <p>Many regard the relationship between the global South and global North as still being one of dependency. The South is still dependent on the North for foreign direct investment, manufactured goods, skills and technology, and developing countries are forced to sell primary products such as coffee or cocoa at prices which do not reflect their true value.</p> <p>International aid is given in order to obtain political concessions and financial institutions from the North, such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank provide highly conditional loans or use debt to force states to open their economies to trade and multinational firms.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be a limited but accurate attempt at a definition/explanation of dependency theory and the link to inequality. Limited use of examples.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be a good attempt at a definition/explanation of dependency theory and link to inequality. Good use of examples and likely use of theorists.</p> | |

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (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><i>Level 2</i> (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><i>Level 1</i> (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 does the 'tragedy of the commons' help to explain the environmental crisis? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>The 'tragedy of the commons' is the idea that common land, historically, could be subject to over-grazing because each herder was able to keep as many cattle as possible on the commons. Sooner or later, this would lead to tragedy as the number of cattle came to exceed the 'carrying capacity' of the land. Ultimately, all would suffer from the lack of coordination and recognition of the bigger picture. As Garrett Hardin put it, 'Freedom in a commons brings ruin to all'.</p> <p>The 'tragedy' of the commons' shows how communities over-exploit shared environmental resources; the depletion of common resources will occur as long as people are self serving, and unilateral acts of restraint such as reducing CO2 emissions are insufficient to tackle the problem. The limited progress in establishing common action to deal with environmental concerns is evident in the disappointment attributed to the perceived failure of international conferences and agreements such as Kyoto and Copenhagen. The inability of the IPCC to bring states to meaningful action is also an illustration of this issue. Agreements tend to be non binding or insufficient.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be a limited but accurate attempt at a definition/explanation of the key term 'Tragedy of the Commons'. Likely to be a limited but accurate explanation of the link to the environmental crisis.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be a good explanation and/or definition of the key term 'Tragedy of the Commons' Likely to be a good explanation of the link to the environmental crisis Likely to be a good range of examples in support and use of appropriate terminology</p> | |

| 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 | What is the 'war on terror', and how does it differ from traditional wars? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>The 'war on terror' is the attempt by the USA and a few other states to destroy a number of groups which are considered to be responsible for global terrorism. The 9/11 attacks served as a catalyst for this war. Although the opening acts were reminiscent of traditional warfare with the assault on Afghanistan in 2001 and the invasion of Iraq in 2003, these actions gave way to a different kind of conflict.</p> <p>The 'war on terror' differs from traditional or 'old' wars in a number of respects. A traditional war tended to be fought against a distinct state and against a uniformed and organised body of men. The 'war on terror' is often seen as a 'new' war in that it has taken many forms including asymmetrical conflicts and the weapons of the 'war on terror' are not always military.</p> <p>This war seeks to tackle non-state actors and terror groups. So called 'rogue' states are also a concern and a desire to limit the spread of weapons of mass destruction is also a central theme. For some, the war on terror seems to be almost exclusively directed at militant or radicalised Islam and can be linked to a clash of civilisations.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be an accurate definition or explanation albeit limited Likely to be at least two valid factors raised although limited in explanation and limited use of examples</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Likely to be a good definition or explanation Likely to be three valid factors raised with a good explanation and use of examples</p> | |

| 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 relationship between corruption and poverty. |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>Corruption is a failure to carry out 'proper' or public responsibilities (good governance) because of the pursuit of private gain, usually, in this context, involving misappropriation of aid. Aid can be channelled through recipient-country governments and bureaucracies where power is concentrated in the hands of an elite and where accountability is undeveloped. Corrupt leaders can divert resources towards a privileged few rather than towards the majority. Aid can even be used to strengthen the power hold of authoritarian regimes through subverting opponents and building up the elements of state control such as the military.</p> <p>Arguably corruption and bribery lead to economic waste and inefficiency because resources are allocated to the activities which yield the greatest bribes, commissions or kickbacks. This may be aid or expenditure based on other sources. It could be argued that investment and expenditure becomes geared towards large defence projects and 'white elephants' rather than economic development, education or health. Examples of a lack of 'good governance' may be used here. Some may also argue that whilst corruption can lead to poverty, poverty can also lead to corruption. However, there is a view that corruption may be necessary to ensure that aid deals go through.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Likely to be some attempt at a definition/explanation of the key term/s• Likely to be a limited explanation of the relationship between them• Likely to be limited use of at least one example <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Likely to be a good attempt at a definition/explanation of the key term/s• Likely to be a good explanation of the relationship between them• Likely to be good use of a number of examples | |

| 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 international community has taken significant action to tackle climate change.' Discuss. |
|--------------|--|

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

There is now widespread agreement that climate change, or global warming, is occurring. Achieving significant global action on climate change is complicated since the tradition within International Relations is state-centric, with a focus on state sovereignty and national interest. Non-state actors such as Transnational Corporations are at least as important as states when it comes to damaging activities. The attempts to tackle global warming, to date, focus on action at state level but there is debate as to the significance of the action and moves which have taken place.

Kyoto can be seen as the first significant 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. Emissions trading, the use of carbon sinks etc suggest that there is inventive thought being applied to how best to tackle global warming, in a realistic fashion. 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 vital if meaningful progress is to be made.

A counter argument could focus on the obstacles to significant action including state self-interest (the tragedy of the commons), especially in view of the significant economic impact of implementing meaningful emissions reductions, great power tensions, and rivalry between developed and developing states. The lack of World Government or effective Global Governance with supranational power makes meaningful progress unlikely. Criticisms have focused on the limitations of the Kyoto agreement. The US refused to ratify Kyoto and the targets set at Kyoto applied only to developed states, thereby excluding emerging economies which were fast becoming major emitters. Disagreement between developed and developing states continues to hinder meaningful progress with arguments over how states should be measured, overall emissions or per capita etc. The Copenhagen meeting was also widely condemned as a failure. In particular, no legally-binding targets emerged from the conference, at either the state or the global level. The Copenhagen Accord seemed to be a weak compromise without any meaningful or realistic commitments.

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

- Likely to be a limited knowledge of key institutions, conferences and agreements which have attempted to tackle climate change
- Likely to have a limited explanation of the hurdles to significant action
- Limited debate between contrasting views
- Limited structure and use of appropriate terminology

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

- Likely to be a good knowledge of key institutions, conferences and agreements which have attempted to tackle climate change
- Likely to have a good explanation of the hurdles to significant action
- Good level of debate between contrasting views
- Good structure and use of appropriate terminology

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 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 | To what extent are universal human rights now globally accepted? |
| Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>Human rights are rights to which people are entitled by virtue of being human. Human rights are universal in the sense that they supposedly belong to all humans rather than to members of any particular country, religion, race, gender or other group.</p> <p>There is a growing body of human rights international law. This stems from the 1948 UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The growing number of significant international human rights documents have increased awareness of human rights worldwide and serves to exert moral pressure on states to improve protection for human rights.</p> <p>NGOs such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch serve to expose abuses of human rights and encourage states to improve their protections for human rights.</p> <p>International courts have been increasingly active in the area of human rights, being willing to prosecute political leaders and other figures for violations of human rights, crimes against humanity and genocide. The development of the ICC and the special tribunals for Sierra Leone, Rwanda and Yugoslavia as well as the development of the principle of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) signal an increased willingness to override the concept of sovereignty in order to protect human rights.</p> <p>Recent examples of humanitarian intervention also suggest that the international community can be prepared to take action in defence of human rights and to prevent human rights violations.</p> <p>Counter argument may focus on the following:</p> <p>Realists have argued that the doctrine of universal human rights should not guide state policy because states should prioritise the well-being of their own citizens over others, their primary concern being to pursue the national interest.</p> <p>The concept of human rights has been criticised as having a western bias which reflects a western, liberal model of human nature that emphasises rights and entitlements over obligations and social belonging. In this respect, universal human rights can be seen as a form of cultural imperialism. Such views have been advanced most clearly by Muslim thinkers who believe that human well-being is divinely ordained, and by some Asian politicians who champion the notion of 'Asian values' or of communitarianism above individual concern.</p> <p>The special tribunals and courts are open to criticism, along with humanitarian intervention which can be viewed as selective and often flawed in terms of protecting human rights.</p> | |

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

- Likely to have at least a limited explanation of the term 'universal human rights'
- Limited debate between contrasting views
- Likely to be a limited use of examples
- Limited structure and use of appropriate terminology

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

- Likely to be a good explanation of the term 'universal human rights'
- Good level of debate between contrasting views
- Likely to be a good use of examples
- Good structure and use of appropriate terminology

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

'The proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction is the major threat to global security.' Discuss.

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

Nuclear proliferation relates to the spread of nuclear weapons, either by their acquisition by more states or other actors (horizontal proliferation), or their accumulation by established nuclear states (vertical proliferation). Weapons of mass destruction may also include chemical and biological weapons. There are a number of arguments which support the view that proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is the major threat to global security. Not only do these weapons have the potential to inflict massive collateral damage with devastating implications for civilian populations but they are also key assets in the security dilemma and in development of state power.

The actions of the United States in attempting to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction have been linked to conflicts such as the Iraq war, Libyan intervention and Syrian conflict in recent years. There is ongoing concern about the Iranian nuclear situation and potential conflict involving Israel. North Korea continues to be a cause for concern. Whilst most attention has focussed on the nuclear threat, the relative ease in which chemical and biological weapons can be developed has led to a growing concern about these types of weapons. The perceived failure of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and other safeguards has led to increased concern also.

Factors other than the proliferation of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction may be perceived as greater threats to global security. There is a view that the Islamic fundamentalist upsurge which has taken place in the late twentieth century and the response from the West is a more significant cause of conflict. The universalisation of western values may have provoked a response from cultures who feel under threat and may have led to a shift to extremism. The clash of civilisations thesis is relevant here with religion seen to be a central defining characteristic in civilisations. This thesis would suggest that religion is of the utmost significance as a primary cause of conflict in global politics and the thesis does suggest a likelihood of conflict between Islam and other groups. Events in Kashmir, the Middle East, Chechnya and the wider 'war on terror' can be used in support of this view. There are numerous examples of conflict based around the actions of Islamic extremists.

Shifts in polarity are worth exploring when considering rising tensions and increased conflict. There is plenty of debate regarding the likelihood of increased conflict as global politics shifts from bipolarity to unipolarity or multipolarity. The actions of a predatory hegemon may be discussed in view of developments such as the Iraq war and the Bush Doctrine. Humanitarian intervention may also result in conflict or widen existing conflict.

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

- Likely to be at least a limited explanation of the key terms
- Limited debate between contrasting views with a limited consideration of alternative threats to global security
- Likely to be a limited use of examples
- Limited structure and use of appropriate terminology

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

- Likely to be at least a good explanation of the key terms
- Good debate between contrasting views with a likelihood of a good consideration of alternative, more significant, threats to global security
- Likely to be a good use of example
- Good structure and use of appropriate terminology

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

