



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel GCE in
Government and Politics (6GP03)
Paper 3A: UK Political Issues

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. 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. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. 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 2017

Publications Code 6GP03_3A_1706_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

General Marking Guidance

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

No. 1	How far do the major political parties agree on the ways to achieve economic growth?
--------------	--

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

Candidates should demonstrate an awareness there is a degree of both agreement and disagreement on the best ways to achieve economic growth, given the UK's recent recession and the continuing global economic challenges.

Ways in which the major parties could be seen to agree may include:

- The major parties support investing in major infrastructure projects, such as HS2, in order to facilitate growth.
- Most parties ultimately agree on the need to control the deficit to support long-term 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).

Ways in which the major parties could be seen to disagree may include:

- 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, and Labour wishing to increase it.
- The level of regulation required to balance financial stability with allowing economic growth, with the Conservative Party favouring a more laissez-faire approach than other parties.
- The respective roles of the public and private sectors in stimulating growth and running certain areas of the economy.
- The relative importance of cutting the deficit to support economic strength and growth in the long run, and thus the degree to which austerity was and is necessary.
- The extent to which EU membership, soft Brexit or Hard Brexit might damage economic growth.

Candidates may also creditably discuss differences how party views on other policy areas, such as Fracking, the Minimum Wage might have on economic growth, provided that the link to growth is clearly made.

A broad interpretation will be allowed for 'major party' but candidates must consider both the Labour and Conservative Parties to achieve Level 3.

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

- Limited understanding of ways in which major parties do and do not agree on the ways to achieve economic growth; or a clear understanding of one side of the question.

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

- Clear understanding of ways in which major parties do and do not agree on the ways to achieve economic growth.

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	Assess the arguments in favour of increasing the length of prison terms.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness that a “hard-line” approach to sentencing policy has been supported by a range of arguments, but that these arguments are countered by those favouring more emphasis on rehabilitation.</p> <p>Arguments in favour of increasing prison terms, and assessment of them, <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They serve as a deterrent. But reoffending rates are high for prisoners compared to those given community sentences. • They remove criminals from the wider population. But they are perceived as a ‘school of crime’, especially for young offenders, turning prisoners into more effective criminals after their release. • They are a form of retribution and ‘just punishment’. But a very high proportion of people in jail are either drug addicts, mentally ill or illiterate and that it is fairer to address the causes of their offending. • Community sentences are perceived as ‘getting away with it’. But prison places carry a much higher cost. <p>Answers that include no accurate assessment of the arguments advanced in favour cannot enter Level 3.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of arguments in favour of increased prisons terms with limited assessment of those arguments; or clear understanding arguments in favour without assessment. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of arguments in favour of increased prisons terms with clear assessment of those arguments. 	

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	Explain the current disagreements between the major parties over education policy.
--------------	--

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

Candidate should show awareness of a range of relevant recent education policies that have caused political debate. These may refer to disagreement between Conservatives on the one hand and Labour and the Liberal Democrats on the other, but relevant references may also be made to other parties.

Ways in which the parties disagree may include

- Labour included plans to scrap tuition fees in its election manifesto, which the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats did not, having increased the fees whilst in government.
- The 'fairer funding formula' introduced by the Conservatives has been criticised as unfair by other parties as it will lead to significant cuts for some schools.
- UKIP and the Conservatives favour an increase in the number of grammar schools, whilst Labour and the Liberal Democrats oppose this.
- The Conservatives announced plans for all state schools to eventually become academies, with the potential of some of these being run by private companies making profit, which Labour oppose.
- There has been disagreement between parties about which meals should be provided free for primary age students, with Labour and the Liberal Democrat proposing to retain free school lunches, and the Conservatives wishing to switch to breakfast.

Agreements over education policy will not be credited.

A broad interpretation will be allowed for 'major party' but candidates must consider both the Labour and Conservative Parties to achieve Level 3.

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

- Limited understanding of the disagreements between the major parties on education policy.

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

- Clear understanding of the disagreements between the major parties on education policy.

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

Using examples, why have UK governments since 2001 sought to implement environmentally sustainable growth?

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

Candidates should demonstrate an understanding that sustainability refers to the balance between economic, social and environmental factors but implies a reformed rather than radically changed form of growth (sometimes referred to as 'getting rich more slowly').

Reasons why governments have sought to implement environmentally sustainable growth may include:

- The increased threat of Global Warming caused by pollution, and in particular carbon emissions.
- The need to meet international targets.
- Fears over the availability of resource due to both supply security and resource depletion concerns.
- Increasing concern over the impact of pollution and other environmental damage, such as habitat destruction, on quality of life.
- The increasing political strength of the 'green lobby'.

A range of examples may be offered including the creation of the Green Investment Bank, the promotion of large environmentally friendly infrastructure projects such as HS2, the shift in energy production, and the increasing use of green taxation. Other relevant examples may also be offered.

Candidates must consider more than one government to achieve level 3.

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

- Limited understanding of why UK governments since 2001 have sought to achievement environmentally sustainable growth, or a clear understanding of how one government since 2001 has.
- Limited use of relevant examples.

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

- Clear understanding of why UK governments since 2001 have sought to achievement environmentally sustainable growth.
- Clear use of relevant 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. 5	Explain the arguments for and against the means testing of the state pension.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the debate about means testing universal benefits in general, but should link arguments on both sides to the state pension in particular.</p> <p>Arguments for the means testing of the state pension <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The huge cost of the state pension, which makes up a significant proportion of the costs of state benefits. • This is exacerbated by the UK's ageing population making a universal pension an ever-increasing and unsustainable drain on an ill-equipped economy. • Many of those who receive the pension have large incomes and do not need state payments: means testing allows for better targeting of resources to those most in need. • Most benefits are now means tested and the pension has only been exempted until now due to the voting power of the 'grey vote'. <p>Arguments against the means testing of the state pension <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The universal pension gives everyone an equal stake in the system: everyone is getting as well as giving, with is consistent with the founding principles of the welfare state. • Means testing dis-incentivises people to make their own provision for old age, knowing that they will be 'punished' with reduced benefits. • Any move from universal to means tested benefits creates either a "poverty trap" or a "squeezed middle" where people just above the threshold suffer. • Means testing is inevitably bureaucratic and invasive, making it potentially more not less expensive to implement. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of argument in favour and against the means testing of the state pension; or a clear understanding of one side of the question. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of argument in favour and against the means testing of the state pension. 	

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

'Government law and order policies since 2001 have been largely unsuccessful.' Discuss.

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

Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that, whilst recorded crime has fallen steadily, there is a continuing debate over whether crime itself is actually falling, and the extent to which governments can take the credit for any reduction. Candidates should 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 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, and other subsequent violent protests such as the 2015 'million mask march' which could be cited as large-scale lawlessness, contradicting the notion of a general reduction in crime.
- Any reduction in crime has been at the cost of eroded civil liberties, which themselves have fuelled an increased level of extremism that poses a greater threat
- The increase in terror attacks which may variously be ascribed to insufficiently strong anti-terror laws, poor intelligence, or police cuts.

Arguments advanced against the premise of the question may include:

- The statistical evidence of falling crime year on year since 1995.
- The significant efforts made to tackle 'historic crime' with the prosecution of major public figures such as Rolf Harris and Max Clifford over sexual offences.
- 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 lack of major terrorist incidents between 2005 and 2015, with recent attacks being an unusual new trend.
- The progress made in tackling anti-social behaviour, with the use of ASBOs, ABCs etc.
- 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.

Candidates may cite police numbers on either side of the debate, given the arguable success of the emphasis on 'bobbies on the beat', PCSOs and community policing, but the recent cuts to this area.

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

- Limited understanding of the arguments and evidence why UK governments' law and order policies since 2001 have been largely unsuccessful, or clear understanding of why one UK government's policies have been unsuccessful.
- Limited understanding of the arguments and evidence why UK governments' law and order policies since 2001 have not been largely unsuccessful, or clear understanding of why one UK government's policies have not been unsuccessful.

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

- Clear understanding of the arguments and evidence why UK governments' law and order policies since 2001 have been largely unsuccessful.
- Lear understanding of the arguments and evidence why UK governments' law and order policies since 2001 have not been largely unsuccessful.

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 have governments since 2010 reversed the progress made on tackling environmental challenges?

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

Candidates should make reference to the environmental record of both the Coalition from 2010-2015, and the Conservative government since 2015. They need not make arguments on both sides of the question for each government, provided that there is a balanced response overall.

Arguments in favour of the premise of the question may include:

- The expansion of less environmentally friendly forms of energy production such as fracking, especially since 2015, and the continued commitment to nuclear power.
- The recent reductions in subsidies to clean renewable energy such as wind and solar.
- The lack of significant implementation of green taxation or punitive measures for companies and individuals who pollute.
- The continued inclination of governments since 2010 to give into the demand on the car lobby over fuel prices and roads projects.
- The approval of further airport expansion, including at Heathrow, under the current government.
- The limitations of such policies as the Green Investment Bank, as well as David Cameron's decision to 'cut out the green crap' have led to accusation that much environment policy, particularly from the Conservative party, is 'window dressing' masking a general de-prioritisation of the area.

Arguments against the premise of the question may include:

- The continued commitment, at least in principle, of the current government to meeting Britain's international treaty obligations.
- Continual year on year improvements in recycling rates, due to a combination of provision, education and enforcement.
- The increasing willingness of governments since 2010 to reflect environmental considerations in transport policy, such as the delays of Heathrow's 5th runway and the introduction of HS2.
- The introduction of the Green Investment Bank.
- Specific measures taken to tackle individual environmental issues, such as the plastic bag tax.
- The progress made by the 2010-2015 coalition towards ambitious targets such as the 25:5 goal to reduce public sector emissions by 25% in 5 years, and the 20:20 goal of reducing UK carbon emissions by 20% by 2020.

Comparison may also be creditably made with the progress achieved by other countries, such as Scandinavian countries on the one hand and the US and China on the other.

Candidates may, when discussing the counter arguments to the premise of the question, argue either that progress has been increased, or that there has been a continuation of the previous level of progress.

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

- Limited understanding of the arguments that UK governments since 2010 have and have not reversed progress made on climate change, or clear understanding of one side of the question.
- Limited use of pertinent illustrative policy examples.

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

- Clear understanding of the arguments that UK governments since 2010 have and have not reversed progress made on climate change.
- Clear use of pertinent illustrative policy examples.

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.

No. 8

'Privatisation remains a political and economic success.' Discuss.

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

Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that privatisation has once again become a 'live' political issue, particularly given the changes in leadership of the Labour party and the recent General Election campaign.

Arguments in support of the success of privatisation may include:

- The political consensus around the retention and expansion of privatisation up until at least 2015.
- The increased efficiency of privatised industries in comparison to state run institutions, for example British Rail or British Telecom.
- The level of competition introduced by privatisation which has lowered prices, for example in parcel delivery, despite the need for such companies to make a profit.
- The extension of share ownership to a much greater proportion of the population, making Britain a 'share owning democracy'
- The amount of capital raised for the public finances, both through direct privatisation and the use of Private Finance Initiatives, which has been to increase investment, boost other areas of public spending and reduce taxes.
- The reduced burden on the state in terms of ongoing subsidy of state owned industries and the employment of their workers.

Arguments that suggest privatisation has not been successful may include:

- The Labour policy of, and public support for, renationalisation of the railways due to the failure of competition (as trains cannot overtake those in front) and a perceived decline in the quality of the service.
- The potential reversal of other privatisations depending on the further development of Labour policy and the result of the 2020 election.
- The concentration of ongoing share ownership in a limited section of the population, as many small shareholders have sold shares for a quick profit.
- A perceived excessive level of profit making, for example in the private utilities and through PFI, at the expense of customer service and prices.
- The high level of job losses in many privatised industries, with senior executive pay increasing significantly whilst worker conditions have declined.
- The perceived failure of the privatisation of the Royal Mail in terms of value to the taxpayer, and a lack of public appetite for the further privatisation of public services such as the NHS, Education or Police.

Candidates may, when discussing the counter arguments to the premise of the question, argue either that privatisation was initially successful but is no longer so, or that the initial success was a fallacy and the policy a wholesale failure.

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

- Limited understanding of the arguments that privatisation does remain a political and economic success, or clear understanding of one side of the question.
- Limited use of pertinent illustrative policy examples.

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

- Clear understanding of the arguments that privatisation does remain a political and economic success.
- Clear use of pertinent illustrative policy examples.

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.