



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel A Level

In Politics (9PL0) Paper 01

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 2019

Publications Code 9PL0_01_1906_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

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.

Guidelines for Marking Source Question

AO1 (10 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding.

When the rubric on the exam paper states that candidates must 'analyse and evaluate **only** the information presented in the source' it means that candidates should only use points referenced in the source to develop AO2 & AO3.

Newly introduced points cannot form the basis for AO2 and AO3 marks.

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source. They should look at the different views that arise from the source and show how these lay the foundations for a judgement.

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the analysis. They must make and form judgments based on the source and they should reach a reasoned verdict which comes down on one side throughout their response.

Marks for analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) should only be awarded where they relate to information in the source

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.

Candidates who do not undertake any comparative analysis of the source and/or have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected throughout their response.

Other valid responses are acceptable

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
1(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few seats change hands in a general election • Class & region are major determinants of voting behaviour • Opinion polls are accurate predictors of voting behaviour • Voting behaviour indicates party alignment <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pattern of few seats changing hands is no longer applicable • People's votes are now influenced by party policies and issues • Opinion polls are no longer a reliable indicator of how people vote. 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been the pattern since the post war period that there are an enormous number of 'safe seats' • This means that a person's class and region are crucial in how they vote • Opinion polls shows stability in voting patterns • This means that not only does a person identify with a class this alignment is further enforced when a person identifies themselves with a particular party working in their interests <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This means that there is increased voter volatility and greater 'swings' or changes in voter preferences • This means that voting is 'instrumental' implying that voters are all independent agents who make up their mind on what is to their rational benefit • This has been evident in recent elections showing voter volatility • Age and education have become better indicators of how people will vote, overtaking class and party loyalty 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, we can conclude that general elections are won and lost in the few marginal seats • One can conclude that class & regional voting leads to predictability and stability in in general election outcomes • We can conclude that the historic accuracy of opinion polls shows stability and predictability in General elections. • We can conclude that elections are predictable as political parties can rely on vast swathes of the electorate to vote for them <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that far from being predictable and stable it is no longer possible to predict vast swathes of 'safe seats' thus general elections outcomes are volatile • Thus, we can conclude that party and class alignment are not reliable as people now vote more out of self-interest • We can conclude that inaccuracies in opinion poll predictions shows that elections are not predictable or stable. • We can reach the verdict that, the basis of predicting voting behaviour has many changing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Age and education have also been factors recently • It is leaders and the media who shape the way people vote 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In recent years there has been more emphasis on the style and brand of parties. This means that a greater sense of importance is attached to these factors 	<p>various, leading to instability in electoral outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that predictability is therefore no longer assured and constant and the switching of voter allegiance means that the fight for people's votes is more intense and on a different playing field than in the past
	<p>Own knowledge not in the source which may be considered as AO1 include:</p> <p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A person's ethnicity is important and provides stability • Religion can play an important part in predicting voting behaviour • Voters in the main remain loyal to the incumbent government and as such vote to keep with the status quo <p>Against the premise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The increased use of referendums has impacted on voter choice in elections • Rising 'other' parties distort voting patterns and create volatility 	<p>NO AO2 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</p>	<p>No AO3 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political events interfere with outcomes and create volatility 		
--	--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

- Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
1(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FPTP damages legitimacy and discourages turnout because of wasted vote • FPTP breeds adversarial politics and negates the need for compromise • FPTP leads to a 'winner takes all' approach which delivers extremes of policy changes which damages the country • PR would encourage more people to vote and improve the chances of a more reflective Parliament. <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PR would hand excessive power to parties • FPTP delivers strong and stable government • FPTP provides for a good MP-constituency link • FPTP is clear and easy to understand and it keeps out extremists 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments and MPs gain election with less than 50% of the vote and thus exercise majority power on a minority vote • The Westminster Parliament is built on adversarial politics with a binary view of issues and causes • Incoming governments are driven by changing their predecessors work and setting off in constantly new directions. • FPTP does not treat all votes as equal and deters many from voting, especially those who support minor parties <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is because deals are made between parties after the election which can be undemocratic, leaders also control the order of the lists in some forms of PR • For decades with only a few minor blips FPTP has served the nation well in delivering single party stable governments • This is because constituency sizes are relatively small enabling constituents to have clear access to their representation • Few spoiled ballots show the clarity surrounding FPTP and it has an impressive record of preventing extremist parties gaining seats 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that FPTP lacks a democratic mandate • We can reach a verdict that FPTP undermines consensus reducing the effectiveness of elections • We can reach a judgement that a strong economy and stable society require PR to provide the framework for this • We can conclude that Multi party politics does not equate with FPTP – a multicultural society is not served well by FPTP <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that PR would not improve elections as it would take power away from the people to parties • We can reach a judgement that FPTP enhances election as Governments are able to carry out their manifesto held accountable at the next GE • We can conclude that having good access to your representative is a crucial factor in a representative democracy • We can reach a verdict that more damage can be done to democracy by extremists parties if FPTP was to go

	<p>Own knowledge not in the source which may be considered as AO1 include</p> <p>For the premise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• People need to be educated about the damage FPTP does and the benefits of PR• The ERS champions STV and condemns FPTP• PR has already been introduced to the UK with little disruption. <p>Against the premise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Changing FPTP was rejected in a referendum• FPTP delivers a quick result• PR has not increased turnout in other elections in the UK compared to FPTP	<p>NO AO2 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</p>	<p>No AO3 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</p>
--	---	---	---

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

AO1 (10 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support or reject the view presented by the question

They should look at the different perspectives that arise from the view presented by the question and show how these lay the foundations for a judgement.

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the analysis.
They must make and form judgments and they should reach a reasoned verdict which comes down on one side throughout their response.

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected throughout their response.

Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Candidates who have only mentioned pressure groups (not think tanks or lobbyists) in question 2a cannot achieve marks beyond level 3.

Candidates who have only mentioned either the Labour or Conservative Party in question 2b cannot achieve marks beyond level 3.

Other valid responses are acceptable

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
2(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments can ignore the vast bulk of influence exerted by think-tanks, lobbyists and pressure groups • Governments tend to ignore collective organisations who have incompatible views • Some collective organisations lack resources to have an impact on government decisions • The vast number of collective organisations that exist in UK society often work to cancel each other out. <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments are conscious of effective collective group activity • Many collective organisations have a powerful political profile (respected think-tanks, lobbyists and insider groups) • Governments have abandoned their policy agendas as a result of collective group activity • Many collective organisations have direct input into government policy as a result of financial, political or academic support 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments have the sole authority to make decisions • Governments have a mandate to carry out their policies, collective organisations do not. • This is because the government may have a monopoly of information or may prevent information reaching the public domain. • Diversity thus creates an impotence in power for collective bodies <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governments will avoid head on confrontation with collective bodies if possible, as it may damage their popularity • Governments respond to these group's concerned more than others without this profile • A well organised collective group may be as effective in changing government policy as other powerful groups. • Government policy is impacted by collective groups who support the governing party of the time. 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude few various examples that government decisions have not been reversed by these actions of these collective organisation • We can reach a judgement that collective organisations with limited compatibility with government policy have limited impact. • We can come to a verdict that for collective organisations to have impact, they have to have substantial resources. • We can conclude that, because the number of collective organisations have increased in recent years, few have managed to have a radical impact on government decisions <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that Governments are mindful of adverse publicity when dealing with pressure groups • We can come to a verdict that it is not a question of whether collective groups have influence but of which ones? • We can come to a judgement that collective groups provide a wealth of information and insight and thus have an impact on government policy. • We can conclude that collective organisation's impact on government policy is extensive

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
2(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It remains the major parties who dominate Parliament and thus the government • The funding, wealth and organisation of these parties cannot be matched by other parties • Other parties may have a few new ideas but the main cauldron of ideas rests with Labour & Conservative. • FPTP will always favour the major parties and secure their dominance <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continued dominance of the Labour and Conservative parties has declined • The electoral and party landscape has changed with the emergence of other parties both in Westminster and in the regions and devolved areas • Governing parties are having to call on other parties to prop them up in government as with the current DUP deal at Westminster • Ideas from the minor parties shape the political agenda 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minor parties may cause a stir in by-elections, but they do not get enough support to control Westminster • The sheer size and scope of the funding system for the major parties means continued dominance for them • Decisions and policies of importance like economic, foreign, law and order and welfare policy emanate from the two parties. • Labour and Conservatives have established 'heartlands' where they usually win seats safely. <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a focus away from the mainstream with people joining other parties • New electoral systems in the devolved regions have meant that votes for minor parties can now count. The SNP dominate Holyrood and PC have a strong base in Wales • As FPTP has worked in the last 3 GEs a hung parliament is the most likely outcome at the polls giving power to other parties • The two parties have struggled to deal with many of the issues that smaller parties have raised SNP – independence, UKIP – Brexit, Greens -the environment 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that as there is little chance of minor parties ever governing alone, therefore they matter less. • We can conclude that in the age of the media, PR firms and advisors money matters – the two main parties have this, the others do not. • We can conclude that the two main parties matter more when it comes to policy formation. • We can conclude that the only thing that can damage these safe seats is electoral reform and neither party will acquiesce to this reform <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that small party membership is rising and recent elections show significant support for the Brexit Party and Lib Dems • We can conclude that additional electoral systems in the UK have made smaller parties matter more. • We can conclude that support for the two main parties is not as solid as it once was and that smaller parties now matter more • We can conclude that smaller parties matter more as the issues they raise

			have not been dealt with effectively by the two main parties
--	--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
--	--	---

Guidelines for Marking Political Ideas Questions

AO1 (8 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

AO2 (8 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support or reject the view presented by the question

They should look at the different perspectives that arise from the question and show how these lay the foundations for a judgement.

AO3 (8 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the analysis. They must make and form judgments and they should reach a reasoned verdict which comes down on one side throughout their response.

Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question otherwise the mark is capped in Level 2

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected throughout their response.

Candidates who *do not* refer to at **least two** specific thinkers from the specification cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

The specific thinkers for socialism are Marx/Engels, Webb, Luxemburg, Crosland and Giddens.

The specific thinkers for conservatism are Hobbes, Burke, Oakeshott, Rand and Nozick

Other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification and beyond may gain credit but they cannot be substituted for the demand to name at least two of the specified thinkers to avoid the level 2 cap,

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	AO1 8 Marks	AO2 8 Marks	AO3 8 Marks
3(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All socialists attach importance to how the economy operates as the economy determines the basic structure of society and life chances (Marx & Engels) • Socialists argue that the economy will be exploited if in private hands (Crosland) • Socialists believe that an unchecked free market cannot deliver social justice (Webb) • All socialists aim for some form of equality in the economy 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fairer economy means a fairer society and wider ownership will result in a fairer society • If the economy is left in private hands, then the working class will continue to be exploited (Marx & Engels) • An economy driven by an unchecked free market will deliver hardship and poor sharing of wealth • Equality is a core value which is at the heart of socialism. 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showing agreement within socialism over the importance of the economy. • There is agreement within socialism that to achieve social harmony the economy cannot run as it does under unfettered capitalism (Webb) • Showing agreement within socialism over widening ownership of industry • Concluding that there is general agreement over equality in socialism
	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disagreement emerges between Revolutionary Socialists and revisionists – social democrats and the third way - over the economy (Marx & Engels) 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Revolutionary Socialists the economy is core and central to the structure of society but for revisionists it is a means to an end • Evolutionary socialists (Webb) reject the Revolutionary Socialist (Luxemburg) 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This shows fundamental disagreement and makes the position of each at odds with one another. • Revisionists and Revolutionary Socialists clash over the need for

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revolutionary Socialists feel the need for a revolution in order to change how the economy operates • Revolutionary Socialists aim for the abolition of capitalism, (Luxemburg) but Revisionists are willing to accept a thriving private sector (Crosland) • Socialists disagree about the nature and form of equality in the economy 	<p>emphasis on a revolution to overthrow the economic structure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revisionists are content for private property ownership to continue believing social progress can be made under a capitalist system (Crosland) whereas Revolutionary Socialists reject this • Revolutionary Socialists emphasise absolute equality, whereas social democrats measure equality by outcome and the Third Way support equality of opportunity (Giddens) 	<p>revolution or evolution to resolve issues over the economy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showing fundamental disagreement between socialists over the role of capitalism in socialism • Showing clear and irreconcilable differences within socialism over equality in the economy
--	--	---	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	5–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).
Level 3	10–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 8 Marks	AO2 8 Marks	AO3 8 Marks
3(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatives view the need for society to provide frameworks for individuals (Hobbes) • All conservatives see society as essential for human development (Burke) • All conservatives prefer a society where the state plays as small a role as necessary (Oakeshott) • Traditional and one nation conservatives both have an organic view of society (Burke) 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most conservatives see natural order emerging in society (Burke) • In their own ways, all conservatives recognise the importance of society where humans are able to flourish • Conservatives are distrustful of the state fearing it will impose restraints on society • They believe that society develops naturally with everyone understanding their role and duties within society 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Showing agreement between all Conservatives over society • Showing general agreement within Conservatism on the importance of society • Showing agreement between Conservatives over the role of the state within society • Showing broad agreement in approaches to society between Traditional Conservatives and One nation Conservatives
	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional and one nation conservatives disagree with the new right over society • Traditional and one nation conservatives disagree with the new right over the importance of the past in society • Traditional and one nation conservatives disagree with the new right over whether hierarchy is natural (Hobbes) • There is disagreement within the New Right over the role of society 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traditional/one nation conservatives have an organic view of society (Burke) whereas the new right feel society is composed of individuals who are free to develop as they desire. (Nozick) • Traditional/one nation conservatives believe society has emerged gradually and that traditions must be respected (Burke) whereas the New Right had a radical agenda seeking to make large changes to society and not bound by the past. • Traditional/one nation conservatives believe society that society will be based on some form of natural inequality with this serving to give a sense of duty to some 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This makes the position of traditional/one nation conservatives at odds with the new right • Showing fundamental disagreement within Conservatism over the role of tradition and gradual change • While both views accept an unequal society, one is based on a fixed hierarchy and the other based on the merits of the individual showing clear disagreement

		<p>(Oakeshott) whereas the New Right believe in a meritocracy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Neo-liberal aspect suggests that society is composed of individuals who are free to act as they choose and are independent (Rand) whereas the neo-conservative aspect appears to require obedience to a moral code in society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The New Right clearly have an inconsistent view of society within their two strands.
--	--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	5-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences, making some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).
Level 3	10-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	15-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom