



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel A Level
In Politics (9PL0) Paper 3B

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_3B_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 Question 1(a)

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one criticism cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Candidates who only refer to one institution cannot advance beyond Level 2.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the criticisms that have been made about the WTO and G7/8 (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The WTO is a powerful intergovernmental organisation created to regulate trade and replacing the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade with a focus on free trade• The WTO is dominated by the US and the EU as part of the so called Quad which also includes Japan and Canada• The WTO and G7/8 are accused of having a focus on economic growth rather than other important issues• G7/8 is a bloc of industrialised states made up of the US, Canada, UK, France, Germany, Italy and Russia	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the criticisms that have been made about the WTO and G7/8 (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some consider that the WTO is too powerful and can compel sovereign states to change laws and regulations by declaring them to be in violation of the rules of the WTO• The Quad appears to be able to set the agenda of the organisation at the expense of issues, such as agricultural protection, which developing countries would rather focus on• A focus on economic activity and economic growth means that the WTO and G7/8 seem indifferent to other issues such as the environment, child labour, and workers' rights

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• G7/8 now faces competition from the G20 organisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The organisation seems less relevant as other economic powers such as India and China have emerged and G7 percentage of global GDP has fallen from 70% in the 1980s to less than 50%• G20 is more diverse than G7/8 with a wider membership representing two-thirds of the world's population, including members such as China, the EU, South Africa and Saudi Arabia
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	<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 (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	<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 (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	<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 (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Guidelines for Question 1(b)

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one factor cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Candidates who only make points related to one country cannot advance beyond Level 2.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the factors that have led to China and India being described as emerging powers (but accept any other valid responses) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An emerging power is considered to be rising primarily in economic power and global influence• China and India are both considered members of the so called BRIC states• Globalisation has provided opportunities for both China and India to grow in significance• Both China and India have huge populations, which are growing in wealth and spending power• Both China and India have seen an increased role in international organisations and conferences as a consequence of their growth and power whilst	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the factors which have led to both China and India being described as emerging powers (but accept any other valid responses) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• China has seen dramatic economic growth in recent years and has the second largest nominal GDP following a sustained period of double digit economic growth• Whilst the BRICs are at varying stages of development and have varying degrees of potential, India and China are considered to have the potential to become superpowers• Both China and India have seen tremendous economic growth based on free trade and export-led growth connected to economic globalisation

	<p>traditional powers such as the United States, UK, France, etc. have declined</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Wealthier populations have created stronger internal markets and investment in infrastructure as well as the emergence of TNCs makes clear the emerging status of these countries• China and India are important members of G20, India has received growing support for a permanent Security Council seat to match China, both have nuclear weapons and both have been important contributors in debate regarding global warming
--	---	---

Section B

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1).• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	<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 aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	<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 (AO1).• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	<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 (AO1).• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Guidelines for Question 2

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of global comparative theories and relevant core politics ideas (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one named theory cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 4.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
2	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the explanation of the likelihood of war and conflict provided by realists and liberals (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realists argue that war and conflict is inevitable based on human nature • Some realists blame the anarchical nature of a state dominated system for war and conflict • The Security Dilemma is seen as increasing the likelihood of war and conflict • Liberals are more optimistic on human nature and believe that states can peacefully coexist • Some liberals see a growth in complex interdependence as reducing the likelihood of war and conflict 	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) to examine the explanations of the likelihood of war and conflict provided by realists and liberals (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realist thinkers such as Morgenthau argue humans are self centred and that humans pursue their interests above and beyond the interests of others which will inevitably lead to conflict between states which are ruled by people • The realist perspective supports the idea that there is anarchy, reflected in never ending and numerous power struggles and conflicts between states, unregulated by external forces • The Security Dilemma occurs when one state takes action to increase its security leading to other states following suit which in turn leads to unstable arms races and then to war and conflict • Liberals argue that individuals are altruistic and capable of selfless concern for others and that states, particularly democracies will see a growing value in cooperation in order to reduce the likelihood of war and conflict

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complex interdependence describes how states are increasingly linked through international organisations, trade and the need to resolve global issues which cannot be resolved at a state level, thus complex interdependence makes war and conflict far less likely between states
<p>Synoptic content –When analysing core political ideas, candidates may refer to:</p>		
	<p>Conservatism core ideas and principles and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy</p> <p>Socialism core ideas and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy</p> <p>Liberalism core ideas and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy</p>	<p>Hobbes – and the consequences of this for the state system and for likelihood of cooperation, his negative view of human nature and the dangers to civil society</p> <p>Greater optimism on human nature linked to the natural relationship among humans being cooperation and work for the common good – Marx – which makes the idea of a global society likely.</p> <p>Emphasis on the benefits of mutual cooperation from both an economic and practical position – Locke – linked to the limited role of government including at a global level.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1). Makes limited synoptic points (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	<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). Makes some relevant synoptic points (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	<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). Makes relevant synoptic points (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	<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). Makes cohesive synoptic points (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Section C

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 and reject the view presented by the question.

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgements and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

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

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.

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

Other valid responses are acceptable.

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic globalisation is the increasing economic integration and interdependence of national, regional, and local economies across the world through an intensification of cross-border movement of goods, capital, etc. and has tended to follow a US or Western philosophy • Cultural globalisation refers to the transmission of ideas, meanings and values around the world, often considered to be dominated by US or Western ideas, meanings and values • Political globalisation may be considered the expansion of a global political system, and its institutions, in which inter-regional transactions are controlled and managed, often by institutions which appear to be US or Western dominated • The end of the bipolar Cold War period is considered by many political commentators to have led to the globalisation phenomenon and to unipolarity 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US or Western dominance of the process of economic globalisation through free trade/trade liberalisation as reflected in the Washington Consensus suggests that alternative models are being removed • The US or West appears to dominate in areas such as film, music, the Arts generally as well as in wider areas such as instilling consumerism, human rights, etc. • The US or West appears to dominate key political institutions such as the Security Council and International Financial Institutions such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO • The end of the Cold War allowed the US to establish economic, cultural and political values for the international community which were subject to very little effective opposition 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A move to a global acceptance of a Western or US economic philosophy suggests that the world is becoming, economically, unipolar • The ability of US/Western ideas, meanings and values to permeate other cultures may have led to a cultural homogenisation based on a unipolar US/Western set of values resulting in one monoculture as a form of unipolarity • US or Western domination of key political institutions in which the rules of world trade, politics, law, etc. are created suggests a unipolar system exists • Globally recognised and accepted economic, cultural and political values, rules and institutions, all dominated by one state (US) or alliance (the West) suggests a unipolar world

	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic globalisation has led to the creation of new regional blocs, the rise of TNCs from numerous countries and has allowed for the growth of a number of states such as the BRICs • Cultural globalisation has allowed the cultures of numerous different states and peoples to enter a global glow in which a hybridisation has developed with almost no states immune to the impact of other states' culture • Political globalisation has involved the creation of a plethora of institutions where numerous states are able to become involved in debate and decision making at a regional and global level • The end of the bipolar Cold War period and the move to a period of globalisation, economic, cultural and political, are considered to have created opportunities for states to create a new multipolar rather than unipolar world 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emergence of powerful new regional blocs such as ASEAN and the AU as well as emergence of economic powerhouses such as China has eroded the power of the US and West economically • Whilst US/Western culture has spread globally, it has had to share the stage with the ideas and values, etc. of other states and civilisations and there has been debate in parts of the US/West about the impact of other cultures on that of the US/West • Global institutions now include a number of states including non-western states who are able to make representation either individually or as regional bodies and are able to set global rules or press their own perspective, often in opposition to the US/West • The US/West have struggled to maintain a dominant position in a globalising world of new opportunities for other states to challenge US/Western dominance with flows of information, technology, people, etc. changing the world dramatically 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These powerful new actors have created a multipolar world economically where newly developed states or regional blocs can oppose the US/West in trade disputes and through bodies such as G20 and the WTO • It is too simplistic to see cultural globalisation as a one way street in which US/western culture dominates rather than a process where all states are impacted on by exposure to other cultures as a reflection of multipolarity • The emergence of new political institutions as well as the growing power of non US/Western states in existing institutions, as a reflection of political globalisation, suggests a multipolar rather than unipolar arrangement to global politics • The US/West may have won the Cold War but globalisation has provided challenges and opportunities which have reordered the polar structure of the world with a shift to a multipolar rather than unipolar structure
--	---	--	--

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).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
3(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of the 2005 Responsibility to Protect concept provides circumstances in which humanitarian intervention can take place against the wishes of a sovereign state • Humanitarian intervention can be immediate and put moral obligations above state sovereignty in the state system • The end of the Cold War seemed to issue a new era or golden age of humanitarian intervention in which state sovereignty could be ignored where human rights violations required intervention • International courts and tribunals are ineffective in taking direct action to protect human rights as they are often joined voluntarily and allow opt outs and protection for certain states 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsibility to Protect suggests that part of state sovereignty is the responsibility of a state to look after its own citizens and that the international community should intervene through humanitarian intervention if necessary • Humanitarian intervention can sometimes be carried out by a single determined state or small alliance saving the time that courts and tribunals would take to act • The lack of effective courts and tribunals at the end of the Cold War meant that states needed to carry out humanitarian intervention in order to protect human rights • International courts and tribunals lack the military force or arrest powers required to protect human rights, often relying on voluntary 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this case, state sovereignty appears to encourage and support humanitarian intervention rather than oppose it, making humanitarian intervention more effective in protecting human rights • Where a single state decides to carry out humanitarian intervention it can protect human rights quickly and without the need for debate and discussion in international courts and tribunals, making humanitarian intervention far more effective • Successful intervention such as that which occurred in Sierra Leone, East Timor and Kosovo supported the idea that humanitarian intervention was the best way to protect human rights

	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courts and tribunals have more legitimacy in the international community • Courts and tribunals have more international support than individual acts of humanitarian intervention and there is an expectation that they will deal with human rights issues • Humanitarian intervention has become discredited and is often seen as an excuse for the selfish actions of states • Humanitarian intervention has led to accusations of double standards being levelled against those who carry out the intervention 	<p>action, allowing 'opt outs' and recognising the principle of state sovereignty</p> <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal courts and tribunals tend to be created by United Nations Resolutions or by regional agreement which provides them with a greater degree of legitimacy than humanitarian intervention • There has been an increased number of courts and tribunals involved in protecting human rights both regionally and globally from the European Court of Human Rights to UN Special Tribunals and the International Criminal Court • There are suggestions that humanitarian interventions in Yugoslavia, Rwanda and Somalia in the 1990s were failures and that in some cases humanitarian 	<p>where courts and tribunals were lacking, suggesting humanitarian intervention is more effective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability of certain states to take effective military action where the international community and courts and tribunals seem unwilling or unable to do so suggest that humanitarian intervention is more effective <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A greater degree of legitimacy helps to ensure that courts and tribunals can be more effective than humanitarian intervention • The growing expectation that human rights will be protected by the increased numbers of courts and tribunals ensures that they are more effective and legitimate than individual acts of humanitarian intervention • Intervention in cases such as Iraq and Afghanistan may have been ineffective or even worsened human rights conditions which suggests that international courts and tribunals may be better suited to protecting human rights
--	---	---	---

		<p>intervention can make matters worse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Humanitarian intervention takes place when a militarily powerful state decides to take action in a militarily weaker state and yet offers no opportunity for human rights protection when abuses are carried out by powerful states as with the US and Guantanamo Bay or Russian action in Chechnya or Ukraine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The selective nature of humanitarian intervention suggests that international courts and tribunals are a better route to follow in protection of human rights
--	--	---	---

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).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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
3(c)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a growing number of regional bodies involved in global politics and in a wider number of policy areas • Most states now rely on regional bodies to protect their trade interests and are unable to do so alone • The most advanced regional bodies now have representation in international bodies and organisations which used to be reserved for states and there are numerous examples of regional bodies able to stand up to the existing major powers in global politics • Regional bodies appear to have taken the lead in a number of issues in global politics and have pressured existing states, including major powers, to follow suit 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The European Union is the most advanced regional body but other bodies such as NAFTA and ASEAN also operate as significant entities and regional bodies have been involved in areas beyond economics such as the environment and human rights or even cultural protection • States of all sizes, including the most significant states involved in global politics, appear to have to rely on regional bodies to protect their interests including the US in NAFTA and China as an associate member of ASEAN Plus Three • The European Union is a full member of G20 and has been involved in trade disputes in the WTO with existing major powers such as the US (Steel Tariffs) and China (Textiles) • The African Union and ASEAN have fought to defend their own members interests whilst the EU has taken a lead on areas such as global warming and the environment 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The growing number of regional bodies and their involvement in a wide number of policy areas suggests that they are seen as a valid and significant phenomenon in global politics which may rival individual states, including the established major powers • The involvement of states, including the existing major powers, in regional bodies shows that they recognise the strength and significance of these bodies as effective rivals to states • Structural significance and an ability to stand up to existing states, including major powers, in areas such as trade disputes is something which member states could not effectively do alone and suggests that regional bodies are now influential • States of all sizes look to regional bodies more and more to protect their interests and the EU has taken a lead in applying pressure on the existing major powers in numerous areas, suggesting they are an effective rival to states

	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The primary entity in global politics has historically been the state • There are significant divisions between states as members of regional bodies which make these regional blocs less effective • Most regional blocs operate on the principle of intergovernmentalism rather than supranationalism and members of regional blocs seem reluctant to abandon their ability to represent their own interests in the international community • Regional bodies tend to have a focus on the economy and on free trade rather than the wider issues that states are involved in 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most global institutions provide representation at state rather than regional level with key institutions such as the Security Council permanent five reserved for states rather than for regional bodies • Divisions within regional bodies such as those that exist relating to widening and deepening in the EU mean that regional bodies sometimes struggle to provide a united front in global politics • A focus on intergovernmentalism in which sovereignty is protected rather than supranationalism in which sovereignty is surrendered ensures that states are left to represent their own interests in global politics rather than relying on more powerful united collectives which may challenge the influence of the existing powers • Almost all regional bodies are formed with a primary focus on economic growth and development and few move beyond this focus which ensures that regional bodies tend only to be a challenge to the existing major powers in the regional sphere 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A relative lack of representation for regional bodies in international organisations and at international conferences means that regional bodies are unable to challenge the existing major powers for influence • Divisions weaken the regional bodies and ensure that they are unable to compete with the existing state structure for effectiveness • Despite some shift to supranationalism in areas such as the ICJ, regional bodies still have to depend on unanimity in key areas when attempting to challenge the influence of states, particularly the more powerful ones • With the exception of the EU it is difficult to measure the influence of regional bodies against the influence of the existing major powers who often hold, military, structural, etc. power as well as economic power
--	--	---	---

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).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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).
--	--	---

