



**Pearson**  
**Edexcel**

Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In Politics (9PL0)

Paper 3B: Comparative Politics – Global Politics

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Autumn 2020

Publications Code 9PLO\_3B\_2010\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## 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 difference cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Answers cannot achieve Level 4 unless they explicitly contrast hyperglobalisers and globalisation sceptics.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences between hyperglobalisers and globalisation sceptics (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Hyperglobalisers believe that globalisation is new, real and is everywhere</li><li>• Hyperglobalisers believe that globalisation drives an integrated global economy with the prospect of prosperity for all</li><li>• Hyperglobalisers believe that sovereignty is becoming less relevant with a demise of the nation state and rise of a global society</li><li>• Globalisation sceptics believe that we are seeing regionalism rather than globalisation and don't believe</li></ul>	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the differences between hyperglobalisers and globalisation sceptics (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Since 1989 we have seen a collapse of communism and the emergence, globally, of a dominant Western model of economic development</li><li>• There has been a shift towards free trade since 1945 and the emergence of the IMF, WTO and W.Bank with associated economic growth supports this view</li><li>• Economic, cultural and political globalisation are all considered to have impacted on the tradition model of state sovereignty.</li></ul>

	<p>that we are moving to global capitalism for the benefit of all</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Globalisation sceptics believe that country borders are not becoming less important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there has been a shift to regionalism, much of this is defensive and aimed at bringing prosperity to members only with the benefits of globalisation arguably enjoyed by the, so called, 'Core' rather than 'Periphery' states.</li> <li>Post sovereign governance has failed to emerge with an anarchical system in which states retain sovereignty both internally and externally, for example, picking and choosing which institutions to join and when to obey them.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
	0	<i>No rewardable material.</i>
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</i></li> <li><i>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).</i></li> </ul>
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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).</i></li> <li><i>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).</i></li> </ul>
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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).</i></li> <li><i>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).</i></li> </ul>
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>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).</i></li> <li><i>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).</i></li> </ul>

### **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 way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Answers cannot achieve Level 4 unless they explicitly contrast the political and economic factors which have led to regionalism

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	<p><b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the economic and political factors that have led to regionalism (but accept any other valid responses) :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic regionalism is considered to bring greater economic opportunities through cooperation among states in a particular geographical region.</li> <li>• Economic regionalism has been the primary form of 'new' regionalism since the early 1990s</li> <li>• Economic regionalism may be seen as a defence, by smaller states, against economically powerful states in global politics</li> <li>• Political regionalism is considered to allow weaker states to develop a more powerful voice in global politics</li> <li>• Political regionalism is considered to allow states to share and protect common values</li> </ul>	<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the economic and political factors which have led to regionalism (but accept any other valid responses) :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic trade areas such as the EU single market bring opportunities to states for growth and prosperity which most EU members have enjoyed since establishing membership.</li> <li>• Since the early 1990s we have seen the development of a significant number of regional bodies with a focus on the economic such as NAFTA, Mercosur and the AU which aims for a free trade area, a customs union, a single market, a central bank, and a common currency</li> <li>• The EU has engaged in collective trade disputes at the WTO with economic powerhouses such as the US and China and other regional bodies feel better able to stand up to the major powers collectively</li> <li>• Regional bodies such as the AU are considered better able to defend member interests when united with the Arab League aiming to 'draw closer the relations between member states and coordinate collaboration between them to safeguard their independence and sovereignty, and to consider...the affairs and interests of Arab countries'.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EU insists that members and potential members uphold democracy, rule of law, human rights etc whilst ASEAN is committed to protecting the so called 'ASEAN way'. Security (NATO) can be linked to Political regionalism</li> </ul>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>

Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li></ul>
---------	-------	---

## Section B

### **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 point 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><b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences between the realist concept of the security dilemma and the liberal concept of complex interdependence (but accept any other valid responses) :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The security dilemma is a realist principle, coined by J Herz in a 1951 book Political Realism and Political Idealism and is based on the idea that states exist in an anarchical system and aim to increase their security</li> <li>• States may do so by increasing their military strength, developing new weapons capabilities and make making treaties with other states.</li> <li>• Unfortunately the actions of one state may lead to instability as other states, suspicious of the actions of the first state, take similar action which may lead to a spiral of increased tension resulting in war</li> <li>• Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye are considered responsible for the concept of complex interdependence, the idea that states are linked in a multidimensional way.</li> <li>• A consequence of complex interconnectedness is that war is less likely and states will have an increased likelihood of cooperation</li> </ul>	<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) to examine the differences between the realist concept of the security dilemma and the liberal concept of complex interdependence (but accept any other valid responses) :</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The anarchical state system ensures that states face a lack of certainty in their relationship with the outside world and have to depend on self-help to preserve their own security, which links to a pessimistic, realist, billiard ball model of global politics</li> <li>• Spending on military capability is a central aspect of almost all states which reinforces the idea that states consider it to be a necessary requirement in a world where it is wise not to rely on collective security institutions</li> <li>• The period immediately preceding WW1 and the Cold War arms race may be used as examples to illustrate the insecurity that states feel as part of the security dilemma with arms build-up and shifting alliances as states attempted to provide a degree of certainty for themselves but provoked uncertainty among other states as a consequence</li> <li>• Globalisation has contributed to a sense of interconnectedness in which states appear more willing to create regional and global interconnected institutions such as the United Nations, WTO etc</li> </ul>

		<p>as part of the cobweb model of global politics to assist trade and resolve global issues which can't be resolved at a state level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As markets become interconnected, global flows of people, ideas and finance take place, the fortunes of states become interlinked and the likelihood of war and conflict , which could have negative consequences for all, becomes less likely as part of a far more optimistic, liberal, view of global politics</li> </ul>
<p><b>Synoptic Content -Candidates may refer to the following when analysing core political ideas:</b></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 and cooperation likely.</p> <p>Emphasis on the benefits of mutual cooperation from both an economic and practical position – Locke.</p>

--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>

## 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 judgments 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"><li>• There are a number of established economic global governance institutions committed to the development of global trade</li><li>• Almost all members of the international community are members of the IMF, World Bank and WTO and some of the most significant states are members of G7, whilst other states have formed regional bodies</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The long established IMF, World Bank, WTO and G7 all play a significant role in easing the flow of trade and encouraging and supporting economic growth globally</li><li>• Almost universal membership of these global governance bodies suggests that states are particularly concerned about economic matters</li><li>• As Human Rights institutions are a more recent development in global politics</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The fact that these institutions have been in place for an extended period suggests that the global community is particularly concerned about economic issues</li><li>• The fact that the more powerful states tend to dominate economic bodies and smaller states seek to balance with creation of regional economic bodies suggests that states are particularly concerned about economic matters</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human Rights bodies are often a more recent development such as the Special Tribunals and International Criminal Court which have been created from the 1990s onwards</li> <li>• Human Rights bodies have struggled to establish universal membership and certain human rights abuses have not been addressed by these institutions</li> </ul> <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a shift to an increased creation and development of human rights institutions and governance in more recent years</li> <li>• The International Criminal Court was created as a response to growing concern about human rights abuses brought about by awareness of human rights abuses</li> <li>• There is an increased interest in the concept of soft power in global politics and soft power is affected by the human rights record of states</li> <li>• Unlike the growing consensus on human rights, there appears to be an end to the</li> </ul>	<p>there is a view that states consider them to be less of a concern than economic institutions which provide for economic governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are numerous examples of states who have refused to join institutions such as the International Criminal Court as well as examples of the international community being unable or unwilling to take action when human rights abuses take place</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more recent shift in global governance concern suggests that human rights is a particular recent and growing concern of the global community</li> <li>• Major powers have funded and supported the establishment of the International Criminal Court and regional human rights courts such as the European Court of Human Rights.</li> <li>• States appear to be concerned about their soft power status and, with the demise of hard power, soft power is seen as a crucial tool in retaining or acquiring status in global politics</li> <li>• The IMF, World Bank and WTO failed to stop the global economic downturn in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If economic governance is a more long standing and deeply embedded form of governance than human rights governance then the global community must be more concerned about economic issues</li> <li>• States appear to take economic global governance membership and involvement far more seriously than human rights institution membership with membership clearly illustrating this</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The recent development of human rights governance bodies suggests that Human rights protection and governance appears to have moved above or in relation to other issues such as economic in the global agenda</li> <li>• Support from major blocs such as the European Union and increasing membership of such bodies as well as awareness of human rights breaches implies that the global community is now far more concerned about human rights</li> <li>• The growing concern for soft power may have encouraged states to</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

	consensus on economic institutions and governance with a shift to protectionism and trade disputes	2007 onwards and states have turned elsewhere for economic support as well as rejecting the core principles of the International Financial Institutions	consider their responsibilities and commitment to human rights issues over and above economic concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lack of economic consensus and increased questioning of the international financial institutions suggests that they no longer have the significance that they once held whilst the consensus on human rights issues seems to be evident in increased numbers of treaties, agreements and shared values in regional and global bodies</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>

Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li></ul>
---------	-------	--

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a significant increase in international institutions since 1945 with the United Nations as the most prominent of these bodies, seeking to resolve state concerns without conflict</li> <li>• States have used the United Nations to attract, to co-opt and to seduce</li> <li>• States have had to turn to the use of soft power via the United Nations with the realisation of the dangers of the use of hard power in the nuclear age and the cost to all when hard power is used, be it military or economic</li> <li>• The use of hard power in cases such as Iraq for the US and Crimea for Russia has led to some condemnation from within the United Nations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States appear keen to establish global norms and values via political institutions such as the United Nations and affiliated economic institutions such as the World Trade Organisation where soft power can be wielded as well as bodies such as UNESCO and UNICEF</li> <li>• States appear increasingly concerned about their reputation in global institutions, we have seen the development of a commonly referred to soft power index and there has been an increased use of the term by diplomats and policy makers with a preference for soft power diplomacy and support for UN judicial institutions like the ICJ</li> <li>• The use of economic sanctions and/or hard military power usually entails significant cost and damage for all involved with the Russian intervention in Crimea/Ukraine and US in Iraq serving as good examples</li> <li>• The United States received almost global reputational damage for its</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The growing number of bodies within the United Nations allows states to use soft power to persuade and attract other states to follow a desired norm appears to support the view that soft power is becoming more significant via these institutions</li> <li>• The increased desire to gain enhanced soft power status in global institutions would appear to suggest that states consider soft power to be a vital and particularly significant resource in their participation in global politics</li> <li>• Political state leaders tend to be concerned about the impact of the use of hard power on their popularity and can see an obvious benefit from using the United Nations to persuade and co-opt rather than risk the damage which the use of hard power often entails</li> <li>• States with influence in the increasing number of United Nations agencies are more likely to use a soft power approach in</li> </ul>

	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The United Nations has an enhanced position for those states who have a degree of hard power with the permanent five in the United Nations Security Council serving as example given that all members have significant hard rather than soft power</li> <li>• Global institutions such as the United Nations and even the linked WTO can sanction and support the use of hard power</li> <li>• Soft power often appears to be insufficient as a policy tool for states with states often turning to hard power when soft power appears to have failed</li> <li>• There are numerous examples of states acquiring their desired outcomes with the use of hard power rather than soft power and taking action without thought for any soft power damage</li> </ul>	<p>action in Iraq and the wider War on Terror which Obama attempted to rectify with use of a soft power, multilateral approach with a focus on soft power diplomacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although the permanent members of the Security Council weren't all nuclear powers when it was established there certainly appears to greater status afforded to states in global politics who do hold military and economic power</li> <li>• The United Nations has sanctioned the use of hard power including the stationing of UN troops in numerous conflict zones</li> <li>• Global institution attempts to use soft power persuasion appear not to have been as effective as hard power threats in recent cases such as the United States dealings under Trump with both North Korea and Iran</li> <li>• Russian actions in Ukraine/Crimea as well as in Georgia in 2008 and more recently in Syria serve as just a few of the examples of the use of hard</li> </ul>	<p>advance of turning to the use of hard power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the global community is dominated by those states who have a hard power capability and global institutions also seem to recognise this then hard power still appears to be more significant than soft power</li> <li>• The fact that the United Nations does sometimes appear willing to sanction the use of hard power in global politics weakens the view that soft power is now the most significant form of power in global politics</li> <li>• Examples of United Nations soft power failure and the success of the use or threat of use of hard power would suggest that soft power hasn't become more significant than hard power in global politics</li> </ul>
--	---	---	---

		power without seemingly a concern for soft power and without regard for global institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If states of differing levels of influence in global politics are still willing to use hard power for their own interests and without regard for the impact on their soft power status then it would appear that soft power status and use in global institutions like the UN is not as significant as some may think</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 4	19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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).</li> </ul>

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(c)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States remain the building blocs of global politics with greater influence than any other entities</li> <li>• International institutions have failed to bring significant changes to either the state system or to world order</li> <li>• The liberal era continues with a continued respect for common values such as democracy and human rights</li> <li>• Polarity remains constant with few if any challenges to the established hierarchical order and what some would consider a unipolar world with the end of the Cold War</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States continue to represent the citizens of the globe in international treaties, conferences, agreements, summits and in international bodies</li> <li>• International bodies have, since 2000, for the most part continued to respect and uphold state sovereignty with most institutions continuing to operate as intergovernmental institutions</li> <li>• With very few exceptions, the liberal era with a respect of democracy and human rights, as supported by Francis Fukuyama, appears still to be the dominant and desired political model in global politics and very little sign of this order being challenged successfully</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State sovereignty has been one of the most enduring aspects of global politics for hundreds of years and the fact that the state remains the key building bloc in global politics suggests that there has been scarcely any change</li> <li>• The fact that global institutions created post the end of the Cold War and existing from before then still respect state sovereignty would suggest that there has been insignificant change in recent years</li> <li>• The retention of the core values which existed post-Cold War and the lack of significant challenges to these values in recent years suggests that there has</li> </ul>

	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state continues to lose significance in global politics with the rise of global problems requiring global responses, a possible shift to a clash of civilisations and the spread of international institutions</li> <li>• Globalisation has had a huge impact on global politics and continues to have a significant impact on the historic state system</li> <li>• Since the end of the Cold War there have been significant events which have changed world order such as the War against Terror</li> <li>• There has been a shift in polarity in global politics since the end of the Cold War with the rise of challengers to what some may have considered to be a unipolar world immediately following the end of the Cold War</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• United States dominance was a key feature of global order post-Cold War with, economic, military and structural superiority in global politics which seems unchanged since the end of the Cold War</li> <li>• Since the end of the Cold War we have seen significant issues such as environmental degradation and weapons proliferation which have required states to surrender greater levels of autonomy in order to tackle these issues as well as a perception that states may be beginning to lose significance to civilizational blocs</li> <li>• Economic, cultural and political globalisation have all eroded state sovereignty in a process which some believe has actually accelerated since the end of the Cold War</li> <li>• The 2001 September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks are credited by many as having changed the relationship between states as well as civilizations and the consequent War on Terror has led to war, instability, erosion of common values and overthrow of governments</li> </ul>	<p>been scarcely any change since the end of the Cold War in world order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The retention of a unipolar system with continued United States dominance would suggest no real and meaningful change in world order.</li> <li>• States surrendering more and more sovereignty, particularly since the end of the Cold War would indicate a significant shift in the traditional state centric system</li> <li>• Any erosion of the historically key element of state sovereignty, particularly enhanced since the end of the Cold War by globalisation must make a significant change to the state system and to world order</li> <li>• The changes brought about by the events of September 11<sup>th</sup> and the War on Terror are so significant that they certainly represent a significant change to world order</li> <li>• Any shift in polarity brings particularly significant change to world order as any international relations or global politics student would know</li> </ul>
--	--	---	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rise of a resurgent Russia, the EU and economic powers such as China herald a new multipolar era in which US hegemony is in decline</li> </ul>	
--	--	---	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>
Level 3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>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).</li> </ul>

Level 4	19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li></ul>
---------	-------	--

Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li><li>• 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).</li></ul>
---------	-------	--

