



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2024

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 2

assessing

Political Power and Political Ideas

[AGP21]

MONDAY 3 JUNE, AFTERNOON

MARK
SCHEME

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to demonstrate:

- AO1** Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and debates.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and theories; identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences between the political systems studied.
- AO3** Construct and communicate coherent arguments making use of a range of appropriate political vocabulary.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for tasks or questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 5: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Inadequate): The candidate makes only a very limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack any clarity and coherence. There is very little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is consistently unclear.

Level 2 (Limited): The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 3 (Satisfactory): The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (Good): The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 5 (High standard): The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Section A: Factors Involved in the Exercise of Power

1 Background

The term crisis of legitimacy was first used by Habermas in the 1970s and has been widely used since then. It describes when trust in the institutions of state declines drastically and the population begin to withdraw their consent. There are many possible causes of a legitimacy crisis, one of which is the popular belief that the state is corrupt. States may respond in a variety of ways, ranging from violent suppression to state reform. An unresolved crisis may well result in the overthrow of the state.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “crisis of legitimacy”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “crisis of legitimacy”. An example may be included to support the response. If no supporting example is given, a maximum of 3 marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “crisis of legitimacy”. A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

2 Background

The Source identifies “suppressing dissenting voices” as one possible way in which the media can be controlled. It involves denying access to the media to any individual or group that expresses critical opinions about those in power. Media sources that do so can be closed down, another possible form of control. Media sources that are loyal to the ruling group will be funded or tolerated.

Any other relevant way.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid way with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid way and offers a more developed explanation. The answer may be supported with a relevant example.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid way and provides a full explanation of the way, including supporting evidence.

Apply criteria for each valid way. One way must come from the Source.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

An answer that does not refer to the Source can be awarded a maximum of [8] marks.

An answer that contains no evidence/example beyond the Source can be awarded a maximum of [8] marks. [10]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

3 Background

The Source gives state corruption as a reason why legitimacy may decline and candidates should identify and explain this. Candidates may also take from the Source the idea that, when the media is regarded merely as the mouthpiece of the state, that this can also undermine legitimacy. It is widely recognised that states that fail to provide economically and socially for their population can expect to see legitimacy fall. Defeat in conflict with another state is yet another reason.

Any other relevant reason.

An answer that makes no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that contains no example/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that has only one reason can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why state legitimacy may decline and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([5]–[8])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the reasons why state legitimacy may decline but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding, and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([9]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the reasons why state legitimacy may decline but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations.

There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([13]–[16])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why state legitimacy may decline and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([17]–[20])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons why state legitimacy may decline and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

20

Section A

35

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

Section B: Theories of Power

AVAILABLE
MARKS

4 Background

The term “diffusion of power” is most frequently employed by Pluralists, although it could be used by other theories of power. It describes a situation in which power within a political system is not concentrated in the hands of a small elite or ruling class. Rather, power is widely shared and exercised by lots of institutions and individuals. Pluralists use it to describe the situation in liberal democracies where, they believe, power is widely distributed.

Any other relevant content.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “diffusion of power”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “diffusion of power”. There will be a supporting example.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “diffusion of power”. Relevant evidence will support the response. If there is no supporting example, a maximum of [4] marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

5 (a) Background

The gender profile of many legislatures and governments has changed in recent years, to varying degrees. Women are much more likely to be political representatives and leaders than was the case even fairly recently. However, the statement in the question insists that this does not disprove the reality of male dominance of political power. It is Feminists who assert that most, if not all, political systems are patriarchal. By this they mean that they are dominated by men and act largely in the interests of men. Feminists can point to a wealth of evidence to support this conclusion: the make-up of parliaments, of governments, of other senior ranks of the state institutions. It is argued by Feminists that men use their control over power to maintain their dominance and to preserve the subordination and oppression of women. Male dominance of power is by no means over. Candidates should examine the contribution of a range of feminist theorists and present evidence that supports the feminist analysis.

Critics of Feminism would argue that they are guilty of ignoring the gender revolution that is underway in many political systems; that Feminism is a conspiracy theory; that female inequality owes something to the decisions and actions of women themselves. Evidence that challenges the Feminist analysis should be discussed.

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display a clear understanding of the question, contain more detailed knowledge and offer a

broader range of evidence.

If an answer has no evidence/example a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If an answer is unbalanced a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of Feminism and its critics and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of Feminism and its critics but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of Feminism and its critics but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of Feminism and its critics and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of Feminism and its critics, and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[35]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

(b) Background

The idea that wealth is the basis of political power is part of the socialist analysis and particularly the Marxist or Revolutionary Socialist view. Socialists go on to argue that the ruling class seek to disguise this fact and one of the key ways in which they do so is by promoting the idea that capitalist systems are democracies. However, for Marxists, democracy is illusory as the state acts in the interests of the ruling class, even when a party such as Labour is in government. Marxists would also argue that a consideration of those who hold key state positions also confirms the conclusion of ruling class power. More recent socialists have debated exactly how the ruling class control the state but are agreed that it does so. Socialists argue that the link between wealth and power is evident in all capitalist systems.

Critics of the Marxist analysis challenge the idea that democracy is an illusion and it is Pluralists who would lead this challenge. They argue that the democratic revolution has taken place in liberal democratic societies is real and not an illusion. Elite Theorists would challenge the Marxist analysis by arguing that democracy is an illusion in all societies.

Some candidates may seek to argue that Elite Theorists would support the argument in the question. If they do so, the differences between Marxism and Elite Theory must be clearly established. Done as Elite Theory
Maximum Level 3

Weaker answers will display only a limited grasp of the issue and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will display a clear understanding of the question, contain more detailed knowledge and offer a broader range of evidence.

If an answer has no evidence/example a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If an answer is unbalanced a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the Marxist and other theories of political power and of how it has been criticised and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed

and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the Marxist and other theories of political power and of how it has been criticised but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding, and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the Marxist and other theories of political power and of how it has been criticised but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the Marxist and other theories of political power and of how it has been criticised and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the Marxist and other theories of political power and of how it has been criticised and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of

political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[35]

Section B

AVAILABLE MARKS
35
75

Option B: Political Ideas

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A: Texts

1 Background

Typical of Conservatives, Edmund Burke had a negative view of the capacity of most human beings to think and act rationally. Most people were inclined to act selfishly and irrationally and this meant that they were ill-suited to decide anything of importance. Burke used this argument to challenge the Revolutionaries' aim of putting more power into the hands of the ignorant masses, as Burke would have seen it. Instead Burke proposed that the masses must be led by those who had the wisdom to be guided by the traditions and values of the past.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by "the private stock of reason in each man is small".

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by "the private stock of reason in each man is small".

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by "the private stock of reason in each man is small".

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

2 Background

Central to Burke's attack upon the French Revolutionaries was his belief that they had undermined the bases of the "good order" that are essential if a society is to function. Following on from Burke's view of human irrationality, he believed that "good order" could only result from respect for traditional institutions and for the customs and values of the past: "the general bank of capital and of nations." This is a far superior guide to the management of a state than the abstract reasoning that the Revolutionaries favoured. Burke therefore predicted that France would collapse into disorder.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of Burke's argument for "good order". There is limited or no use of the Item or own knowledge.

Level 2 ([4]–[7])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of Burke's argument for "good order". There is some use of the Item or own knowledge. If no reference to the Item is made, a maximum of 7 marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([8]–[10])

The candidate provides a full explanation of Burke's argument for "good order". There is good use of the Item and own knowledge.

(AO1: 10 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

3 Background

Both today and in his own time, Burke's ideas have been widely criticised. While Burke argued that his proposals were designed to create "peace and order", his critics insist that his main purpose was to defend the privileges of the wealthy, aristocratic elite and the corrupt established church that ruled and controlled Britain. Specifically, critics attack Burke's pessimistic view of the mass of the population as ignorant and incapable of participating politically. His rejection of the idea of human rationality is, in turn, rejected by Liberals. His defence of strong law and order is seen by critics as just seeking to justify the repression that the ruling class regularly employed against those seeking democratic and liberal reforms. Burke's view of tradition and custom as the essential guide to political action today, is dismissed as a defence of inequality and privilege.

Any other valid criticisms.

No reference to Source maximum Level 3.

No evidence maximum Level 3.

Only one criticism maximum Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of Burke's ideas for creating "peace and order" and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([5]–[8])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of Burke's ideas for creating "peace and order", but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([9]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of Burke's ideas for creating "peace and order", but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([13]–[16])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of Burke’s ideas for creating “peace and order” and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([17]–[20])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of Burke’s ideas for creating “peace and order” and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[20]

Section A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

20

35

Section B: Ideologies

AVAILABLE
MARKS

4 Background

“Hierarchy” is a term used to describe any system in which individuals or institutions are organised according to their relative importance. It is commonly used in political discourse, especially in debates between competing political ideologies. Conservatism, for example, would tend to see “hierarchy” as both inevitable, due to human difference, and necessary to the effective operation of any political system: the Conservative notion of “aristocracy”. Socialists would see the term as an ideological attempt to justify both political and socio-economic inequality. Liberals would also dismiss the term as contrary to their ideas of equal rights and equality of opportunity.

Any other relevant meaning.

No example maximum [4] marks.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “hierarchy”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “hierarchy”. There will be some supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “hierarchy”. Relevant evidence will support the response.

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately. [5]

5

5 (a) Background

There are pre-capitalist forms of socialism but the ideology is most obviously a critique of the capitalist mode of production. Socialists attack capitalism as an unequal and unfair system, based upon the exploitation of the many by the few. Early Socialists tended to adopt a Revolutionary Socialist analysis of capitalism, believing that the exploitation and inequality of capitalism means that it cannot be improved upon or reformed. Therefore, the system must be destroyed and replaced by socialism. Private ownership of the means of production cannot be tolerated as this is the basis of capitalist exploitation.

Later, Reformist Socialists, are less inclined to advocate the complete destruction of capitalism, arguing instead for a reformed capitalism that combines the benefits of capitalism with state action in the form of welfarism, state health care and redistribution of wealth. Capitalism can be tamed and made to serve the needs of the majority, not the few.

Democratic Socialism could be said to come somewhere between revolutionary socialism and social democracy. Democratic Socialists wish to achieve power through democratic means (rather than by revolutionary action) but would then use state power to abolish the core elements of capitalism, rather than just reform it.

The Socialist analysis, especially the revolutionary variety, has been

attacked by both Liberals and Conservatives and candidates may refer to these alternative views of capitalism as a way of critiquing socialism.

Any other relevant material.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of Socialist views on revolution and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of Socialist views on revolution but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of Socialist views on revolution but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of Socialist views on revolution and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of Socialist views on revolution and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant

and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

No evidence maximum Level 3.

No balance maximum Level 4.

[35]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

35

(b) Background

Classical Liberals, such as Locke, had a deeply suspicious view of the absolutist state and regarded it as the biggest threat to individual liberty. They sought to impose restrictions on the state in order to avoid tyranny and to maximise individual freedom. For example, the emphasis upon natural rights was intended to define the limits of state action. The statement “that government is best which governs least” expresses much of what Classical Liberals believed.

Modern Liberalism, as illustrated by the ideas of Keynes and Beveridge, was much less hostile to the state, given that the threat of absolutism had largely disappeared. Instead it supported state intervention in society in order to tackle social problems that prevented individuals from becoming free.

However, both varieties of Liberalism saw liberty as the highest goal, unlike their Socialist and Conservative opponents. Modern Liberals were prepared to accept a degree of state action but were adamant that the state should not go beyond its limited remit. For these reasons, it can be argued that Classical and Modern Liberals share similar goals.

Any other valid information.

Level 1 ([1]–[7])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of Liberal views of the role of the state and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are inadequate. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited.

Level 2 ([8]–[14])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of Liberal views of the role of the state but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. An argument or explanation is constructed, communication and structure

tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([15]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of Liberal views of the role of the state but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are satisfactory. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 4 ([22]–[28])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of Liberal views of the role of the state and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([29]–[35])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of Liberal views of the role of the state and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

No evidence maximum Level 3.

No balance maximum Level 4.

[35]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

35

Section B

75