

# Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2013

GCE Government and Politics 6GP03 3A  
UK Political Issues

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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) for our BTEC qualifications.

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).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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)

Summer 2013

Publications Code UA036085

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

<b>No. 1</b>	Why do governments find it difficult to reduce a budget deficit?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should show awareness that the UK has struggled to reduce the budget deficit at the hoped for rate. They may link this to worldwide difficulties, with is creditable although the main focus should be on UK governments.</p> <p>Reasons advanced for these difficulties <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget deficits usually arise during times of financial crisis when tax income is already reduced (from earnings, corporation tax, rates etc.) whilst pressure on spending is higher (more out of work and needing benefits, more investment required)</li> <li>• Furthermore, cutting deficits places further pressure on growth – by increasing the benefits needed (e.g. if government workers lose their jobs) and reducing the amount of money puts into the economy (e.g. infrastructure programmes), creating a vicious cycle.</li> <li>• Cutting a deficit means making tough political choices – politically there is only so far that a government can cut, and several UK controversies could be advanced to support this.</li> <li>• When a government has a budget deficit it becomes harder to borrow at reasonable rates and to attract investment into the economy.</li> <li>• The international dimension of financial crises, particularly in the current situation, means that government control over its own economy may be limited.</li> </ul> <p>Credit cannot be given for content that does not address ‘difficulties’.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of the on-going difficulties with the deficit.</li> <li>• Limited knowledge of at least one difficulty that governments encounter in trying to tackle budget deficits.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the on-going difficulties with the deficit.</li> <li>• A clear explanation of at least two difficulties that governments encounter in trying to tackle budget deficits.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>No. 2</b>	Assess the benefits of the use of green taxes
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should display understanding of the concept of 'green taxes' as taxes levied on negative environment impacts – they may refer to the 'polluter pays' principle.</p>	
<p>Benefits, and assessments of them, that could be offered <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They can be used to incentivise the development of green technologies e.g. the Climate Change Levy BUT they may further damage already troubled traditional industries who cannot afford to invest in greener methods of working.</li> <li>• Environmentalists argue that they are the only way to force people to take environmental concerns seriously e.g. congestion charge and fuel duty discourage the use of cars BUT such extra burdens could be considered inappropriate in the current credit crunch, especially as they are unequal e.g. motoring taxes hit rural areas more.</li> <li>• They can be used to offset the rising costs of greener forms of transport- Greenpeace argue this is what should have been done with the proposed per-passenger air tax BUT some argue that this should be dealt with by the free market, and that subsidising some forms of transport is unfair competition.</li> <li>• Green taxes can include tax rebates as well as tax rises, and so encourage people and companies to change their behaviour BUT in practice they are often an example of a 'stealth tax' and, according to groups like the Taxpayers' Alliance, do not help governments to meet their green targets.</li> </ul>	
<p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of what a 'green tax' is.</li> <li>• Limited knowledge and assessment of one benefit of green taxes.</li> </ul>	
<p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of what a 'green tax' is.</li> <li>• Clear explanation and assessment of two benefits of green taxes.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>No. 3</b>	Why and how have recent governments encouraged schools to become academies?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of developments in education policy to encourage more schools to become academies, both pre and post 2010, and the reasons and methods involved.</p> <p>Reasons for government support of academies <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Labour and the Coalition, arguably for different reasons, sought to reduce the local authority role in schools and provide more central oversight.</li> <li>• Academies bring a sponsor with a track record from outside education which Labour saw as bringing 'qualities of success' to failing schools, leading to higher standards.</li> <li>• Academies can also secure additional investment from these sponsors.</li> <li>• The Coalition sees academies as allowing successful schools more freedom to innovate.</li> <li>• Some may argue that academies are a deliberate step on the road to partial privatisation of schools as an ideological goal of the Conservatives in particular.</li> </ul> <p>Ways in which school have been encouraged to seek academy status <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under both governments 'failing schools' are effectively forced to become academies.</li> <li>• Post-2010 the Coalition has provided considerable financial incentives, leaving many schools a choice of 'cuts or academy'.</li> <li>• Additional infrastructure funding has also been made available to early academies, whilst schemes for schools generally, like 'Building Schools for the Future', were cut.</li> <li>• Under both governments academies have been given more freedom over their operation, curriculum, personnel etc.</li> </ul> <p>To achieve level 3 candidates must make some reference to more governments both pre and post 2010</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge of why governments have encouraged schools to become academies.</li> <li>• Limited knowledge of how governments have encouraged schools to become academies.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear explanation of why governments have encouraged schools to become academies.</li> <li>• Clear explanation of how governments have encouraged schools to become academies.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>No. 4</b>	Explain the arguments for and against the wider use of community sentences for offenders
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should show awareness of the nature of community sentences, as opposed to custodial sentences, which may include unpaid work, restitution, curfews, mental health or drug treatment etc.</p> <p>Arguments in favour of community sentencing <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reoffending rates for people given community sentences are significantly lower than for offenders sentenced to prison.</li> <li>• By keeping criminals out of prison they avoid the 'academy of crime' effect.</li> <li>• They are much more effective than prison in addressing mental health or drugs problems.</li> <li>• They encourage offenders to remain integrated into the community and to 'give something back'.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments against community sentencing <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They are less effective than prison in deterring crime.</li> <li>• They have less support from the public who see them as a 'soft option' which fails to provide proper retribution and punishment for offences.</li> <li>• They do not remove criminals from the wider population and therefore do not protect the public – hence Michael Howard's 'prison works' comment.</li> <li>• Lower reoffending rates for community sentences are arguably to do with the sort of offences for which they are used, not their general effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness what a community sentence is.</li> <li>• Limited knowledge of at least one argument for or against community sentences.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of what a community sentence is.</li> <li>• Clear explanation of at least one argument for and one argument against community sentences.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>No. 5</b>	Explain the advantages and disadvantages of universal welfare benefits
--------------	--

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

Candidates should demonstrate awareness that universal benefits are those which everyone receives regardless of their income such as old age pension, free bus pass, winter fuel allowance, NHS services free at the point of access etc. (but, as some may reference, no longer Child Benefit)

Advantages of universal welfare benefits may include:

- They give everyone an equal stake in the system: everyone is getting as well as giving, with is consistent with the founding principles of the welfare state.
- They incentivise people to make their own provision, e.g. for old age, knowing that they will not be 'punished' with reduced benefits, instead supplementing universal benefits.
- Any move from universal to means tested benefits creates either a "poverty trap" or a "squeezed middle" where people just above the threshold suffer – the original plans for Child Benefit being a good example.
- They avoid the bureaucratic complications and invasiveness of means-testing making them simpler and often cheaper to implement.

Disadvantages of universal welfare benefits may include:

- They are extremely expensive, costing the exchequer over £7billion per year in an environment where cuts are needed.
- The UK's ageing population, who receive most of these benefits, make universality an ever-increasing drain on an ill-equipped economy – this is unsustainable.
- Many of those who receive them have large incomes and do not need state payments.
- They can lead to a 'dependency culture' where people rely on the state and avoid work instead of taking responsibility for themselves.

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

- Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of the meaning of 'universal welfare benefits'
- Limited knowledge of at least one argument for or against universal welfare benefits.

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

- Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the meaning of 'universal welfare benefits', with examples.
- Clear explanation of at least one argument for and one argument against universal welfare benefits.

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

<b>No. 6</b>	To what extent have the coalition government's promises about environmental policy been met in practice?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should be able to identify specific elements of the coalition governments' promises about environment policy, and may use these to support specific points.</p> <p>Points in defence of the coalition's record <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The government has increased incentives for some forms of Renewable Energy – under the renewable heat incentive a supplement is paid for low-carbon forms of heat like biomass, solar and energy from waste, and is arguably on track to meet its 15% target by 2020.</li> <li>• As promised the government <i>originally</i> cancelled the third runway at Heathrow, and has invested in more sustainable transport via the High Speed Rail Link</li> <li>• The Green Investment Bank was established as promised and with larger than expected funding of £3billion, despite the general context of government cuts.</li> <li>• The government was largely successful in meeting its promises under the 10:10 campaign, having pledged to cut central government emissions by 10% in 2010.</li> <li>• Money has been offered to local councils to maintain weekly recycling collections, working towards a 'zero waste' economy.</li> </ul> <p>Criticisms of the coalition government <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Heathrow third runway issue has not yet disappeared, with a commission now established to look into 'all options' and a final decision postponed until after 2015.</li> <li>• Whilst the government may have invested further in renewables it is also moving forwards with environmentally questionable methods of energy production, such as Fracking.</li> <li>• The government's plan to sell off the National Forests is seen as showing their 'true colours' on conversation and wildlife issues: effectively attempting to 'privatise nature'.</li> <li>• The badger cull has been heavily criticised by environmentalists as an overreaction, placing a possible economic issue ahead of a definite conservation problem.</li> <li>• As part of spending cuts some subsidies have been reduced – for example to solar panels.</li> </ul> <p>Reference to pre-2010 governments is creditable if used for the purposes of comparison. Criticism of the original Coalition policies and promises, as opposed to discussion of whether or not they have been kept, is not creditable by itself. However arguments as to whether those promises <i>could</i> have been kept should be credited.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Awareness of specific environmental policies pursued by the coalition.</li> <li>• Limited knowledge of how government environmental policies have met coalition promises.</li> <li>• Limited knowledge of how government environmental policies have failed to meet coalition promises.</li> </ul>	

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

- Sound understanding of at least two specific environmental policies pursued by the coalition.
- Clear explanation of how government environmental policies have met coalition promises.
- Clear explanation of how government environmental policies have failed to meet coalition promises.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

<b>No. 7</b>	'In a globalised world UK governments have lost their ability to control the national economy' discuss
--------------	--

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

Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of recent economic developments both globally and in the UK, and may use these to advance specific arguments.

Arguments that could be advanced in support of the premise of the question include:

- The level of economic power and influence exerted by the huge multi-national corporations who now make up more than half of the world 100's largest economies.
- The reality that banking reform, financial regulation and some taxation (e.g. a Tobin Tax) can only be meaningfully tackled by global co-operation – unilateral action by the UK will always fail because of corporations' ability to shift their investment.
- The sheer scale of global economic and financial forces that have the capacity or overwhelm, and dictate, government policy as happened on 'black Wednesday' and in the aftermath of the collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008.
- The 'domino effect' of sovereign debt forces the UK to indirectly participate in bailouts of other governments because of the interdependency of globalised economies.
- The requirement to adhere to EU economic regulations, especially in respect of the Single Market, which are themselves partly a reaction to globalisation.

Arguments that could be advanced against the premise of the question include:

- Despite globalisation, the UK Government continues to make most key economic decisions - taxation levels, public expenditure etc.
- The UK government is a leading player in international bodies that shape and respond to the global economy – EU, NATO, IMF etc.
- The UK has retained control on monetary affairs, by not joining the Euro, and has consistently resisted proposals for increased co-ordination of fiscal policy across Europe.
- There have been several unilateral successes in limiting large companies from 'unacceptable behaviour' such as the Starbucks tax issue and the Goldman Sachs bonuses outcry, suggesting that governments can still exert influence on multinationals.
- Candidates may also cite a number of factors other than globalisation that have led to a loss of economic control: insufficient regulation, 'excesses of capitalism', increased privatisation, or mistakes by previous governments such as Labour's post-2008 stimulus. However these must be linked to the question of 'a globalised world'.

Candidates can creditably advance arguments that apply to all countries, but should clearly draw links between these arguments and the UK specifically, and some reference must be made to specific developments within the UK to advance beyond the middle of Level 2.

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

- Awareness of the nature of economic globalisation.
- Limited knowledge of ways in which national governments have lost economic control.
- Limited knowledge of ways in which national governments have retained economic control.

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

- Sound understanding of the nature of economic globalisation.
- Clear explanation of ways in which national governments have lost economic control.
- Clear explanation of ways in which national governments have retained economic control.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

<b>No. 8</b>	TWE have law and order policies since 1997 eroded civil liberties in the UK?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the tension between law and order, security and civil liberties. They should be able to identify specific law and order policies which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments :</p> <p>Arguments that could be advanced in support of the premise of the question include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anti-terror measures have breached basic and historical human rights – such as detention without trial - previously guaranteed under both Magna Carta and HRA.</li> <li>• Whilst imprisonment without trial has ended, the use of control orders and the extension of detention without charge has continued.</li> <li>• Anti-terrorism powers have been abused with their use against people exercising their democratic rights (and in some cases local even by local council investigating benefits claimants), or their alleged excessive use e.g. at the G20 riots</li> <li>• Government have been increasingly taken to task by our own courts under HRA for the arbitrary nature of some new police powers particularly in relation to stop and search.</li> <li>• Whilst the Coalition has improved rhetoric this arguably does not match policies, such as the Communications Bill which would have increased scrutiny of private communications.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments that could be advanced against the premise of the question include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adoption and continuation of HRA shows that governments are committed to a fair balance between security and freedom. Governments have also generally responded when courts have ruled against them (e.g. imprisonment without trial).</li> <li>• Only a small minority of citizens have directly experienced any loss of liberties: it could be contended that this is often in response to their own actions (terrorists, rioters, etc.)</li> <li>• Many changes have been in response to changes in technology – the law catching up with regulating freedoms that did not themselves previously exist (such as the internet).</li> <li>• The coalition could be seen to have made several steps forwards on civil liberties including scrapping ID cards and the Communications Bill, and a proposed 'Freedom Bill'.</li> <li>• In comparison to the vast majority of other countries Britons continue to enjoy an extensive range of civil liberties – the fact that they are so able to criticise these developments could be seen as evidence of this in itself.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates may argue that measures have targeted certain groups (e.g. Muslims): non-anecdotal evidence is needed as it is not sufficient to presume or assert this point. Candidates may also creditably discuss whether any loss of liberties is proportionate given the increased threat, but this should not be the main focus and</p>	

is not necessary for Level 3.

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

- Awareness of specific law and order policies pursued by UK governments since 1997.
- Limited knowledge of how government law and order policies since 1997 have eroded civil liberties in the UK.
- Limited knowledge of how civil liberties in the UK have been retained.

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

- Sound understanding of at least two law and order policies pursued by UK governments since 1997, including governments both pre and post 2010.
- Clear explanation of how government law and order policies since 1997 have eroded civil liberties in the UK.
- Clear explanation of how civil liberties in the UK have been retained.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b><i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b><i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

## SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

*These grids should be used in conjunction with the fuller Level descriptors.*

### PART A - SHORT QUESTIONS (15 marks)

<b>Level 3</b>	Excellent	15
	Very good	13-14
	Good	11-12
<b>Level 2</b>	Sound	10
	Basic	8-9
	Limited	6-7
<b>Level 1</b>	Weak	4-5
	Poor	2-3
	Very poor	0-1

### PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

<b><i>A01 / A02 / Synopticity</i></b>	
<b>Level 3</b> (Good to excellent)	9-12
<b>Level 2</b> (Limited to sound)	5-8
<b>Level 1</b> (Very poor to weak)	0-4

<b><i>A03</i></b>	
<b>Level 3</b> (good to excellent)	7-9
<b>Level 2</b> (Limited to sound)	4-6
<b>Level 1</b> (Very poor to weak)	0-3

Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA036085 Summer 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website  
[www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

