

Mark Scheme for 9PL0/01

UK Politics and Core Political Ideas

EAMS

Guidelines for Marking Source Question

AO1 (10 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding.

They can be awarded for using the source and developing separate own knowledge.

When the rubric states that candidates should 'use knowledge and understanding to help you analyse and evaluate' it means that candidates should use only knowledge and understanding from the source. Newly introduced own knowledge cannot form the basis for AO2 and AO3 points/marks.

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should focus their comparison on analysing the different opinions in the source in terms of similarities and differences. They should look at the different approaches and views that arise from political information and show how these can form the basis for differing opinions.

AO3 (10 marks)

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

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

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusions.

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

Other valid responses are acceptable

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
1(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It involves a mass of people • It provides an improvement on how democracy has been operating • It is a practical and viable means of participation for people • Proof that it works is that it gets politicians to change their mind • As more people are involved in choice this enhances decision making <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many organisations 'spin' the truth 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure groups work well in representative democracy as they allow mass participation • Representative democracy has struggled to maintain and motivate citizens to participate – as with the low turnout levels at all elections • It is a practical and viable means of participation for people. Direct democracy as such in a modern society with millions of voters is impractical. • If we assume that politicians operate in self interest the activity of pressure groups acts to provide scrutiny and accountability to office holders • As more people are involved in choice this enhances decision making. The wider that political awareness becomes – the more improved is decision making <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often pressure groups operate in 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass participation is crucial to a functioning and vibrant democracy • We can conclude that this is a viable route to engage many and prevent apathy which is growing • Given the impracticality of direct democracy we create a pluralist democracy with a wide range of pressure groups • We can conclude that as it involves and makes accountable politicians this is a good thing for democracy. • Democracy and participation is enriched when people learn about issues and choices in society. <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democracy is damaged and participation possibly stifled if pressure groups manipulate the

	<p>and lead to exaggerations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Groups such as 38 Degrees oppose issues just for the sake of opposition • Their actions prevent open and honest debate and ignore facts • They veer into areas of illegitimacy by their posturing <p>Quite often as with 38 Degrees they get their facts wrong and make numerous mistakes</p>	<p>'self interest' and self promotion. On occasions this may lead to 'spin' where minimal truths are blown up beyond all proportion of their merit and scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The source hints that there is almost an 'automatic pilot' amongst pressure groups which reacts negatively to all government proposals • By their very nature pressure groups are biased and favour one side in a debate Pressure groups tend to stifle honest and pragmatic debate to make progress and instead adopt more extreme views where compromise is not possible • Pressure groups like all other organisations do get things wrong and their views should be the subject of scrutiny and debate just as political parties 	<p>facts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This can be harmful to the best workings of democracy and builds opposition when consensus over certain issues may be required • To govern is top choose and often the government has to decide what is best for the country as a whole – this will no doubt upset some pressure groups – but that is democracy • Pressure groups are not subject to the same lines of accountability nor do they take responsibility for all their actions – unlike governments who are trusted to govern in the interests of all
	<p>Points for and against based on own knowledge In support of the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure group action proves an active democracy 	<p>NO AO2 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</p>	<p>No AO3 is rewarded if linked to new material from Own Knowledge</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• They are invaluable between elections• They help and assist in informing both the public and governments• They provide an alternative to political parties for action and ideas• They educate the public <p>In disagreement with the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is the danger of 'mob rule' where some pressure groups secure victory just on the basis of numbers• Pressure group activity gets in the way of organised and legitimate government• Much pressure group activity is passive and is not fully supported or endorsed by its members• Many pressure groups are internally un-democratic in leadership and profile• It is often the wealthy or elite pressure groups who prosper – with the bulk failing to reap any benefit		
--	--	--	--

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

		<p>ideas and concepts (AO2).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
--	--	--

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	A03 10 Marks
1 (b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They promote competing channels of legitimacy • They promote conflict between elected representatives and the general public • They promote uncertainty if the margin on the decision is close • They instil the notion that they will be repeated until a certain outcome is obtained • They only work if a broad consensus is achieved 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They promote competing channels of legitimacy. Referendums may damage legitimacy • Far from being a 'final arbitrator' referendums can cause frustration and resentment between the public and the government • A close result in a referendum can cause damage to the democratic process. Furthermore referendums on 'major' changes should carry a clear majority • Evidence shows that governments often re-run referendums until they obtain the outcome they desire 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competing source of legitimacy are destabilising for representative democracy and may simply provide one massive 'invitation to struggle' • We can conclude that referendums do not provide solutions but rather continue to ferment problems and cause unrest. • Knife edge decisions we can conclude simply aggravates the issue from the losing side, so instead of consensus the remains division • We could make a judgment that democracy is subverted by continual referendums and this may

	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A big turnout means that the outcome has to be respected • They link our system to direct democracy which is good • Parliament has to be subservient to the will of the people in a referendum • They should be carried out if promised in prior manifestos • The results are accepted by other democratic nations 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referendums are about democracy and that is decided by the majority no matter how big or small • Referendums are refreshing supplement to our system of representative democracy • Parliament may have legal sovereignty but it does not have popular sovereignty • Referendums tie in with representative democracy. The public were promised a referendum in a party manifesto. • All leaders of the EU nations and their countries may have been upset at the UK leaving the EU but they accepted the outcome. 	<p>introduce apathy</p> <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More people voted in the referendum for leave than voted for any recent government so the verdict must have legitimacy. • If used selectively referendums engage and educate the public in New areas and this is good for democracy • The will of the majority of the public is far superior to a minority of elected politicians • In a winning parties manifesto a mandatory promise thus emerges and to go against this precedent would damage democracy. • The verdict carries international legitimacy
	<p><u>Own knowledge in favour of the premise may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referendums undermine 		

	<p>representative democracy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued use of referendum can lead to fatigue and apathy in voters It is often far too hard to put many political issues into a binary yes/no option for voters They often arise to placate political party problems not national ones Governments have significant control in deciding to hold them and use them to their advantage <p><u>Own knowledge against the premise may include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They create political awareness and education They show how representative democracy can be enhanced by direct democracy They act as a check on governments and parliaments They act to unite and heal if there are divisions in parties and the public- by producing a definite result. 	<p>NO AO2 is rewarded if linked to New material from Own Knowledge</p>	<p>NO AO3 is rewarded if linked to New material from Own Knowledge</p>
--	--	---	---

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

Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
---------	-------	--

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 conclusions.

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
2(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In recent years citizens have experience a loss of Rights curtailed by the governments • This process has been undertaken as governments have sought to protect citizens from acts of terrorists • This can be seen in various Terrorism Acts which increase detention periods for suspected criminals • We have also seen the Right to protest in the vicinity of Parliament removed • The government has also introduced 'control orders' to restrict the freedom of movement <p>Disagreement</p>	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is simply a fact that although legislation exists to promote Rights counter legislation has at the same time removed them • Governments argue that they are making the country safe from terrorists but all too often the power hits at basic political Rights • The huge growth in Terrorism Acts placed on the statute book is out of all proportion to the threat. • Pressure group evidence continually shows proof of governments undermining Rights in the UK – as seen in the work of Liberty and Stonewall <p>Disagreement</p>	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thus we need a process where Rights are entrenched and as such are not able to be removed by the government such as a UK based Bill of Rights • One clear example being the removal of Rights to protest at the heart of our democracy Parliament • For example more people die from knife crime in one week in London than a whole year of terror related killings, governments have other more important tasks and responsibilities to protect. In addition the courts have rejected many of moves to restrict Rights – but the government simply passes New legislation to thwart the independence of the Judiciary • Independent proof by numerous agencies in the UK proves that Rights are under attack

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In recent years the passage of more detailed legislation means that Rights are set out clearly and in detail • These include the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010 • All of the above has established a clear Rights based culture • This base allows the judiciary to be more pro-active in defence of individuals and their Rights. • A more active social and press media can champion the case of individuals who have been denied their Rights in the UK 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability of a host of progressive legislation since 1997 provides a clear platform for enhanced and defined Rights An active judiciary has used legislation such as the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Equality Act 2010 to defend citizens • If there are more cases and disputes in the News concerning Rights it is not indicative of increased problems but rather shows increased transparency and the evidence of 'Rights in action' • The judiciary has been empowered and alongside the Constitutional Reform Act of 2005 The growth of the social media platform affords greater connection to individuals who may have previously before felt isolated and vulnerable 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can conclude that citizens can readily feel that their Rights are fully protected and a Rights culture has been established. • This has given the promotion and protection of Rights more authority and legitimacy to challenge the government and its ministers. Citizens are more pro-active in defence of individuals and their Rights • We can reject the premise that citizens no longer feel that their Rights are secure and protected.
--	---	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of

		which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
2(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtually all the general public gain their information via the media • The media has the capacity to 'sensationalise' policy statements and add bias • Bias is endemic in the press but in theory curtailed in the broadcasting media <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general public will make up their own mind from a vast range of media sources • Political parties are about policy and ideas, they generate these not the media • Bold and dynamic policy 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few members of the public astutely read policy statements and manifestoes, but use the media • The public are easily swayed by persuasive and dramatic headlines in the Newspapers • Bias in the press does make political parties change and amend their policies <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The general public do vary and change and on occasions ignore the media e.g. GE 2017 • The general public tend to choose media sources which reflect and endorse their views • Political parties at times have to be bold and radical and offer 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The power of the media in terms of press, broadcasting and social media continues to grow • The public appeared to be swayed by a largely anti-EU press in the run up to the EU referendum • Heavy criticism in the press has made leaders change their policies such as Philip Hammond and his U turn on rising tax levels for the self-employed <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The media is only one source of bias and influence there are many others factors such as family and class • There is evidence that the media tries to reflect rather than create the views of the general public • Political parties can and do produce

	statements make parties different and attract voters	differing choices for the general public	policy which is met with unfavourable views from the general public – and often in Government parties carry out unpopular decisions.
--	--	--	--

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

		(AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Guidelines for Marking Political Ideas Questions
<p>AO1 (8 marks)</p> <p>Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)</p>
<p>AO2 (8 marks)</p> <p>Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question</p>
<p>AO3 (8 marks)</p> <p>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 conclusions.</p>
<p>Candidates must consider both sides presented in the question.</p>
<p>The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion.</p>

Candidates who *do not* refer to specific thinkers from the relevant section of the specification in the question raised and/or/only consider one side cannot achieve beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses and use of other appropriate thinkers identified in the specification.

Question number	AO1 8 Marks	AO2 8 Marks	AO3 8 Marks
3(a)	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Nation conservatives are pragmatic and flexible in their approach to the economy whereas the New Right is more ideological and inflexible (Burke) One Nation conservatives are positive about the state (Oakeshott) even in the economic arena whereas the new right distrust the state believing it has no role in the economy One nation conservatives venerate the past and wish for gradual change (Burke) whereas the New Right are willing to abandon the past and embrace change <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservatives agree that an 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Nation conservatives will not risk change into the unknown and will stick with the tried and tested economic approach (Burke) whereas the New Right is far more daring and willing to embrace radical change if it advances self-interest and economic prosperity (Rand). One Nation conservatives will use the state to steer the economy whereas the New Right is inherently sceptical of any benefits brought about state interference in the economy One nation conservatives venerate the past as a guide to the future and wish to preserve and build on history (Burke) whereas the New Right reject the economic Keynesian consensus, preferring instead to allow free enterprise and market dynamics 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Radical, ideologically-driven change is an inherent aspect of new right thinking but not one-nation conservatives (Burke) <p>The state and its role in the economy differs fundamentally between the two branches (Rand)</p> <p>Tradition and customs, even in the economy, are judged to be vital for one-nation conservative but irrelevant to / the new right</p> <p>Agreement</p>

	<p>ordered society (Hobbes) is required to promote a flourishing economy</p> <p>Conservatives agree on the importance of free enterprise (Burke)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservatives recognise that people are motivated by self-interest and advancement (Rand). 	<p>to shape the future (Rand)</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservatives see the need for a state as a guardian of law and order even if it is minimal in order for the economy to function effectively (Nozick), this arises out of the natural capacity of humans to err and be imperfect (Oakeshott) Conservatives recognise the capacity of individuals to create wealth (Burke, Oakeshott, Nozick). Conservatives accept that self-interest and material acquisition are a driving force in society and this is at the core human nature (Oakeshott, Rand and Nozick) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conservatives agree that some form of state involvement is inevitable and necessary Conservatives agree that the economy benefits from a society which is made up of different people with different skills, talents and functions All conservatives agree that these innate drivers exist in human nature
--	---	---	--

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

		<p>many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences, making mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	15–19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences, making relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	20–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political concepts, theories and issues, which are selected effectively in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning making cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	AO1 8 Marks	AO2 8 Marks	AO3 8 Marks
3(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All conservatives agree that human nature carries common threads and impulses. There is an innate need to form society and collective groupings for advancement and this is built on tradition and past 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many conservatives feel that the traditions and customs of yesterday is the guide for behaviour and human nature today and tomorrow, experience is the pathfinder and director of human nature (Burke) 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatives conclude that these patterns can be seen in all societies as human nature is constant and unchanging • All conservatives share the view that the family is a natural part of all human development.

	<p>experience (Burke)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All conservatives agree that the family and its support mechanisms are vital in an individual's life and this is where human nature gains its roots • All conservatives agree that human nature pursues private as opposed to public ends and as such the state should not regulate in this area (Joseph) <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some conservatives fear human nature and that it can if left unchecked cause problems (Hobbes) others however feel it should not be constrained (Nozick) • Some conservatives feel that human nature relies on traditions and customs (Burke) whereas others are more inclined to let human nature take whatever course works for each individual • Some conservatives are pessimistic about human nature and think that it is unreliable and faulty whereas others take a more progressive view of the potential of self-seeking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human nature for many conservatives is formed in the family as the socialiser of human beings • Conservatives think often in terms of variety and individualism in relation to human nature, hence the link to organic principles <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This shows a diverging attitude to human nature between those who will grant maximum freedom (Nozick/Rand) to those who fear unbridled freedom allowing variety in human nature to bring chaos (Hobbes). • Traditional conservatives put great faith in customs and traditions to guide human nature and plot its course (Burke) whereas the New Right feel that human nature should shift for itself and pursue New avenues if this can deliver success • Traditional conservatives fear the automatic 'negative' consequences of unrestricted human nature which will lead to disorder and chaos and as such 	<p>Expressly put in Mrs Thatcher's quote 'there is no such thing as society, there are families and individuals'. Establishing a view which evaluates the family and innate human nature to be crucial in shaping society</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All attempts to regulate human nature will fail, this is why all conservatives form a critical judgment about of socialism's attempt at conformity <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These differing position between Nozick and Hobbes have an inbuilt inconsistency • Again we can infer that there is a great deal of inconsistency within conservatism over how human nature is viewed by the different sections. • These views are polar opposites and have no consistency. We can judge this to be a divergence as it takes either a pessimist or an
--	---	--	---

	individualism	would feel the need for strong law and order systems (Hobbes) this contrasts with the libertarian element in conservatism having little fear in imposing value structures on people (Nozick/Rand)	optimistic view of human nature held by different strands of conservatism.
--	---------------	---	--

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

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