



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel GCE In Politics

Paper 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas
(9PL0/01)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2023

Question Paper P72622A

Publications Code 9PLO_01_2023_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

Section A: Political Participation

Guidelines for Marking Questions 1a and 1b
<p>AO1 (10 marks) Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>They can be awarded for using the source and developing separate own knowledge.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Marks for analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3) should <i>only</i> be awarded where they relate to information in the source.</p>
<p>Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.</p> <p>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.</p>

In AO2 and AO3, political information means source.

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
--	--	---

Question number	Indicative content Evaluate the view that in 1997 the election was lost by the governing party rather than it being won by the Labour opposition.
1(a)	<p>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding from the source and their own knowledge (AO1) in relation to the outcome of the 1997 general election</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Conservative Party was deeply divided and split • An election is won when the issues that matter form the central part of the battle for the vote • The public lacked economic confidence in the Conservatives. • The Conservative government failed to handle events well and appeared to be an unsafe pair of hands in government <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Labour Party worked hard to please the media and get it on side • The Labour Party was united and not beset by any factional warfare as the Conservatives were • The Labour campaign was excellent and outshone that of the Conservatives. • The policies which the Labour Party presented to the voting public were appealing and inspiring. <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fundamental disagreements over Europe plagued the party and the cracks were manifest and damaging. There had been challenges to Major’s leadership of the party. If the party has doubts about the direction of travel this loss of confidence influences the electorate (AO2) We arrive at the conclusion that the public lose faith and trust in a government if it is split on core issues. (AO3) • The Conservatives misread what the core issues were and what mattered to the voting public. If core ideas and topics are avoided, then that party – here the Conservatives appear out of touch with the people they aim to govern (AO2) We can easily reach a verdict that a party has to be sensitive and in touch with public opinion and what matters to them. (AO3) • For many reasons the Conservatives had a tarnished reputation on economic matters stemming from the record in office in the last five years. Economic competence is a key factor for a government in office, and if they fail on this their electoral credibility takes a huge dive. (AO2) We can conclude it was hard to blame the opposition for the economic problems and choices which it made, and the Conservatives could not shake off this negative image. (AO3) • The party handled events and their fallout badly and this sat alongside its failing economic competence. The government seemed tired and weak and did not instil the confidence of a party which could be trusted to continue in office for another term. (AO2) We reach a verdict that the ruling party had lost momentum and drive. It had run out of new ideas to engage the electorate and move the country on. (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- Blair wooed the Murdoch press and got papers like the Sun to back Labour. The press tends to support the Conservative Party, but this election showed different press allegiances. (AO2) We can conclude that support from the media is crucial, and Labour felt the damage done by the media in 1992 cost them the election and they had fixed this core problem (AO3)
- The core message given out by Labour was one of unity and discipline. This has the effect that a party has a clear vision of how it will govern and the unity in opposition can be transferred to unity in government. (AO2) Parties that are united can succeed but parties that are disunited and split lose public confidence and votes. (AO3)
- Labour had a much more efficient and effective grip on its campaign. It had learned from its previous mistakes, and this instilled a sense of professionalism which enhanced its potential to form a new government. The campaign strategy was well executed and productive covering many aspects needed to instil confidence and secure victory. (AO2) We can conclude that presentation and message are vital to success. (AO3)
- Reform to the constitution had been avoided by the Conservatives in the last 18 years but reform in areas where there had long desired change – such as the House of Lords, devolution, and human rights carried great voter appeal. (AO2) We arrive at a verdict that alongside choosing the right topics to fight the election on appealed to the public (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	Indicative content Evaluate the view that the UK has a democratic deficit.
1(b)	<p>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding from the source and their own knowledge (AO1) in relation to the view of a democratic deficit in the UK:</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our system of FPTP fails to provide results which accurately reflect how people voted. • Fatigue and disengagement continue to rise in politics amongst the general public • There is a lack of accountability by professional politicians • Power over individual rights is excessive and corrodes liberal democracy <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democracy in the UK is distinguished by open and free debate. No views are silenced, and we tolerate differing points of view. • New governments are formed and old ones are removed by the public • Our system of democracy is well furnished with methods of ensuring accountability • Our electoral system is seen as being ‘free, fair and open.’ – it thus has legitimacy and competence. <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results are skewed beyond belief. MPs and Governments secure victory on far less than 50% support of the voting public. Election after election continues to expose the flaws in FPTP. (AO2). We arrive at the conclusion that only PR can solve this problem – which is in essence one of legitimacy. (AO3) • Ordinary citizens feel out of touch with the people who govern them, the process is one of alienation and if this fatigue and disengagement continues it will produce rule by an ever-smaller elite (AO2) We can reach a verdict that it can undermine the system of democracy itself. (AO3) • Elected politicians avoid taking responsibility for their decisions. This is achieved by either simply not revealing the truth or at worse lying. This affects the public when the decisions made have an impact on them. Democracy has to rely on accountability and transparency and when this disappears so does true democracy. (AO2) We can conclude that If we cannot see what actions have been taken in the public’s name democracy is undermined. (AO3) • Governments are keen to preserve their power and status and have over time chipped away at individual rights and increased their power over ordinary people to do such things as legitimately protest and discover truths concealed from them (AO2) It becomes easy to conclude that when rights are denied by government a whole array of democratic opportunities is lost. (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- The different views in the UK are seen by not having any restrictions on new parties and pressure groups forming to put their views across. This openness so very much integral to our democracy reveals a pluralist democracy with numerous avenues for open debate and a regular increase of democratic channels. (AO2) It is easy to conclude that this makes the UK a healthy democracy (AO3)
- As new governments form with a mandate for change it means that new ideas and new policies become available in the UK democratic system. (AO2) The peaceful transition of power – or indeed the sharing of power in a coalition government - is a beacon of democracy as parties give way to others (AO3)
- Government ministers and PMs are held to account by an assembly of all parts of the UK – Parliament. Sitting MPs can be subject to recall in certain circumstances. The ballot box can and does remove politicians and parties who have failed. Legislation is in place which ensures transparency such as the Freedom of Information Act – and this has been effectively deployed to hold politicians to account (AO2) This shows that democracy is alive and well in the UK (AO3)
- On a practical side, FPTP almost always transfers governing power to the party with the most support in the country, it also allows governments who can implement their election manifesto and get things done (AO2) To conclude we see FPTP as having more strengths than weaknesses across a range of issues from geographical representation to keeping out extremism (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.

Guidelines for Marking Questions 2a and 2b**AO1 (10 marks)**

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question.

AO3 (10 marks)

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

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

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

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

Other valid responses are acceptable

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 analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes 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	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 analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make 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 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 analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make 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	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 analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make 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	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 analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make 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	Indicative content Evaluate the view that referendums held in the UK since 1997 have brought more disadvantages than advantages.
2(a)	<p>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in agreeing with the view that referendums have brought more disadvantages than advantages:</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referendums have not fully settled many issues since 1997 with results still being contested after the outcome – a good example is the EU referendum in 2016 and the Scottish independence referendum in 2014. • Referendums have set in change major constitutional change which has undermined the union. • Not all referendums had widespread support, for example the referendum which set up Welsh devolution in 1997. • Many referendums have little to do with the choice of the public but are really means to satisfy sections of political parties. <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referendums allowed the devolved regions to gain political influence and revive civic pride • The referendum in Northern Ireland over the Good Friday Agreement was a pivotal landmark in the peace after the ‘troubles’. • Referendums allowed the public a say on matters which divided parties such as the EU • Referendums have engaged, educated and motivated the public into political action <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many issues remain contested political topics even after the outcome of a referendum. For instance, the referendum in 2016 over EU membership still divides public opinion given the vote was so close (AO2). We could be led to form a view that for a referendum to have real and lasting legitimacy it must have more than just a simple plurality of votes. (AO3) • The benefits claimed for devolution are minimal given the cost it has created and the political damage to the unitary and union state, it has fuelled the case for Scottish independence and created uncertainty in Northern Ireland (AO2) It becomes possible to conclude that the consequence of referenda has been negative, (AO3) • In 1997 the Welsh voted for devolution by a margin of less than 1%, based on the turnout of just over 50% this in fact meant that devolution in Wales had the support of no more than 25% of people and a threshold should be set of turnout and a wide margin to adopt any change (AO2) It is easy to make a judgement that some decisions in referendums are not the true will of the majority (AO3)

- Referendums may be paraded as an experience of direct democracy but introduction the referendum on AV was a ploy to satisfy the Liberal Democrats by the Conservatives. In the same way David Cameron never wanted a referendum on the EU but did so to placate a section of his party (AO2) We arrive at a verdict that greater democracy or participation is rarely the reason for calling referenda (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- The referendums which introduced devolution have created institutions which are accepted and valued in all regions, and they have worked well (AO2) We can conclude that it would now be impossible to remove them without the consent of the people as their impact has been so strong (AO3)
- Northern Ireland is a vastly more secure and prosperous region than before the referendum in 1998, it has allowed power sharing across the political divide (AO2) We can conclude that without a referendum which had an approval of over 80% of voters such a change would not have been possible (AO3)
- At times there are some issues where parties cannot agree amongst themselves, and a referendum is a huge advantage to end this gridlock The Conservative party was in this stalemate over EU membership (AO2) We can conclude that a public referendum is sometimes the only option to bring clarity (AO3)
- Referendums have produced turnouts greater than recent General Elections such as the two most recent ones in September 2014 and June 2016, people engaged and participated on the issues (AO2) We can conclude that referendums produce more legitimate results than do elections (AO3)

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

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

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	Indicative content
2(b)	<p data-bbox="341 226 1398 293">Evaluate the view that the current funding of political parties in the UK requires reform.</p> <p data-bbox="341 331 1182 367">AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p data-bbox="341 405 1382 510">Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that party funding requires reform:</p> <p data-bbox="341 548 507 584">Agreement</p> <ul data-bbox="341 622 1430 972" style="list-style-type: none"> • The funding of political parties is never clear, it is not known who backs any party in detail before elections. • The current funding system is unfair as it favours wealthy individuals who can donate large sums to a party and expect some form of return. • The current funding suits the largest two parties, the Conservative and Labour parties, who benefit from the status quo. • Parties other than Labour or Conservative struggle to compete fairly on even terms and they face a huge disadvantage. The answer to this is state funding for all who contest elections. <p data-bbox="341 1010 552 1046">Disagreement</p> <ul data-bbox="341 1084 1430 1507" style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes and reforms introduced by the Political Parties, Elections and Referendum Act 2000 (updated in 2009) provide enough safeguards to make the issue of party funding secure and any further reform unnecessary. • If state funding was introduced, it would cost the taxpayer – and mean that other government provision or public services would be cut • State funding would require a vast and complex framework to monitor and administer in addition to the financial cost • Parties funded by membership and private donations benefit from the fairness of a free market in ideas and policy, it develops new ideas and keeps political parties competitive <p data-bbox="341 1545 1321 1612">Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul data-bbox="341 1650 1430 2069" style="list-style-type: none"> • It is only after an election that parties reveal in full their sources of funding and where it has originated. If we are to be a transparent representative democracy then when we cast our vote, we should know who has financed the party we vote for and if the policies it promotes favour the backers of the party as opposed to the wider public good. (AO2), We can conclude that reform is required and this can only be solved with state funding (AO3) • It is often the wealthy and powerful who make their voice heard in society and policies emerge from the established parties to please this sector. The less affluent in society are ignored with less input into policy options. There is a clear correlation between giving a party funds and receiving personal benefits (AO2) We can easily reach a

verdict that this is little more than basic bribery to get titles or policy options (AO3)

- The two main parties benefit most from the current system of funding and as such have a vested interest not to dismantle this system. To run a national campaign costs millions of pounds, small and emerging parties cannot amass this wealth. (AO2) We can conclude that this limits political choice and fair political competition. (AO3)
- Emerging and minor parties cannot compete on equal terms with the Labour and Conservative parties. The organisation these two established parties have cannot be replicated and it limits other parties and creates a huge imbalance. (AO2) If the battle to win the electorates vote is unfair, we could assert that the outcome of the election is equally unfair (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- The 2000/2009 Act introduced a range of safeguards to monitor spending in elections, capping amounts allowed and ensuring transparency on those who provide funds Little other reform is required, and the Act removed all potential dangers that existed. (AO2), We can conclude that the Act functions well and has introduced a good level of transparency. (AO3)
- Democracy, elections, and political parties in the UK have functioned well without the need for state funding. Who would decide what provision would be cut to allow this to take place? (AO2) We can reach a verdict that it will raise taxes or that other government services will be cut to make way for a system which the public have not significantly called for (AO3)
- State funding requires for others to make judgments of what level of funding parties will receive, who decides the amount and how do we manage smaller parties? (AO2) We can conclude that state funding is every bit as problematic as the current system. (AO3)
- The current system of funding encourages dynamism from parties, state funding may lead to complacency. State funding would limit the link of political parties with wider society. Rather than bringing the political parties closer to the public it would actually distance them more from it (AO2) we can conclude that the current system promotes positive relationships between parties and the public (AO3)

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

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

Accept any other valid responses.

Section B: Core Political Ideas

Guidelines for Marking Questions 3a and 3b
AO1 (8 marks) Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)
AO2 (8 marks) Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question
AO3 (8 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 sides presented in the question. The judgement a candidate reaches about these sides should be reflected in their conclusion. Candidates who <i>do not</i> refer to specific thinkers from the specification 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.

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). • 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).

Level	Mark	Descriptor
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	Indicative content To what extent does Liberalism have a fear of the state?
3(a)	<p>AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the extent that liberals are fearful of the state:</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All liberals are suspicious of the state, seeing it as a ‘necessary evil’. They believe it should maintain order, protect property and defend against external attacks (Locke) Hence all liberals are keen to see limits on state power. • All liberals also fear the power of the state as a restriction on freedom of the individual and personal liberty, supporting the harm principle (JS Mill). • All Liberals fear the state and believe its function should be limited by a Social Contract, to protect rights (Wollstonecraft) and liberties <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern liberals began to re-evaluate the Classical Liberal view on the role of the state and this view is advanced by Rawls • Modern Liberals advocate an enabling state rejecting the classical liberal approach of a minimal state. • Modern and classical liberals fear the state to different degrees shown by their differing views on the role of the state in the economy. <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The state is a necessary evil as it can limit individual choice and personal autonomy. John Locke’s view of the state had limits and the state had to be bound by contractual obligations. (AO2) We can conclude that liberals base their fear of the state on the assumption that the state could be corrupted and corrupting if unlimited (AO3) • Due to their fear of the state, Liberals have a mechanistic theory of the state, where the state must exist to benefit the people, not vice versa, and authority for the state comes from below. This is because Liberals fear that the unchecked power of a state can undermine freedom of the individual (JSMill). (AO2) We can conclude that all Liberals fear an unchecked state. (AO3) • All Liberals accept the limits to the state based on Social Contract theory which requires individuals to give up the state authority over them in return for being protected from harm. Legitimate government can only be established by the consent of those governed (AO2) This shows liberalism’s clear position of fear of the state. (AO3) <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern and Classical Liberals fear the state to different degrees and subsequently disagree over the extent of the role of the state. Modern Liberals came to see the

state less as a threat to individual liberty but more as its guarantor (Rawls) (AO2), Thus we can see that there are clear differences in the extent Liberals fear the state (AO3)

- Modern and Classical Liberals fear the state to different degrees shown by the fact that Classical Liberals believe in a minimal state and modern liberals believe in an enabling state. These differences are due to their respective views on individualism and freedom, with classical liberals believing in egoistical individualism and negative freedom and modern liberals believing in developmental individualism and positive freedom liberty (**Rawls, Friedan**). (AO2) Thus we can see that Modern and classical Liberals fear the state in different ways. (AO3)
- Classical Liberals believe in a free market, laissez faire economy with a minimal welfare and role for the state whereas Modern liberals support a Keynesian approach alongside a welfare state, (**Rawls**) which means a larger role for the state in the economy. (AO2) This shows a differing level of fear of state involvement.(AO3)

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

Question number	Indicative content
3(b)	<p data-bbox="344 237 1246 264">To what extent does the Third Way effectively abandon socialist principles?</p> <p data-bbox="344 271 1118 304">AO1 (8 marks), AO2 (8 marks), AO3 (8 marks)</p> <p data-bbox="344 342 1318 450">Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in agreement in which the Third Way effectively abandons socialism:</p> <p data-bbox="344 488 507 521">Agreement</p> <ul data-bbox="392 524 1422 730" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="392 524 1362 589">• The Third way embraces free markets in a way which is rejected by the other socialist strands such as Revolutionary Socialism and Social Democracy <li data-bbox="392 591 1422 656">• The Third Way embraces a form of equality of opportunity or equality as inclusion (Giddens) which is rejected by other Socialists. <li data-bbox="392 658 1414 730">• The Third Way reject class analysis of society in contrast to other socialist strands who accept class conflict as a factor which destabilises society. <p data-bbox="344 768 560 801">Disagreement</p> <ul data-bbox="392 804 1417 1055" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="392 804 1355 869">• Third way socialists still support a positive role for the state which is also the position of Social Democrats. <li data-bbox="392 871 1331 978">• Third way socialists still recognise the importance of community which is a socialist principle supported by both Revolutionary Socialists and Social Democrats. <li data-bbox="392 981 1417 1055">• Third way socialists remain committed to a fairer society and protecting the most vulnerable which is consistent with the principles of other socialists strands. <p data-bbox="344 1093 1321 1200">Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the agreement:</p> <ul data-bbox="392 1202 1433 1776" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="392 1202 1414 1413">• All other strands of socialism reject a free market believing that it brings injustice (Marx and Engels). At the core of this socialist view is that the free market reinforces inequality and injustice. Many socialists hold the view that a free market is corrosive and encourages greed. In essence it advances an unequal society. (AO2) We can conclude that the Third Way has therefore abandoned this socialist principle (AO3) <li data-bbox="392 1415 1433 1626">• Third Way's commitment to a different form of equality sets them apart from other Socialists strands like Social Democracy who advocate greater social and economic equality (Crosland) or Revolutionary Socialists who support absolute equality which can't be achieved under capitalism. (Marx and Engels) (AO2) We can conclude that the Third Way has therefore abandoned this socialist principle (AO3) <li data-bbox="392 1628 1422 1776">• Third Way's rejection of class analysis shows an abandonment of socialist principles. Both Revolutionary Socialists and Social Democracy seek to tackle class differences to advance inequality and injustice. (AO2) We can conclude that the Third Way has therefore abandoned this socialist principle (AO3) <p data-bbox="344 1814 1321 1921">Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when reviewing the extent of the disagreement:</p> <ul data-bbox="392 1924 1414 2020" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="392 1924 1414 2020">• Both Third Way and Social Democracy support an evolutionary approach to achieving socialism (Webb) via the state, which shows a continuity of socialist principles between these two strands. Both strands also recognise that the state,

to varying degrees, has positive benefits. (AO2) Therefore Third Way has not abandoned traditional socialist principles (AO3)

- Third way socialists share with both other socialist strands a commitment to community (**Luxemburg**), recognising that humans are social beings and have an obligation to each other. (AO2) Therefore Third Way has not abandoned traditional socialist principles (AO3)
- Third way socialists commitment to a fairer society is consistent with the approach of Social Democracy (**Crosland**). Neither wants to abolish capitalism to create a socialist economy or society. Both recognise that capitalism can be used to target support at the most vulnerable and that the state can guide and direct capitalism's resources to work for the greater good. (**Giddens**) (AO2) Therefore Third Way has not abandoned traditional socialist principles (AO3)

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