



# Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2021

Pearson Edexcel A Level  
In Politics (9PL0) Paper 3B

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

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

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

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

October 2021

Question Paper Log Number P66605

Publications Code 9PL0\_3B\_2111\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 202

### Guidelines for Question 1(a)

#### AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one criticism cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li><li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li></ul>
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li><li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li></ul>
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li><li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li></ul>

Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
---------	-------	--

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	<b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the criticism of the ICC and special UN Tribunals (but accept any other valid responses):</b>	<b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the criticism of the ICC and special UN Tribunals (but accept any other valid responses):</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ICC and special UN Tribunals often take years to prosecute individuals eg the trial of Milosovic - indicted in 1999, on trial in 2002 and died during trial in 2006</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critics have suggested that it is unacceptable that victims should have to wait so long for courts and tribunals to act and that length of trials undermines the credibility of both</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States can disagree with decisions made by Judicial bodies such as the ICC and special UN Tribunals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State sovereignty is a fundamental, accepted building block of global politics and states/critics may argue that courts and tribunals have no right to challenge their ultimate authority</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The special UN Tribunals have taken action in a few areas such as Rwanda and Yugoslavia rather than elsewhere, where crimes may have also been committed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Critics suggest that courts and tribunals are too selective in applying international law and that it is unacceptable that certain</li> </ul>

		states and individuals escape prosecution
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Numerous human rights violations continue to take place globally ie Rohingya people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critics argue that the continuance of global human rights violations means that the ICC and special UN Tribunals have failed as a deterrent</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only a few prosecutions have taken place at the ICC and special UN Tribunals despite significant cost</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critics may imply that the ICC and special UN Tribunals are poor value for money given the relatively small number of prosecutions that have taken place and the high cost of trials</li> </ul>

### **Guidelines for Question 1(b)**

#### **AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)**

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one role/significance cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	<p><b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences between the role and significance of NATO and the role and significance of the UN (but accept any other valid responses) :</b></p>	<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the differences between the role and significance of NATO and the role and significance of the UN (but accept any other valid responses) :</b></p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The United Nations was formed in 1945 with varied aims and objectives from peace and security to economic and social development whilst NATO was formed in 1949 with a primary security focus</li> </ul>	<p>There is a clear difference in role and significance as the United Nations has a far wider collection of aims and objectives and greater involvement in global decision making than NATO which had a far narrower role as a collective security organisation to defend against communism</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NATO was created as a regional body covering North America and part of Europe (30 members in 2020)- the UN has almost global membership – (193 members in 2020 )</li> </ul>	<p>With only a regional membership, NATO clearly has to have a narrower role with less legitimacy than the United Nations which has a global significance with almost all states acting as members</p>

		<p>and participating in the actions of the organisation so enhancing its legitimacy</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The United Nations has a range of bodies from judicial such as the ICJ to environmental such as the IPCC as part of the UNFCCC and health ie the WHO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unlike the UN with its wide range of bodies, NATO role and significance is focussed primarily and more narrowly on a military, defence capability role and excludes involvement in other wider areas of significance which limits its role in comparison</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Almost all states are UN members and are committed to the organisation and show support to its actions whereas NATO membership/commitment/support is limited to a smaller number of states and is criticised by numerous states including Russia</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In comparison with the UN, the role and significance of NATO is bound to be limited by reduced membership and the criticism that it receives from certain countries who</li> </ul>

		<p>argue that it has served its original role and purpose and now lacks legitimacy, acting as an expression of Western power and influence</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision making in the United Nations Security Council is subject to a complex process with some member states holding the power of veto and able, in certain circumstances, to overrule other states whereas NATO voting is based on consensus</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whereas decision making in the United Nations can lead to states being overruled, which leads to questions about its legitimacy, there is a need to accept agreement in NATO given that there is a need for consensus which can undermine the role and significance of the organisation as it has to accept the expression of the collective will of all of the</li> </ul>

		sovereign members
--	--	-------------------

## Section B

<b>Guidelines for Question 2</b>
<p><b>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</b></p> <p>This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of Global comparative theories and relevant core politics ideas (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Candidates who refer to only one point cannot achieve marks beyond Level 1.</p> <p>Candidates who do not make any synoptic points cannot achieve Level 4</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues,</li> </ul>

		<p>many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
2	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the divisions that exist between realists and liberals over the impact of international organisations and the significance of states (but accept any other valid responses) :</p>	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) to examine the divisions that exist between realists and liberals over the impact of international organisations and the significance of states (but accept any other valid responses) :</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realists are sceptical about international organisations as they believe that states are self-absorbed whereas liberals are more optimistic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The realist view of international organisations suggests that they are far less likely to be effective and to have an impact than the liberal view which is based on the value of complex interdependence and suggests they can be effective</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realists believe in zero sum theory that states are power maximisers, set to take advantage of other states where possible whereas liberals believe that states see the benefit in working together</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The realist view of zero sum theory is at odds with the liberal view that states can gain more by working together than by competing and that states are focused on absolute, not relative, gains which means that liberals are far more optimistic about state cooperation and the impact on international organisations</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Realists believe that, at best, international organisations exist for the global hegemon to impose their aims and objectives on others or exist as a forum for competition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The realist view is at odds with the liberal view that international organisations are a forum for debate and diplomacy, where states can build trust and find common</li> </ul>

	<p>between states whereas liberals see international organisations as encouraging cooperation</p>	<p>ground rather than be oppressed by a hegemon or find themselves forever in competition and therefore liberals are far more optimistic about international organisations having an impact</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realists believe that states are the predominant actors in global politics and that sovereignty is their main feature whereas liberals see a growing role for non-state actors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The realist view of states as the predominant actor in global politics is at odds with the liberal view that the power of the state is in decline as international organisations, non-state actors and globalisation all continue to erode state power and influence and therefore lessen state impact</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realists believe that the nature of government of states is irrelevant as states all have the same objectives in an anarchical system where survival is the key objective whereas liberals see type of government as important</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The realist view that the nature of government of states is irrelevant is at odds with the liberal view that the nature of government of states is crucial as seen in the 'democratic peace thesis' and republican liberalism where war is considered less likely between states as the number of democracies grows</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Synoptic Content -Candidates may refer to the following when analysing core political ideas:</b></p>	
	<p>Conservatism core ideas and principles and how they relate to</p>	<p>Hobbes-and the consequences of this for the state system and for likelihood of cooperation, his negative</p>

	human nature, the state, society and the economy	view of human nature and the dangers to civil society
	Socialism core ideas and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy.	Greater optimism on human nature linked to the natural relationship among humans being cooperation and work for the common good – Marx - which makes the idea of a global society and cooperation likely.
	Liberalism core ideas and how they relate to human nature, the state, society and the economy.	Emphasis on the benefits of mutual cooperation from both an economic and practical position – Locke.

### Section C

<b>Guidelines for Marking Essay Question</b>
<p><b>AO1 (10 marks)</b></p> <p>Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)</p>
<p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question</p>
<p><b>AO3 (10 marks)</b></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 conclusion.</p>
<p>Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.</p> <p>The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.</p>

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	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
<b>AGREEMENT</b>			
<b>3(a)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EU is an amalgamation of 28 states (2019) with a GDP of approx US\$ 18,800,000 and a single market of approx. 500 million people with the majority of members making up a Eurozone</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The combined GDP of the EU ranks it at 2<sup>nd</sup> in the list of states in global politics only very slightly behind that of the United States which implies that it is certainly comparable to the superpower United States in economic measurement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We can reach a conclusion that economic power is considered to be an important element of status and significance in global politics and contributes towards the label of superpower with the EU acting as one economically</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The European Union is a member in its own right of the World Trade Organisation and G20 and is a participant in a number of other key agreements and treaties such as the ICC and environmental meetings. This affords the EU structural power</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Structural power is considered to be an important element of status and significance in global politics and has allowed the EU to stand up to other significant states such as the EU in trade and political disputes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The fact that the EU, as a regional body, is now accepted as a member of key structural bodies and with the same status and power as individual states such as the US would lead to conclusion that it is comparable to the United States in structural measurement. We reach the verdict that this status gives the EU the</li> </ul>

			influence of a superpower
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The European Union has the world's largest development aid budget targeted on global South, and to further its influence in the world, is a promoter of human rights globally and has previously won the Nobel Peace Prize. This is the deployment of soft power</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The increased significance of soft power in global politics and the relative strength of the EU in comparison to the US would develop the view that the EU can certainly be considered as a superpower. We can link this for the EU to be a growth in status</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soft power is of growing significance in global politics and whereas the United States has faltered as a result of actions in Iraq and Afghanistan and via the proclamations and actions of Donald Trump, the EU continues to grow in soft power status. We could make a judgement that in soft power terms the EU is not merely comparable but in advance of the US</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EU continues to increase the development of its military capability. The continuance of the CSDP, the retention of a nuclear weapons and aircraft carrier capability via constituent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Military power is considered to be a fundamental element of the label of superpower as well as, according to W Fox, a 'great mobility of power' which the EU appears to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This manifest military base and technological prowess of the EU leads us to conclude that this has given the EU superpower status in line with that of the</li> </ul>

	members. In addition the EU has a large military manufacturing and development programme. This places the EU at the forefront of global military technology	have developed	US. We reach a verdict that the EU satisfies the categorisation or label of superpower, according to the definition by W Fox, a 'great power plus great mobility of power' which the EU has attained.
--	---	----------------	---

**DISAGREEMENT**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EU is made up of 28 sovereign states and none are individual equals to the US – a superpower has to be considered an autonomous individual state such as the US or China</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The term superpower was initially used to refer to individual states, most notably the US and the Soviet Union rather than a collection of states who do not speak over many topics with a single united voice. There are policy and ideological divides within the EU member states</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The significant divisions between the member states of the EU on economic and foreign policy leads us to conclude that there is insufficient unity for the organisation to be considered an economic superpower, comparable to the US</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The United States is a permanent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite membership</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A true superpower would be expected</li> </ul>

	<p>member of the UN Security Council, a key decision maker in the IMF and W.Bank as well as in G7. The EU does not have this reach of membership of key organisations</p>	<p>of a few global bodies, the EU isn't a member of the most important decision making institutions in global politics, most importantly the UN Security Council. This means that the US is stronger in the structural global bodies than the EU</p>	<p>to be represented at the top rank of global institutions and to hold primary structural power which the US does but clearly the EU fails to do as yet, so we can conclude the EU isn't a superpower comparable to the US</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The United States usually ranks towards the top of the table of soft power, it sets the rules for global economics and has significant cultural influence through US movies, soft drinks, fast foods, technology and music</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although individual EU member states may rank highly in soft power tables there are few elements of EU identity which are remotely comparable with those held by the US. When we compare the US with the EU there is a lack of a common brand image which is</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A true superpower would be expected to hold economic, political and also cultural power and significance which the US achieves through various elements of globalisation which no other state can replicate, never mind a regional body such as the EU which therefore isn't a superpower</li> </ul>

		portrayed by the EU	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The United States ranks as the most significant military power in the world with military spending approaching half of global spending, high technology warfare capability and friendly bases as well as aircraft carrier groups stationed globally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The EU has no control over member states nuclear capability or aircraft carrier deployment and even collectively it spends only a fraction of the amount that the US spends on military capability</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Without a coordinated ability to deploy member states military forces and a lack of ability to mobilise military forces globally, the EU can't be considered a superpower</li> </ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities</li> </ul>

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

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
<b>AGREEMENT</b>			
<b>3(b)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a significant increase in the number of major environmental conferences and agreements in recent years with the Kyoto conference in 1997, Copenhagen 2009 and Paris 2015 setting global targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An increase in the number and significance of environmental conferences as a focus of global governance suggests that the environment is a particular recent and growing issue of the global community in comparison with other concerns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We could make a judgement that the relatively recent development of environmental agreements and conferences shows that that environmental protection and governance are receiving greater attention than other issues such as economic in the global agenda</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The international community has established the Intergovernmental Panel for Climate Change with respected reports on Climate Change as part of the UN</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a growing involvement and participation of major powers, such as the EU, and at times US and China in the funding and support of these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We can conclude that the support from major blocs such as the European Union and the increasing number of reports and</li> </ul>

	<p>Framework Convention on Climate Change</p>	<p>environmental agencies and bodies suggesting they are more willing to support environmental protection</p>	<p>declarations from the key environmental bodies alongside the increased willingness of states to abide by agreements shows that global concern for the environment is increased in relation to other concerns in global politics</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a significant increase in the number of NGOs and social movements committed to tackling environmental concerns such as the global Schools' climate strike in early 2019 and Extinction Rebellion or Friends of the Earth</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The development of the hundreds of national, regional and international organisations committed to tackling environmental issues is dwarfing the number of similar economic groups as a sign of a global focus on the environment over other issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We could reach a conclusion that the growing number of national, regional and international organisations concerned about the environment represents a seismic shift in attitudes to the environment which makes clear the greater attention on environmental issues above other issues</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual countries and political parties have recognised the growing public interest and support for tackling environmental concerns and have developed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The developing consensus amongst countries and political parties over the need to resolve environmental concerns and the development of similar policies is a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We could make a judgement that the weakened economic consensus and increased questioning of the international financial</li> </ul>

	environmental policies as a result whilst there has been an end to the consensus on economic institutions and free trade economic governance	recognition of the global desire to focus on environmental issues at the expense of others such as economic where we have seen a drift to protectionism and trade disputes	institutions suggests that they no longer have the significance that they once held whilst the consensus on the threat to the environment seems to be evident in the recent actions of the global community
--	--	--	---

**DISAGREEMENT**

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of long established economic global governance institutions committed to the development of global trade such as the IMF, World Bank and WTO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IMF, World Bank, WTO and G7 all continue to play a significant role in easing the flow of trade and encouraging and supporting economic growth globally through support for free trade</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We could make a judgement that, the fact that these economic institutions have been in place for an extended period and continue to do so suggests that the global community is particularly concerned about economic issues rather than others</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost all members of the international community are members of the IMF, World Bank and WTO and some of the most significant states are members of G7, whilst other states have formed regional bodies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Almost universal membership of these global governance bodies suggests that states are particularly concerned about economic matters rather than environmental issues and the US</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We may conclude that universal support for and dominance by the major states of these economic bodies with broad agreement on</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

	<p>based on economy such as the EU</p>	<p>stance on climate change (Trump withdrawal from Paris) confirms this</p>	<p>economic policy shows that economic matters are significant than environmental issues where there is less of a consensus</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental agreements tend to include opt outs such as the controversial carbon sinks and carbon trading that are allowed as part of the Kyoto agreement and similar treaties such as Copenhagen and Paris where states can often avoid firm targets</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where agreements are voluntary with no real punishment for those who break the agreements there has to be concern that states are unlikely to take the agreements seriously and this is in contrast to the more structured and formalised economic agreements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We may conclude that if environmental governance are based on non-binding agreements whilst economic agreements are more rigid and structured such as within the IMF and WTO then there is more concern for economics rather than the environment</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Governments and Political parties focus on economic policy as a recognition that the economy tends to be a, if not the key determining factor in deciding elections and in gaining popular</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Global economic philosophy is deeply ingrained and any serious attempt to tackle environmental issues would require a change in economic thinking which is unthinkable where it challenges consumerism and materialism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We may conclude that the global concern for economic growth and prosperity is so deeply ingrained that it will remain the key focus in global politics, particularly when compared with the environmental</li> </ul>

	support and approval	as ideological elements of capitalism	disunity represented in the so called 'Tragedy of the commons'
--	----------------------	---------------------------------------	--

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

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

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
<b>AGREEMENT</b>			
3(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There has been a significant increase in the number and type of regional cooperative bodies in recent years and particularly since the 1980s</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An increase in the number of regional bodies has been accompanied by an increase in the areas that they are now involved in, from security to trade, worker rights and even the environment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We may reach the conclusion that the increase in number and focus of these regional bodies shows that the nation state may no longer represent the sole or most significant decision maker in global politics</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The European Union claims that it 'pools sovereignty' and to many such as UKIP/Brexit Party in the UK this must represent an erosion of state sovereignty as do the critics of the trade relationship in NAFTA who call for the US to leave</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Regional bodies appear to involve the pooling of sovereignty in one or numerous areas with an understanding that states will apply common rules and regulations in order to benefit members and the creation of so many parties opposed to this strengthens the view that it is indeed taking place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pooling of sovereignty suggests that there has been a movement in the location of sovereignty which, we may conclude, shows that the original sole holder of sovereignty has lost a degree of power and growing opposition to regional bodies supports this view</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The European Union includes a number of institutions such as the European Court of Justice, Commission and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A number of these institutions appear to hold Supranational characteristics such as the ECJ which</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We may conclude that regional bodies, particularly those which exhibit Supranational</li> </ul>

	Parliament which make decisions impacting on member states	can make decisions that states may not wish to obey but have no choice but to accept such as the Factortame case in the UK or decisions made by QMV in the Council of Ministers	characteristics, must be eroding state sovereignty as states are having to obey decisions that they disagree with
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some regional bodies represent their members in global decision making such as the EU which represents its members in the WTO</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The European Union is authorised to make decisions for member states in the WTO and does represent the collective members in a series of other organisations and agreements including environmental agreements which implies that states have lost a degree of control and sovereignty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We may conclude that decision making on behalf of states but which states have no direct control over and may actually disagree with is a clear indication of weakened sovereignty so it is plain to judge that regionalism has eroded sovereignty</li> </ul>
<b>DISAGREEMENT</b>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sovereign states remain the main building block of global politics in all of the most significant institutions such as the United Nations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no regional bodies in the most significant global institutions as states are unwilling to surrender decision making to them at the highest levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We may conclude that as states are only willing to allow regional bodies to make decisions in certain global institutions but excluding the most important of these institutions then state sovereignty has not really been eroded</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supranationalism has been resisted in most regional bodies such as ASEAN and the African Union</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The African Union is a staunch defender of state sovereignty, territorial integrity and the independence of its member states and ASEAN was created primarily as a defence against superpower influence and with a protection of sovereignty and the ASEAN way at its core</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We may conclude that as most regional bodies make clear that they are established with a recognition of and respect for state sovereignty then clearly they are not eroding state sovereignty</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been a rise in concern about the impact of regional bodies in certain states such as the UK which has led to a reassertion of the nation state and of nationalism</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The fact that the UK is able to withdraw from the European Union and that there has been a backlash against further integration through anti EU movements in Hungary, Poland, Austria, Netherlands and Italy suggests a reluctance to accept any challenge to state sovereignty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We may conclude that the opposition to deeper integration shows that regional bodies are unlikely to be able to integrate further and certainly deeper without hitting a political wall when they begin to challenge state sovereignty</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EU began as an economic entity and other regional bodies focus on the economic arena ie NAFTA the AU and ASEAN as part of an</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the case that the vast majority of regional bodies are economic in focus rather than political and are used as a</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We may conclude that the focus on economics within regional bodies often to collectively protect the economies of</li> </ul>

	attempt to protect members in a globalised economy	protection for the nation state against the process of globalisation via loose arrangements with similar states with the EU economic example acting as a blueprint for others to follow	individual states in a global market shows that regionalism is actually an extension of the sovereignty of member states
--	--	---	--

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

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