

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in  
Government and Politics  
(6GP03/3A)

Paper 3A: UK Political Issues

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

[www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus)

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

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

Summer 2015

Publications Code UA041705\*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## **General Marking Guidelines**

- 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.

<b>No. 1</b>	What domestic factors have limited the government's ability to stimulate growth since 2010?
--------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Candidates should show awareness that the UK has suffered with continued problems of sluggish growth since 2010, including a prolonged recession and the downward revision of growth predictions, albeit with some recovery from 2013 onwards.

Specific factors discussed may include:

- The trade-off between stimulating growth and cutting the structural deficit, with significant disagreement about the relative priorities between these goals.
- The lack of consumer and investor confidence caused by the credit crunch which has contributed to a 'vicious circle' of stagnated growth.
- The political difficulties created by attempting to shift spending from areas that might not directly benefit growth to investment and infrastructure projects.
- The backlash against bankers' bonuses and perceived failure of 'an excess of capitalism' which could be argued to have discouraged risk taking both in banking in terms of lending and business in terms of innovation.
- The perception by free-marketeers that the over-regulation of the economy, particularly of small businesses and employment matters, is a significant drag on growth.

Credit *cannot* be given for content that does not address 'difficulties' or relates specifically to non-domestic factors such as globalisation, or to pre-2010 governments although credit can be given for 'continuing difficulties'.

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

- Limited understanding of the ways in which domestic factors have limited the government's ability to stimulate growth since 2010
- Limited understanding of specific relevant economic policies since 2010.

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

- Clear understanding of the ways in which domestic factors have limited the government's ability to stimulate growth since 2010
- Clear understanding of specific relevant economic policies since 2010.

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

<b>No. 2</b>	Explain the arguments for and against the High Speed Rail link (HS2)
--------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Candidates should show awareness of the controversies surrounding HS2, which enjoys broad support from political parties but opposition from various pressure groups and some MPs. More able candidates will identify both economic and environmental arguments as well as covering both sides of the debate.

Arguments in favour of HS2 may include:

- The Economic benefit especially to the midlands and north - the Government argues that over the next 30 years HS2 will cost £32 billion to build but will provide £43.7 billion of economic benefits and generate £27 billion in fares.
- The project will update the rail network which is outmoded, with under-investment for some years. This will encourage individuals to change their travel habits.
- Rail is more environmentally beneficial than roads and internal flights due to reduced emissions. As HS2 provides a meaningful alternative for businesses this would therefore have a positive environment effect.
- The government argue that, far from ruining the landscape, the line will eventually enhance it with plans to create a corridor of woodland to mask the line establishing a new forest that will foster rather than damage wildlife.

Examples may be given of High Speed rail links in other countries and the benefits they are seen to have had, such as the French TGV and the Japanese Shinkansen (bullet train).

Arguments against HS2 may include:

- High speed trains blight communities affected by the route, threatening traditional ways of life, causing noise pollution, and requiring some people to be relocated.
- This will furthermore have a significant detrimental effect on wildlife along the route, disrupting natural habits, including ancient woodlands, and damaging ecosystems.
- The cost of the project continues to rise and are excessive at a time of national stringency and austerity. This diverts funds from other critical areas of expenditure.
- HS2 will divert investment from the wider rail network, particularly in the other regions, limiting upgrades and modernisation to other main lines and branch lines.

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

- Limited understanding of the arguments for and against HS2, or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of the arguments for and against HS2 including a clear degree of balance.

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

<b>No. 3</b>	To what extent has there been a cross-party consensus on tackling terrorism since 2001?
--------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Candidates should demonstrate awareness of how and why terrorism has been an on-going political issue since 2001, with a general consensus but differences on some specific policies.

Ways in which there could be seen to be a cross-party consensus may include:

- The general aims of anti-terror policy, to tackle threats to the UK whilst still protecting 'essential liberty', are common to all parties.
- The initial anti-terror legislation, including imprisonment without trial, passed parliament very quickly and with minimal disagreement.
- There was been little disagreement on the approach to the war in Afghanistan, and even the war in Iraq had initial cross-party agreement.
- Labour did not take the opportunity to attack the government over the 'snoopers' charter' and were criticised by civil liberty groups for remaining quiet.
- Parties are united on the importance of tackling radicalisation, particularly with respect to ISIS.

Ways in which there could be argued to be a lack of cross-party consensus may include:

- The Labour government's defeat on 90 day detention without trial was broadly along party lines, with a relatively small backbench rebellion adding to a unified opposition from the other parties.
- The Liberal Democrats have taken a consistently more 'pro-civil liberties' approach to the other parties, both in government and in opposition.
- Although there has been broad consensus within the major party leaderships, backbenchers from all parties have challenged the consensus including the Labour left on Iraq, David Davis on ID cards etc.
- The Iraq war, although relatively consensual at the time, is still a live political issue both within and between the parties.
- There is disagreement about the extent to which HRA protections should apply to suspected terrorists.

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

- Limited understanding of the ways in which there has and hasn't been cross-party consensus on tackling terrorism since 2010, or clear understanding of one side of the question.
- Limited reference to specific relevant anti-terror policies.

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

- Clear understanding of the ways in which there has and hasn't been cross-party consensus on tackling terrorism since 2010.
- Clear reference to specific relevant anti-terror policies.

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

**No. 4**

Explain the main implications of globalisation for economic policy-making in the UK.

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

Economic globalisation is the increasing integration, across international borders, of trade, finance and labour.

The implications for UK economic policy-making may include:

- Supporters of economic globalisation would argue that it strengthens the UK economy, allowing a wider range of economic policy options.
- The power of multinationals means that policies to tackle issues like tax avoidance and evasion, excessive bonuses, and banking regulation can no longer be effectively made at a UK level, but instead require international co-operation and agreement.
- Effective control over the movement of labour has become more difficult (and has been relinquished altogether in respect of the EU) making attempts to preserve "British jobs for British workers" largely meaningless.
- Financial crises, such as the credit crunch since 2008, cannot be contained within individual countries: instead there is likely to be a 'domino effect', meaning that the Eurozone crisis may impact significantly on the UK. These crises also have a knock-on effect on areas such as money supply and interest rates.
- Globalisation makes it both more important and more difficult to attract international investment, particularly given the increasing challenge from the BRIC countries.
- Responses to economic globalisation and to crises tend to strengthen the powers of international bodies such as the EU and IMF, further eroding economic sovereignty. However it could be argued that if action can be co-ordinated with other countries then it can be much more powerful than in a pre-globalised world.

Content that focuses on cultural or political globalisation without explicitly linking this to economic globalisation cannot be credited.

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

- Limited understanding of the nature of economic globalisation.
- Limited understanding of the implications of globalisation for economic policy making in the UK.

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

- Clear understanding of the nature of economic globalisation.
- Clear understanding of the implications of globalisation for economic policy making in the UK.

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

<b>No. 5</b>	Using examples, explain why there were disagreements between the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government and the opposition on welfare policy.
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of both the disagreement on specific welfare policies between the Coalition and Labour and the underlying reasons for these different approaches.</p> <p>Examples of how the coalition and opposition disagreed <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Welfare Bill, with its benefits cap and limits on benefit increases.</li> <li>• The introduction of the Universal Credit.</li> <li>• Changes to Housing Benefit, including the cap and also the 'bedroom tax' or 'spare room subsidy'.</li> <li>• Removal or reduction of Child Benefit from higher-rate taxpayers.</li> </ul> <p>A number of reasons could be advanced for these disagreements which <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Philosophically the Coalition portrayed a clear divide between 'strivers' and 'skivers' whilst Labour argued that most on benefits were in work, and that 'skivers' were few.</li> <li>• Practically the Coalition believed that changes saved money by removing unreasonable subsidies, such as housing benefit for unnecessary bedrooms, but Labour saw this as failing to consider circumstances on the ground – the lack of smaller housing and the need in many cases for spare rooms for carers, children in the services etc.</li> <li>• In terms of impact they were portrayed by Labour as hurting the poorest in society, whereas the coalition saw them as fair 'spreading the pain' given the economic crisis and limits on pay increases for workers.</li> <li>• The general role of the opposition in highlighting practical anomalies in government policy, for example with the removal of child benefit for higher rate tax-payers.</li> </ul> <p>Content that seeks to address areas of agreement between government and opposition, or disagreement within the Coalition, cannot be credited.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of the reasons why there were disagreements between the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government and the opposition on welfare policy.</li> <li>• Limited reference to specific relevant welfare policies to illustrate these reasons.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of the reasons why there were disagreements between the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government and the opposition on welfare policy.</li> <li>• Clear reference to specific relevant welfare policies to illustrate these reasons.</li> </ul>	

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

<b>No. 6</b>	How effective have governments since 1997 been in tackling environmental challenges?
--------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

Candidates should show understanding of the major environmental challenges facing the UK, which should go beyond a basic of awareness 'climate change' or 'global warming' and may include the sustainability of resources, the need to protect wildlife and biodiversity, and the need to reduce waste.

Candidates should be able to identify specific environment policies from both Labour governments and the Coalition *and* to assess their effectiveness. Therefore policies where the impact is currently unclear – such as HS2 – are not likely to receive significant credit.

Ways in which government policies could be argued to have been effective may include:

- The Labour government promoted a range of environmental policies designed to meet international treaty obligations that are now generally accepted such as the Climate Change Levy, differential Road Tax and the Congestion Charge.
- The Coalition rejected the third runway at Heathrow originally proposed by Labour, largely on environmental grounds. This would have significantly increased emissions, and so its reversal suggests a change of priorities between economy and environment.
- The Coalition appears to have made progress towards its ambitious environmental targets such as the 25:5 goal to reduce public sector emissions by 25% in 5 years, and the 20:20 goal of reducing UK carbon emissions by 20% by 2020.
- The use of renewable energy has increased, and the level of impact could be compared favourably to the US.
- The environment could now be characterised as an area of policy consensus with clear agreement between all major parties to continue in the current direction of sustainable development.

Ways in which government policies could be argued to have been ineffective may include:

- Recent governments have failed to seriously tackle air travel as a cause of pollution with Labour, and potentially the Conservatives after 2015, supporting the third runway at Heathrow and not taxing aviation fuel.
- Similarly both governments have 'given in' to the fuel lobby and to public opinion with regard to the fuel escalator and road building programmes.
- Governments have failed to adopt effective or meaningful policies towards a range of environmental issues other than climate change such as peak oil and conservation.
- Despite strong rhetoric on increasing the use of renewable energy both Labour and the Coalition have failed to make significant practical impact. Furthermore the Coalition has failed to rule out a new generation of nuclear power plants and has embraced the process of 'Fracing', both of which could be seen to mitigate against renewables.

- Progress towards targets has been slower than hoped and the level of impact could be compared unfavourably to many European governments.

Answers that only cover one government since 1997 cannot achieve a level three mark.

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

- Limited understanding of government environmental policy since 1997.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which governments were and was were not effective in tackling these challenges; or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of government environmental policy since 1997.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which at least two governments were and were not effective in tackling these challenges.

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

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

**No. 7**

"The 'rehabilitation revolution' for offenders promised by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition was not implemented in practice" Discuss.

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

Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the general rehabilitation vs. punishment debate and of how this played out within coalition policy. Specific penal policies of the Coalition are critical to both sides of this debate whilst an understanding of internal tensions within the coalition, and of changes over time, are likely to be significant features of strong answers.

Arguments in support of the premise of the question may include:

- Coalition plans to build new 'super prisons' as part of an extensive prison building and rebuilding programme, within the context of general financial austerity.
- Despite the opposition of the first coalition justice secretary, Ken Clarke, plans were announced for 'tougher sentences', for example mandatory minimums for knife crimes, and Clarke was moved after only a short period in office.
- The crackdown that followed the London riots suggests that any brief period of support for rehabilitation over punishment was not sustained as exemplary sentences were handed down for relatively minor offences.
- Public spending cuts have included several programmes that could be considered to be part of 'soft rehabilitation' such as youth work and social work.
- It could be argued that the rhetoric of rehabilitation is being used to mask an increasingly 'tough' prison regime with reduced privileges and larger penalties for rule-breaking within prisons.

Arguments against the premise of the question may include:

- The Prison population has actually remained fairly static through the life of the coalition at around 80,000-85,000 inmates which has stemmed the previous upwards trend.
- There has been a significant focus on further increasing the role of compulsory education and drugs and alcohol rehabilitation within prisons.
- The use of community sentencing or 'payback' has continued to rise, in particular replacing a significant number of short-term sentences.
- The Coalition has made to substantially strengthen the level of support to inmates released after sentences of less than 12 months including mentors and private contractors offering support on a 'payment by results' basis.
- The controversial ASBOs are being phased out and replaced with behaviour orders.

Candidates may creditably contend that the Coalition policies in fact represent a continuation of the previous Labour governments balance between punishment and rehabilitation and are neither more nor less geared towards rehabilitation.

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

- Limited understanding of specific Coalition government penal policies.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which Coalition penal policy could be seen as a 'rehabilitation revolution' and the ways in which this could be challenged, or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of specific Coalition government penal policies.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which Coalition penal policy could be seen as a 'rehabilitation revolution' and the ways in which this could be challenged.

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

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

**No. 8**

To what extent did the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition transform the education system?

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

Candidates should demonstrate awareness that education reform was a significant focus of the Coalition. They should be able to identify and discuss specific education policies which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments.

Arguments that the Coalition radically overhauled UK education may include:

- Thousands of new academies were created from 2010 onwards, bringing them out of local authority control and granting much more control over their admissions and operation. This went along with the increasing size of academy chains.
- Free schools gave the power to parents and faith or community groups to create their own schools and to control their own admissions and curriculum but with state funding.
- The overhaul of GCSEs represented a marked shift away from the last 25 years of educational assessment whilst the shift away from the expansion of vocational education, including the downgrading of many vocational qualifications and encouragement of more 'traditional subjects', was a clear reversal of Labour policy.
- There have been a great many changes to teachers pay and conditions including to their pensions and pay structure, and the abolition of a single national framework.
- The tripling of tuition fees represented a major shift in the funding and structure of Higher Education.

Arguments that the Coalition did not radically overhaul UK education may include:

- Academies were not an original policy but simply an expansion of a Labour idea. Although initially the process was targeted at 'successful schools' it quickly shifted to the forced academisation of 'failing schools' as under the previous government.
- The reform of GCSEs was greatly watered down from the original proposals of their abolition, or return to a two tier system of qualifications.
- There has been little change to the measuring of success in education – league tables and Ofsted remain largely unchanged with only minor changes to the criteria used.
- There has been much continuity including in areas where a Conservative led government might be expected to reform: there was no mass return to Grammar Schools, no reintroduction of corporal punishment and no return to the 'three rs'.
- Most of the Coalition reforms could be characterised as either tweaks within the context of a broadly similar system – such as Gove's amendments to the History curriculum - or else shifts back to previous practice before Labour – such as the similarity between academies and 'grant maintained schools'.

Content on education policy pre-2010 should only be credited insofar as it seeks to demonstrate continuity or departure by the coalition.

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

- Limited understanding of specific Coalition education policies.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which Coalition education policy could be seen as a transformation and the ways in which this could be challenged, or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of specific Coalition education policies.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which Coalition education policy could be seen as a transformation and the ways in which this could be challenged.

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

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

## SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

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

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

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

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

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

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

