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General marking principles for Higher Modern Studies Paper 1

Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates’ responses.

(a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding; marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.

(b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.

(c) Where a candidate does not comply with the rubric of the paper and answers two parts in one section, mark both responses and record the better mark.

(d) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.

(e) Use the full range of marks available for each question.

(f) The detailed marking instructions are not an exhaustive list. Award marks for other relevant points.

(g) Award marks only where points relate to the question asked. Where candidates give points of knowledge without specifying the context, award marks unless it is clear that they do not refer to the context of the question.

(h) Award marks for knowledge/understanding where points are
   • relevant to the issue in the question
   • developed (by providing additional detail, exemplification, reasons or evidence)
   • used to respond to the demands of the question (for example evaluate, analyse).

Marking principles for each question type

For each of the question types the following provides an overview of marking principles.

The extended-response questions used in this paper are
   • discuss . . . 20 marks
   • to what extent . . . 20 marks
   • evaluate . . . 12 marks
   • analyse . . . 12 marks

Extended response (12 or 20 marks)

For 12 mark questions, award up to 8 marks for knowledge and understanding (description, explanation and exemplification). Award the remaining marks for the demonstration of higher-order skills of analysis or evaluation. Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, award as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.
For **20 mark questions**, award up to **8 marks** for knowledge and understanding (description, explanation and exemplification). Award the remaining marks for the demonstration of higher-order skills of analysis and evaluation and structured argument. Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of **6 marks**, award as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

In *Section 1 — Democracy in Scotland and the United Kingdom* and *Section 2 — Social Issues in the United Kingdom*, award marks where candidates’ responses refer to Scotland only, to the United Kingdom only, or to both Scotland and the United Kingdom.

- **Discuss** questions
  Candidates communicate ideas and information on the issue in the statement. Candidates gain marks for analysing and evaluating different views of the statement or viewpoint.

- **To what extent** questions
  Candidates gain marks for analysing the issue in the question and coming to a conclusion or conclusions which involve an evaluative judgement, which is likely to be quantitative in nature.

- **Evaluate** questions
  Candidates gain marks for making a judgement based on criteria; for determining the value of something.

- **Analyse** questions
  Candidates gain marks for identifying parts of an issue, the relationship between these parts and their relationships with the whole; and for drawing out and relating implications.
Higher Modern Studies marking grid for 20 mark questions (KU = 8 marks; analysis/evaluation = 12 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
<th>5–6 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range of relevant knowledge</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate, relevant, up-to-date.</td>
<td>One relevant aspect of the issue given with some description.</td>
<td>Two relevant aspects of the issue given with some description or one relevant aspect covered with detailed and accurate description.</td>
<td>One relevant aspect of the issue with detailed and accurate description and one relevant aspect with some description.</td>
<td>At least two relevant aspects with detailed and accurate descriptions which should include the key aspects of the issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of explanation/exemplification of the issue</strong></td>
<td>Some explanation of one aspect of the issue or relevant exemplification.</td>
<td>Some explanation of two relevant aspects of the issue or detailed explanation of one aspect of the question which may include relevant exemplification.</td>
<td>Detailed explanation of one relevant aspect of the issue with relevant exemplification and some explanation of one aspect of the question.</td>
<td>Full explanation of at least two aspects, which relate closely to the key aspects of the question and extended, relevant, accurate and up-to-date exemplification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>One relevant and accurate analytical comment.</td>
<td>One relevant and accurate analytical comment that is justified or exemplified or two different relevant and accurate analytical comments.</td>
<td>One developed relevant and accurate analytical comment that is justified and exemplified; this should relate closely to a key aspect of the question.</td>
<td>One extended, accurate and justified analytical comment of an insightful nature which relates closely to the key aspects of the question and is exemplified.</td>
<td>At least two developed relevant and accurate analytical comments that are justified and exemplified. These should relate closely to the question and may be linked for 6 marks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Award up to 6 marks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
<th>5–6 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops a consistent and clear line of argument.</td>
<td>Clear structure that addresses the issue identified in the question.</td>
<td>Structure that clarifies the issue, presents evidence and develops a clear and consistent line or argument.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award up to 2 marks.</td>
<td>One conclusion that addresses a key issue in the question.</td>
<td>One extended and balanced conclusion that addresses a key issue in the question or two conclusions that address key issues in the question.</td>
<td>One extended and balanced conclusion that is justified and directly addresses the key issue(s) in the question or two balanced conclusions that address the key issues in the question, one of which is extended.</td>
<td>One extended and balanced insightful conclusion that is justified and directly addresses the central aspects of the question and which considers a range of viewpoints.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Evaluative comments which make a judgement(s) and or reach a conclusion(s) which address the key issues in the question.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award up to 4 marks.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where a candidate makes more analytical and/or evaluative points required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.

**Note:** answers to 20 mark questions should demonstrate at least two relevant aspects of knowledge and provide detailed analysis and evaluation.

For **full marks** in the KU aspect of the question (8/8), a response **must** include a range of points, have detailed explanation, and include a range of accurate exemplification.

Award a maximum of **6 marks** (from 8 for KU) if there is no exemplification.

For **full marks** (20/20), a response **must** be structured, include a range of points, have detailed explanation, include a range of accurate and relevant exemplification and contain extended analysis and evaluation.
Higher Modern Studies marking grid for 12 mark questions (KU = 8 marks; analysis/evaluation = 4 marks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of relevant knowledge.</th>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accurate, relevant, up-to-date.</td>
<td>One relevant aspect of the issue given with some description.</td>
<td>Two relevant aspects of the issue given with some description or one relevant aspect covered with detailed and accurate description.</td>
<td>One relevant aspect of the issue with detailed and accurate description and one relevant aspect with some description.</td>
<td>At least two relevant aspects with detailed and accurate descriptions which should include the key aspects of the issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality of explanation/exemplification of the issue.
Award up to the maximum of 8 marks available for KU.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis/evaluation</th>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments that identify relationships, implications and make judgements</td>
<td>One relevant and accurate analytical or evaluative comment.</td>
<td>One relevant and accurate analytical or evaluative comment that is justified or exemplified or two different relevant and accurate analytical/evaluative comments.</td>
<td>One developed relevant and accurate analytical or evaluative comment that is justified and exemplified; this should relate closely to a key aspect of the question.</td>
<td>One extended, accurate and justified analytical or evaluative comment of an insightful nature which relates closely to the key aspects of the question and is exemplified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.

**Note:** answers to 12 mark questions should demonstrate at least two relevant aspects of knowledge.

For full marks in the KU aspect of the question (8/8), a response must include a range of points, have detailed explanation and include a range of accurate exemplification.

Award a maximum of 6 marks (from 8 for KU) if there is no accurate or relevant exemplification.

For full marks (12/12), a response must include a range of points, have detailed explanation, include a range of accurate and relevant exemplification and analysis or evaluation.
**Marking instructions for each question**

**Section 1: Democracy in Scotland and the United Kingdom**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. (a)   | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following.  
- links between different components  
- links between component(s) and the whole  
- links between component(s) and related concepts  
- similarities and contradictions  
- consistency and inconsistency  
- different views or interpretations  
- possible consequences or implications  
- the relative importance of components  
- understanding of underlying order or structure.  
Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. | 20 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of **20 marks**. Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following  
- ongoing debate around alternative governance for Scotland  
- implications on Scotland and rest of UK of an alternative governance for Scotland.  
Candidates may refer to  
- the ongoing debate around Independence and a second Independence Referendum  
- implications of Brexit vote on Scotland  
- devolution – the status quo  
- devolution max  
- ‘the vow’  
- federalism  
- ‘power grab’ by Westminster during Brexit negotiations  
- the Calman Commission  
- the Smith Commission  
- constitutional implications of alternatives to the future governance of Scotland.  
*Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this kind of question.*  
**Possible approaches to answering this question**  
**Response 1**  
The Independence referendum of 2014 was a victory for those that wished Scotland to remain part of the United Kingdom. Fifty five percent of Scottish voters said that they wanted to remain part of the UK. *(1 mark KU)* This shows that Scotland wishes to remain part of the UK and therefore this democratic vote should be respected. *(1 mark analysis)*  
**Total 2 Marks — 1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis.** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | Award up to **8 marks** for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to **12 marks** for analytical or evaluative comments. |          | **Response 2**  
The Scottish Parliament currently has some powers in very important areas such as Health and Education. They have also been given some tax raising powers recently which means that Scottish people pay a higher rate of tax than people in the rest of the UK. *(1 mark KU)* Some groups such as the Labour Party, argue that by having these powers and being part of the UK, Scotland has the best of both worlds. *(1 mark KU)* They argue that there is no reason to change or become Independent as Scotland has the benefit of extra powers and the protection of being part of the United Kingdom in, for example, Defence. *(1 mark analysis)*  
Total 3 marks — 2 marks KU, 1 mark analysis. |
|          | Award up to **6 marks** per point. |          | **Response 3**  
Some people argue that decisions taken by Scotland are disregarded and overlooked by decisions taken in the rest of the UK. For example, some people argue that Scottish people were not listened to during the Brexit vote and that Scotland voted differently from large parts of the UK. *(1 mark analysis)* Sixty two percent of Scottish voters voted to remain part of the EU as opposed to 48% across the UK. *(1 mark KU)* Many argue that this is a democratic deficit which will see Scotland being forced to leave the EU against their will. They have argued that the best option for Scotland would be to be independent from the rest of the UK but still remain part of the EU. *(1 mark analysis)* This point of view is one that has been adopted by the SNP and has been described as ‘feasible’ by some MEPs in the European Parliament’. *(1 mark KU)*  
Total 4 marks — 2 marks KU, 2 marks analysis. |
|          | Award up to **full marks** if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this. |          | **Response 4**  
Some people argue that Independence is the best way forward for Scotland. This means that Scotland would be fully responsible for all the decisions taken and powers used in Scotland. *(1 mark KU)* They argue that Westminster does not listen to the people of Scotland and often acts against their interests. In 2017, a motion brought by the SNP to the Scottish Parliament that called for a second Independence Referendum was passed by a majority of MSPs. However, the Prime Minister, Theresa May refused to back the proposals for a second referendum saying that, ‘Now is not the time’. This highlights that even when the Scottish Parliament votes for something, Westminster can refuse or ignore the request. *(2 marks KU, 1 mark analysis)* This has led to a lot of anger from those in favour of Independence and is often used by them as their main argument as to why the current devolution settlement is unfair to Scotland. *(1 mark evaluation)*  
Total 5 marks — 3 marks KU, 1 mark analysis, 1 mark evaluation. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (b)      | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following  
  - links between different components  
  - links between component(s) and the whole  
  - links between component(s) and related concepts  
  - similarities and contradictions  
  - consistency and inconsistency  
  - different views or interpretations  
  - possible consequences or implications  
  - the relative importance of components  
  - understanding of underlying order or structure. | 20 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of **20 marks**. Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following  
  - the various ways that parliament can hold to account the work of government  
  - the effectiveness or otherwise of parliament in holding to account the work of government.  
  Candidates may refer to  
  **Scotland**  
  - First Minister’s Questions (FMQs)  
  - work of committees  
  - questions to individual ministers  
  - voting  
  - type of government can affect effectiveness — minority, majority or coalition — SNP having to rely on votes from other parties due to minority government  
  - size of government majority  
  - backbench rebellion  
  - debates and motions  
  - role and power of the whips  
  - decision time.  
  **UK**  
  - Prime Minister’s Questions (PMQs)  
  - work of committees  
  - questions to individual ministers  
  - role of House of Lords as amending chamber  
  - power of the whips  
  - type of government — minority, majority and coalition 2017 Conservatives relying on DUP  
  - size of government majority  
  - backbench rebellion  
  - Early Day Motions/Ten Minute Bills  
  - voting  
  - Salisbury Convention for policies in government manifesto. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 12 marks for analytical or evaluative comments. Award up to 6 marks per point. Award up to full marks if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</td>
<td>Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this kind of question. Possible approaches to answering this question Response 1 There are many ways in which parliament can hold the government to account. Parliamentary representatives like MPs can question the Prime Minister at PMQs every Wednesday. (1 mark KU) Total 1 mark — 1 mark KU. Response 2 There are many ways in which parliament can hold the government to account. Parliamentary representatives like MPs can question the Prime Minister at PMQs every Wednesday. (1 mark KU) PMQs is a good opportunity to hold the government to account. PMQs can be effective as it has the potential to embarrass the PM, the government and their policies. (1 mark evaluation) Labour MP David Lammy has asked many questions recently at PMQs particularly over the Windrush scandal which led to a review of policy relating to this. (1 mark KU) However, PMQs can be seen as being ineffective as many of the questions and PM responses are scripted and therefore much of the time for holding government to account is wasted. (1 mark evaluation) Total 4 marks — 2 marks KU, 2 marks evaluation. Response 3 One way that parliament can hold the government to account is through individual backbenchers proposing new legislation which is then voted on by MSPs. (1 mark KU) The success of this often depends on the type of government in power. A minority government such as the current SNP government will struggle to defeat a Member’s Bill particularly if all the opposition MSPs join forces and back the proposed piece of legislation. (1 mark analysis) This happened when Labour MSP James Kelly’s Member’s Bill was successful in overturning the SNPs Offensive Behaviour at Football Act. (1 mark KU) This shows that parliament can have some success against the government, particularly when the party in charge have a minority of the MSPs. (1 mark evaluation) Total 4 marks — 2 marks KU, 1 mark analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the main roles of parliament is to hold to account the work of government. Parliament can do this in many ways. They can ask questions of government ministers and they can take part in debates. They can also propose new laws themselves. Another good way is by proposing amendments to legislation put forward by the government. Parliament then votes on these amendments. **(1 mark KU)** In the UK, parliament includes members of the House of Lords. Recently, the House of Lords voted against the government over the terms of Britain leaving the EU. The House of Lords disagreed with the government and voted against the government’s proposals. **(1 mark KU)** This shows that parliament has an important job and can hold to account the work of government. MPs also can be effective in holding to account the work of government such as forcing the government to seek changes to the ‘Tampon Tax’. **(1 mark analysis)** However, the success of MPs in parliament is often dependent upon the type of government in power. A government with a minority of MPs, such as the Conservatives in 2017, is much more likely to be defeated and held to account by parliament more effectively than a government with a huge majority, such as Tony Blair’s majority of 166 in 1997. **(1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis)** Theresa May’s 2017 Conservative government has had to rely on the DUP to win some votes in parliament. This highlights how parliament can be very effective but is sometimes limited by the size and type of government. **(1 mark evaluation)**

Total 6 marks — 3 marks KU, 2 analysis, 1 mark evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (c)      | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following  
- links between different components  
- links between component(s) and the whole  
- links between component(s) and related concepts  
- similarities and contradictions  
- consistency and inconsistency  
- different views or interpretations  
- possible consequences or implications  
- the relative importance of components  
- understanding of underlying order or structure. | 20 | Candidates can be credited in a number of ways up to a maximum of 20 marks. Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following  
- types of pressure groups and the methods they use  
- effectiveness of pressure groups and the methods they use.  
Candidates may refer to  
- types of pressure groups: insider and outsider groups, sectional and interest groups  
- success often dependent upon political leanings of party in power  
- types of methods used, for example, petitions (including e-petitions), marches, non-violent direct action, lobbying  
- individual backing of pressure group campaigns by MPs and MSPs  
- ways in which some pressure groups use the media to influence decision-making through public opinion  
- backing of MPs by trade unions and business organisations  
- use of social media and internet  
- role and influence of paid lobbyists within the House of Lords and the Commons.  
*Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this kind of question.*  
**Possible approaches to answering this question**  
**Response 1**  
Some groups outside of parliament are more effective than others in influencing governmental decision-making. For example, insider groups can be said to be more successful and effective in influencing government policy than outsider groups.  
*(1 mark evaluation)* Insider groups generally have strong links to the government and are often asked by the government for their opinion and ideas on areas that they are familiar with. *(1 mark KU)*  
Total 2 marks — 1 mark KU, 1 mark evaluation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 12 marks for analytical or evaluative comments. Award up to 6 marks per point. Award up to full marks if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Response 2&lt;br&gt;The success of pressure groups often depend on the type of methods used and how they appear to the general public. Groups such as CND actively break the law through non-violent direct action which often leads to many members and supporters being arrested during events such as the Big Blockade at Faslane Naval Base. (1 mark KU) On the one hand, this generates a great deal of publicity for their cause and may increase the number of people supporting them. (1 mark analysis) However, their methods could alienate members of the public who don’t think it is right to break the law to make a point. (1 mark analysis) Total 3 marks — 1 mark KU, 2 marks analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Response 3&lt;br&gt;Some groups outside of Parliament are more effective than others in influencing governmental decision-making. For example, insider groups can be said to be more successful and effective in influencing government policy than outsider groups. (1 mark evaluation) Insider groups generally have strong links to the government and are often asked by the government for their opinion and ideas on areas that they are familiar with. (1 mark KU) The success of insider lobby groups often depend on the political party in power, for example, a pro-business, pro-employer group such as the CBI are likely to have more success when a Conservative government is in power. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) Likewise, a Labour government with Jeremy Corbyn as Prime Minister will be more likely to listen to pro trade union groups such as the Trades Union Congress or a union such as Unison. The effectiveness of these groups therefore will often depend upon the political leanings of which party is in power. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) Total 6 marks — 3 marks KU, 2 marks analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Section 2: Social inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. (a)   | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source, to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following:  
- links between different components  
- links between component(s) and the whole  
- links between component(s) and related concepts  
- similarities and contradictions  
- consistency and inconsistency  
- different views or interpretations  
- possible consequences or implications  
- the relative importance of components  
- understanding of underlying order or structure.  
Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 4 marks for analytical comments.  
Award up to 6 marks per point.  
Award up to full marks if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a | 12 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 12 marks.  
Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following:  
- social inequality affecting the group  
- economic inequality affecting the group.  
Candidates may refer to:  
- young/old  
- gender differences  
- ethnicity  
- social/economic status  
- disability.  
Any other point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this kind of question.  
If a response considers more than one distinct group, it should only be credited for the one which attracts the highest mark.  
Possible approaches to answering this question  
Response 1  
People from ethnic minority backgrounds in the UK are paid 26% less on average than the majority white population. (1 mark KU)  
Total 1 mark — 1 mark KU.  
Response 2  
People from ethnic minority backgrounds in the UK are paid 26% less on average than the majority white population. (1 mark KU) This can lead to a lifetime average difference of around £500,000. (1 mark KU) This is a clear income inequality and makes securing a mortgage more difficult meaning that many BAME workers live in poorer housing. (1 mark analysis)  
Total 3 marks — 2 marks KU, 1 mark analysis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this. |          | **Response 3**  
Despite decades of equal opportunities legislation, most recently the Equality Act (2010), the UK’s Black and ethnic minority population still faces inequality. (1 mark KU) Lower levels of pay (26% lower on average than that of Whites) leads to a higher chance of living in poverty for example, according to the JRF, the BAME population has poverty rates around twice the level of those among the white population. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) The BAME population is more likely to find employment in sectors of the economy with lower wages, such as the retail sector. (1 mark KU) This in turn contributes to lower educational attainment among some BAME communities. For example, males from the Black Caribbean community are most likely (18%) to leave school with no qualifications. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis)  
Total 6 marks — 4 marks KU, 2 marks analysis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Evaluation involves making judgments based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 4 marks for analytical comments. Award up to 6 marks per point. Award up to full marks if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 12 marks. Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following - government policies that tackle inequalities - successes/failures of policies. Candidates may refer to - government policies designed to tackle income/wealth inequalities - government policies designed to tackle health inequalities - government policies designed to tackle housing inequalities - government policies designed to tackle education inequalities. Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question. Possible approaches to answering this question <strong>Response 1</strong> In all sectors, low paid and well paid women still earn less than men. In part to tackle the gender pay gap the government introduced the National Minimum Wage in 1999. (1 mark KU) Total 1 mark — 1 mark KU. <strong>Response 2</strong> In all sectors, low paid and well paid women still earn less than men. In part to tackle the gender pay gap the government introduced the National Minimum Wage in 1999. (1 mark KU) The NMW helps women more than men due to the fact the NMW benefits 3 in 10 women and women make up 60% of all lowest paid employees. (1 mark KU) The NMW especially helps women who work in the 5 C’s — catering, cleaning, clerical, caring and cashier. (1 mark KU) This highlights that as women make up the majority of low-paid positions the NMW has been most beneficial in increasing their income. (1 mark evaluation) Total 4 marks — 3 marks KU, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In all sectors, low paid and well paid women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>still earn less than men. In part to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tackle the gender pay gap the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>introduced the National Minimum Wage in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1999.  <strong>(1 mark KU)</strong> The NMW helps women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>more than men due to the fact the NMW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>benefits 3 in 10 women and women make up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60% of all lowest paid employees.  **(1 mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KU)** The NMW especially helps women who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>work in the 5 C’s — catering, cleaning,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clerical, caring and cashier.  <strong>(1 mark KU)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This highlights that as women make up the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>majority of low-paid positions, the NMW has</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>been most beneficial in increasing their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>income.  <strong>(1 mark evaluation)</strong> However</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>many would argue that the NMW is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unsuccessful as some people believe it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>raises unemployment by making workers too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expensive to employ. Others argue the NMW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is regarded as being too low, at only £8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>for those over 25 (referred to as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Living Wage).  **(1 mark KU, 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mark evaluation)** Therefore, this shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that government have been fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>successful but as there is still a gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pay gap, more must be done that the NMW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alone won’t fix.  <strong>(1 mark evaluation)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>**Total 7 marks — 4 marks KU, 3 marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evaluation.**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (c)      | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source, to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following:  
- links between different components  
- links between component(s) and the whole  
- links between component(s) and related concepts  
- similarities and contradictions  
- consistency and inconsistency  
- different views or interpretations  
- possible consequences or implications  
- the relative importance of components  
- understanding of underlying order or structure.  
Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 4 marks for analytical comments.  
Award up to 6 marks per point. | 12 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 12 marks.  
Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following:  
- types of crime  
- effects of crime on the victim.  
Candidates may refer to:  
- range of types of crimes, for example violent and non-violent  
- short and long-term effects of crime on the victim, for example physical, emotional, financial, psychological  
- reference to official crime figures  
- case studies and examples with reference to effects of different crimes.  
Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question.  
Possible approaches to answering this question  
Response 1  
A person can suffer physical and mental consequences as a result of being a victim of crime. A victim can be left injured, disabled or scarred for life if they suffer a physical attack. (1 mark KU)  
Total 1 mark — 1 mark KU.  
Response 2  
A person can suffer physical and mental consequences as a result of being a victim of crime. A victim can be left injured, disabled or scarred for life if they suffer a physical attack. (1 mark KU)  
This in turn can change a person’s whole life as they may find it more difficult to get a job if they have an obvious scar, because of discrimination. (1 analysis)  
Total 2 marks — 1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | Award up to full marks if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this. |          | Response 3  
A person can suffer physical and mental consequences as a result of being a victim of crime. A victim can be left injured, disabled or scarred for life if they suffer a physical attack. (1 mark KU) This in turn can change a person’s whole life as they may find it more difficult to get a job if they have an obvious scar, because of discrimination. (1 mark analysis) After being the victim of a violent assault the mental trauma can last months or years. The person may be reluctant to venture out and may find themselves suffering from mental illness such as depression and anxiety. (1 mark KU) A combination of unemployment and mental illness may often lead to a lower income and a greater chance of experiencing poverty. (1 mark analysis)  
Total 4 marks — 2 marks KU, 2 marks analysis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Evaluation involves making judgments based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 4 marks for analytical comments. Award up to 6 marks per point. Award up to full marks if candidates answer within a Scottish context only, a UK context only, or refer to both Scotland and the UK as appropriate. Where candidates make more evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 12 marks. Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following • various methods of non-custodial responses • success/failures of non-custodial responses. Candidates may refer to • Community Payback Orders (CPOs) • Restriction of Liberty Orders (RLOs) • electronic tagging • restorative justice • Drug Treatment and Testing Orders (DTTOs) • statistical evidence and official crime figures • case studies and examples with reference to different crimes/criminals. Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question. Possible approaches to answering this question Response 1 Community Payback Orders (CPOs) are targeted at those offenders who haven’t committed particularly serious crimes. They aim to change the offender’s behaviour towards their community and their attitude to go out and work. (1 mark KU) Total 1 mark — 1 mark KU. Response 2 Community Payback Orders (CPOs) are targeted at those offenders who haven’t committed particularly serious crimes. They aim to change the offender’s behaviour towards their community and their attitude to go out and work. (1 mark KU) CPOs consist of unpaid work, offender supervision as well as often consisting of mental health treatment, drug and alcohol therapy. (1 mark KU) Total 2 marks — 2 marks KU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Payback Orders (CPOs) are targeted at those offenders who haven’t committed particularly serious crimes. They aim to change the offender’s behaviour towards their community and their attitude to go out and work. (1 mark KU) CPOs consist of unpaid work, offender supervision as well as often consisting of mental health treatment, drug and alcohol therapy. (1 mark KU) It has been proven that offenders who serve a CPO instead of a custodial sentence are four times less likely to end up in custody for future offences. This highlights a key success of CPOs in that they not only ensure the offenders are contributing something positive back into society but they also ensure offenders are rehabilitated afterwards. (1 mark KU, 1 mark evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 4 marks – 3 marks KU, 1 mark evaluation.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: International issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. (a)   | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following:  
  - links between different components  
  - links between component(s) and the whole  
  - links between component(s) and related concepts  
  - similarities and contradictions  
  - consistency and inconsistency  
  - different views or interpretations  
  - possible consequences or implications  
  - the relative importance of components  
  - understanding of underlying order or structure. | 20 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 20 marks.  
Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following:  
  - the political system of the world power studied  
  - the relative powers of different political institutions.  
Candidates may refer to:  
  - the role of political parties  
  - executive authority held by the President/Prime Minister/Cabinet  
  - authority held by main legislative bodies  
  - judicial authority  
  - relationship between the executive, legislative and judicial bodies  
  - relationship between national, state, provincial and local governments.  
*Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question.*  
**Possible approaches to answering this question**  
**World power: USA**  
The US political system was designed to separate executive, legislative and judicial powers to ensure that no one political institution was able to dominate decision-making. (1 mark KU) For example, the Congress proposes and ratifies legislation, but each bill must be signed by the President if it is to become law. (1 mark KU)  
Total 2 marks — 2 marks KU.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to <strong>8 marks</strong> for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to <strong>12 marks</strong> for analytical or evaluative comments. Award up to <strong>6 marks</strong> per point. Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</td>
<td>World power: China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Chinese Constitution sets out a system that divides executive, legislative and judicial authority within the country to be held by the President, the National People’s Congress and the Supreme People’s Court. (1 mark KU) However, in reality each branch of government is controlled by the Communist Party of China (CPC) and it acts to rubber stamp its decisions. (1 mark KU) This shows that the CPC dominates all government decision-making to a significant extent and does not face scrutiny by other political institutions. (1 mark evaluation) Total 3 marks — 2 marks KU, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Within China legislative powers are held by the National People’s Congress (NPC), which forms China’s Parliament. The NPC has the power to pass legislation and to appoint the President and ratify their nomination for the Premier. (1 mark KU) However, the NPC meets only once a year and 2119 of the 2980 members belong to the Communist Party. (1 mark KU) This means that the NPC has relatively little influence within China as it does not meet regularly enough to do more than just ratify legislation, and when it does meet the Communist Party of China (CPC) has a vast majority within it and can control decision-making. (1 mark analysis) Overall, it is clear that as a result of its dominance within the legislature the CPC is able to dominate government decision-making and that it faces little scrutiny. (1 mark evaluation) Total 4 marks — 2 marks KU, 1 mark analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World power: South Africa</td>
<td>The President is elected to office by the National Assembly rather than directly by the public which shows that his ability to dominate decision-making is potentially limited due to his reliance on the Assembly. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) However, former President Jacob Zuma managed to be re-elected to a second term in 2014 despite accusations in 2013 that he spent millions of rand of taxpayers money on a swimming pool at his private home. (1 mark KU) His ability to hold onto power despite facing political scandals shows that the President’s power is extensive and that he faces only weak scrutiny from the legislative. (1 mark evaluation) However, in reality the reason he was able to maintain his power in government is because he was the ANC party leader. The ANC dominates election results winning a majority of over 60% of the National Assembly. (1 mark analysis) When President Zuma attempted to extend his own rule by proposing his wife to be the new ANC leader in 2017 he was forced out by the ANC who elected Cyril Ramaphosa to be the new leader instead which forced Zuma to resign his Presidency in 2018. (1 mark KU) This shows that whilst decision-making in South Africa is dominated by the President, it is in reality the political institution of the ANC party that is able to dominate government decision-making as it chooses the President. (1 mark evaluation)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Note: apply the 6 mark maximum for South Africa response as it only addresses one point (Powers of the President).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (b)      | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following | 20       | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of **20 marks**. Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following:  
- the political, economic, cultural and military influence  
- the extent of the influence.  
Candidates may refer to  
**World power: China**  
- political influence  
  – permanent membership of the UN Security Council with a veto over decisions  
  – ‘soft power’ lobbying activities worldwide  
- economic influence  
  – membership of the G20  
  – investment in Africa  
  – trade influence — China is the second largest importer of goods and services  
- military influence  
  – nuclear power  
  – the People’s Liberation Army is the largest military in the world — it has increased spend and been growing its military assets in recent years.  
**World power: South Africa**  
- political influence  
  – membership and influence in the African Union  
- economic influence  
  – membership of the G20  
  – membership of BRICS and IBSA countries  
  – second largest economy in Africa  
- military influence  
  – South African National Defence Force — contributions to UN Peacekeeping missions on the continent, for example supporting MONUSCO in the DRC. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          | Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 12 marks for analytical or evaluative comments. Award up to 6 marks per point. Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this. |          | World power: USA  
- political influence  
  - permanent membership of the UN Security Council with a veto over decisions  
  - political influence worldwide — role in Middle East peace negotiations  
  - role as a nuclear superpower and leading role in negotiating/policing nuclear disarmament — Obama’s deal with Iran, Trump’s potential role in negotiating North Korea disarmament  
- economic influence  
  - membership of the G7 and G20  
  - economic power and influence over world trade  
- military influence  
  - leading role in NATO — despite ‘collective decision-making’ the USA contributes 70% of budget  
  - military power and involvement in global conflicts such as Syria and Libya and withdrawal from Afghanistan and Iraq  
  - reference to USA as ‘world policeman’. Any candidate who considers the cultural influence of a world power should be awarded a maximum of six marks for this section. Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question. Possible approaches to answering this question World power: China  
China’s People’s Liberation Army is the largest military in the world which allows it to demonstrate a significant power through its large military displays and marches. (1 mark KU) China is also a nuclear power and one of the five official Nuclear Weapons States in the world. (1 mark KU) Total 2 marks — 2 marks KU. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>World power: South Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa’s economy is still in development but its international economic influence is increasing. They are the only African member of the G20 which allows it to be involved in discussions on global economic policy. (1 mark KU) As the only African member it acts as a representative for the continent within the G20 and its influence therefore extends beyond its own borders. (1 mark analysis) South Africa’s economy is the second largest in Africa and therefore has a significant regional influence on trade matters, however it struggles to compete with larger economies around the world such as the USA and China. (1 mark analysis) This means that whilst South Africa does have an international economic influence it is limited by nature to the African region or as a spokesperson for the region. (1 mark evaluation) Total 4 marks — 1 mark KU, 2 marks analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World power: USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The USA has a significant influence on the world due to its political power. America has a permanent membership of the UN Security Council which means it can both propose and veto UNSC resolutions. (1 mark KU) For example, the US proposed a resolution in 2017 to impose new sanctions on North Korea in response to their missile tests which was unanimously accepted. (1 mark KU) They can also veto resolutions and they can use this to pursue their own agenda. In 2017 the US used its veto to stop a resolution which would have called for them to withdraw Donald Trump’s recognition of Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. This shows that the US has a significant influence on international political decision-making as it is able to use its seat on the Security Council to further its own agenda. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) However, it is not the only country to hold a veto and as a result the USA cannot force through a decision which shows a limitation to its influence. The USA has not been able to get a resolution passed that would respond to the use of chemical weapons in Syria because it has been vetoed by Russia. This shows that their political influence can be limited by other influential countries. (1 mark KU, 1 mark evaluation) Total 6 marks — 4 marks KU, 1 mark analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (c)      | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following:  
  - links between different components  
  - links between component(s) and the whole  
  - links between component(s) and related concepts  
  - similarities and contradictions  
  - consistency and inconsistency  
  - different views or interpretations  
  - possible consequences or implications  
  - the relative importance of components  
  - understanding of underlying order or structure. | 20 | *Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 20 marks.*  
Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following:  
- the effects of a world issue  
- to what extent do these effects have international influence.  
**World issue: Development in Africa**  
Candidates may refer to:  
- impact of economic migrants on European countries and the wider world  
- increase in terrorism and development of Boko Haram and IS activity across the globe  
- health epidemics, for example Ebola and its spread to Europe  
- cost of aid programmes to other countries and to international organisations such as the UN, WFP  
- benefits to the developed world of African health professionals for example brain drain  
- changing demands on international charities, and changing public attitudes for example compassion fatigue  
- Debt owed to/written off by international banks  
*Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible approach to answering this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There was a significant international programme of support to help prevent the recent Ebola epidemic spreading further which was both costly to the donor countries and potentially dangerous as aid workers could contract the disease. It is estimated that the USA, the UK and Germany spent $3.6 billion on this programme. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) A poor health infrastructure in one country can have an international effect as it can cause problems within the region and across the wider world, for example the Scottish nurse who caught Ebola whilst working for a charity in Sierra Leone. (1 mark KU) This had a major impact on the UK because there was a public health scare which was very costly, impacting greatly on society. (1 mark evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total 4 marks — 2 marks KU, 1 mark analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context.

Award up to **8 marks** for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to **12 marks** for analytical or evaluative comments.

Award up to **6 marks** per point.

Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

### Specific marking instructions for this question

**World issue: Conflict**

Candidates may refer to

- the impact of refugees from conflict zones on neighbouring countries and the wider world
- impact of conflict on oil prices
- impact of terrorist groups outside the immediate conflict zone
- increase in overall political instability, for example resurgence of Cold War tensions over Syria.

*Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question.*

**Possible approach to answering this question**

**Response**

The Syrian Civil War has now been ongoing since 2011 and has caused around 5 million people to flee Syria as refugees. (**1 mark KU**) This has created a crisis in neighbouring countries who have struggled to house the influx of refugees. Most of these refugees are now in Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Egypt with 10% going further to Europe. (**1 mark KU**) The infrastructure in host countries is often not sufficient to manage the numbers of people now reliant on it which goes on to cause increased tensions between refugees and the host population increasing the chances of civil unrest. (**1 mark analysis**) A consequence of this unrest has been the mass movement of Syrian refugees towards the EU. This has resulted in a huge loss of life in the Mediterranean sea and a humanitarian crisis in Southern Europe costing many billions of Euros. This may also have been partly responsible for the rise of populist right-wing parties across much of Europe, for example AFD in Germany. (**1 mark KU, 2 marks analysis**) **Total 6 marks — 3 marks KU, 3 marks analysis.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>World issue: International terrorism</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Candidates may refer to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• rise of ISIS has led to increased attacks around the world and an increase in instability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• increased security measures across the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• increased threat to human rights across the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• online propaganda and recruitment tactics used by groups such as ISIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• worsening relationships in the Middle East between Saudi Arabia and Iran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this type of question.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Possible approach to answering this question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The UK government has tried to increase surveillance powers on social media as a result of attacks such as that on British Army soldier Lee Rigby. <em>(1 mark KU)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many human rights groups have argued that this is an infringement on our right to privacy and as such should be abandoned. <em>(1 mark analysis)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total 2 marks — 1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (d)      | Award an analysis mark where candidates use their knowledge and understanding or a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly show at least one of the following:  
  - links between different components  
  - links between component(s) and the whole  
  - links between component(s) and related concepts  
  - similarities and contradictions  
  - consistency and inconsistency  
  - different views or interpretations  
  - possible consequences or implications  
  - the relative importance of components  
  - understanding of underlying order or structure. | 20 | Candidates can be credited in a number of ways up to a maximum of **20 marks**.  
Award marks where candidates refer to aspects of the following:  
- the responses by individual countries  
- the effectiveness of these responses.  
**World issue: Politics of development**  
Candidates may refer to:  
- bilateral aid  
- weaknesses in aid programmes and accusations of corruption in spending  
- UK Department for International Development responses  
- USAID  
- NGOs from individual countries  
- Chinese investment across Africa.  
*Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this kind of question.*  
**Possible approach to answering this question**  
**Response**  
The UK Department for International Development is responsible for spending a budget of £8 billion on programmes that are designed to improve infrastructure in health, education and food security. (1 mark KU) However there are many criticisms of development aid as it can be difficult to prevent corruption within the country from redirecting the funds elsewhere. (1 mark analysis)  
Total 2 marks — 1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation involves making judgements based on criteria, drawing conclusions on the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence; counter-arguments including possible alternative interpretations; the overall impact or significance of the factors when taken together; the relative importance of factors in relation to the context. Award up to 8 marks for KU (description, explanation and exemplification) and up to 12 marks for analytical or evaluative comments. Award up to 6 marks per point. Where candidates make more analytical and/or evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>World issue: Conflict in Syria Candidates may refer to - Russian/USA/UK/French military action and support - Saudi Arabian and Iranian intervention - economic sanctions - diplomatic support to negotiate peace - humanitarian support and responses to the refugee crisis. Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking instructions for this kind of question. Possible approaches to answering this question Response 1 Countries have tried to intervene in the Syrian war through military interventions. Donald Trump recently authorised air strikes against Assad’s troops in response to a chemical weapons attack on rebel held areas. (1 mark KU) Total 1 mark – 1 mark KU. Response 2 The USA has responded to the Syrian Civil War by imposing economic sanctions on Syrian banks in an attempt to pressurise the Assad government to stop fighting and negotiate peace. These sanctions make the transfer of funds into the country nearly impossible and could bankrupt the Syrian government. (2 marks KU) However, they have not been effective in reducing the power of the Syrian government as a black market trade in money has developed instead. (1 mark analysis) America has also banned American products from being exported to Syria. This has also not been effective as the Syrian government is still able to access what it needs from partners such as Iran and Russia, while the trade ban prevents aid agencies from using medical equipment made in America. (1 mark KU, 1 mark analysis) Overall this shows that the economic sanctions imposed by the USA have largely failed to provide an effective response to the crisis as they have not forced Assad to negotiate peace and have only worsened the impact on those suffering in the war. (1 mark evaluation) Total 6 marks – 3 marks KU, 2 marks analysis, 1 mark evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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General marking principles for Higher Modern Studies Paper 2

Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates’ responses.

(a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding; marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.

(b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.

(c) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.

(d) Use the full range of marks available for each question

(e) The detailed marking instructions are not an exhaustive list. Award marks for other relevant points.

Marking principles for each question type

For each of the question types the following provides an overview of marking principles.

The information handling questions used in this paper are

- to what extent is it accurate to state that ... 10 marks
- what conclusions can be drawn ... 10 marks
- to what extent are sources ... reliable 8 marks

Objectivity questions (10 marks)
- Award up to 3 marks for a single developed point depending on the use of the evidence in the sources and the quality of the analysis or evaluation.
- Award marks where candidates synthesise information both within and between sources.
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.
- Candidates must also make an overall judgement as to the extent of the accuracy of the given statement. Award a maximum of 8 marks if no overall judgement is made on extent of accuracy of the statement.

Conclusions questions (10 marks)
- Award up to 3 marks for a single developed point depending on the use of the evidence in the sources and the quality of the analysis or evaluation.
- Award marks where candidates synthesise information both within and between sources.
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.
- Candidates are required to make an overall conclusion about the issue in the question. Award a maximum of 8 marks if candidates do not provide an overall conclusion.

Reliability questions (8 marks)
- Award up to 2 marks for a single developed point depending on the use of the evidence in the sources and the quality of the analysis and/or evaluation.
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.
- Candidates must also make a judgement based on the evidence on the most reliable source. Award a maximum of 6 marks if candidates do not provide an overall judgement.
- Award a maximum of 3 marks if only one factor is considered, for example, date, bias, sample size, provenance.
### Higher Modern Studies marking grid for 10 mark source based (objectivity/conclusions) questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
<th>5 marks</th>
<th>6 marks</th>
<th>7 marks</th>
<th>8 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use of sources of evidence.</strong>&lt;br&gt;Award up to 8 marks.</td>
<td>Candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence from one source relating to one aspect of the issue.</td>
<td>Candidate links two distinct pieces of evidence relating to one aspect of the issue which may be from within a single source or between sources.</td>
<td>Candidate synthesises two distinct pieces of evidence relating to one aspect of the issue which may be from within a single source or between sources, and gives an evaluative comment.</td>
<td>In addition the candidate addresses a second aspect of the issue with reference to one relevant piece of evidence.</td>
<td>In addition the candidate addresses a second aspect of the issue is addressed with reference to synthesised evidence including an evaluative comment.</td>
<td>In addition the candidate addresses a third aspect of the issue with reference to one relevant piece of evidence.</td>
<td>In addition the candidate addresses a third aspect of the issue with reference to linked evidence. <strong>OR</strong> Synthesised evidence including an evaluative comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Objectivity**<br>Candidate presents an analysis of the accuracy/selectivity/objectivity of a given view against the evidence.<br>Award up to 2 marks. | Candidate provides an objective assessment of a given view, based on evidence presented from the sources. | Candidate provides a detailed objective assessment of a given view, based on evidence presented from the sources. | 1 For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer. Award a maximum of 6 marks if all sources are not used. |

2 **Objectivity questions**<br>• Award up to 8 marks for an accurate evaluation of the given view using evidence.<br>• Award up to 2 marks for an overall judgement as to the extent of accuracy and/or objectivity of the view.

3 **Conclusions questions**<br>For full marks candidates must make evaluative comments or judgement(s) or draw a conclusion about each of the points given in the question. Award a further 2 marks for an overall conclusion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>1 mark</th>
<th>2 marks</th>
<th>3 marks</th>
<th>4 marks</th>
<th>5 marks</th>
<th>6 marks</th>
<th>7 marks</th>
<th>8 marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate presents an overall evaluative comment(s) derived from a judgement of the evidence.</td>
<td>Candidate presents an overall conclusion that is clear and supported by evidence from the sources.</td>
<td>Candidate presents an overall conclusion that is insightful and supported by detailed evidence from the sources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Award up to 2 marks.
| Higher Modern Studies marking grid for 8 mark source based (reliability) questions |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
|                                  | 1 mark                          | 2 marks                         | 3 marks                         | 4 marks                         | 5 marks                         | 6 marks                         |
| **Use of sources of evidence.** |                                |                                |                                |                                |                                |                                |
| Award up to 6 marks.            | Candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence accurately to explain the reliability of one source. | Candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence accurately to explain in detail the reliability of one source. | In addition, the candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence accurately to explain the reliability of a second source. | In addition, the candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence accurately to explain in detail the reliability of a second source. | In addition, the candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence accurately to explain the reliability of a third source. | In addition, the candidate uses one relevant piece of evidence accurately to explain in detail the reliability of a third source. |
| **OR**                          | Candidate uses two distinct pieces of evidence accurately to explain the reliability of one source. |                                |                                |                                |                                |                                |
| **Reliability**                 | Candidate presents an overall evaluative comment(s) on which source is the most reliable, derived from a judgement of the evidence. | Candidate presents an overall conclusion on the most reliable source, that is clear and supported by evidence from the sources. | 1 For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer. Award a maximum of 5 marks if all sources are not used. Award a maximum of 3 marks if only one factor is considered, for example, date, bias, sample size, provenance. | 2 Award up to 6 marks for an accurate evaluation of source reliability. Award a further 2 marks for an overall judgement on the most reliable source. |                                |                                |
### Marking instructions for each question

**Conclusions question**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.       | Candidates interpret and/or evaluate complex sources in order to reach conclusions. In order to gain marks candidates must show evidence which explains the conclusions reached.  
  - Award up to 3 marks where candidates use evidence appropriately, depending on the quality of the explanation and the synthesis of the evidence to reach any one conclusion.  
  - For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.  
  - For full marks candidates must reach conclusions about each of the points given and make and overall conclusion on the issue. | 10 | Candidates can be credited in a number of ways up to a maximum of 10 marks. Possible approaches to answering the question. The impact of minimum unit pricing on consumption by socio-economic group.  
Response 1  
The impact of MUP has lowered consumption levels for poorer people. Source C shows that those from social classes CDE drink 2 units less than they did before MUP. Total — 1 mark (conclusion with supporting evidence).  
Response 2  
MUP has had a mixed impact on consumption by socio-economic group. Source A states that those who live in poverty now drink less. This is backed up by Source C which shows that social classes CDE have cut down their drinking but it also shows that social classes A and B have not. Total — 2 marks (conclusion with supporting evidence synthesised from Sources A and C).  
Response 3  
The impact of MUP has lowered consumption levels for poorer people but made no difference to the middle and upper classes. Source C shows that those from social classes CDE drink 2 units less than they did before MUP was introduced, whereas those from social classes AB remain unchanged, still drinking 12 units per week. This is supported by Source A where it states that ‘drinkers who live in poverty used to purchase approximately 500 units of alcohol per year, for less than 50p per unit, however after a year of MUP this figure has decreased. Interestingly, this has not been the case with those in better off socio-economic groups (A and B).’ Total — 3 marks (conclusion with synthesis of evidence from Source C and then synthesised with Source A). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The impact of minimum unit pricing on crime rates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|          |                             |         | **Response 4**  
|          |                             |         | MUP has had no impact on crime rates. 60% of young offenders were drunk at the time of their offence, often having consumed strong tonic wine which is priced above 50p per unit.  
|          |                             |         | **Total — 1 mark (conclusion with supporting evidence from Source A).** |
|          |                             |         | **Response 5**  
|          |                             |         | High tariff crimes such as murder and violence show a small decrease in recent years but it is debateable whether this has any relation to MUP (Source A). This is shown in Source B where both violent and hate crimes have decreased since MUP was introduced but only by a small amount. Source A also states that MUP might have actually caused a crime increase as supermarkets have reported a rise in theft. Overall, MUP has had little impact on crime rates and may have actually made crime worse.  
|          |                             |         | **Total — 3 marks (evidence from Source A synthesised with Source B, then the use of Source A with conclusion).** |
|          |                             |         | The impact of minimum unit pricing on health. |
|          |                             |         | **Response 6**  
|          |                             |         | Source B shows that alcohol related hospital admissions are decreasing in Scotland and increasing in England. Source A states that Scotland was the first country in the world to have MUP, and England doesn’t yet have it. This shows that MUP has had an impact on lowering alcohol related health issues in Scotland.  
<p>|          |                             |         | <strong>Total — 2 marks (Source B synthesised with Source A with conclusion).</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Source A states that MUP aims to make dangerous ‘binge drinking’ more expensive and that ‘binge drinking’ is a major cause of hospitalisation. This links with Source B which shows that alcohol related hospital admissions in Scotland have reduced since MUP was introduced in 2018 and it shows that it is projected to continue to decrease. Source B also shows that alcohol related hospital admissions in England are actually rising and they do not have a MUP yet (Source A). This shows that MUP appears to be working in improving health. <strong>Total — 3 marks (Source A synthesised with Source B, evaluative comment and conclusion).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Possible overall conclusion on the extent to which peoples’ drinking habits have changed due to minimum unit pricing.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I conclude overall that MUP has changed the drinking habits of some groups but the majority of people (63%) have continued to drink in the same way. <strong>Total — 1 mark (overall conclusion supported by evidence from Source A).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I conclude overall that MUP has changed the drinking habits of some groups but not women overall whose consumption stays the same according to Source C. <strong>Total — 1 mark (overall conclusion supported by evidence from Source C).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I conclude overall that MUP has changed the drinking habits of some groups but the majority of people (63%) have continued to drink in the same way. It has reduced consumption of alcohol in lower class groups but critics argue that it is not the ‘prosecco drinking well-to-do in society that minimum pricing affects, it is the everyday person trying to buy a drink that he or she can afford’ (Source A). This means it has not worked fully to change drinking habits. <strong>Total — 2 marks (overall conclusion supported by detailed evidence).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>General marking instructions</td>
<td>Max mark</td>
<td>Specific marking instructions for this question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Any other valid point that meets the criteria described in the general marking principles for this type of question.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Do not award marks for a valid conclusion which is not supported with relevant source evidence.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectivity question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.       | Candidates interpret and/or evaluate complex sources of information, detecting and explaining the extent of objectivity. In order to gain marks candidates must show evidence which supports the extent of accuracy in a given viewpoint.  
- Award up to 3 marks where candidates use evidence appropriately, depending on the quality of the explanation and the synthesis of the evidence, for any one explanation of the extent of objectivity.  
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.  
- For full marks candidates must make an overall judgment as to the extent of the accuracy of the given statement. | 10 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 10 marks.  
Evidence that supports the view: ‘that efforts to reduce the threat posed by nuclear weapons have been successful’.  
Examples of types of evidence that support the view include  
- new START Treaty targets met by both Russia and the USA (Source B)  
- ‘the advantages and successes of the New START deal so far will improve the likelihood of a renewal of the Treaty’ (Source B)  
- treaty on the Prohibition on Nuclear Weapons agreed to by 122 countries (Source A)  
- treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons signed by UN Secretary General and ‘celebrated as a step towards a nuclear free world.’ (Source A)  
- public opinion poll — 57% agree that there is a reduced threat from nuclear weapons (Source A)  
- four out of the five nuclear weapon states have reduced their stockpiles from 1985 levels (Source B)  
- the number of global nuclear warheads has fallen by over 50,000 between 1985 and 2017. (Source B)  
Possible approaches to answering the question.  
Response 1  
The statement is supported by evidence because Source B shows that four out of five nuclear weapons states have all reduced their total global nuclear warheads stockpile since 1985.  
Total — 1 mark (evidence used from one source) |
**Response 2**
The statement is supported by evidence because there has been a reduction in the number of nuclear weapons. Source A shows that in 2010 the New START Treaty between the US and Russia set a target of reducing their strategic warheads by February 2018. Source B shows that both Russia and America achieved this target, Russia with a massive reduction of over 30,000 since 1985. Source B also shows that the ‘advantages and successes of the New START deal so far will improve the likelihood of a renewal of the Treaty’ in 2021 showing that the process of nuclear disarmament should continue.

**Total — 3 marks (synthesis of evidence from Sources A and B with evaluative comment).**

**Evidence that opposes the view: ‘that efforts to reduce the threat posed by nuclear weapons have been successful’**.

**Examples of types of evidence that oppose the view include**
- increase in number of states with nuclear warheads since 1965 (Source B)
- nuclear weapon states have refused to attend the treaty negotiations (Source A)
- heightened tensions as a result of tweets by Donald Trump (Source B)
- North Korea ‘has now conducted six nuclear tests’ (Source B)
- withdrawal of the USA from Iran deal (Source B)
- uncertainty over NEW START renewal (Source B).

**Response 3**
The statement is inaccurate because Source B shows that there is growing tension between America and North Korea over the North’s development of nuclear weapons. North Korea now has 15 warheads in their stockpile and Donald Trump has threatened to ‘totally destroy’ North Korea and said that he too has a ‘nuclear button, but it is much bigger and more powerful one’ than North Korea’s which is true as the USA still has 4000 nuclear warheads. This shows that one of the main nuclear weapons states continues to threaten to use nuclear weapons showing that efforts to reduce the threat have not been successful.

**Total — 3 marks (synthesis of evidence within one source with evaluative comment).**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|          |                             |          | For full marks, candidates must make an overall judgment as to the extent of the accuracy of the given statement.  
Examples of possible overall judgements  
- the statement that efforts to reduce the threat posed by nuclear weapons have been successful is accurate (0 marks)  
- overall it is not accurate to state that efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons have been successful (0 marks)  
- overall it is largely accurate to state that efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons have been successful. Whilst there has been an increase in the number of states with nuclear weapons, the number of weapons that they have is relatively small in comparison to the amount that Russia and the USA have. The success of the New START Treaty has led to a significant reduction in the overall number of warheads Russia and USA have and shows that there is now a much smaller threat posed by nuclear weapons than in the past (2 marks)  
- overall it is only true to a very small extent to say that the efforts to reduce the threat have been successful because the President of the USA has clearly been threatening other countries with use of nuclear weapons and so whilst they have fewer warheads than in the past, the threat remains a significant one as only one missile could create significant destruction (2 marks)  
- the statement is partially true as while the number of warheads has decreased, enough remain in the world for the threat to still exist. (1 mark) |
Reliability question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.       | Candidates interpret and/or evaluate three complex sources of information, evaluating and explaining the extent or reliability.  
In order to gain marks candidates must show evidence which supports the evaluations reached.  
- Award up to 2 marks where candidates use evidence appropriately, depending on the quality of the explanation and the synthesis of the evidence, for any one explanation of the extent of reliability  
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer  
- For full marks candidates must make an overall conclusion on the most reliable source of information. | 8 | Candidates can gain marks in a number of ways up to a maximum of 8 marks.  
Source A  
Response 1  
Source A is reliable.  
Total — 0 marks (no evidence or explanation provided).  
Response 2  
Source A can be seen as not reliable as it is out of date. The opinion of the public may have changed since then.  
Total — 1 mark (straightforward evidence provided)  
Response 3  
Source A is mostly reliable and trustworthy. It comes from a respected polling company (Ipsos Mori) with a reputation to protect and in its research it asked a large sample of over 1000 voters. This should help ensure that the information presented is representative.  
Total — 2 marks (detailed evidence provided)  
Source B  
Response 4  
Source B can be viewed as not being reliable as it comes from a political campaign group (Vote Leave) and could be biased.  
Total — 1 mark (straightforward evidence provided) |
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Response 5
Source B can be viewed as not being reliable as it comes from a political campaign group (Vote Leave) and could be biased. It also gives a figure (£350m per week) but hasn’t included any evidence or a reference as to where the information came from. This makes it difficult to check this figure and therefore calls into question how reliable this source is.
Total — 2 marks (detailed evidence provided)

Source C

Response 6
Source C can be viewed as not being reliable as it is produced by a political party and therefore could be considered biased.
Total — 1 mark (straightforward evidence provided)

Response 7
Source C can be viewed as not being reliable as the presentation of the graph indicates that the information has been manipulated as the differences in the figures and the bar graphs are not proportionate and gives the impression that the gap between the Green Party and the Conservatives is larger than it actually is.
Total — 2 marks (detailed evidence provided)

Examples of an overall conclusion on the most reliable source of information

Response 8
Source A is the most reliable source as it comes from a reputable source and contains a very high number of respondents to the survey.
Total — 1 mark (overall conclusion supported by evidence from one source).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>General marking instructions</th>
<th>Max mark</th>
<th>Specific marking instructions for this question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Response 9</strong>&lt;br&gt;Source A is the most reliable source as it comes from a reputable source and contains a very high number of respondents to the survey. The information may be out of date, however, when compared to the other two sources which come from potentially biased organisations such as political parties and campaign groups, it is the most reliable of the three.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;Total 2 marks (overall conclusion supported by detailed evidence from all sources).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;For full marks, candidates must make an overall judgement on the most reliable source.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>