

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of the question paper.

Candidate 1

Question 1 (a)

The candidate was awarded **12/12 marks** as follows:

Knowledge and understanding scope and development (8 marks available)

The candidate covers three aspects of the question: traditional, charismatic and rational legal authority. This would meet the criteria for three aspects, two with detailed description. The candidate gives descriptions at the beginning of the paragraphs and further descriptions are given throughout the paragraphs. The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for scope.

Three aspects are developed, two with detailed explanation and/or exemplification. Reference is given to Saudi Arabia, North Korea, USA, Adolf Hitler and Steven Lukes. The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for development.

Analysis (4 marks available)

The candidate makes a number of analytical comments at least one of which is extended and/or justified or exemplified. For example:

- ◆ relevance of traditional authority
- ◆ showing consequence of rational legal authority
- ◆ linking different components; charismatic authority linked Luke's third face of power

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**.

Candidate 2

Question 1 (b)

The candidate was awarded **10/12 marks** as follows:

Knowledge and understanding scope and development (8 marks available)

The candidate covers three aspects of the question: Self-serving politicians, improved political literacy and direct democracy claim to be legitimate. This would meet the criteria for three aspects, two with detailed description. The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for scope.

Three aspects are developed, two with detailed explanation and/or exemplification (self-serving politicians and legitimacy). Reference is given to MPs expenses, Plato's works, Scottish Referendum and London Mayoral election. As the work of a political theorist are referenced the candidate can be award up to 12 marks overall. The candidate was awarded **4 marks** for development.

Analysis (4 marks available)

The candidate makes a number of analytical comments. For example:

- ◆ consequence of participating in democracy often
- ◆ inconsistency regarding legitimacy

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**.