IQM3006

LEVEL 3 · CONTROLLED STAFF DOCUMENT

INTO QUALIFICATIONS

Law and International Relations

Assessment 2: Written exam

STAFF ONLY · Mark scheme

Duration
2 hours

Total marks
100

Assessment window
Sample assessment

Assessment set
Set S of 2026

Audience
Staff only

Release timing
exam release

Exam date
_____

Assessment set ID
2026-S

STAFF ONLY · Use only this assessment-specific scheme and approved standardisation decisions.	
Assessment window Sample assessment	**Exam date** _____
Paper —	**Assessment set** Sample 2026 · ID 2026-S

General marking principles

- Record every awarded mark in the corresponding OCR-readable annotation on the candidate response document.
- Credit equivalent valid answers only where the approved item-specific scheme permits them.
- Do not infer grade boundaries from raw marks; award boundaries are held in programme specifications.
- Sections A–C are compulsory. In Section D mark one selected response only.

For Section A award 1 only for the correct option, with no negative marking.
For Section B apply the point allocations, crediting equivalent valid explanations. Do not double-credit the same point.
For C/D read the complete response, choose the best-fit level, then place the mark within its range according to consistency, accuracy and development. Do not add separate criterion scores.
Credit relevant supported alternatives and legitimate disagreement. Assess the reasoning and evidence, not the candidate's political position.
If both D alternatives are attempted without a clear selection, refer to the controlling programme rule; do not invent a highest-score rule.
Marks are raw assessment marks. Leave moderation decisions, identities and approval fields for authorised staff.

Section A · Multiple-choice questions

Award 1 mark for each correct answer.

Question	Correct answer
A1	Award 1 mark for B: Protecting interests and providing a means of resolving disputes. The rule protects workers and provides a legal remedy mechanism; it does not guarantee that disputes disappear.
A2	Award 1 mark for C: Follow the binding legal principle from the higher-court decision. The relevant binding principle applies through the hierarchy; materially different facts may instead permit distinguishing.
A3	Award 1 mark for A: Royal Assent. Royal Assent completes enactment; commencement of particular provisions may occur later.

Question	Correct answer
A4	Award 1 mark for D: It is a simplifying way of comparing political positions whose meaning depends on context. Positions and the issues used to distinguish them vary across place and time.
A5	Award 1 mark for A. The contrast concerns the starting importance given to individual freedom compared with continuity, inherited institutions and gradual reform. These are broad tendencies, not claims that every liberal rejects tradition or every conservative opposes individual freedom. No negative marking.
A6	Award 1 mark for C: Expand collectively funded essential services and redistribute resources towards disadvantaged groups. Socialist traditions vary, but collective provision and economic equality are relevant shared themes.
A7	Award 1 mark for B: Nationalism. Nationalism centres the nation and its collective interests; it need not have one fixed economic programme.
A8	Award 1 mark for D: Reducing the cost of international transport and communication. Lower communication and transport costs facilitate exchanges; they do not ensure equal benefits.
A9	Award 1 mark for C: Soft power through attraction. The stated influence works through attraction, not compulsion; cultural activity does not automatically succeed.
A10	Award 1 mark for A: To improve security in a system without a central authority able reliably to protect every state. Alliances may help states balance threats; they do not remove uncertainty or conflicting interests.

Question	Correct answer
A11	Award 1 mark for D: Emphasis on how institutions and interdependence can enable cooperation despite conflicting interests. Institutional rules, information and repeated interaction may facilitate cooperation without abolishing states.
A12	Award 1 mark for B: It is not adopted because of the permanent member's veto. A negative permanent-member vote blocks adoption on substantive matters. A permanent-member abstention is different.
A13	Award 1 mark for C: It identifies incompatibility without invalidating the provision. Section 4(6) preserves validity, operation and enforcement; the declaration itself is not repeal or automatic compensation.
A14	Award 1 mark for A: The 1948 Declaration set out a universal standard; the Convention is a regional treaty that entered into force in 1953. The Convention was adopted in 1950; 1953 is its entry into force. The Declaration is not itself the regional treaty.
A15	Award 1 mark for B: Several major centres of power can influence international outcomes. Multipolarity concerns several significant power centres; equality between all states is not required.

Extended-response questions

Item ID	Question / requirement	Solution and allocation	Alternatives / notes	Max
B1	A fictional proposed law would restrict advertising aimed at children. A children's charity submits research to MPs, while an industry association meets ministers. Explain one advantage and one disadvantage of these influences on parliamentary law-making, and identify one way parliamentary scrutiny can test their claims.	1 mark(s): Identify a relevant advantage, such as specialist evidence or representation of affected interests. 1 mark(s): Explain the advantage in this context: research can inform how children are affected or industry evidence can reveal implementation costs. 1 mark(s): Identify a relevant disadvantage, such as unequal access, selective evidence or pressure favouring a narrow interest. 1 mark(s): Explain how that disadvantage could distort this proposed advertising law or exclude less-resourced voices. 1 mark(s): Identify a valid scrutiny method, such as committee questioning of witnesses, examination of evidence or debate of amendments.	Accept other relevant influences and scrutiny mechanisms. Do not award the explanation marks for repeating a label. Do not assume that all lobbying is corrupt.	5
B2	Explain how one cross-border economic or cultural connection can shape a government's policy choices. Compare how liberal and conservative perspectives could interpret the same choice, using a brief example.	1 mark(s): Identify one relevant cross-border economic or cultural connection and the policy choice it affects. 1 mark(s): Explain a plausible mechanism linking that connection to government policy, such as investment mobility, trade commitments or cultural exchange. 1 mark(s): Explain a relevant liberal perspective on the same policy choice, for example, individual freedom, openness or cooperation. 1 mark(s): Explain a relevant conservative perspective on the same choice, for example, continuity, national institutions or caution about rapid change. 1 mark(s): Compare how the two perspectives lead to different considerations or likely policy responses, applied to the brief example. Credit defensible interpretations; do not treat either ideology as internally uniform.	Either benefits or constraints may be explained. Credit accurate alternatives. Do not require named contemporary statistics or reward an unqualified assertion that governments have lost all choice.	5

Item ID	Question / requirement	Solution and allocation	Alternatives / notes	Max
B3	Distinguish war from terrorism as concepts, and explain one way that contemporary conflict can involve actors or methods beyond conventional fighting between national armies.	1 mark(s): Explain war as organised armed conflict between political communities or organised groups; it can be interstate or intrastate. 1 mark(s): Explain terrorism in terms of violence or threatened violence intended to intimidate a wider audience or coerce political action, commonly through attacks on civilians. 1 mark(s): Make a valid distinction: war describes a form of conflict, whereas terrorism describes a tactic or form of political violence that can occur within or outside war. 1 mark(s): Identify a relevant actor or method, such as a non-state armed group, transnational network or cyber operations linked to conflict. 1 mark(s): Explain how it changes the nature of conflict, such as blurred territorial boundaries, attribution difficulties or civilian vulnerability.	Definitions of terrorism are contested. Accept a defensible formulation that distinguishes the concepts; do not require one jurisdiction's statutory definition. Do not equate a particular religion or nationality with terrorism. A cyber incident is not automatically a war.	5
B4	Explain the difference between a claim that human rights belong to people because they are human and a claim that legal rights depend on recognition within a legal system. Then distinguish a liberty (freedom or permission to act) from a right that places a corresponding duty on another person or body, using one example.	1 mark(s): Explain the inherent or natural-rights position: entitlement does not depend solely on a government granting it. 1 mark(s): Explain the legal-recognition position: a right's status as a legal right depends on the relevant legal system's sources or rules. 1 mark(s): Make the distinction explicit: a moral claim can criticise existing law even where that law does not recognise an enforceable entitlement. 1 mark(s): Distinguish a liberty as freedom or permission to act from a right that places a corresponding duty on another person or body. 1 mark(s): Give an example that illustrates the distinction, such as freedom to speak versus a legal claim requiring an authority not unlawfully to interfere; recognise that ordinary usage can overlap.	Credit accurate alternative terminology, including natural rights and legal positivism. Do not imply legal positivism necessarily endorses unjust law or denies moral rights. No named philosopher required.	5

Item ID	Question / requirement	Solution and allocation	Alternatives / notes	Max
B5	A fictional state threatens economic sanctions to change another government's behaviour and also offers overseas scholarships intended to build goodwill. Explain how these actions illustrate hard and soft power, and give one reason why either action might fail.	1 mark(s): Identify the threatened sanctions as hard power through coercion. 1 mark(s): Explain how expected economic costs may pressure the other government to change behaviour. 1 mark(s): Identify the scholarships as a potential source of soft power through attraction or goodwill. 1 mark(s): Explain how favourable relationships or perceptions could encourage voluntary cooperation. 1 mark(s): Give a developed relevant limitation, such as alternative trading partners reducing sanctions pressure or distrust of the sponsoring state preventing goodwill.	Scholarships are not automatically effective soft power. Accept an explained limitation of either action; no extra mark for giving two. Neither action must succeed merely because it is attempted.	5
C1	Two fictional neighbouring states increase military spending after a border dispute. They also continue trading and establish a joint commission to exchange information about troop movements. Compare realism and liberal institutionalism as explanations of these actions. Assess which explanation is more convincing, or whether a combination is needed.	Apply the common 15-mark best-fit scale. Indicative content is not a checklist and separate marks are not awarded for each bullet. Realism: insecurity, national interests and uncertainty may explain military spending; reciprocal precautions can intensify a security dilemma. A commission may still be compatible with pragmatic state interests, so cooperation alone does not disprove realism. Liberal institutionalism: trade can raise the costs of conflict, and the commission can share information, reduce misperception and support repeated cooperation. Institutions need not remove conflicting interests or make war impossible. Compare explanatory mechanisms directly using the spending, trade and commission in the scenario. Explain what each theory captures and what it leaves uncertain. A supported judgement may favour either account or combine them. The limited scenario cannot establish private motives conclusively; a strong answer can identify evidence needed to distinguish explanations.	The scenario is constructed. No additional case study or named theorist is required. Credit relevant independently known examples without treating their absence as an automatic cap.	15

Item ID	Question / requirement	Solution and allocation	Alternatives / notes	Max
C2	A fictional parliament is considering restrictions on public demonstrations. Supporters emphasise safety and access to essential services; critics emphasise freedom of expression and assembly. Compare how parliamentary law-making and judicial protection of rights can respond to these competing concerns. Assess one strength and one limitation of each, drawing on the UK Human Rights Act 1998 where relevant.	Apply the common 15-mark best-fit scale using legal knowledge, direct comparison, contextual application and reasoned evaluation. Parliament can debate, amend and enact general rules; elected representation, consultation and scrutiny may test safety and liberty concerns. Majority pressure, time constraints or unequal influence can weaken protection of less powerful groups. Courts decide cases and interpret and apply law using evidence and legal reasons. Under the Human Rights Act, rights-compatible interpretation is required so far as possible, and specified courts can declare incompatible primary legislation; such a declaration does not itself invalidate the provision. Compare the institutions' roles: prospective general rules and democratic accountability versus independent adjudication of particular disputes and legal scrutiny. Judicial remedies and access depend on the legal context; courts do not simply replace Parliament. Expression and peaceful assembly are qualified rights. A response can examine whether restrictions are prescribed by law, pursue a legitimate objective and are necessary and proportionate, rather than assume public safety defeats rights or that any restriction is forbidden. Conclude on the interaction and limits of these safeguards in the scenario. Credit a reasoned preference or a complementary account supported by the comparison.	No case name or section number is required. The scenario specifies no actual enacted restriction and supports no definitive legal ruling. Credit valid comparisons with other systems if the answer still addresses the question; do not import another jurisdiction's power to strike down primary law into the UK HRA account.	15

Item ID	Question / requirement	Solution and allocation	Alternatives / notes	Max
D1	Evaluate the view that global governance can reduce conflict and poverty only when it serves the interests of powerful states. Use relevant examples, including the United Nations and one other international actor or mechanism, and reach a reasoned conclusion.	Use the common 30-mark best-fit scale. Judge knowledge, argument, examples/evaluation and conclusion together, not as four separately scored criteria. Focus on a coherent argument addressing the claim, not a checklist of every institution or power concept. Arguments supporting the view may examine Security Council vetoes, dependence on state resources and consent, unequal influence, selective enforcement, sanctions or strategic aid. Arguments challenging the absolute word only may examine institutional rules and coordination, diplomacy, humanitarian or development work, non-governmental organisations, reputational pressure or shared interests that institutions help create. Distinguish institutional activity from demonstrated outcomes. Use relevant evidence to explain effects on conflict or poverty and recognise limits in attribution, distribution or sustainability. The two examples required by the prompt may be developed selectively; further examples are not required. A conclusion may be conditional, explaining when power alignment matters and whether the evidence supports exceptions. Discussion of great or emerging powers, hegemony, realism or liberalism may support the argument but is not a separate required sub-task. Credit justified competing interpretations and apply the existing holistic descriptors without additional marks or automatic caps.	Credit accurate relevant examples from any defensible period, identified clearly. No fixed current-affairs list or agreement with the proposition is required. Do not award a high mark simply for numerous names. A one-sided or single-issue answer is judged through the common descriptors, without an invented automatic cap.	30

Item ID	Question / requirement	Solution and allocation	Alternatives / notes	Max
D2	Evaluate the view that competing centres of power limit how effectively international institutions can address conflict and poverty. Use relevant examples and reach a reasoned conclusion. Your discussion may consider opportunities as well as limits to cooperation.	Use the same common 30-mark best-fit scale as D1. The task is to evaluate institutional ability under competing power centres, not to produce a forecast with one prescribed answer. A coherent line of argument is more important than a checklist of all possible issues. Limits may include vetoes, rivalry, competing security priorities, selective enforcement, coercion or non-state conflict. Explain how a relevant limit affects institutional action rather than listing it. Opportunities may include shared problems, negotiated rules, information exchange, coalition building, mediation or development cooperation. Consider institutional resources or legitimacy where relevant. Use evidence to assess effects on conflict or poverty, distinguishing activity from impact and recognising limits in attribution. One or two relevant examples may be developed; do not require separate coverage of every power concept or actor. Reach a reasoned judgement on the extent of institutional ability implied by the question. A conditional account may explain how outcomes differ by issue, institution or level of agreement. Discussion of multipolarity, great or emerging powers, hegemony, realism or liberalism may support the argument but is not a separate required sub-task. Credit justified competing interpretations and apply the existing holistic descriptors without additional marks or automatic caps.	Apply the same expectations as D1. Credit accurate historical comparisons and contemporary examples. No specific number of power centres, named states or political conclusion is prescribed. Do not require agreement that today's world fits one uncontested polarity label.	30

15-mark best-fit scale

Mark range	Descriptor
13–15	Strong relevant knowledge, effective direct comparison, well-applied evidence or scenario detail, and balanced evaluation leading to a reasoned conclusion. Clear and well structured.
9–12	Sound relevant understanding with some comparison and evaluation. Examples or scenario application are present but may be underdeveloped.
5–8	Basic relevant knowledge, limited comparison and minimal evaluation. The response is largely descriptive.
1–4	Limited understanding, weak structure and little or no relevant comparison or evaluation.
0	No creditworthy response.

30-mark best-fit scale

Mark range	Descriptor
25–30	Excellent relevant knowledge; balanced and well-developed arguments; strong examples used critically; clear evaluation and a sustained, reasoned conclusion answering the question.
19–24	Secure knowledge and clear analysis; both sides addressed, although evaluation may be uneven; several relevant examples with evaluation; a conclusion that may lack depth.
13–18	Reasonable understanding and some relevant examples; argument may be descriptive in places with limited evaluation; conclusion is brief or partly supported.
7–12	Limited knowledge and weak application; minimal balance or evaluation; limited examples; conclusion may be unsupported or unclear.
1–6	Very limited understanding; little relevance; no meaningful evaluation or conclusion.
0	No creditworthy response.