



AS POLITICS

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE UK

Mark scheme

Version 1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Level-of-response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate. Examiners are required to assign each of the students' responses to the most appropriate level according to its overall quality, then allocate a single mark within the level. When deciding upon a mark in a level examiners should bear in mind the relative weightings of the assessment objectives and be careful not to over/under credit a particular skill. For example, in questions 4 and 5 less weight should be given to AO1 than to AO2 and AO3. This will be exemplified and reinforced as part of examiner training.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Generic levels-of-response mark scheme for 6-mark questions

Question 1: Explain, with examples, the convention of collective cabinet responsibility.

Question 2: Explain, with examples, the principle of judicial independence.

Target AO1: 6 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
3	5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer demonstrates accurate knowledge of relevant political concepts, institutions and/or processes relevant to the question. Developed explanation(s) and appropriate selection of supporting examples demonstrate accurate understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes.
2	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer demonstrates generally accurate knowledge of political concepts, institutions and processes relevant to the question. Some development in the explanation(s) and generally appropriate selection of supporting examples demonstrate generally accurate understanding, though inaccuracies will be present.
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes relevant to the question. Limited development in the explanation(s) and selection of supporting examples demonstrate limited understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with further detail required and inaccuracies and omissions present throughout.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing worthy of credit

Question 1: Explain, with examples, the convention of collective cabinet responsibility.

Indicative content

In their explanation of the convention of collective cabinet responsibility, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Definition of collective cabinet responsibility: (All cabinet members will publicly support government policy. This is the case regardless of whether they privately disagree. Those unwilling to offer support will normally resign).
- Explain that being a convention, not a statutory requirement, collective responsibility can be diluted when expedient.
- Explain how the convention has been used (or misused) in British politics, illustrating with historic or recent examples.

This should be illustrated with historical or recent examples, such as its abandonment for the 1975 or 2015 referendums on EU membership, or the reduction of collective cabinet responsibility the 2010 coalition's 'agreement to differ' principle, on issues such as reforms of the electoral system and of the House of Lords.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks. Some may introduce further relevant points which should be credited.

Question 2: Explain, with examples, the principle of judicial independence.

Indicative content

Students should explain that judicial independence is the principle that those holding judicial office should be free from political influence. They should explain that it is protected in a number of ways such as the following:

- Explain that judges enjoy security of tenure, their continuance in office being limited only by the requirement to retire at the age of 75.
- Explain that the salaries of judges are met directly from the Consolidated Fund, effectively placing their remuneration beyond the day-to-day control of politicians.
- Explain that the *sub judice* rules prevent politicians, the media and others from seeking to influence the courts by speaking whilst legal proceedings are ongoing.
- Explain that the 2005 Constitutional Reform Act introduced a number of relevant reforms including the creation of the Supreme Court and an independent Judicial Appointments Commission, and the replacement of the Lord Chancellor by the lord chief justice as head of the judiciary.
- In offering an example to illustrate judicial independence students may refer to a case, such as the Supreme Court decision in January 2017 commanding the government to bring its Brexit bill before Parliament.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks. Some may introduce further relevant points which should be credited.

Level of response mark scheme for a 12-mark extract based question

Question 3: Analyse evaluate and compare the arguments presented in both of the above extracts in order to reach a conclusion on the extent to which backbench MPs are able to influence government policy.

Target AO1: 2 marks, AO2: 6 marks, AO3: 4 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the extract (AO1) Relevant perspectives are evaluated in constructing arguments. (AO3). Analysis of the extract is developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further. The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set. (AO2). Comparisons are well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2).
3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1). Relevant perspectives are successfully commented on in places, though evaluation often lacks depth (AO3) Analytical points relating to the extract are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set (AO2). Comparisons are made and supported by examples. (AO2).
2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though these contain inaccuracies and irrelevant material (AO1) Evaluation is attempted and perspectives relevant to the extract are identified, though evaluation remains superficial(AO3) Analysis of the extract takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are asserted. The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2). Comparisons tend to be limited and often unsupported by examples. (AO2). <p>Answers that only address one of the extracts are limited to this level.</p>
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1). Little or no evaluation of perspectives relevant to the extract is evident (AO3). Analysis of the extract takes the form of description and assertion. The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2). Comparisons tend to be superficial and undeveloped. (AO2).
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing worthy of credit

Question 3:

Analyse evaluate and compare the arguments presented in both of the above extracts in order to reach a conclusion on the extent to which backbench MPs are able to influence government policy.

Indicative content

In their analyses, evaluation and comparison of arguments presented in both of the above extracts students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Analysis and evaluation of factors (electoral system, fusion of powers) leading to the government having a dominating Commons majority, with very few government defeats.
- Analysis and evaluation of the way in which the government's MPs support it out of loyalty and self-interest.
- Analysis and evaluation of the way in which parliamentary business is determined by whips, including the use of patronage and the payroll vote.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the above weak-MP thesis with the argument that MPs are not powerless because deals over policy between them and the whips are done to avoid defeat and to minimise discontent.
- Analysis and evaluation of the thesis that MPs lack influence because there are few government defeats following rebellions because, while not leading to defeats, they can lead to various retreats. These may be discussed more fully.
- Analysis and evaluation of the argument that the need for responsiveness at the decision stage of policy formulation requires backbench opinion to be taken into account.
- Comparison of the argument that the increase in rebellions might suggest increasing independence of MPs with the alternative view that the act of defying the whip does not amount to meaningful independence.
- The analysis and evaluation of any political information is affected by;
 - who the author is - their position or role;
 - the type of publication - newspaper, academic journal, electronic media;
 - the overt or implicit purpose of the author - to inform, persuade or influence;
 - the relevance of the extract to a political issue or concern, and how representative the extract is of a particular viewpoint. Candidates will be expected to address some of these factors in their analysis and evaluation of the extract.

In relation to the extracts for this question reference should be made to the fact that they were published in research reports at LSE and UCL and that the purpose of the research is to inform and influence. Responses may also make reference to when they were published at extract 1 was published before the 2015 general election and extract 2 was published afterwards.

Students are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments presented in the extract. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views may be awarded marks for analysis (AO2). To gain marks for evaluation (AO3) the student must focus on which arguments in the sources, in their judgement, are stronger.

The analysis and evaluation must clearly focus on the arguments presented in the sources. Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples.

Students who fail to focus their discussion on the arguments in the sources, however complete their answer may otherwise be, cannot achieve above level 2.

Although synopticity is not a requirement of the question synoptic points could be introduced by students to support their evaluation of the source, if relevant credit should be given.

Level of response mark scheme for 25-mark essay

Question 4: 'A prime minister's power to hire and fire government members is unlimited.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Question 5: 'There is a strong case for Britain retaining its uncodified constitution.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Target AO1: 7 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 8 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
5	21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are consistently used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1). Analysis is balanced and consistently developed. (AO2). Synoptic links are well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2). Evaluation leads to substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3). Relevant perspectives are evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3). The answer is well organised, coherent and has an analytical focus on the question (AO2)
4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analytical points relevant to the issue under discussion, though inaccuracies and omissions are occasionally evident (AO1). Analysis is balanced and is developed for the most part. (AO2). Synoptic links are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2). Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion but may lack balance (AO3). Relevant perspectives are developed in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation is inconsistently developed (AO3). The answer is organised, generally coherent and focused on the question as set (AO2).
3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Largely accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support many points made, though inaccuracies and omissions are evident (AO1). Analysis is largely balanced and is developed in places, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. (AO2). Synoptic links supported by examples tend to be limited and undeveloped (AO2). Some evaluation is developed, leading to conclusions that require further substantiation (AO3). Relevant perspectives are occasionally developed in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation requires more development (AO3). The answer is organised and is largely focused on the question (AO2).
2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies and omissions are evident (AO1) Analysis is attempted and shows some balance, though many points will be descriptive. Where explanation is attempted, it is not developed or sustained (AO2).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synoptic links tend to be limited and often unsupported by examples; few if any points from the wider examples are offered. (AO2) • Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives on politics are identified, but evaluation is superficial (AO3). • The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).
1	1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1). • Analysis takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2). • Synoptic links tend to be superficial and undeveloped. (AO2). • Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3). • Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives is present (AO3). • The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing worthy of credit

Question 4: ‘A prime minister’s power to hire and fire government members is unlimited.’ Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation of the statement students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Analysis and evaluation of the constitutional powers given to prime ministers to ‘hire and fire’ government members (ie. the power of patronage derived from the Royal Prerogative). This could be illustrated by examples of contemporary or historic ministerial appointments and dismissals.
- Analysis and evaluation of the impact of political uses of the prime minister’s patronage power. For example, the prime minister may choose to give a consolation to a defeated rival, choose ideological sympathisers, or reward assistance given during a leadership campaign.
- Analysis and evaluation of political limitations on the prime minister’s power to hire and fire government members. For example, cabinet members may be inherited from a previous administration (as when Brown replaced Blair or May replaced Cameron), MPs with particular expertise may be regarded as indispensable (Heseltine in the Major cabinet) potential trouble makers may be better in than out (Johnson on the Cameron cabinet), dominant political personalities cannot easily be omitted or sacked, (Brown in the Blair cabinet), MPs with a strong following in the Commons cannot easily be omitted (Howe in Thatcher cabinet).
- Analysis and evaluation of the influence of partisan newspapers and the mass media upon prime minister’s power to hire and fire. This could be illustrated by reference to cases where newspapers make calls for sacking or resignations of ministers.
- Analysis and evaluation of the role of public opinion and the need for geographical, ethnic and gender balance could also be considered with regard to this issue. This could be illustrated with reference to presence (and number) of women or ethnic minority ministers in government (eg. Health was said to have included Thatcher as a token women, Sayeeda Warsi first female Muslim cabinet member, Caroline Flint accused Brown as including her as ‘window dressing’)

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as individual and collective responsibility, party discipline, government/party relations, influence of the media on the outcome of elections. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above level 4.

Students are not required to cover all the above areas to gain high marks. Equally, some may introduce further

relevant points and these should be credited. It does not matter what view students reach. In their evaluation, they may agree with the statement, disagree with it, or take an intermediate position.

Question 5: 'There is a strong case for Britain retaining its uncodified constitution.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation of the statement, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Analysis and evaluation of the nature and purpose of the British constitution.
- Analysis and evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of an uncodified constitution (eg more flexibility and easily adaptable, powers can be abused if constitutional right of leader is unclear).
- Analysis and evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of codified (or written) constitutions (eg stability, certainty, protection against arbitrary rule, does not move with the times, gives excessive power to the judges).
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the British constitution with the constitutions of other countries (eg. the USA) may be made.
- Analysis and evaluation of the concepts of constitutional flexibility and rigidity.
- Analysis and evaluation of the role of Parliament in the British constitution, and the concept of parliamentary sovereignty, elaborating the relevance of this point to the case for an uncodified constitution.
- Analysis and evaluation of previous unsuccessful attempts to reform the British constitution and their relevance in the statement in the question (eg. first past the post/proportional representative voting, constituency boundaries).
- Analysis and evaluation of the roles played by different groups and interests in the debate around Britain's constitution. (eg. Charter 88), Unlock Democracy, Liberty, Electoral reform Society,
- Analysis and evaluation of the place of the judiciary in the British constitution and the value and dangers of judicial involvement in politics (eg. unelected).

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as judiciary, recent constitutional changes, interest groups, scrutiny of the executive. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above level 4.

Students are not required to cover all the above areas to gain high marks. Equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. It does not matter what view students reach. In their evaluation, they may agree with the statement, disagree with it, or take an intermediate position.

Level of response mark scheme for 6-mark questions

Question 6: Explain, with examples, the concept of direct democracy.

Question 7: Explain, with examples, the process of partisan dealignment.

Target AO1: 6 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
3	5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer demonstrates accurate knowledge of relevant political concepts, institutions and/or processes relevant to the question. Developed explanations and appropriate selection of supporting examples demonstrate accurate understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes.
2	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer demonstrates generally accurate knowledge of political concepts, institutions and processes relevant to the question. Some developed explanations and generally appropriate selection of supporting examples demonstrate generally accurate understanding, though inaccuracies will be present.
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The answer demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes relevant to the question. Limited development of explanations and selection of supporting examples demonstrate limited understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with further detail required and inaccuracies and omissions present throughout.
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing worthy of credit

Question 6: Explain, with examples, the concept of direct democracy.

Indicative content

In their explanations of direct democracy students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Explanation with an example that direct democracy is a system of government in which all decisions are made on the basis of a collective choice made by citizens.
- Comparison with representative democracy, where the decisions are made by representatives, such as MPs.
- Students may explain that direct democracy for all decisions is impractical in a modern state.
- As an example of an instrument of direct democracy students could cite a specific example from one of the referendums which has taken place in the UK.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks. Some may introduce further relevant points which should be credited.

Question 7: Explain, with examples, the process of partisan dealignment.

Indicative content

In their explanation of the process of partisan dealignment, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- A definition of the term 'partisan dealignment' (where people stop aligning themselves politically in terms of class, or believe that they no longer belong to a certain class).
- Evidence of partisan dealignment. This could be illustrated with examples of electoral outcomes since 1945 in which the electorate began to reject the class imperative.
- Terminology and concepts relevant to the process. These could be illustrated with terms such as the 'new working class', the 'shrinking working class' and 'sectoral cleavage', 'north-south divide', 'consumer voting' and 'generational change'.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks. Some may introduce further relevant points which should be credited.

Level of response mark scheme for a 12-mark question

Question 8: Analyse evaluate and compare the arguments presented in both of the above extracts concerning the value of pressure groups in Britain.

Target AO1: 2 marks, AO2: 6 marks, AO3 4 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the extract (AO1) Relevant perspectives are evaluated in constructing arguments. (AO3). Analysis of the extract is developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further. The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set. (AO2). Comparisons are well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2).
3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1). Relevant perspectives are successfully commented on in places, though evaluation often lacks depth (AO3) Analytical points relating to the extract are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set (AO2). Comparisons are made and supported by examples. (AO2).
2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though these contain inaccuracies and irrelevant material (AO1) Evaluation is attempted and perspectives relevant to the extract are identified, though evaluation remains superficial(AO3) Analysis of the extract takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are asserted. The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2). Comparisons tend to be limited and often unsupported by examples. (AO2). <p>Answers that only address one of the extracts are limited to this level.</p>
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1). Little or no evaluation of perspectives relevant to the extract is evident (AO3). Analysis of the extract takes the form of description and assertion. The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2). Comparisons tend to be superficial and undeveloped. (AO2).
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing worthy of credit

Question 8: Analyse evaluate and compare the arguments presented in both of the above extracts concerning the value of pressure groups in Britain.

Indicative content

In their analyses, evaluation and comparison of arguments presented in both of the above extracts students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that pluralism is a defining feature of democracy and the view that the insider-outsider dichotomy suggests that access and power are by no means equal.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that group membership permits continuous engagement in politics and the view that resources are unequally distributed, with some ('insiders') having greater opportunities.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that large groups deserve greatest power and the view that tightly knit groups can prosper while some with vast memberships suffer.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that pressure groups provide a voice for minorities and the view that this also opens the door to extremists and even terrorists.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that groups can campaign on various causes and the view that strikes and demonstrations can cause widespread suffering and sometimes violence.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that governments need groups for their expertise and the view that consultation with government can lead to 'pluralist stagnation'.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the argument that public policies avoid extremism and the view that such policy-making leads to caution that avoids tough decisions.
- Analysis, evaluation and comparison of the view that government dependence on groups acts as a check on overweening power and the argument that vocal minorities can thwart the 'General Will' of the people.
- The analysis and evaluation of any political information is affected by;
 - who the author is - their position or role;
 - the type of publication - newspaper, academic journal, electronic media;
 - the overt or implicit purpose of the author - to inform, persuade or influence;
 - the relevance of the extract to a political issue or concern, and how representative the extract is of a particular viewpoint. Candidates will be expected to address some of these factors in their analysis and evaluation of the extract.

In relation to the extracts for this question reference should be made to the fact that the views are that of leading academics and that their purpose is to inform, influence and persuade.

Students are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments presented in the extract. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views may be awarded marks for analysis (AO2). To gain marks for evaluation (AO3) the student must focus on which arguments in the article, in their judgement, are stronger.

The analysis and evaluation must clearly focus on the arguments presented in the article. Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples.

Students who fail to focus their discussion on the arguments in the extracts, however complete their answers may otherwise be, cannot achieve above level 2.

Although synopticity is not a requirement of the question synoptic points could be introduced by students to support their evaluation of the source, if relevant credit should be given.

Level of response mark scheme for 25-mark essay

Question 9: 'In the battle for Westminster, Britain's political parties have become vote maximising machines rather than promoters of ideologies.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Question 10: 'Proportional electoral systems create as many problems as they solve.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Target AO1: 7 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 8 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
5	21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are consistently used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1). • Analysis is balanced and consistently developed. (AO2). • Synoptic links will be well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2). • Evaluation leads to substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives are evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3). • The answer is well organised, coherent and has an analytical focus on the question (AO2)
4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analytical points relevant to the issue under discussion, though inaccuracies and omissions are occasionally evident (AO1). • Analysis is balanced and is developed for the most part. (AO2). • Synoptic links are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples. (AO2). • Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion but may lack balance (AO3). • Relevant perspectives are developed in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation is inconsistently developed (AO3). • The answer is organised, generally coherent and focused on the question as set (AO2).
3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support many points made, though inaccuracies and omissions are evident (AO1). • Analysis is largely balanced and is developed in places, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. (AO2). • Synoptic links tend to be limited and undeveloped. (AO2). • Some evaluation is developed, leading to conclusions that require further substantiation (AO3). • Relevant perspectives are occasionally developed in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation requires more development (AO3). • The answer is organised and is largely focused on the question (AO2).
2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made but many inaccuracies and omissions are evident (AO1) • Analysis is attempted and shows some balance, though many points will be descriptive.

		<p>Where explanation is attempted, it is not developed or sustained (AO2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Synoptic links tend to be limited and often unsupported by examples; few if any points from the wider examples are offered (AO2). • Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives on politics are identified, but evaluation is superficial (AO3). • The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).
1	1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1). • Analysis takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2). • Synoptic links tend to be superficial and undeveloped. (AO2). • Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3). • Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives is present (AO3). • The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing worthy of credit

Question 9: 'In the battle for Westminster, Britain's political parties have become vote maximising machines rather than promoters of ideologies.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation this proposition students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Analysis and evaluation of the significance of the of the 'catch-all' party,
- Analysis and evaluation of the concept of ideologically based party and its decline with policy convergence on the centre ground.
- Analysis and evaluation of the effect of the FPTP electoral system such as the promotion of a two-party-dominant system, the restriction of opportunities for minority parties, the prevention of extremism, the creation of a strong MP-constituent link.
- Analysis and evaluation of the effects of public opinion on the approaches political parties in Britain take to Westminster elections such as effect of the print newspaper on public opinion, the use of opinion polls, the impact of charismatic political figures.
- Analysis and evaluation of modern campaigning styles in British general elections such as the use of the 'battle bus', TV leaders debates, use of the 'soapbox', advertising, canvassing, public meeting, targeting of marginal constituencies.
- Challenge to the statement in question by considering the extent to which political parties go beyond vote maximising such as ideological declarations in speeches and manifestoes, references to past leaders (Churchill, Lloyd George) altruistic policies, talk of class struggle, promotion of unpopular policies.
- Analysis and evaluation of the extent to which ideology can still be considered significant in election campaigns could be examined to challenge the statement such as opinion poll responses on policy issues, differences in party election manifestoes, attempts by the parties to distinguish themselves from their rivals.
- Comparison of ideological differences between parties, with reference to the political parties in Britain.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as democracy, electoral behaviour, media, party funding. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above level 4.

Students are not required to cover all the above areas to gain high marks. Equally, some may introduce further points and these should be credited. It does not matter what view students reach. In their evaluation, they may agree with the statement, disagree with it or take an intermediate position.

Question 10: 'Proportional electoral systems create as many problems as they solve.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation this statement students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- Analysis and evaluation of various PR systems and the mechanics of Britain's existing system of first-past-the-post.
- Analysis and evaluation of weaknesses and problems with Britain's first-past-the-post electoral system such as MPs elected with below 50 per cent support in their constituencies, governments formed with below 50 percent of the national popular vote, two-party dominance, wasted votes, limited party choice and limited policy options,
- Analysis and evaluation of the strengths of the first-past-the-post system such as clear choice of party, strong and stable government, moderate policies, single party opposition, close MP-constituency link, governments with clear mandates, popularity and simplicity in operation.
- Analysis and evaluation of the possible effects of PR on parliamentary representation in Britain, such as increased representation of minor parties, the emergence of new parties, and a decline and fragmentation of major parties.
- Analysis and evaluation of the effects of PR on the level of electoral turnout.
- Analysis and evaluation of weaknesses and possible problems of the PR system, such as the emergence of hung parliaments, unstable coalition government, rise of extremist parties, minority centre-party dominance in Westminster and the loss of the constituency link for MPs.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as representative democracy, participation, voting behaviour, manifestos and campaigns. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above level 4.

Students are not required to cover all the above areas to gain high marks. Equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. It does not matter what view students reach. In their evaluation, they may agree with the statement, disagree with it or take an intermediate position.