



## General Certificate of Education

# Government and Politics 5151/6151

*GOV8 Synoptic Unit*

## Mark Scheme

*2005 examination – June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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.

## Government and Politics

### CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2

#### Introduction

The AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principles of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

#### Using a levels of response mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

Examiners should initially make a decision about which Level any given response should be placed in. Having determined the appropriate Level the examiners must then choose the precise mark to be given within that Level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the Level, where that Level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest whether the middle mark is unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the Level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid 'bunching' of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?

- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?”

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

## Synoptic Module GOV8

### A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS SYNOPTIC MODULE – GOV8 GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (Maximum 40 marks)

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them.</p> <p>The candidate selects material from the full range of the specification subject content with discrimination and shows that he/she clearly understands the links between the various elements. The candidate confidently demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the holistic nature of politics and identifies, and shows advanced understanding of, subsystems contained within the political institutions and processes identified in the specification.</p> <p>The candidate fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates a high level of contextual awareness. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations and provides accurate evidence and up-to-date, wide-ranging and imaginatively chosen examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> The candidate confidently applies a wide range of fully developed concepts and theories. The candidate demonstrates that he/she fully understands the question and recognises the need for a synoptic perspective in his/her analysis. The candidate constructs cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. The candidate provides analysis that displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of contemporary issues. Parallels and connections are identified with creativity and imagination, together with well-developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. The candidate demonstrates advanced ability to draw upon relevant material from the whole range of the specification content and uses it to inform their discussion and to construct arguments that cover the subject in the broadest sense. The candidate may integrate advanced knowledge derived from his/her wider study and appreciation of politics. Although taking a synoptic perspective, the candidate ensures that all material presented is directly relevant to the discussion. The essay shows evidence of imagination and flair.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions with sophisticated style and complete clarity, using a political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information. There is a precise sense of logical progression flowing throughout the essay, leading to a clearly argued conclusion that logically derives from the preceding analysis.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (GOV8) (continued)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 3 (9 –12 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them.</p> <p>The candidate selects material from a good range of the specification content and shows understanding of the links between the various elements. The candidate generally recognises the holistic nature of politics and identifies, and shows sound understanding of, subsystems contained within political institutions and processes identified in the specification.</p> <p>The candidate soundly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates a competent level of contextual awareness. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations and provides clear evidence and well-chosen examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b> The candidate applies a good range of concepts and theories, demonstrating a grasp of the question and recognising the need for a synoptic perspective in his/her analysis. The candidate constructs sound arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis that displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of contemporary issues. Parallels and connections are competently identified, together with viable comparisons.</p> <p>There is a clear and reasonably full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates the ability to draw upon relevant material from much of the specification content and uses it to inform their discussion and to construct arguments that cover the subject broadly. The candidate may integrate accurate knowledge derived from his/her wider study and appreciation of politics. Although taking a synoptic perspective, the candidate ensures that material presented is largely relevant to the discussion.</p> <p>The essay shows evidence of advanced study and some use of imagination.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> The candidate communicates explanations and conclusions within a structured argument, using a political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information.</p> <p>There is a sound logical progression flowing throughout the essay, leading to a clearly argued conclusion that logically derives from the preceding analysis.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (GOV8) (continued)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates an outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them.</p> <p>The candidate selects material from a limited range of the specification content and shows incomplete understanding of the links between the various elements.</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited grasp of the holistic nature of politics and little understanding of subsystems contained within the political institutions and processes identified in the specification. The answer includes a partial but reasonably effective approach to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a limited but useful level of contextual awareness. The use of examples is limited and the choice is not entirely appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> The candidate uses a restricted range of partly developed concepts and theories, demonstrating a limited grasp of the question, and is not entirely clear about the need for a synoptic perspective in analysis.</p> <p>The candidate constructs only embryonic arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis that displays some awareness of differing viewpoints and a limited recognition of contemporary issues. There is a recognition of some basic parallels and connections together with some limited comparisons. There is a simplistic attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate draws upon material from a limited range of the specification content. This may be used in a general way to inform their discussion and to construct arguments. It is not always clear that a synoptic perspective is being taken and not all material presented is strictly relevant to the discussion. Where a synoptic perspective is offered, there is a tendency towards a series of disjointed points of unequal relevance and a lack of logical progression.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions adequately, with a straightforward narrative and/or explanation, using a limited political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion may be offered, but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit. The answer is loosely structured.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (GOV8) (continued)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and a limited awareness of the relationships between them. There is a very limited approach to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a low level of contextual awareness and there is little understanding of the concept of synopticity. Few examples are introduced and these are often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-4 marks)</b> The discussion is not adequately supported by the use of concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations are not well constructed and there is virtually no attempt to apply a synoptic perspective. Analysis shows little, if any, awareness of differing points of view and very few parallels and connections are used to establish comparisons.</p> <p>Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial and naïve. Arguments and explanations are undeveloped.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b> The answer relies upon narrative that is not fully coherent, with little or no use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>The conclusion is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

## Section A: Power

A1.

Total for this question: 40 marks

‘The power of governments can often be more limited than is popularly thought.’ Discuss.

(40 marks)

### Knowledge and Understanding

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key concepts such as power, influence and authority.
- Sources of power such as office, wealth, tradition, electoral legitimacy.
- Theories of the location of power such as elitism, Marxism and pluralism.
- The ideological dimension, such as the liberal democratic view (leading to the ‘Westminster model’ of government) of the Marxist view that the government is an instrument of the bourgeoisie.
- Examples of positions of political power within the state at various levels (eg central, provincial, local, federal).
- Bureaucratic power at all levels.
- The limits on power-holders such as constitutions, laws, the weight of tradition, forces for incrementalism, inertia, existing policy communities and networks, unintended consequences of policies, the media, popular opinion, institutional inertia and bureaucratic resistance.
- Forms of power held by those not in formal political office, such as leaders of various types of pressure group, charismatic figures in the media and business, global actors, financiers, party donors.
- Power of international and supranational organisations and hegemonic countries (mainly the USA).
- Forms of power gained through the threat or use of violence.
- Powers of, and within, the devolved institutions in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
- Material for comparison from other systems such as the USA and EU.
- Relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments.

### Skill/Analysis

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the extent to which governments can be said to possess



real power in a world where there are many other forces acting upon them. Key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined.

In the main body of the answer candidates will need to explain the meaning of power in politics and its various locations. They should acknowledge that power can lie with various actors and institutions beyond the formal institutions of the state. It does not matter how this part of the discussion is approached, but it is important that it is addressed in one way or another.

Examples may be introduced to show the way in which much political activity centres on the acquisition and exercise of power. However, it may be argued that this power can be illusory. Examples may also be given to illustrate how power is exercised in various policy arenas (eg education, defence, economy, welfare state, law and order). Various powerful informal political actors may be considered through examples of non-state institutions such as the City, big business and, say, the mass media. Studies of particular incidents and cases may also be discussed to illustrate where these non-state actors may have exerted influence. Examples may be historical, calling upon significant events where the location of power was at issue (eg legislation or decisions favouring one section or individual over another, such as Suez or the British decision to go to war against Iraq).

Candidates may take theoretical perspectives, such as pluralism, elitism or Marxism, to argue that real power always lies beyond the state institutions.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification and these should be used in constructing arguments and discussions that cover the subject in the broadest sense. Sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section that derives from the previous discussion. This must clearly follow from the discussion and should centre on the proposition that the power of governments can be illusory. Although candidates may accept or reject the proposition, in this case it is more likely that they will accept it.

**A2.**

**Total for this question: 40 marks**

<p>‘Modern democracy does not mean that all citizens have equal power.’ Discuss. <span style="float: right;">(40 marks)</span></p>
--

### **Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key relevant concepts such as modern democracy, citizen and political equality.
- The idea of relative power in the contemporary world.
- Ideological dimensions, such as the political equality supposedly guaranteed in liberalism, or the social equality promoted in socialism or denied in Marxist analysis.
- Differential sources of individual power, such as position, income, wealth, social connections, educational attainment and occupational status.
- Unequal patterns of power arising from class, gender and race.
- Differential levels of endowment with resources that can be used for political activity and influence.
- Channels through which citizens can express their preferences and apply pressure on government.
- Theories of power such as Marxism, pluralism and elitism, with particular stress on neo-pluralism.
- Criticism of theories of power.
- Electoral systems and the concept of universal suffrage.
- Role of the media in expressing citizens’ views and also in shaping those views, perhaps to create a culture of contentment with the system.
- Examples from Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales.
- Examples from other systems, particularly the USA and EU.
- Relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that essentially the analysis should seek to assess the way the effective power of individuals may vary in modern democracies, despite the dominance of liberal democratic ideals and the universal franchise. Key relevant terms, such as those indicated above, should be introduced and defined.

In the main body of the answer candidates will develop their arguments. They may note shortcomings of the electoral system and the weakness of most MPs and of Parliament itself. They may develop an

ideological debate around the values and practice of liberalism and neo-liberalism. They may refer to the theories of pluralism and neo-pluralism. They may give examples to illustrate differential levels of power enjoyed by various categories of citizen, citing institutions such as the public schools, Oxbridge, the civil service, the military, the church, the City and the boardrooms of big business, contrasting these with protest marchers, demonstrators, members of voluntary associations, and so on.

They may make a comparison between Britain and the USA, perhaps arguing that the latter's political culture has been more open and egalitarian. They may also look to the provincial systems of Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland and ask whether devolution and the so-called 'new politics' give rise to a more egalitarian distribution of political power and influence. They may also examine local government reforms (eg elected mayors, cabinet systems) to consider a changing balance of local power. At various points in the discussion they may make comparison with other systems and may also look at the EU and consider the question of a possible 'Euro-elite'.

The main body of the essay must remain broadly focused on the ideal of equality in the power of citizens and the extent to which this may be denied. It does not matter how this part of the discussion is approached but it is important that it is addressed in one way or another.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification and these should be used in constructing arguments and discussions that cover the subject in the broadest sense. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section that derives from previous discussion. This may argue either that modern democracy does not mean that all citizens enjoy equal power or that it does.

## Section B: Participation and Representation

**B1.**

**Total for this question: 40 marks**

<p>‘Effective participation in modern politics remains the preserve of the few.’ Discuss. (40 marks)</p>
--

### Knowledge and Understanding

In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of the knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Relevant key terms such as ‘participation’, ‘representation’ and ‘representative government’.
- Meaning of the term ‘effective participation’.
- The machinery of representative government, ie various electoral systems.
- Various alternative views of voting as a means of participation, such as delegate representation, Burkean representation and representation of organised interests. Candidates may use alternatives to these particular terms.
- Theory of the mandate and its limitations in practice.
- The ideological dimension, such as the liberal view of representative government and the Marxist view that it is a deception of the mass.
- Various sections/groups/subcultures within society that might claim a right to representation.
- Various forms of participation, ranging from the formal to the informal and perhaps violent.
- Examples of citizens claiming a right to participate and perhaps being denied this.
- Representative forums (eg Westminster, the European Parliament, Scottish, Welsh and Irish assemblies, US Congress, local councils, TUC, CBI, NHS trusts, regional councils, etc).
- Composition of representative assemblies and other forums in terms of such factors as proportions of black people, women, young people and old people, and the influence of religion, place, class, etc.
- MPs as representatives of interests other than constituents – sleaze, Register of Members’ Interests.
- Governments beholden to powerful interests, including those donating to parties.
- The press as the representative of the popular voice.
- Alternative forms of formal participation, such as canvassing, party membership, forming a party, voting, standing at election for national assembly or local council, serving on NHS trusts, as school governors, on regional councils, etc.
- Informal means of participation such as publicity-seeking, lobbying, demonstrating and direct action, joining various types of pressure group, trade union membership and leadership, donating funds to a party, private meetings with civil servants.
- Relevant examples from throughout the specification to illustrate arguments.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

### Skill/Analysis

*The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following specification is indicative rather than definitive.*

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers are judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the meaning of genuine participation in modern politics and the extent to which it may be said to be the preserve of the few.

In the main body of the answer candidates may consider various forms of participation, noting the extent to which these are effective and 'genuine'. This may entail a discussion on the nature of representative government and the limited degree of participation it allows. Some may use examples to illustrate the lack of genuine participation, such as when the government appeared to ignore much popular opinion in going to war against Iraq. Some may argue that MPs should represent only their constituents, some that they represent interest groups (including those who sponsor them), some that they represent their party; others may take the Burkean position that they represent only themselves and their statesmanlike view on the issues of the day. Some may consider the archaic notion of virtual representation.

Analysis may identify various forums where forms of representation exist (eg Westminster, Scottish, Welsh and Irish assemblies, US Congress and, say, local councils). They may go beyond the formal institutions of government to examine other bodies with a claim to a representative function, such as unions, the TUC, CBI, NHS trusts, regional councils, etc.

Analysis of participation may include some application of pluralist theory, the concept of insider and outsider pressure groups and policy communities and policy networks. There may also be analysis of various channels of access to representatives (eg lobbying parliament, ministers, civil servants, media, demonstrations, direct action). Analysis of causal factors may include the resources of pressure groups such as money, connections with the establishment, access to the media, large membership, knowledge and expertise, veto power.

At the heart of the discussion should be a consideration of the limitations on participation permitted within a putatively democratic political system. It does not matter how this part of the discussion is approached, but it is important that it is addressed in one way or another.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section that derives from preceding discussion. This should focus clearly on the proposition in the question, which may be supported, qualified or refuted.

**B2.**

**Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘Representative government today means a choice of leaders rather than a choice of policies.’ Discuss.  
(40 marks)

### **Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key terms such as ‘representative government’, ‘party leader’, ‘policies’.
- Trends in electoral campaigning.
- Concept of the manifesto and its legal status.
- Development of manifesto politics and examples of manifestos.
- Examples of manifesto promises broken or compromised and why this may occur.
- Theories of elections and government such as those of Schumpeter.
- Concept of single-issue elections.
- Party image in terms of competence, trustworthiness and unity.
- Opinion polls at election times.
- Elections as a choice of local MPs or a contest between party leaders.
- The cult of personality politics and examples of charismatic figures.
- Ideological dimension: parties and leaders as embodiments of ideologies.
- Policies and their relationship to ideologies.
- Role of the media in elections, personalisation, sensationalism, etc.
- Elections to various assemblies, including Westminster, the European Parliament, the US Congress, local government, and the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland assemblies.
- Alternative methods of conducting elections (including the various recent experiments in local government).
- Use of PR in UK provincial elections and Euro-elections.
- Relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed, and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers are judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the practical working of representative government. They may also consider whether developments represent a serious problem for democracy.

In the main body of the answer candidates should show awareness of the mechanics of electoral systems and the nature of the campaigns fought around them. Illustrative examples may come from elections to the various representatives assemblies referred to above. There may be some consideration of the policy positions of parties and the way these are presented in manifestos. This may develop into a consideration of the reliability of manifesto promises and the factors that can lead to governments renegeing. Candidates may also question whether citizens are really concerned with manifestos or whether they vote for other reasons. There may also be discussion on the extent to which modern campaigns are waged in terms of a cult of personality. Examples may be used to identify charismatic politicians who might be expected to attract votes on the grounds of personal appeal rather than policy. Similarly, there may be some consideration of the issue of a party's competence to govern. This may be based on personalities within the party and its record in government. The issue of falling turnouts may be mentioned, as a response to changes in campaigning, etc.

Candidates may consider ideological dimensions, examining the extent to which people see parties or their leaders adopting ideological positions. They may ask whether the claim of certain parties to sail under any particular ideological banner is realistic.

The essay should show some awareness of possible defects in a mass democracy where manifestos become vague and all embracing (through 'catch-all' parties). It does not matter how this part of the discussion is approached, but it is important that it is addressed in one way or another.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification and these should be used in constructing arguments and discussions that cover the subject in the broadest sense. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the preceding discussion. This should clearly refute or support the proposition that representative government today means a choice of leaders rather than a choice of policies.

## Section C: Political Culture

C1.

Total for this question: 40 marks

‘There is no simple definition of the concept of political culture.’ Discuss. (40 marks)

### Knowledge and Understanding

In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Types of political culture such as traditional, secular, participant, subject, parochial and civic.
- Social factors relating to political culture, such as class, sexism, racism, xenophobia and geographical divides.
- Historical factors shaping political culture, such as revolutions, wars and the growth of political parties.
- Ideological factors such as individualism and collectivism.
- Concepts such as citizenship, deference, homogeneity and consensus.
- Institutions that both define and shape political culture, such as constitutions, judiciaries, monarchy, aristocracy, assemblies, electoral systems, public bureaucracies and levels of devolution.
- The traditions of parties and governments.
- Relevant related terms such as ‘elite’, ‘ruling class’, ‘the establishment’, ‘underclass’.
- Related factors such as patterns of political recruitment to institutions and political structures.
- Various key social attitudes such as those towards class and social stratification, gender and race.
- The extent to which people feel they can influence their government.
- Factors shaping popular attitudes and beliefs such as TV, radio, the press, religion, the family, the peer group, the school, and the government itself.
- Relevant examples from throughout the specification to illustrate arguments.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

### Skill/Analysis

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers are judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the definition and nature of the concept of political culture.



In the main body of the answer candidates should explore in some detail the nature of the political culture and the problems of defining it. They may also give details of different types of political culture and may illustrate these with examples, most likely choosing the UK, the USA, and other countries with which they may be familiar.

Candidates will need to examine the multifarious factors that can be said to constitute political culture. They may argue that the concept itself is often used vaguely, some authors including more features than others. They may examine such concepts as citizenship and attitudes towards government such as deference, homogeneity and consensus. Other key attitudes, such as those towards class and social stratification, gender and race, may be brought in to the analysis. Candidates may also argue that factors that shape popular attitudes and beliefs, such as TV, radio, the press, religion, the family, the peer group, the school, and the government itself, should be included in the definition of political culture.

Some may introduce historical factors such as revolutions, wars and the growth of political parties. In addition they may consider the dominant ideology, such as liberalism, socialism, individualism and collectivism. There is also the institutional framework comprising the constitution, judiciary, monarchy, aristocracy, assemblies, electoral systems and public bureaucracy. This may lead to related factors such as patterns of political recruitment to institutions. Examples may be drawn from developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland and comparative examples may come from other systems such as the USA and EU.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the previous discussion. This may argue that there is indeed no simple definition of the concept of political culture, but a candidate is at liberty to argue otherwise.

C2.

Total for this question: 40 marks

‘In modern democracies citizens are becoming increasingly unwilling to trust their governments.’  
Discuss. (40 marks)

### Knowledge and Understanding

*In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.*

Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key terms such as ‘modern democracies’, ‘citizenship’ and ‘trust in government’.
- The importance of trust in government.
- The current state of popular attitudes and beliefs.
- Factors indicating trust in government, such as willingness to forgo guarantees of civil liberties, to obey the law and to show respect for the police.
- Changes and developments in societal attitudes, values, and norms, such as declining deference, embourgeoisement.
- Decline of the working class.
- A more questioning and critical media.
- Sleaze and scandals in government.
- Rising educational standards.
- Ideological changes such as a rise in neo-liberalism and a more competitive society.
- Feminism and its various manifestations and achievements in challenging a patriarchal culture.
- The changing socio-economic position of women and their rising assertiveness.
- The presence of ethnic minorities bringing new attitudes towards social, political and public life.
- The issue of illegal immigration and asylum-seekers and the possibility (or otherwise) of a clash of political cultures.
- Criticism of and declining respect for, modern policing with trends such as militarisation, centralisation, use of arms and racism.
- Increasing violence in society.
- Scottish, Welsh and Irish nationalism and associated issues of trust in Westminster government.
- A rise of direct action and political protest movements.
- Declining interest in joining political parties.
- Electoral apathy and falling turnout.
- Broken manifesto promises.
- Government policy over the Iraq war.
- Public opinion polls, attitude survey data.
- Constitutional dissatisfaction, as in calls for greater openness, a written constitution, abolition of the monarchy and House of Lords and electoral reform.

- Violence and tension within society as a result of the various cultural divides and possible loss of trust.
- The impact of political cultures of globalisation and technological developments.
- Relevant examples from throughout the specification to illustrate arguments.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed, and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers are judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answer should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition of trust in government as a key factor in political culture. Subsequent analysis should consider the extent to which it may, or may not, be declining in the light of contemporary developments.

In the main body of the answer candidates may argue that government actions can be more prescriptive where people are trusting and deferential. As a further alternative they may say that the type of rulers a society produces will affect the trust they engender as, for example, when they tend to come from a social elite. Alternatively, or in addition, candidates may seek to examine the way in which politicians may themselves influence the level of trust in government by seeking to establish a dominant ideology that will, for example, shape people's expectations of government. They may examine claims by politicians of left and right designed to increase trust – eg that Britain is a classless society, that government has high levels of competence, that people can influence governmental policy, that there is no such thing as institutional racism in government institutions. Various institutions may be chosen as examples of declining levels of trust, such as the police, the civil service, the NHS, parliament, local government, the devolved institutions and the judiciary. There may also be comparative reference to the USA, the EU and other countries.

Candidates may with validity choose various time frames in discerning patterns of changing levels of trust, some going back historically further than others. They may also detail a range of forces leading to change in levels of trust, such as decreasing deference, a more aggressive media, sleaze in government, broken manifesto promises, a more politically sophisticated citizenry, increased political confidence amongst ethnic communities, environmental concerns, a more dominant presence of women in politics and the workplace, waves of immigration and global events such as the Iraq war. They may argue that in an ethnically diverse society it is more difficult to establish trust in government because of conflicting values, norms and religious beliefs.

They may introduce some discussion of the political tensions arising from these forces and offer examples from various parts of the specification. They may well cite the work of Almond and Verba (which showed high levels of trust amongst the British at the time of the survey) and go on to ask whether their schema is appropriate today.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the previous discussion. This may support the assertion that in modern democracies trust in government is breaking down, it may refute it, or it may adopt some intermediate position.

---

## Section D: Continuity and Change

**D1.****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘Oppositions promise change, governments preserve continuity.’ Discuss.

(40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

*In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.*

Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- The basic concepts of change and continuity.
- Pressures for change from within society.
- The ideological dimension, particularly ideologies of conservatism and those of change (liberalism and socialism).
- The conservative critique of revolution and arguments for stability and organic change.
- Promises of change and reform in electoral politics (manifestos and campaigning).
- The role of opposition in politics.
- Pressures for change in the informal patterns of politics, such as pressure group activity, patterns of consultation, relations between politicians and officials, media campaigns.
- Real change contrasted with apparent change (ie window-dressing).
- Examples of changes proposed by opposition parties that have either taken place or been resisted.
- Forces preventing change by parties in office, such as bureaucratic obstructionism, adverse media coverage, financial restraints, unforeseen circumstances, backbench revolts, Lords’ opposition, faintheartedness and political expediency.
- Reasons given by governments why changes have been either implemented or resisted.
- Examples of change and resistance to change in other systems, particularly the USA and the EU.
- Examples of change and resistance to change in local government.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Relevant examples from throughout the specification to illustrate arguments.

**Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed, and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers are judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on resistance to change and forces for continuity in the governmental process. Key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined.

In the main body of the essay candidates should explain the concepts of change and continuity in the context of a political system and the policies produced. The ideological dimension may well be introduced by considering the doctrine of conservatism that change should be organic rather than revolutionary. This may be contrasted with liberalism and socialism, where the emphasis is on change and reform. Candidates may link these ideologies to political parties. However, they may also note that not all Conservative governments have been conservative in ideological terms, and not all socialist and liberal governments have been reformist. The coming of the New Right, neo-liberalism and the Third Way may be cited.

Candidates should draw the distinction between oppositions and governments, noting that the former can call for policies without the responsibility for implementing them. Candidates may look at the political debates surrounding change and continuity as, for example, when politicians speak glibly of change and reform as a basis for winning the support of individuals and groups. However, candidates should be aware that once in office, parties encounter various obstacles to reform, such as those listed above. They may consider and apply theories such as disjointed incrementalism and its advocacy of piecemeal reform.

Answers may contain examples of continuity from any of the numerous areas covered under the headings in the specification, such as Westminster, Whitehall, local government, devolution, various government policies in education, health and so on. Candidates may introduce examples from other countries, particularly the USA and EU.

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Candidates should demonstrate an ability to draw parallels and make comparisons across the whole range of the specification studied and to use these in constructing arguments and discussions that cover the subject in the broadest sense. At all times sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

Conclusions should clearly evaluate the appropriateness of the statement that oppositions promise change while governments preserve continuity. Any position is acceptable, but must be derived from the preceding analysis.

**D2.****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘Reforms of the institutions and processes of government are of less importance to citizens than changes in policy.’ Discuss. (40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

*In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.*

Candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key terms and concepts, such as change, continuity, machinery of government, citizen, policy.
- The concept of change in the machinery of government.
- The concept of change in policy.
- Major patterns of policy change in areas such as education, health, foreign affairs, home affairs.
- Major trends in changes to the machinery of government, such as local government reform, civil service reform, establishment of provincial assemblies, possible establishment of regional assemblies, parliamentary reform.
- Examples of key milestones in reforms to the machinery of government.
- Examples of key milestones in policy reform.
- Assessment of impact of change in policy upon the lives of citizens.
- Assessment of impact of change in the machinery of government upon the lives of citizens.
- Key ideological shifts associated with change.
- Changes in political cultures, including political disengagement, apathy and alienation.
- Relevant examples from throughout the specification to illustrate arguments.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

**Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis, and the following specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer. The question is in the form of a proposition to be discussed, and candidates may support the statement, reject it, or sit on the fence. Answers are judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the relative impact of changes in substantive policy and in

the machinery of government upon ordinary citizens. Key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined.

In the main body of the answer candidates may begin by identifying and analysing significant policy and machinery-of-government changes that have taken place in a defined time period. This period may vary from candidate to candidate. The analysis will entail the use of a wide range of examples drawn from throughout the specification. They may introduce a comparative dimension, looking particularly at the USA and EU, or any other country with which they are familiar.

Candidates may argue that changes in the machinery of government can have little impact on the lives of ordinary citizens. What matters to them is, for example, the quality of their children's education or health care. Some candidates may note that changes in the machinery of government are sometimes closely linked with policy changes (say, the creation of the NHS or the reform of the RUC as the Police Service of Northern Ireland). At other times, changes to the machinery may be deployed by governments as subterfuge; as an alternative to real policy change (as in the setting up of a new Whitehall department or a Royal Commission).

There should be a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times, sophisticated use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Arguments should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the previous discussion. It may reject or support the contention that changes in the machinery of government can often be of less importance to citizens than changes in policy, or it may decide to adopt an intermediate position.