



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **Government and Politics 5151/6151**

**GOV1      Electoral Systems and Voting  
Behaviour**

## **Mark Scheme**

*2007 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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

## CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

### 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 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, 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.

---

**AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (GOV1, GOV2 and GOV3)****GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 8 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>Levels 3–4 (3–4 marks)</b> The candidate successfully demonstrates accurate or generally accurate knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p> <p>Where appropriate, the candidate is able to illustrate his/her answer with relevant evidence/example(s).</p>	<p><b>Levels 3–4 (2 marks)</b> The candidate provides an appropriate analysis of political data, concept(s) or term(s) showing an awareness of differing viewpoints where appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3–4 (2 marks)</b> The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary.</p>
	<p><b>Levels 1–2 (1–2 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates slight or basic knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p> <p>The candidate may illustrate his/her answer with evidence/example(s) of limited relevance.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1–2 (1 mark)</b> The candidate provides a superficial or partial analysis of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p>	<p><b>Levels 1–2 (1 mark)</b> The candidate communicates with limited clarity and effectiveness using a limited political vocabulary.</p>

**AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (GOV1, GOV2 and GOV3)****GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 22 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 (10–11 marks)</b> The candidate successfully demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing an answer that deploys relevant knowledge and understanding to address the requirements of the question and that demonstrates significant contextual awareness.</p> <p>The candidate's answer includes relevant evidence and/or examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> The candidate evaluates political institutions, processes and behaviour, applying appropriate concepts and theories.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis which displays sound awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with valid and precise comparisons. The answer includes relevant and convincing interpretations or explanations.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> The candidate communicates clear arguments and explanations using accurate political vocabulary. The candidate produces answers with a clear sense of direction leading towards a coherent conclusion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing an answer that addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates adequate contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer provides evidence backed up by clear examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> The candidate evaluates political institutions, processes and behaviour, applying some concepts or theories.</p> <p>The candidate provides clear arguments and explanations and demonstrates awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with some sound comparison.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> The candidate communicates arguments and explanations using some political vocabulary. A conclusion is linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (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 (4–6 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationship between them. He/she makes a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question, and may produce limited evidence and/or few examples.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> The candidate offers a simplistic evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour and begins to construct arguments which contain basic explanation.</p> <p>The candidate shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is recognition of basic parallels or simplistic comparisons.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> The candidate attempts to develop an argument using basic political vocabulary. Where a conclusion is offered, its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates slight and/or incomplete knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationship between them.</p> <p>The candidate makes a very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the context of the question is evident and the few examples cited are often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> The candidate makes a partial attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes and behaviour. Arguments offered are superficial. There is very limited awareness of parallels or comparisons.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> The answer relies upon narrative which is not fully coherent and which is expressed without using political vocabulary. A conclusion is either not offered or it is not related to the preceding material.</p>

1

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Explain the term *protest candidates* used in the extract.

(8 marks)

Candidates might explain protest candidates in terms of what are normally seen as pressure groups competing in elections in order to gain publicity. By-elections may be identified as providing better opportunities for publicity than general elections. Although the stimulus links protest candidates and parties, there is no great requirement to differentiate between candidates and parties given the context of the stimulus material, but credit should be given to those candidates doing so effectively. Successful examples of recent protest candidates in the context of general elections are Martin Bell (Tatton) and Dr Richard Taylor (Wyre Forest). Stronger responses should include brief analysis exploring, for example, why some candidates contest seats knowing there are no chances of success. Responses might cite candidates put forward by protest parties as being protest candidates, and these might include the Pro-Europe Conservatives, the Pro-Life Alliance and the Legalise Cannabis Alliance as well as local examples.

(b) 'Large swings and low turnouts were once only typical of by-elections. Today they are typical of **both** general elections **and** by-elections.' Discuss.

(22 marks)

The stimulus is somewhat assertive on the differences between by-elections and general elections although an apparent exception is made regarding many Liberal Democrat by-election wins that are repeated at subsequent general elections. Candidates have the opportunity to consider and analyse many aspects of electoral stability and volatility (typically swing and turnout) as they impact upon by-elections and general elections (there may not be an equal balance of consideration regarding the elements in the set question and some relevant themes may be drawn from local devolved and Euro elections). For example, are contemporary levels of turnout so distinctive with some constituencies in the low forties (eg Liverpool Riverside lowest at 41.5%) Protest voting, especially for the BNP, was evident in some constituencies (eg Barking and Hornchurch). Stronger responses will also note that swing is now a local rather than uniform electoral phenomenon – turning a general election into over 600 individual distinctive contests (eg each somewhat more like a by-election than in the past). Other topics and themes are likely to be examined which have an impact upon contemporary voting, such as declining partisan attachment, increasing 'rational'/issue/image-led voting which might result in increased volatility overall. Some candidates will be more persuaded by the position struck in the stimulus and elaborate upon or reinforce with additional argument and example. The distinctiveness of by-election circumstances might be argued in terms of, for example, local issues. Responses which simply rework the stimulus material can gain only limited credit. There should be a conclusion, albeit a tentative one, which assesses the validity of the quote within the set question.

---

**2****Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Briefly explain the term *political values* used in the extract.

(8 marks)

Candidates are not expected to differentiate substantially between values, beliefs, opinions or, indeed, ideology. Political values may be expressed in generic terms, such as collectivism, individualism or pacifism or as specific opinions such as pro-welfare, pro-private healthcare or anti war in Iraq. The stimulus might result in brief analysis that considers generation differences. Otherwise, different political values might be linked to political parties, ideology or change over time. Candidates might cite simple examples, such as 'pro-welfare' or 'anti-foxxhunting' or present values as closely related to an ideology such as 'socialism' or 'liberalism'.

(b) To what extent do young people now share a political culture that differs from the political culture of middle-aged and elderly people?

(22 marks)

The extract provides some material that both confirms and challenges the statement as applied to the 1980s. The set question is asking candidates to update the generational perspective on Britain's political culture. There is great scope for different parts of the Unit's specification to be considered as part of the required assessment. For example, candidates might consider the involvement of the individual and examine levels of turnout. Patterns of voting or the influence of the media might also be discussed as well as differing forms of political behaviour. Examples might include orthodox and 'new' forms of participation. There might be reasoned speculation on specific political values or opinions, such as reducing the voting age to 16 or campaigns to legalise recreational drugs. Some candidates might argue in ways that accept the thrust of the statement in the set question; some might disagree; others might follow a more complex route and argue that differences are to be found within generations as well as between them. Examples might include both the young and old who support hunting and those who oppose hunting – similarly with pro-Life and pro-choice. Even political behaviour might be examined in this context, since around 37 per cent of the young did vote in 2005 whilst 25 per cent of over 55 year olds did not. Other factors may be introduced which are argued to have greater explanatory power such as regionalism, ethnicity, class or gender, but these factors should not supplant the consideration of the 'generation' effect. Some might include brief historical comparison, although this is not necessary but should be credited, such as the impact of the Great Depression and War on the popular socialism of the 1940s and 1950s or increased affluence on popular capitalism of the Thatcher years (more share-holders than trade unionists). There should be a conclusion which addresses the demands of the set question and attempts an assessment.



---

**3****Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Explain the term *majority in the House of Commons* used in the extract. (8 marks)

Candidates might define the term with an example calculated from the stimulus and state that Labour won a 66 seat (or 67 if the delayed election and/or Speaker is included) majority in May 2005, proceeding to state what this meant in terms of parliamentary arithmetic. An alternative calculation might be the number of seats won over and above the 50 per cent of the seats in the Commons. The implications of small and large majorities might be considered with examples such as Major's 'whipless' rebels or Blair's past landslide majorities. Some candidates might include brief mention of their Lordships influence given either a large or small parliamentary majority. Others will take their arguments from the stimulus and develop them in the direction of the mandate, legitimacy or the 'English' dimension.

(b) 'Labour lost support in 2005 and won fewer seats, showing that the First-Past-The-Post system can and does respond to changing electoral opinion.' Discuss. (22 marks)

At face value the assertion in the set question appears justified. Candidates have the opportunity to use the skills of AO2 to differentiate, analyse, assess and compare in order to establish the nature of the responsiveness of the election result to the change in voting pattern and reach their conclusions. Some candidates are likely to deploy arguments in favour or against FPTP, arguing that there is a trade-off involved before drawing a final conclusion. However, a pre-packaged pro and anti FPTP answer which pays scant attention to the set question can only be rewarded with limited credit. Other candidates are likely to deploy statistical material, either new or drawn from the stimulus, to support their arguments. For example, some might argue that FPTP is currently biased in favour of Labour regardless of its alleged limited responsiveness. Evidence might take the form of the average number of votes each party has to win in order to secure an MP (Labour 26,872; Conservatives 44,531; Liberal Democrats 96,485). The stimulus mentions the English vote, which might be included in supporting development, or the argument that Labour would still have won in 2005 with only 30 per cent of the popular vote. Some candidates might focus on other than Labour and Conservative. They might challenge the proposition in the set question: the Liberal Democrats won less than a tenth of seats in the Commons despite getting 23% of the vote. Even though their representation increased, their position as a third party remains 'unfair' in light of electoral support. It is likely that there will be some discussion of reform, but it must be in the context of the set question such as related to responsiveness. The workings of other electoral systems might be referred to, but again it should be within the context of the set question. Candidates should present a conclusion which includes the necessary evaluation.

4

**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Explain the term *binding on the government* used in the extract. (8 marks)

Candidates will define binding in terms of committing the government to pursue the policy choice made by the voters in the referendum. They are likely to contrast this with advisory referendums. Better responses will refer to the sovereignty of parliament and see UK referendums as inevitably advisory in terms of legitimating government's preferred policy or being subject to parliamentary rejection. There is scope for controversy in the very best answers which may question the position if provision in an Act for an apparently 'binding' referendum creates a binding referendum. At least one example should be cited, even if it is the English devolution example drawn from the stimulus.

(b) 'Referendum results rarely show what the electorate wants.' Discuss. (22 marks)

Candidates are able to draw some material from the stimulus, particularly the yes/no policy that results from most referendums and which may be at odds with qualified preferences of public opinion. For example, whether or not Britain joins the euro could depend on a number of conditions (exchange rate) rather than simply on principle. Subtleties of policy are not possible from referendum results. Associated issues, such as the level of turnout, may be discussed in terms of producing popular decisions. For example, only 25 per cent of the Welsh electorate voted for the establishment of the Welsh Assembly – was this what the electorate wanted? Can the feelings of non-voters be discounted? Some candidates might refer to the timing of the referendum as a government tool for influencing the outcome and, citing European examples, repeated referendums until the government obtains its desired outcome. Also there may be a danger that governments can use referendums for ulterior motives. Others might observe that referendums frequently result in conservative outcomes, such as that given in the stimulus material. Or that only certain questions are subject to referendums and not the broad sweep of policy tackled by government. Many candidates in past papers have referred to the absence of a referendum on the war in Iraq – ideally there should be some appreciation of the difficulties of putting certain questions to the electorate as a referendum and proceeding to act on the result. The expertise required in certain areas might be seen as an inhibitor to greater public involvement in policy-making, whilst others might see lack of expertise as an advantage with the referendum electorate acting like juries. Others may ask whether good government is achieved by excluding popular participation – for example, would a referendum have endorsed the poll tax or rail privatisation? A conclusion should be included which assesses issues concerning the effectiveness of referendums in showing the wishes of the electorate.