



General Certificate of Education

**Government and Politics
5151/6151**

GOV8 Synoptic Module

Mark Scheme

2008 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

Copyright © 2008 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Introduction

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.

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

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	A01	A02	A03
	<p>Level 4 (13 – 16 marks) 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>Level 4 (13 – 16 marks) 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 their 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>Level 4 (7 – 8 marks) 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)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 3 (9 – 12 marks) 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>Level 3 (9 – 12 marks) 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 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>Level 3 (5 – 6 marks) 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)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (5 – 8 marks) 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>Level 2 (5 – 8 marks) 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>Level 2 (3 – 4 marks) 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)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 1 (1 – 4 marks) 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 addressing 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>Level 1 (1 – 4 marks) 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>Level 1 (1 – 2 marks) 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**

<p>'Power without authority is might without right.' Discuss.</p>	<p><i>(40 marks)</i></p>
---	--------------------------

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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, might, right, legitimacy and authority;
- bases of authority such as electoral legitimacy, office, expertise and popularity;
- bases of power (arguably) without authority such as threat or use of violence, electoral fraud, wealth, ownership of means of production, veto power, religion, control of the media, charisma and tradition;
- relevant concepts such as elitism, Marxism and pluralism;
- examples of power positions within the state at various levels (eg central, provincial, local, federal);
- power and authority beyond the formal positions in the state (eg the power of various types of pressure group, the media, high finance and business, global economic actors);
- power at the level of the devolved institutions in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland;
- material for comparison from other systems such as the USA and EU;
- examples of major political events and decisions in which governments and other political actors have acted with greater or lesser authority.

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 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 is on the distinction between power which is legitimately held (in the form of authority) and that which is not.

In the main body of the answer candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as those indicated above. Candidates will need to recognise the fundamental distinction between legitimate and non-legitimate power. They should recognise that there are many power holders within a pluralistic political system holding varying degrees of legitimacy.

Candidates may well take a variety of states to illustrate their arguments, perhaps looking at totalitarian regimes. There could be much on the subject of force and violence as a basis for power. Some may cite bomb outrages from bodies such as the IRA or Muslim extremists. They should also recognise however that forms of illegitimate power may arguably be found in ostensibly democratic systems. They may, for example, argue that government advisers, quangos, or the House of Lords, enjoy power without electoral legitimacy. They may also argue that electoral systems themselves do not always operate fairly. Beyond this they may cite electoral malpractice or fraud. Again, they may argue that expertise, or the holding of official positions in public bureaucracies, offer only a tenuous degree of legitimacy in a democracy.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. At all times 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 must come back clearly to the proposition that power without authority is might without right. They may support the proposition, refute it, or argue an intermediate position.

A2**Total for this question: 40 marks**

<p>'Freedom is only secure when power is dispersed.' Discuss.</p>	<p><i>(40 marks)</i></p>
---	--------------------------

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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:

- definitions of key relevant terms such as freedom, totalitarianism, pluralism and the dispersal of power;
- dangers of centralised power;
- concept of the constitutional separation of powers;
- provision in constitutions for executive dominance;
- theories of pluralism and countervailing power;
- ways in which power may be dispersed centrally to assemblies and judiciaries;
- ways in which power may be dispersed territorially including federalism, local government and devolution;
- practical failings in constitutional means of separating power such as weak parliamentary scrutiny;
- centralisation within executives; cabinet and presidential forms of government;
- ways in which executive centralisation may be combated such as cabinet revolts, cabinet leaks, cabals and resignations;
- personalisation and charisma in modern politics;
- examples of political figures of past and present who have exerted dominant and centralising presence;
- events where political factors have led to increased centralisation such as war and national emergencies;
- such examples may come from all points within the political system including Westminster politics, Scottish, Welsh or Northern Ireland politics, local government, the EU, the USA and the world of interest group politics;
- comparative material, particularly US presidents and British prime ministers;
- value of rivals in politics as a check against totalitarian styles of government;
- modern centralising trends in politics including the weakening of local government and the rise of prime ministerial power, an public relations, news management and 'spin doctoring';
- the increasing role of figures such as the prime minister's press secretary, or director of communications, in enhancing the power of the office;

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 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 dangers of over centralised government and

totalitarianism. They should discuss this at an abstract or theoretical level. The extract offers a clear steer on the discussion.

In the main body of the answer candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as those indicated above. Candidates will need to recognise the fact that constitutions usually make some provision for dispersing power. They may discuss these but also note that, in practice, many fall short of the ideal.

Candidates may also note that power may be dispersed politically by means such as opposition and rivalry from opposition parties, pressure groups and even from within a leader's own party. Candidates may note the contrast between the positions of the British prime ministers (whose colleagues could be contenders for the top position) and the US president (where this is not the case). Some candidates may argue the case for strong government. There is scope for a large range of examples from past and present to illustrate this dimension of power politics. In addition, the synoptic range may lead to examples from provincial assemblies and local authorities, and US figures.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. At all times 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 clearly derives from preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that freedom is only secure when power is dispersed. Alternatively, the conclusion may argue that there are conditions when freedom must be sacrificed to some greater good such as national survival.

Section B: Participation and Representation

B1**Total for this question: 40 marks**

'In a pluralist society, political participation goes well beyond the ballot box.' Discuss.

(40 marks)

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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 political participation, ballot box, pluralist society, representative democracy;
- the nature of pluralist democracy;
- forms of voting and representative democracy;
- voting behaviour, apathy and electoral turnout;
- forms of participation beyond the 'ballot box' such as lobbying, demonstrating, pressure-group membership, direct action, party funding, meetings with bureaucrats;
- measures of participation such as membership of political organisations;
- the ideological dimension, particularly socialism, liberalism, liberal democracy, and conservatism;
- problems with representative government such as non-inclusion, party domination and elitism;
- limitations of representative assemblies and other forums (eg proportions of ethnic minorities, working class, women, young people, old people, etc);
- strengths and/or weaknesses in representative institutions' procedures such as question time, select committees, debate opportunities, congressional committees and local government scrutiny committees;
- relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments;
- comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

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 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 limitations of representative democracy and the alternative means of participating in politics permitted in a pluralist society.

In the main body of the answer candidates should introduce and define relevant key terms such as those indicated above. Analysis should note the limitations in a system which allows citizens to the expression of preferences through voting. Theories of representation, as mentioned above, may be drawn into the analysis. They should then explain and examine the nature of participation in a broader sense, noting the various forms it may take. This may be illustrated with a large range of examples drawn from throughout the specification. There may be some analysis of ideology, particularly socialism (equal participation of all), liberalism (freedom to participate), liberal democracy

(participation through the market), and conservatism (participation confined to an elite class 'born to rule').

The analysis may make comparative reference, particularly to the USA, and the EU. The analysis may argue that despite the participatory shortcomings of representative government it offers a viable level of participation.

A conclusion should arise from the foregoing discussion and contain a clear acceptance or refutation of the proposition that, in a pluralist society, participation can go beyond the ballot box.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. At all times use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints

B2**Total for this question: 40 marks**

<p>'Modern parties seek to govern but no longer seek to represent.' Discuss.</p>	<p><i>(40 marks)</i></p>
--	--------------------------

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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 relevant to the question such as modern parties, elected representative, representative government;
- the roles of elected representatives such as representatives, scrutinisers, publicisers, debaters and legislators;
- theories of representation such as the Burkean view, microcosmic representation, representatives as delegates, representatives as advocates and theory of the mandate.
- traditional alliances of parties with social groups;
- representation of interest groups by elected representatives;
- 'park barrel politics' and 'log-rolling';
- modern party manifestos;
- modern campaigning styles;
- party convergence on the centre ground;
- partisan dealignment;
- the ideological dimension, particularly the liberal view on representative government.
- developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland;
- comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

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 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 argument that modern political parties are more concerned with gaining office than in representing a particular social, ethnic or economic group.

In the main body of the answer key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined.

A discussion on the campaigning styles of the modern parties would be particularly helpful. They may discuss the view that parties are mainly concerned with vote maximisation rather than with any particular programme or ideology. There could be some comparison with more traditional campaigning styles, which could be seen as more class-based. There could also be some discussion on the way in which elected assembly members sometimes represent, and argue the case for, certain interest groups such as unions, professional associations and voluntary societies. Examples may be offered showing how and why parties use the strategies they do.

Some candidates may seek to reject the proposition in question. To this end they may consider the range of parties with no serious expectation of gaining power such as the BNP and the Liberal Democrats.

Candidates may also develop the argument that parties must win power in order to further the interests of those whom they represent so that actual strategy must be a continuing compromise.

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 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 preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that modern political parties are more interested in gaining power than representing people.

Section C: Political Culture

C1**Total for this question: 40 marks**

'The political attitudes and beliefs of individuals are shaped by numerous factors.' Discuss.
(40 marks)

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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:

- the central concepts of political attitudes, political beliefs, political socialisation and political culture;
- types of political culture such as traditional, secular, participant, subject, parochial and civic.
- relevant aspect of political culture such as ideology, citizenship, deference, patriotism, xenophobia, homogeneity and consensus;
- social factors shaping political culture such as class, religion, sexism, racism, xenophobia and geographical divide;
- institutions that shape political culture such as constitutions, judiciaries, assemblies, electoral systems, public bureaucracies and levels of devolution;
- key attitudes forming political culture such as those towards class and social stratification, gender and race;
- understanding of determinants of political culture such as major historical landmarks, patterns of immigration, salient political issues, notable political figures, the presence of ancient institutions (monarchy, aristocracy), climate, geography, imperial experience and the media;
- instruments of political socialisation such as TV, radio, the press, religion, family, peer group, school, and the government itself;
- relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments;
- relevant current issues, events and debates;
- cultural features in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland;
- comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU;

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 will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, degree of synopticity, appropriateness of examples and 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 identification and examination of the wide range of elements that constitute a political culture.

In the main body of the answer candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as those indicated above. They should identify and critically appraise a range of determinants of political culture. Importantly, they should consider and identify a substantial range of agents of political socialisation. Some may assess the relative importance of these.

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 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 preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that the political attitudes and beliefs of individuals are shaped by numerous factors.

C2**Total for this question: 40 marks**

'To what extent can modern governments expect to find deference, consensus and homogeneity amongst their citizens?' *(40 marks)*

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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:

- definition and examination of key terms such as deference, consensus, homogeneity and citizens;
- patterns of political culture found in the Almond and Verba study;
- the rise of nationalism and devolution;
- increased multiculturalism;
- the rise of various forms of feminism;
- effect of the media and modern journalism;
- increased crime rates;
- declining role of Christian religion as evidence by falling church attendance;
- greater assertiveness from ethnic minorities;
- the rise of 'youth culture';
- the ideological dimension including the rise of neo liberalism;
- wider higher educational opportunities;
- loss of faith in traditional representative politics;
- perceptions of sleaze brining alienation and mistrust of politicians;
- moves towards alternative forms of more assertive political engagement such as direct action, marches, internet campaigning;
- relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments;
- developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland;
- comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

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 issues questions there is no right or wrong answer to this question. 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 centre on changes in political culture from the consensus period of the immediate post-war years. The extract offers a steer on the discussion although there are many other ways of looking at the question.

In the main body of the answer key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined. Candidates should identify and critically examine changes with respect to the three variables identified in the question. Some may decide to concentrate mainly on one of them. This is acceptable providing a logical justification is provided for the decision.

Candidates may argue variously. Some may posit that all three variables are less in evidence while others may discern relative differences. Some may say that there has been no decline in any of the three. There may also be normative discussion on whether such change is desirable or not.

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 examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times 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 preceding discussion. This must clearly come back to the issue of possible decline in the traditional features of deference, consensus and homogeneity in western states. However the thesis presented may go either way.

Section D: Continuity and Change

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

'Within all political systems, reformers favouring change will come into conflict with traditionalists favouring continuity.' Discuss. (40 marks)

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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:

- the basic concepts of change and continuity;
- understanding of the terms reformers and traditionalists;
- pressures for change from society;
- pressures for change within institutions;
- pressures for change from political parties with reform agendas;
- pressures for change in the informal patterns of politics such as pressure-group activity and media campaigns;
- forces for tradition and continuity such as bureaucratic resistance, political timidity, nostalgia and fear of the new;
- the ideological dimension such as the conservative critique of revolution and argument for stability and the reformists agendas of radical parties;
- real change contrasted with apparent change (ie window-dressing);
- examples drawn from the range of institutions and political structures where political controversy over change has taken place such as constitutions, national, provincial and regional assemblies, electoral systems, House of Lords, bureaucracies at various levels, local government systems, executives and judiciaries;
- reasons why changes have been implemented or resisted;
- developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland;
- comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

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 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 tension between reformers and conservatives in political systems.

In the main body of the answer key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined. Candidates may explain that much political debate centres on demands for change and resistance to these demands. They may also examine the extent to which self-interest often lies behind these respective positions; those benefiting from the *status quo* will argue for its continuance. Alternatively, they may elaborate on the ideological debate, with conservatives arguing

that change can be dangerous and respecting the 'wisdom of the ages'. They may show conservatism as arguing for slow organic change lagging behind social development and socialism arguing for radical change leading social development.

Candidates may look at controversies over significant reforms (as suggested above) and may also look at failed reforms such as regional devolution in England.

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 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 preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that proposals for change will inevitably meet with opposition. It is also possible to adopt a valid intermediate position.

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

'Changes in a political system may require more than institutional reform.' Discuss. (40 marks)

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able 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 relevant to this theme such as political change and institutional reform.
- a range of political institutions where reforms may be observed, such as constitutions, assemblies (national, provincial and regional), electoral systems, bureaucracies at various levels, local government systems, executives and judiciaries;
- examples of institutional change which may not have brought about the intended political change such as privatisation, which may not have produced the autonomy from government envisaged or local government reform which has not decreased central control;
- examples of political change which have taken place without institutional reform such as changes in political attitudes, increased dominance of executives over assemblies;
- the ideological dimension of the question, making particular reference to conservatism and those ideologies favouring change or even revolution;
- evidence and up-to-date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made;
- developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and comparative examples from other systems, such as the USA and EU.

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 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 way in which much institutional change serves more to preserve continuity. It should be recognised that this is one of the most fundamental questions that can be asked with respect to the theme of continuity and change. This is the thesis developed in the extract, which offers a clear steer on the discussion.

In the main body of the answer key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined. Candidates should be able to illustrate a clear difference between a political change and an institutional change. They should recognise that these may be independent of each other. They may pursue the argument that governments are often accused of appearing to promote change while really seeking to preserve continuity.

Candidates may be expected to argue that political change requires changes in attitudes, expectations and behaviour, as well as in institutional structures, if it is to be genuine. They may address the issue of the political motives of those apparently promoting change.

The examples of change to be examined may come 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 argue

that general elections and presidential elections may change the personal and party of government without necessarily securing policy change. They may note that politicians often speak glibly of change as a basis for winning support of individuals and groups. Candidates may also consider ideological change such as the coming of the New Right, neoliberalism and the 'third way', asking whether such ideologies produces real change or merely rhetoric. They may consider change within political parties and other organisations such as pressure groups.

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 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 preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that changes in a political system may require more than institutional reform.