

Mark Scheme

Winter 2008

GCE Government and Politics (Unit 1) People and Politics

These instructions should be the first page of all mark schemes

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	Indicative content
1(a)	A political party is a group of people that is organised for the purpose of winning government power. In a democratic system, parties put candidates up for election, in the hope of gaining representation and ultimately forming (or participating in) government. Parties typically adopt broad issue focuses, addressing each of the major areas of government policy. Their members are also united by shared political preferences and a general ideological identity, although these tend to be broadly defined. Examples include the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-1	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. No meaningful appreciation of how political parties fit within the political system.
Level 2	2-3	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. The response has a tendency to make generic comments with superficial awareness of political parties.
Level 3	4-5	Good or better knowledge and understanding. The response may be exemplified and clearly developed. Detail will be exact and relevant.

Question Number	Indicative content
1(b)	Some are major policy divergences and other policy differences are at margins. Examples may cover for instance policy approach to the EU and the Euro. Many differences exist on ranges and levels of taxation policy. Less significant differences emerge over law and order and the NHS. Currently the Conservative Party disagree over the proposed introduction of ID cards. The Conservatives are also sceptical of ECHR/HR legislation. The Conservative party take a pragmatic view of constitutional reform and have an individual approach in each area. Recent Conservative policy has attempted to place a more environmental focus and difference to labour. Likewise a recent Conservative policy is to move to a system of workfare which has been opposed by Labour.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-5	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Limited political information. No depth of political information. Many points raised are not fully relevant or appropriate.
Level 2	6-10	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate political information. Three points will not be articulated well. Two points may be developed with clarity. There may be some inaccuracy in developing party policy which no longer applies.
Level 3	11-15	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective political information. The response will be well informed with accurate and detailed contemporary information which highlights the clear differences between the two parties.

Question Number	Indicative content
1(c)	<p>The Labour party's commitment to traditional socialism was reflected an 'old' Labour belief in reforming the capitalist system in the interests of greater equality and social justice. This was reflected in policy terms in support for a mixed economy, economic management (using Keynesianism) and a cradle-to-grave welfare state based on Beveridge principles. These policies have been significantly revised through the 'modernisation' process that started in the late 1980s and accelerated under Blair though the construction of so-called 'new' Labour. Many 'socialist' policies have been abandoned. Industries privatised under the Conservatives have not been re-nationalised, and there have been some additional privatisations. Keynesian economic management has given way to a free-market approach to the economy that emphasises low inflation and a 'prudent' control of government spending. The Beveridge welfare system has been revised through, for example, a greater use of targeted benefits and the introduction of market reforms to public services. Reference may be made to the reform made to Clause IV of the constitution as a significant indication of the abandonment of socialism. Likewise the move from singling out the working classes as a key focus of policy is now no longer seen as appropriate. In education the introduction of fees at HE level can be seen as going against universal benefits. On the other hand, it can be argued that certain 'socialist' priorities have survived. These would include the emphasis on boosting health and education spending since 2001 and efforts to reduce child poverty. The labour Party has introduced the minimum wage and the Social Chapter which advances working rights. Safeguards are in place to provide grants for students from low income families who enter HE. Credit may be advanced for questioning how socialist the Labour Party ever was prior to 1997.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-10	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Limited analysis and evaluation of political information. No real or meaningful connection with the changing policy platform of the Labour Party.
Level 2	11-20	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate analysis and evaluation of political information. Although policy options are discussed the response lacks a holistic approach. The original supposed socialist platform may not be coherently developed. There may be an omission of balance with only one

		aspect of the question addressed, but this one sided response must develop criticism and evaluation.
Level 3	21-30	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective analysis and evaluation of political information. Contemporary and informed examples are used to illustrate both knowledge and analysis. The development will feature in the response though this does not have to be evenly progressed.

Question Number	Indicative content
2(a)	<p>Direct democracy is associated more commonly (though not exclusively) with ancient Athens whereas representative democracy is a more modern phenomenon. Referendum can be seen as a device of direct democracy. There are several differences between direct and representative democracy. For example, they differ over the nature of political participation. In a direct democracy the people <i>make</i> policy directly, whereas in a representative democracy popular participation is indirect, in that the public merely choose (usually by election) who will make policy on their behalf. They also differ on the extent of popular participation. In direct democracy popular participation is ongoing and continuous, whereas in a representative democracy it is infrequent and brief, usually limited to the act of voting every few years. In addition, in a direct democracy the people <i>are</i> the government, in that no institutions stand between government and the people, whereas representative democracies operate through intermediate institutions that both represent the people and help to make government accountable.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-1	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Confuses the two types of democracy and makes no real progress.
Level 2	2-3	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. There may be a tendency to describe on type of democracy more clearly than another. Possibly the response fails to connect with the question by clearly illustrating the differences requested.
Level 3	4-5	Good or better knowledge and understanding. A full and accurate illustration of two differences that exist between the two types of democracy.

Question Number	Indicative content
2(b)	<p>Direct democracy has been criticised for a number of reasons, including the following. First, the people may lack the education, knowledge and experience to govern wisely in their own interests. Representative democracy therefore has the advantage of offering government by experts. Second, direct democracy may be impracticable. It is difficult to imagine how government by mass meeting could be applied to large societies or modern nation-states. Government by referendum would also mean that government decision-making would be cumbersome and long-winded. Third, direct democracy places a heavy burden on all ordinary citizens, who have to participate continuously in the processes of government. Representative democracy therefore has the advantage that it creates a division of labour enabling citizens to get on with their working life and domestic existence. Fourth, direct democracy may also result in political instability, as increased levels of popular participation makes citizens more passionate and committed to their own beliefs and causes, leading to conflict and perhaps civil strife. Representative democracy therefore has the advantage that, in distancing ordinary citizens from politics, it encourages them to accept compromise. Direct democracy may also produce what is termed the "tyranny of the majority" in which minorities are placed at a disadvantage with either discrimination against them and possible restriction on their freedom. This is sometimes viewed as "mob rule." Direct democracy can be seen to undermine parliamentary sovereignty.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-5	<p>Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. No depth of political information. Many of the points raised are not fully relevant or appropriate.</p>
Level 2	6-10	<p>Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate political information. The points will not be articulated fully. Some aspects may be developed with clarity. There may be some inaccuracy in describing certain features of direct democracy.</p>
Level 3	11-15	<p>Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective analysis of political information. The problems that have been associated with the direct democracy will be clearly and fully articulated. Examples will highlight these aspects.</p>

Question Number	Indicative content
2(c)	<p>Representative democracy in the UK operates through the electoral process and through the role of Parliament. The health of representative democracy is reflected in the fact that the UK has an established system of free and fair elections which are based on the principles of universal suffrage, and one person one vote. Candidate and party competition in these elections also ensures that politicians and governments are forced to reflect public opinion. Parliament lies at the heart of the UK's democratic system. As the only popularly-elected institution in UK central government, Parliament delivers representative and responsible government, both articulating the interests of constituents and calling government to account.</p> <p>Representative democracy has been extended through devolution and new assemblies and Parliaments created. For instance in Northern Ireland representative democracy has replaced the civil unrest which stalked the province in recent history. Furthermore the abandonment of FPTP for many elections to these new bodies (and for MEPs') has allowed PR to enliven representative democracy. Individual human rights are better protected with the introduction of the ECHR into UK law. The introduction of the Freedom of Information Act has also been implemented. Political parties may vie for control and government but there is no general dissatisfaction with the system of representative democracy by any main political party or the general public.</p> <p>However, representative democracy in the UK has been criticised for a number of reasons. These include the following. First, the electoral system for the House of Commons is disproportional and therefore unrepresentative. The 'first past the post' system therefore distorts public opinion. Second, the House of Lords is non-elected, meaning that representative democracy does not operate in the second chamber of Parliament. Third, Parliament is generally ineffective in ensuring responsible government because, thanks to the electoral system and the party system, the executive can usually dominate Parliament through its majority control of the House of Commons. The UK, arguably, has a system of 'executive democracy' rather than 'parliamentary democracy'. Fourth, the health of representative democracy has been called into question by evidence of growing public apathy and declining public participation. This is most clearly reflected in declining electoral turn-outs, with around 40 per cent of the</p>

	<p>electorate staying at home in the 2001 and 2005 general elections. The presence of sleaze both sexual and financial has damaged the reputation and health of the UK's representative democracy. This has made an impact on both the main parties of government.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-10	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Limited analysis and evaluation of political information. The response will lack a contemporary developed base.
Level 2	11-20	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate analysis and evaluation of political information. The response may lack an appreciation of balance to fully evaluate the question raised. Examples may be used but these may be limited in their application and relevance.
Level 3	21-30	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective analysis and evaluation of political information. The response will be supported by clear and well developed examples which provide a basis for analysis and evaluation.

Question Number	Indicative content
3(a)	Proportional representation is the principle that parties should be represented in direct proportion to their overall electoral strength. The percentage of seats they win should therefore equal the percentage of votes they gain. Proportional representation does not refer to a single method of election but to a variety of electoral systems, which, despite different rules and arrangements, each secure a high and reliable degree of proportionality. It is suggested that proportional representation avoids wasted votes and that all votes are used and the voter feels more valued. These systems include the party list system, the additional member system and the single transferable vote system.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-1	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Fails to give relevant and informative detail surrounding PR, disconnected generic statements may be advanced.
Level 2	2-3	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. May accurately cite PR systems but fail to provide the basic theory which lies behind all the types of PR that exist. Correct in sections but not fully encompassing the principle which underpin PR. Material inaccuracies may be present.
Level 3	4-5	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Clarity is achieved by the provision of the core principles which define PR. This may be done more easily by reference to examples but it is not a pre-requisite.

Question Number	Indicative content
3(b)	<p data-bbox="395 248 1273 409">Five electoral systems are currently used in the UK. They are the 'first past the post' system, the additional member system (AMS), the single transferable vote (STV), the party list system and the supplementary vote (SV).</p> <p data-bbox="395 461 1262 707">'First past the post' (used for the House of Commons) is a constituency system in which voters select a single candidate, indicating his or her name with an X on the ballot paper. Each constituency returns a single candidate, the winning candidate needing only to achieve a plurality of votes (more votes than any other single candidate, not necessarily an overall majority).</p> <p data-bbox="395 759 1273 1216">AMS (used for the Scottish Parliament, Welsh Assembly and GLA) is a hybrid system comprising both 'first the post' and 'closed' party list features. A proportion of seats are filled using single-member constituencies, and the remaining seats are filled using a 'closed' party list (in Scotland and London, 56 per cent of members are constituency representatives, whereas in Wales it is two-thirds. Electors therefore cast two votes: one for a candidate in a constituency election and the other for a party in a list election. The party list element in AMS is used to top-up the constituency results, and they are used 'correctively' to achieve the most proportional possible outcome.</p> <p data-bbox="395 1267 1273 1641">In STV there are multi-member constituencies (in the Northern Ireland Assembly, each returns 6 members). Parties put up as many candidates as there are seats to fill in each constituency. Electors vote preferentially, by ranking candidates in order, with winning candidates achieving a quota of votes, determined by the Droop formula. Scottish local government and the Northern Ireland MEPs are elected by this system. The supplementary vote is a majoritarian system where the voter expresses two preferences, a first and second choice.</p> <p data-bbox="395 1693 1257 1771">Should no candidate reach 50% on the first count, votes are then redistributed. This is used to elect the London mayor.</p> <p data-bbox="395 1823 1267 2020">The party list is based on a number of large multi-member constituencies (12 across the UK for the European Parliament elections). Parties compile lists of candidates to place before the electorate, in descending order of preference, meaning that these lists are 'closed' in the sense that voters have no choice of</p>

	candidates. Voters vote for parties, which are then allocated seats in direct proportion to the votes cast.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-5	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. No depth of political information. Fails to show a real appreciation of different electoral systems and their features. Often only one system identified.
Level 2	6-10	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate political information. Three systems will not be articulated and described fully. Some aspects may be developed with clarity. There may be some inaccuracy in depicting PR systems and their individual functions. Often there may be a mislabelling of systems and how they operate.
Level 3	11-15	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective political information. Three systems articulated with clarity precision. Identification may be added of where each electoral system sits within the UK political system.

Question Number	Indicative content
3(c)	<p>The use of PR electoral systems has affected party representation in the UK in three main ways. First, it has resulted in greater proportionality, in the sense that parties receive representation more in line with their proportion of votes. The 'over-representation' of large parties and the so-called 'landslide effect' of 'first past the post' is absent when PR systems are used. Second, minor parties that are denied representation by FPTP are more likely to win seats when PR systems are used. This substantially broadens the basis of party representation and creates multi-party systems. For example, the Green Party has no representation at Westminster, but has two seats on the Scottish Parliament, two seats in the Greater London Assembly, and two seats in the European Parliament. The UK Independence Party won over 600,000 votes in the 2005 general election but gained no seats in the House of Commons. On the other hand UKIP has 12 seats in the European Parliament. Third, the tendency of PR systems to produce multi-party systems means that it is more likely that parties are forced to work together in coalition governments. For example, Labour-Liberal Democrat coalition executives were formed after the 1999 and 2003 Scottish Parliament elections. Where coalitions are not formed, executives tend to be minority governments or to have slim majorities. The 2007 Scottish Parliament election resulted in the formation of a minority single-party Scottish National Party executive.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-10	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Limited analysis and evaluation of political information. Fails to appreciate the application of electoral system to political party fortunes. A distinct lack of reliable and accurate contemporary political data.
Level 2	11-20	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate analysis and evaluation of political information. The response raises relevant points and descriptions but is not all encompassing. There may be material inaccuracies. There may be lack of extensive and reliable contemporary political information to provide a platform for analysis and evaluation.
Level 3	21-30	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective analysis and evaluation of political information. Well supported by accurate and informed contemporary political examples which allow penetrative and well constructed analysis and evaluation. Covers a range of political parties and their fortunes under PR.

Question Number	Indicative content
4(a)	<p>Sectional pressure groups represent a specific section of society, usually occupational groups such as businesses, professional associations and trade unions. They are concerned to protect and advance the interests of their members, and membership is only open to people in a particular occupation, career or economic position.</p> <p>Promotional/Cause groups are set up to advance particular principles, ideals or causes, rather than the common interests of their members. Promotional/Cause groups are concerned with a variety of issues - charity and welfare, education, religion, culture and art, civil liberties and so on (examples include Greenpeace, Amnesty International, Shelter and the RSPB). Membership of such groups is open to all, and members are motivated by moral or altruistic concerns (the betterment of others).</p> <p>Insider pressure groups are groups that enjoy regular, privileged and usually institutionalised access to government. This operates through routine consultation at ministerial or official level or through representation on government bodies (examples include the CBI, the BMA and the NFU).</p> <p>Outsider pressure groups are groups that are either not consulted by government or consulted only irregularly and not usually at a senior level. Outsider groups therefore mount public-opinion campaigns, often associated with attracting media attention (examples include the ALF, Fathers4Justice and Make Poverty History). Both insider and outsider groups have been divided into sub-categories.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-1	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. The response fails to provide an adequate outline of two types and no supportive example.
Level 2	2-3	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. The response does not fully encompass an outline definition of pressure group types and the example may be unclear or not correct.
Level 3	4-5	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Provides an accurate and precise outline with relevant illustrative examples.

Question Number	Indicative content
4(b)	<p>Pressure groups and political parties appear to be different bodies but the differences between them are often blurred. This can happen for a number of reasons. First, many small political parties resemble pressure groups in their political orientation. Unlike major political parties that have a broad issue focus, many small parties tend to focus on a narrow range of issues. For example, the British National Party is primarily concerned with issues of race and immigration. Second, some pressure groups use elections as a tactical weapon, rather than as a means of winning representation and gaining government power. The <i>motive</i> for engaging in electoral politics may therefore be as important as the fact of standing for election in distinguishing between parties and pressure groups. The Legalise Cannabis Alliance contested 21 constituencies in the 2005 general election, in the hope of gaining publicity and attracting media attention, with no expectation of winning these elections. Third, parties may be confused with pressure groups because they have overlapping membership and political sympathies, sometimes being part of larger social movements. This applies in the case of the environmental movement, which has a political wing in the form of the Green Party and a pressure group wing in the form of groups such as Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth and WWF. Certain pressure groups have worked so closely with both government and opposition parties that policies and even personnel can become very similar.</p>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-5	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. No depth of political information. Fails to show a real appreciation of the difficulty in distinguishing between political parties and pressure groups.
Level 2	6-10	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate political information. Although the difficulties in distinguishing the two are indicated, the response lacks an informed depth.
Level 3	11-15	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective political information. The difficulty that has arisen between pressure groups and political parties are well developed. Relevant and informed examples show a full and precise understanding.

Question Number	Indicative content
4(c)	<p>Pressure groups may have become more important in recent years for three reasons. First, there has been a growth of cause groups and 'new' types of political participation. Over half the cause groups now in existence have been created since 1960, and the membership of such groups often dwarfs that of contemporary political parties. It is said, for example, that the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds has a membership larger than the combined membership of the main UK political parties. Single-issue groups have also developed new forms of political activism, involving popular protests, demonstrations and marches, that have proved to be attractive to people disillusioned by 'conventional' party politics. Second, there are now more access points through pressure groups to exert influence in the UK, given the introduction of devolution, the advance of European integration and the introduction of the Human Rights Act (strengthening the courts as an access point). Finally, some argue that globalization has substantially increased pressure group power by allowing major corporations to dictate to governments through their ability more easily to relocate production and investment abroad. The rise in importance of pressure groups can also be associated with the decline in the profile of political parties who have been seen as a failure as an agent of change for the electorate or that the electorate sees pressure groups as more able to respond to their individual needs more accurately than political parties.</p> <p>The rise in importance can also be associated with a more intrusive and developed media who in recent years has followed the profile of pressure groups. The spread of the Internet has allowed easier communications channels and this makes political activity easier for pressure groups to work through and create an impact.</p> <p>However, others argue that pressure group importance may be in decline. This is either because of the end of corporatism, which has broken the close partnership between government, business and labour, or because of a general decline in social capital, which means that although group membership has increased, these members are mainly passive and often disengaged from political activity. This is reflected in the rise of the so-called 'chequebook group'. It is also argued that pressure groups have declined in importance as the number of pressure groups have</p>

	<p>increased their power has been diluted. This can arise from two perspective firstly it can multiply voices such as the growing environmental pressure group lobby which may cause the message to become confused or secondly it can raise credible opposition to pressure groups allowing more alternatives to form. It may also be argued that pressure group importance is still tied to political party fortunes and as each party holds government office the star of certain pressure groups rise while others fall. As such trade unions fell under the Conservatives and constitutional pressure groups such as Chapter 88 have enjoyed a raised profile under Labour.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Level	Mark	Descriptor
Level 1	0-10	Poor to weak knowledge and understanding. Limited analysis and evaluation of political information. The response fails to relate to the profile and importance of contemporary pressure group activity.
Level 2	11-19	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding. Adequate analysis and evaluation of political information. The activities of pressure group and their importance in a political context will be cited, but the range of examples will be narrow and lack of development. There may be a lack of balance in the response and thus the full remit of the question will not be addressed.
Level 3	20-30	Good or better knowledge and understanding. Effective analysis and evaluation of political information. The response will deal with both aspects as indicated in the question. Thus a meaningful balance will be achieved. One side of the debate may elicit more response but both sides will show knowledge and analysis. The use of developed examples will allow entry in this level and developed use promotes advancement within the level.