

Mark Scheme (Results) Summer 2015

Pearson Edexcel GCE in Government and
Politics (6GP01/01)

Unit 1: People and Politics

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Publications Code US041699

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

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.

| | |
|---|--|
| No.1(a) | Define democratic legitimacy and outline two ways in which it is achieved |
| Indicative content (<i>The following does not exhaust relevant points or appropriate knowledge</i>) | |
| <p>Democratic legitimacy is the rightful use of, or exercise of power which has been gained or operates through accepted democratic channels. It can be seen to operate in a direct or representative democracy. It can be achieved by some of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It can be obtained via success in elections. • It can be achieved with the use of referendums. • It can be secured by a majority vote in the legislature. • It can be obtained by adherence to accepted constitutional arrangements and procedures. | |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2 marks for a developed description <i>of democratic legitimacy</i>. • Up to 2 marks for each developed way in which democratic legitimacy is achieved. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| No. 1(b) | Explain three ways in which representative democracy in the UK could be improved |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| There have been numerous suggested methods by which representative democracy can be improved in the UK: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electoral reform for the House of Commons. • Introduction of elections for the second chamber. • The use of digital or electronic methods to speed and aid democracy has been suggested, such as e-voting. This would bring politics more into the modern era. • Developing and improving the power of recall of MPs. • The lowering of the voting age from 18 to 16 has been suggested to raise awareness and participation levels and reflect the attitudes of contemporary society. • Compulsory voting for all adults with the sanction of a fine. This would raise participation levels and add to democratic accountability. • Specific methods for strengthening minority representation such as all women shortlists. | |
| A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference is made to at least 2 ways with a limited explanation of how they would improve representative democracy. | |
| A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is discussion of three ways with clear awareness of how they would improve representative democracy. | |
| Level 3 5-7 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-4 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to evaluate and explain the methods and detail the implications of these | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Level 3 3 Marks | Good or better ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 2 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 1 Mark | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1(c) | To what extent is there a democratic deficit in the UK? |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>A democratic deficit is the notion that democracy is failing and not providing the accountability and is lacking in legitimacy. There may be faults in the process of representative democracy.</p> <p>Those who argue that in the UK there is a 'democratic deficit' may cite the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The low turnout at elections at all levels serves to undermine the democratic legitimacy of those who are elected into office. It suggests governments have no real mandate to introduce policies. Also it means that elected officials do not speak or act with the confidence of the majority of citizens. • This leads to wider political malaise endemic in the population with apathy about politics and ignorance of the democratic system. • The inherent bias or flaws in the electoral systems most notably the first-past-the-post system used for Westminster elections • Membership of the EU means that decisions are now taken far away from the legitimate points of power, away from democratically elected legislature and in a non-elected bureaucracy in Brussels. • Undemocratic institutions such as the House of Lords and monarchy. <p>However there are those who deny that there is any sense of democratic deficit and cite the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK democracy has acceptable levels of electoral participation in line with Western democracies, and the arguably low turnout could be portrayed as contentment with rising levels of affluence. • An active media serves to check politicians and elected officials. Corruption is exposed and dealt with. • There is no major demand for electoral reform as seen with the results of the 2011 AV Referendum. • Membership of the EU has widened UK trade and given the country a shared or pooled sovereignty in decision making. • Pressure groups are a supplement to UK democracy, and their membership and influence are arguable growing. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited discussion of both sides of the debate, or a clear discussion of one side of the debate. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear discussion of both sides of the debate showing clear knowledge and understanding. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to analyse and explain the scope of the notion of a democratic deficit. • Ability to analyse and explain conflicting explanations surrounding the alleged democratic deficit. | |
| Level 3 7-9 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 4-6 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 0-3 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as electoral reform, democratic deficit, voter turnout and participation and other relevant and illustrative terminology. | |
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|--|--|
| No.2(a) | Outline the workings of the regional party list electoral system |
| Indicative content (<i>The following does not exhaust relevant points or appropriate knowledge</i>) | |
| <p>The regional party list is used for elections in the UK to the European Parliament for MEPs. The system has the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is a proportional system of voting, not a plurality. • The constituencies are regional and multi-member returning several representatives. • In the closed list voters choose the party not the individual candidate. • In an open list voters are able to choose between candidates as well as between parties. • Parties rank their candidates with those higher on the list having the greater chance of being elected. • Seats are allocated using the d’hondt method. • Some versions of the system use a quota/threshold that parties must achieve in order to gain any seats. <p>Other aspects of the workings may be advanced and developed.</p> | |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 2 marks for each aspect of the workings of the regional party list system. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| No. 2(b) | Explain three disadvantages of proportional representation. |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>There are several disadvantages claimed for proportional electoral systems some of which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complexity. Some systems of proportional representation are overly complex, both in terms of casting the vote (which produces spoilt ballots) and reaching a final outcome (counting and verifying results). • It often produces coalition government which is a compromise outcome and does not deliver single party government with clear lines of accountability. • Some methods of PR remove the representative link/MP constituency link. • The complexity of some PR systems may impact on turnout. • PR tends to allow extremist parties to gain representation. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference is made to at least 2 disadvantages with a limited explanation of why they could be seen as disadvantages. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is discussion of three disadvantages and clear awareness of why they are disadvantages. | |
| Level 3 5-7 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-4 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| AO2 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to analyse and explain the disadvantages of proportional systems. | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Level 3 3 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 2 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 1 Mark | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |

| | |
|--|--|
| No.2(c) | Make out a case in favour of electoral reform for Westminster elections. |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>Electoral reform for Westminster elections would involve the replacement of the first-past-the-post system with one of a number of alternative electoral systems, most of which (but not all) would be more proportional.</p> <p>There are a range of factors in favour of reforming the Westminster electoral system, some of which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The present Westminster electoral system consistently distorts popular political preferences, giving parties majority control of the House of Commons on the basis of a minority of votes. Systems of PR are much better at balancing representation and providing accountability. • There is an inherent bias as parties with concentrated support who gain more seats than their % of vote reflects. This can provide opportunities for 'sea-changes' in political life, without the base of widespread support. • The system becomes distorted when other parties gain credible amount of votes; this damages fair representation. • Turnout has been falling since the 1970's. This contradicts the idea that first past-the-post is appealing to voters as it is "simple" and raises questions of legitimacy. • In reality seats only change hands in marginal constituencies where the balance of ownership is tight – again making votes of unequal worth. • The presence of safe seats also reduces accountability for some MPs who are very unlikely to lose their seats. • There exists a wide range of alternative electoral systems which have far more advantages and less faults than the current Westminster electoral system. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited discussion of a range of points in favour of electoral reform with limited awareness of the alternatives. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear discussion of a range of points in favour of electoral reform with clear awareness of the alternatives. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to analyse and explain the disadvantages of the Westminster system. • Evaluate the positive case for reform | |
| Level 3 7-9 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 4-6 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 0-3 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as voter turnout, tactical voting, strong and stable government amongst other pertinent political terminology | |
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a | Outline two differences between promotional and sectional pressure groups |
| Indicative content (<i>The following does not exhaust relevant points or appropriate knowledge</i>) | |
| <p>A pressure group is a group of like minded people united by a common theme or topic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sectional group is in the main open only to certain groups of people whereas a promotional group has a wider membership remit with fewer restrictions on entry. • A sectional group exists to protect the interests of its members, whereas promotional groups exist to benefit other groups of people/causes. • Sectional groups are more likely to deal with economic issues whereas promotional groups tend to focus on broader issues which may be moral/ethical in character. • Sectional groups are more likely to be permanent and/or insider than promotional groups | |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 mark each for correctly identifying up to two differences between promotional and sectional groups. • Up to 2 additional marks each for developing these differences, which may include the use of illustrative examples. | |

| | |
|--|--|
| No. 3(b) | Using examples, explain three methods used by pressure groups to achieve their aims |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>Pressure groups have used many methods in order to achieve their aims, some of which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many pressure groups use celebrity endorsement to promote their cause. This raises the profile of the pressure group and engages people who may not have been politically active. The success of the campaign for the Ghurkhas was attributed to the recruitment and support of Joanna Lumley who attracted favourable media attention. • The widespread use of media techniques to alert the general public of the validity and worth of the pressure group cause. This ranges from the use of the internet to traditional advertisement in the press. The RSPCA has long been successful in recruiting members and donations with the use of press advertisement. • Insider groups who have a good and positive working relationship with ministers and high ranking civil servants can make direct contact and prevent or promote a particular cause of action or inaction. The BMA and NFU are groups which are both said to enjoy this privilege access to successfully advance their cause. Groups can also use lobbyists to influence ministers as the Save England’s Forests Campaign did. • Pressure groups can also commission surveys and publish these to articulate a certain point of view. If these are independent and verifiable they can raise the profile of the group to achieve their aims. • Pressure groups can access the courts, including the use of judicial review to challenge government actions. Stop HS2 succeeded in forcing the government to repeat their consultation process using this method. • Pressure groups can use a range of methods that could be considered direct action including strikes, press stunts or illegal actions, for example Greenpeace’s ramming of whaling boats. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited reference is made to at least 2 pressure group methods with reference to a relevant example of each. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear reference is made to at 3 methods with explanation of a relevant example of each. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Level 3 5-7 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-4 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to analyse and explain the methods used by pressure groups | |
| Level 3 3 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 2 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 1 Mark | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3(c) | Do pressure groups distribute or concentrate power? |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>This is a question about pluralism and elitism and whilst responses need not reference this explicitly they should focus on the debate as to whether pressure groups spread or concentrate power within society.</p> | |
| <p>Those who favour the notion that pressure groups distribute power cite the following, amongst other points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure groups aid pluralist democracy which rests upon the spread of power brought about by numerous pressure groups of opposing views or interests battling for ascendancy. • A wide diversity in competitive pressure groups will see power being distributed, especially where pressure groups have equal access and thus equal power potential. This can be seen in competitive groups who have political power and influence such as the pro and anti abortion groups and trade unions and employer organizations. • The increasing use of e-democracy and social media has enabled pressure groups to spread awareness and power to a wider audience. • Pressure groups provide a voice to minority groups who otherwise lack representation and power. | |
| <p>Those who favour the notion that pressure groups concentrate power cite the following, amongst other points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure groups possess unequal power and an elite model of power distribution is more accurate a reflection of their status. • The variations in pressure groups are based on many factors including wealth and media support. The NSPCC can also be seen as a pressure group with no limiting opposition. • The government encourages elitism by determining which groups are insiders, and at least in part, which groups succeed in their aims. • Some cite wealthy pressure groups such as the British Banking Association who have little formal opposition; others cite privileged insider groups such as the NFU who have an unfair amount of power. | |
| <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited discussion of both sides of the debate, or a clear discussion of one side of the debate. | |
| <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear discussion of both sides of the debate showing clear knowledge and understanding. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to analyse and explain the concept of power distribution and concentration • Ability to evaluate the different possibilities from concentrated or distributed power. | |
| Level 3 7-9 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 4-6 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 0-3 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as elitism pluralism, insider and outsider status and other pertinent illustrative terminology. | |
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|---|--|
| No.4(a) | Define consensus politics, using an example. |
| Indicative content (<i>The following does not exhaust relevant points or appropriate knowledge</i>) | |
| <p>Consensus politics is where there is widespread and broad agreement over policies and ideas between the main competing parties who vie for governmental office. The main parties subscribe to the same ideological values and principles and will differ only at the margins, in implementation and in managerial style. This consensus will cover areas such as the economy, foreign policy law and order. It contrasts to adversary policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The period from 1945 until the 1970's witnessed the post-war social democratic consensus, or 'Butskellite' consensus. • The period from the mid 1990's saw the emergence of a modern consensus, variously described as the post-Thatcherite, 'third-way' or liberal consensus. <p>Although the coalition is not a valid example of consensus politics in itself, reference to it may form part of an explanation of the post-Thatcherite / third-way consensus.</p> | |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| <p>Up to 3 marks for an accurate definition of consensus politics</p> <p>Up to 3 further marks for an accurate example of consensus politics</p> | |

| | |
|--|---|
| No. 4(b) | Explain three similarities between political parties and pressure groups. |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>Pressure groups and political parties are similar in a number of ways, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both ultimately have the same aims of bringing about political change. • Both attempt to influence and educate the population about significant policy areas – such as the economy and the environment. • Some pressure groups resemble political parties by having a wide issue focus, whilst some political parties resemble pressure groups by having a narrower issue focus, and may be single issue parties. • Pressure groups and political parties may arise from and be part of a larger political movement, such as the Labour Party and trade unions. • Some pressure groups have, like parties, stood for political office albeit for different purposes. • Both pressure groups and political parties rely on recruited members to fund and serve their organisations. • They are both political organisations with similar structures including membership, leaders, conferences etc. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited explanation of at least two similarities. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear explanation of three similarities. | |
| Level 3 5-7 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 2 3-4 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. |

| | |
|--|---|
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to explain the various similarities between the two. | |
| Level 3 3 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 2 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 1 Mark | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |

| | |
|--|--|
| No.4(c) | To what extent do the major political parties agree over policies and ideas? |
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Key knowledge and understanding (<i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>) | |
| <p>The major parties have areas where they agree on policy and ideas and areas where there is difference. It is also accurate to say there are differences in emphasis within certain policy areas between the major parties as opposed to polar divides. Areas discussed may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is common agreement over the economy and the need to reduce the deficit from Labour, the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats. However the Conservatives seek not only to eliminate the deficit in the life of the Parliament but to return the UK to surplus though a further £12 billion cut in government spending with the suggested axe in welfare in areas such as a benefit cap. Labour and the Lib Dems merely seek deficit reduction whilst the SNP and the Greens demand an end to austerity and government cuts. • With regard to the EU there are a range of policies and ideas. At one end UKIP seek the UK's withdrawal from the EU, the Conservatives plan a renegotiation and referendum on membership in 2017. Labour and the Lib Dems (and the nationalist parties) are much more pro-EU. • A similar spectrum of views have been presented on immigration. At one end UKIP sought to introduce a points based immigration system whilst other parties sought to reduced numbers overall. Lib Dems and Green tended towards more neutral or pro-immigration policies. • All parties pledged to provide more money and resources for the NHS, although there were disagreement about how much, and about the merits of private sector involvement and commissioning boards. • The Conservatives have pledged to extend the 'Right to buy' to tenants in housing associations, whilst the other parties offered more commitment to providing more social housing. • UKIP and the Conservative parties were disposed to offer more English votes on English issues. All parties showed a commitment to further devolution to the regions. Both parties promise House of Lords reform but the Conservatives do not prioritise it as highly as some others. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited discussion of both sides of the debate, or a clear discussion of one side of the debate. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear discussion of both sides of the debate showing clear knowledge and understanding. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Intellectual skills relevant to this question | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to analyse the policy and idea similarities in the major UK political parties • Ability to evaluate these similarities and consider their impact | |
| Level 3 7-9 Marks | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 2 4-6 Marks | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| Level 1 0-3 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences. |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Appropriate vocabulary in this question may include terms such as left wing, right wing, consensus and adversarial politics and other pertinent illustrative terminology. | |
| Level 3 6-8 Marks | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 2 3-5 Marks | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 1 0-2 Marks | Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary |

