

# Government and Politics

Advanced GCE A2 7834

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3834

## Report on the Units

---

**January 2007**

3834/7834/MS/R/07J

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A-level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE Government and Politics (7834)

### Advanced Subsidiary GCE Government and Politics (3834)

#### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	1
2595	Elections, Electoral Systems and Voting Behaviour in the UK	2
2596	Politics of the UK	4
2597	Government of the UK	6
2694	US Government & Politics	9
2695	Political Ideas and Concepts	11
*	Grade Thresholds	13



## ***Report on the Units Taken in January 2007***

### **Chief Examiner's Report**

It was a refreshingly uncomplicated session. Centres clearly responded positively to the changes to unit 2597: Government of the UK. The fact that the EU does not have to be studied any more is popular in places. What was good to see was that many still centres did study the EU and do it very well. Like it or not, the EU will play a major part in our political life for decades to come, and many feel that it should be a major component of any AS Politics course. What will be required with the new specifications remains to be seen. Clarification is gradually emerging on issues such as "Stretch and Challenge" and "Quality of Written Communication", as well as on required specification content. OCR's intention is to get the new specifications into centres by autumn 2007.

As always we encourage knowledge of contemporary politics and examiners are encouraged to reward recent relevant examples, in both UK and US politics. Do stress this to candidates. Many used the "cash for honors" breaking case in the question in unit 2595: Elections, Electoral Systems and Voting Behaviour on election funding as an exemplar and that was good to see. Do encourage such use. Quality of Written Communication did improve this series and this made it much easier to award high marks. It is always worth while stressing to candidates that good performance in this respect does make a difference to their overall mark.

Centres should take care in 2595 and 2596: Politics of the UK, to ensure full coverage of the specifications. We know that it is not easy in the time available and take steps to make it easier for the candidates. For example, in the Sources in 2595 there is a tendency to use material on the less frequently studied topics such as the EU and Welsh electoral systems and expect 'own knowledge' on the UK system. There are realistic expectations of what it is possible to get candidates to do in the time available in terms of content. All the Principal Examiners for AS are very experienced AS and A Level teachers of Politics and are well aware of what is reasonable to expect from a seventeen year old doing possibly three other AS levels as well.

There are still signs that centres are teaching some topics in too much depth, and therefore not getting the time to cover all the topics in 2595 and 2596 where there is no choice of question.

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

### **2595: Elections, Electoral Systems and Voting Behaviour in the UK**

#### **General Comments**

Candidates rose to the challenges and then performed poorly on well known topics. As always there was very variable use of the sources. It does often appear to that if the candidates know something about the topic, they ignore the source, and if they don't, they use it very well. More candidates than normal did not do the questions in the 'right' order. More of those seemed to have problems in finishing in the required time than those who did the questions in the 'right' order, and none of those which I saw who got full marks did them in the 'wrong' order. It makes no difference to an examiner, but does seem to make a difference to the candidates.

- 1 It was really good to see the majority of candidates answer this question. What was involved in 'features' bothered some. Lots of good candidates picked up plenty of marks from the source – as was intended. The proportionality of the system, the scope for minor parties, the multi member constituency etc were the main points made. Few commented on the turnout. The fact it was a closed list system with fixed terms etc were the main components of 'own knowledge'. A significant minority made no use of the source at all which made it difficult to get out of Level 2 marks. Inevitably a fair number wasted time on the inequities of the system and its tendency to produce the dreaded coalition governments.
- 2 On the whole this was well done. It was a very straightforward question. Some did not read the source titles correctly and thought that the first table referred to elections for the Scottish parliament and wasted a lot of time on how good (or bad) that system was. The better ones spotted the fact that the Conservatives got 16% of the vote and 2% of the seats in the general election there, while the SNP got 18% and 10% respectively. The second table was usually well used. Lots of other points were made, such as the wasted vote, two party dominance, the 'winner takes all', growing apathy and lowering turnout etc. As always a fair number felt it necessary to stress the advantages of the present system producing a 'strong' government and we were regularly warned of the dangers that coalitions would bring to our system (again). The best adopted a two paragraph approach, basing the first one of the source and the second on own knowledge.
- 3 This on the whole was much better done than we thought it might be, as the topic is not one of the more regular features of this paper. The whole 'cash for peerages' issue tended to be very well known and was usually very well used. Many made the good point stressing that the need for parties to raise money for elections had led to the whole crisis which was now threatening to seriously damage both the Prime Minister and his government. Many had detailed knowledge of the whole Ecclestone affair which was well used (it has obviously been much taught, as for years candidates have used it when it was in no way relevant). Less relevant was the endless detail we got on the 'cash for questions' issue with the Harrods owner and Hamilton. Many candidates clearly know their scandal and like to write about it. Quite a lot had a 'the case for the state funding of political parties' essay prepared, so that proved very useful. There was a lot of good information there and often well used, about the relevant legislation and Neill Report. The source was extremely well used by many. Points such as secrecy, the 'business case', the loophole in the Electoral Commission's rules etc, where the spirit of the law was being broken etc. The AO2 and AO3 marks tended to be very high.

## ***Report on the Units Taken in January 2007***

- 4 This question was not well done which surprised us. We have tended to get lot of answers to this question when we have not asked it, so to get mediocrity when we finally did, was unusual. We were looking for a fairly straightforward case each way. There was lot of points in the source which were often ignored. The A/B Conservative decline between 1992 and 2005 is an obvious one, and what happened to Labour's ethnic vote between the two elections was another. Those who had little knowledge of their own and just used the sources sensibly and added some explanation tended to get reasonable Level 3 marks. There were plenty of good answers which had strong arguments in favour of one side, but showed enough awareness of the 'other side' to get high Level 4 marks. Those who were trained to adopt a four paragraph approach, the first being the case 'for', using the source, the second based on own knowledge, the third being the case 'against' using the source etc. There was not the sureness of touch in what was involved in 'discuss' as there was last summer.

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

### **2596: Politics of the UK**

#### **General comments**

This paper produced the familiar range of answers although perhaps fewer scripts were particularly weak ie most candidates produced were able to display some knowledge of each of the areas questioned. Again, virtually all candidates attempted all the questions and the majority of papers showed an appropriate balance of shorter answers to the early questions with more time devoted to questions 3 and 4.

The instruction to use continuous prose was followed and standards of spelling, punctuation and grammar were improved upon previous examination sessions.

As is often the case, questions three and four proved to be the best discriminators with more variety in terms of range and depth of knowledge as well the ability to evaluate in a balanced manner.

In terms of techniques, fewer candidates attempted to write essays for Question 3/4. Whilst starting with a background setting paragraph may be advisable where time and space permit, in this paper candidates might typically devote 16/17 minutes to Question 3 and perhaps 22/23 minutes to Question 4. Given the time constraint, candidates are advised to be focused directly on the question from the start.

#### **Comments on the Individual Questions**

1 A straightforward and familiar question that presented few problems. Almost all candidates had some awareness of citizenship. In part (i), examiners were wanting candidates to appreciate 'active' citizenship rather than just defining citizenship *per se*. Candidates often produced a range of good examples of active citizenship and thus regularly scored full marks. In part (ii) best candidates distinguished between obligations and expectations but again most candidates were able to achieve Level 4 marks. Again the use of examples helped to increase the scores.

2 Examiners were looking for a range of roles, described with appropriate development and ideally, an example from both the Labour and Conservative parties. Nearly all answers achieved Level three or four responses, describing opportunities to influence policy, links between the leaderships and grassroots, chances to promote the party, maintain unity and for leading figures in the party to develop their credentials. Many referred to the recent Conservative Party presentations by candidates for the leadership. Fewer candidates appreciated the potential role for the Labour Party in leader / deputy elections or the role of the conference in relation to the National Executive Committee.

Many candidates were aware of the changes to the role of the Labour Party vis à vis the National Policy Forum or indeed the existence of alternative venues for policy debates in the Conservative Party.

3 Candidates scored more marks for knowledge than evaluation for this question.

Examiners notice that almost invariably, candidates see questions on pressure groups as an opportunity to present their definition of a pressure group and of their knowledge of various typologies. At times, this can score marks, depending upon the question asked. If candidates feel compelled to offer such knowledge, they should ensure that they specifically relate definitions / typologies to the question set and this was regularly not the case in this situation.

Success in this case, turned on understanding of representative democracy and how groups may add to it or cause problems. Candidates who identified a range of



## ***Report on the Units Taken in January 2007***

contributions (perhaps four) that were assessed could certainly score in Level 4. The reluctance to evaluate in a balanced manner often caused candidates to score well in AO1 but notably under-perform in AO2.

Evidence and examples were in short supply and therefore unable to support assertions offered.

- 4 Candidates commonly found this question to be the most challenging on the paper. Examiners were prepared to accept answers that concentrated on policy rather than ideology but even so, candidates' knowledge of contemporary party policies tended to be vague, superficial (eg Labour and Conservatives agree on education and the NHS without fuller development) or inaccurate.

Weaker answers asserted that both parties have moved to the political centre but were unable to provide detail in support of this statement. A further reason for candidates to struggle was an over-concentration on psephological matters ('Labour are no longer a party for the working class') without using this in relation to the question.. Whilst examiners might accept this as associated with ideological change, the question required specific attention to ideological knowledge.

It was relatively rare for candidates to offer knowledge of ideological or policy differences between Labour and the Conservatives eg over constitutional matters. All too frequently, candidates accepted the question's proposition without challenge, perceiving no difference whatsoever in the ideologies of the Labour and Conservative Parties.

It is often true that weaker answers have a tendency to resort to little more than opinion ('I believe Labour and the Conservatives are the same.'). This was often the case with regards to this question.

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

### **2597: Government of the UK**

#### **General Comments**

There was no reason to believe that candidates were confused by this first examination of the recently revised specification for this unit. No more of them seem to misinterpret the rubric than in previous years and the vast majority appreciated the need to write more in answer to part (b) than part (a) of the questions.

Some centres had clearly prepared their students well for the exam, with large numbers gaining more than 100/120. That said, some candidates answered the questions they had chosen very briefly, or didn't have the breadth of knowledge to tackle three questions.

As usual, weak candidates chose to ignore the questions, sometimes in worryingly large numbers, and to write about any aspect of topic they felt more comfortable with. For example, when asked to describe the main features of the membership of the Commons and Lords, they outlined their functions, and when asked about the role of the major EU institutions, they described their membership. In some cases these candidates gained no marks at all: it is difficult even for generous examiners to give any credit for a response in answer to a question on the individual responsibility of ministers when a candidate insists on writing entirely about the collective responsibility of the government.

Generally the examiners were pleased with the way the exam worked. Good candidates were able to score very highly, very often, on the part (a) of questions, but the slightly longer length of the part (b) questions allowed for greater discrimination.

It was also encouraging to note that the question on the judiciary attracted significantly more answers than has been the case in the past and that answers to the question on the EU were common and far more focused.

#### **Advising candidates**

Centres may care to pass the following advice on to candidates.

- The examiners are looking for:
  - focus: have you answered the question set?
  - range: have you included a number of different points?
  - balance: in part (b) have you discussed both sides of the question?
  - depth and detail: have you explained your point fully and included examples?
- So:
  - Identify exactly what the question is asking you to do and do it: get to the point straight away and stick to it
  - Don't write an introduction or a conclusion - they are not necessary and waste time and words
  - Write short, sharp, paragraphs - 50 to 75 words is ideal - in short, sharp, sentences
  - For part (a), just do exactly what the question asks for and no more, and for part (b), try to make six points in six paragraphs
  - When a part (b) question asks you to 'Discuss the view that ...' you must provide a balanced answer, that is you must look at both sides of the question
  - Spend 20 minutes on each question: 6 minutes on part (a), writing about 100 words and 14 minutes on part (b), writing about 300 words. If it helps, imagine an open, double page of the answer booklet and try and fill the first ½ page answering part (a) and the remaining 1½ pages answering part (b)

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

### **Comments on Individual Questions**

1. Explain what a constitution is / Discuss the view that the British constitution has been subject to fundamental change since 1997.
  - (a) Most candidates knew what a constitution was, but fewer were able to explain it in any detail, for example by distinguishing between its function in describing the structure of government and outlining the rights of the individual. A large number of candidates provided a very brief explanation of what a constitution was but then went into considerable detail about the sources and principles of the British constitution. This was not asked for and not rewarded.
  - (b) Candidates who knew what changes to the constitution had taken place 1997, and who were able to make some brief assessment of their importance, did well. Weaker candidates typically made no reference to any reforms at all, discussed the case for and against a written constitution or devoted themselves exclusively to the impact of the EU on British sovereignty since 1971.
2. Outline the main features of the membership of the House of Commons and the House of Lords / Discuss the view that parliament is unrepresentative.
  - (a) Most candidates did not the usual mistake of only writing about one chamber, but often restricted themselves to one aspect of membership, for example, demographic features. A surprising number ignored the question entirely and wrote about the functions of parliament and therefore got not marks at all.
  - (b) Most candidates had little trouble discussing why parliament may, or may not, be unrepresentative. Again those who restricted themselves to discussing age, gender and ethnicity did not do as well as those who considered a wider range of features.
3. Outline the convention of individual ministerial responsibility / Discuss the view that individual ministerial responsibility is no longer important in British politics.
  - (a) For what might be regarded as a central principle of British government, a larger than expected number of candidates confused individual ministerial responsibility with collective responsibility, either in whole or in part. Some did so completely, that they were awarded no marks at all. A number of candidates also thought that this was a question about MPs and whipping.
  - (b) Where candidates had failed to identify individual ministerial responsibility correctly in part (a), inevitably their answers to part (b) were usually equally often way off-track, however, most candidates were able to provide a good response to this question.
4. Outline the main features of the rule of law / Discuss the view that the judiciary has too much power in the British political system.
  - (a) Most of those who attempted this question had a clear idea of what the rule of law was, though, as with the question on the constitution, some were better able to expand upon the basic principle. A few candidates grasped at straws and missed.
  - (b) There were a number of good responses to this question, though some candidates focused entirely on social background.

## ***Report on the Units Taken in January 2007***

5. Outline the roles of the principal institutions of the EU / Discuss the view that the EU is a democratic organisation.
  - (a) Well-prepared candidates found this question a rich seam to mine, though many simply, and unnecessarily, listed the institutions first in their opening paragraph before going on to repeat themselves when outlining their role. Weaker candidates ignored the question entirely and described membership.
  - (b) The traditional Euro-rant was much less in evidence this session, and candidates often ranged widely over the EU seeking evidence for its democratic pretensions - or lack of them. Inevitably large numbers of candidates devoted sometimes quite lengthy and entirely irrelevant paragraphs to the ECHR.

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

### **2694: US Government & Politics**

#### **General Comments**

There were still too many prepared answers where candidates spotted a key word in the title, like 'pressure group', and then wrote the essay they wanted to write on it. A lack of recent and relevant information often stopped clearly good candidates getting the very highest grades. There were many totally theoretical answers which made no reference at all to contemporary US politics. There were also too many list writers who resolutely refused to 'discuss' or 'evaluate' when asked to. Spelling was occasionally poor especially with words which are actually in the essay title. 'Principle' when asked about the 'principal weaknesses' came up a lot and a significant minority were totally incapable of spelling 'amend' correctly although it is clearly in the essay title.

On the whole it was found to be a perfectly accessible paper, with the full range of questions being attempted.

- 1 Many candidates answered this question. There were some excellent answers which surveyed a wide range of weaknesses and made a real attempt to prioritise them. Those who argued that one specific weakness, be it cost, longevity or whatever was more damaging than others tended to do very well, especially if they backed it up with recent examples from 2000 and 2004. Some brought in the early manoeuvring of the Democrats, but the spelling of the current two main contenders often defeated them. We had no idea how many variants there were to 'Hillary'. There were rather a lot of theoretical lists. Some had a 'case for and against the use of primaries' essay to peddle which often stayed at the lower end of Level 3 when a more focused use of the information could have brought in lot more marks. It was sad that often a good grasp of a complex topic coupled with quite a depth of knowledge did not always bring in very good marks as the candidate simply did not tackle the question set. Some candidates clearly got primaries badly confused with the Electoral College.
- 2 There were some exceptional answers to this question. Clearly some centres do the topic thoroughly and do it well. Their candidates have a good grasp of what has been happening in US politics in the past decade or so and we got some superb discussion based on their ideas about 'compassionate conservatism' and Clinton's 'New Democrats'. Those that clearly separated ideology from policy invariably did well. Harder to mark were those who had a good grasp of recent party politics and left it to us to deduce whether there was much of an ideological difference there or not. Some had a voting behaviour essay to offer and felt this was the right place to do it. These candidates seldom got out of Level 1 as so little was of relevance. Again there were a couple of centres who had some very good candidates, but were using textbooks / notes which were dreadfully out of date. The South is no longer solidly Democrat, and has not been for a very long time.
- 3 The better candidates clearly did some thinking about the 'importance' of their roles and rose above the standard AS list of the role of pressure groups we so often get. Their importance to the US system in particular needed emphasising and the better ones also illustrated the points they made with recent and relevant examples. Too often we just got a very standard list of roles which could have applied to almost any democracy with little or no reference to the US. There are still many centres that seem to have only the NRA to call upon as an example. There were an awful lot of the 'threat to democracy' essays which tended to get few AO2 marks. Having Enron as the main example did not help much either. The prepared essay still will not go away.

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

- 4 The inability of so many to copy the word 'amend' correctly from the title was alarming. It was surprising that so many found it necessary to put at least 3 and frequently 4 'm's into amendment. Apart from that it tended to be both a popular and well done question. The better ones rose above just writing a list of reasons and tried to prioritise what they felt were the major ones and why. Those who just produced a rather heavy handed list with only limited attempts to 'discuss' made it difficult for us to award much in the way of AO2 marks. However good the details are we can only allocate 12 marks to that aspect of an essay. There has to be a genuine and obvious attempt to 'discuss' to pick up the AO2 marks. One frequently made error on this question is to give the President a major role in the whole process.
- 5 Like the previous question it was both popular and well done. Again there were too many lists and not quite enough 'evaluation', but on the whole there was a better grasp of the machinations of Congress and the influences on voting behaviour of its members than has been the case in the past. There were some very good ones who did not quite get 100% as their knowledge was very theoretical and there was a lack of recent and relevant examples.
- 6 This essay did cause some problems. Candidates wanted to write an essay on 'success' and in many cases just did so. It was surprising how many simply ignored the word 'effective' altogether and even started their essays by writing 'The main reason for a President's success is....' One candidate realised at the end of the essay that they had got the key word wrong, and simply went through the essay crossing out the word 'success' and putting 'effective' in instead as if that might help. It did not. The best thought about what 'effective' might mean in this context (and they came up with some very interesting ideas which were highly rewarded) and then considered those criteria in relation to Reagan and his successors. A couple of centres were very good in this respect, but their knowledge of Presidents seems to have stopped with Carter which probably kept them out of the really high AO1 marks. Those who focused on Bush-Clinton-Bush did best. We were surprised that an essay which differed only very slightly from the 'norm' should produce so much irrelevance and an inability to cope.
- 7 This was a popular essay and it produced a very varied response. We were surprised to see so little discussion of the recent appointments given the publicity they have been given in the quality UK press, let alone the US coverage. Candidates tended to be very good on the details of Clarence Thomas' private life prior to appointment, but vague on the Roberts appointment. Again the prepared essay reared its head, and we got a lot of an essay set before, on whether Supreme Court appointments were more important than Cabinet ones. Detailed discussions on the impact of Ms Rice's work did not win any marks here. Some candidates were very good on many of the key points, such as the presidential 'legacy', the ideological balance of the court etc, but made no mention of judicial review which made it hard to mark. We only credit what is there and do not penalise candidates for leaving things out, but that was quite a serious omission. As always we found that many candidates seem unaware that the Supreme Court has dealt with more than two cases since 1945, Brown and Roe v Wade. The better candidates came up with a good range of reasons, (including the impact of judicial review!) and were well aware of key developments and appointments in the past decade.
- 8 Those who knew their stuff and kept the focus firmly on the Senate did well. Again the best candidates thought about 'effective' and really tried hard to prioritise. Some just wrote lists of the checks with little or no attempt to analyse their effectiveness. This is not the way to pick up AO2 marks. We did accept those powers which were shared with the House. There were centres that had a very good knowledge of events in the Clinton - GW Bush presidencies who used that very effectively. Those who clearly had done their homework on the Roberts/Alito appointments found that information very useful here as well as on Question 7, but often knowledge on treaty ratification, appointments, declaration of war could be very hazy.

## **Report on the Units Taken in January 2007**

### **2695 Political Ideas and Concepts**

With a limited number of candidates entered for this module it was difficult to gain a full appreciation of the range of ability. Whilst unfortunately there were some candidates who lacked the necessary understanding and sophistication to tackle essay questions on political theory, there were also a pleasing number who had been thoroughly prepared and had impressive knowledge of relevant political ideas. Many produced text book answers showing a great propensity to learn almost verbatim chunks of information from the most widely used texts written by Andrew Heywood. Unfortunately these answers did not always adapt the information to suit the specific question asked on the exam paper.

Another factor that distinguished the quality of answers was the ability to understand a range of relevant theories and relate ideas to individual political theorists. Some weak answers showed almost a general studies approach in hypothesising personal opinions based upon a very limited understanding and knowledge of political theory. Some answers whilst displaying a reasonable knowledge of relevant ideas, were highly descriptive in their explanation of the issues, thus limiting themselves in achieving AO2 marks.

#### **Comments on the Individual questions**

##### **1 Assess what is required to make government legitimate**

This proved popular question that required candidates to relate theories of legitimation to the practice of government. The most obvious relation to theory came from writers such as Weber and Beetham in their discussions on the right to rule (Weber) and the three principles behind legitimate government (Beetham). A number of good answers went on to consider Marxist and neo-Marxist interpretations regarding issues such as the existence of a bourgeois hegemony and a legitimation crisis amongst modern capitalist governments. Where some answers tended to lose focus was in a broad discussion of power and authority alongside legitimacy. Still some candidates had prepared for and were determined to answer a question comparing between power and authority!

##### **2 Compare and contrast the principal elements of Marxism and social democracy**

This question also proved popular as many centres focus much of their preparation time on the topic of ideology. Whilst most candidates had a good understanding of the key principles of socialism and also of Marxism, fewer had such a confident grasp of social democracy. This led to some very uneven answers that tended to write mostly on Marxism making only vague generalisations when comparing the two ideological strands. In order to access the higher levels for analysis and evaluation candidates were expected to highlight similarities and differences between the two ideologies. Areas that could have been considered were attitudes to equality, human nature, the role of the state, reforming or abolishing capitalism, and revolution or gradualism.

##### **3 Evaluate the justifications for limiting individual liberty**

There was much scope here for candidates to evaluate a wide range of ideological justifications ranging from conservative theories through to liberal (classical and modern) and socialist ideas. Many candidates tended to limit their justifications to only liberal aspects, particularly classical liberal writings such as those of Mill and Locke. A significant number also wrote generally about the meaning of liberty, spending much time discussing issues such as negative and positive liberty without relating this distinction to the question set. Some very good answers were able to evaluate the justifications utilising a wide range of ideas and also consider the extent of the limitations being advocated.

## ***Report on the Units Taken in January 2007***

### **4 Discuss the justifications for political revolutions**

The better answers to this question were able to discuss a range of justifications for a variety of different revolutions, ranging from Marxist, through to liberal and nationalist arguments. Where a significant number of candidates did lose focus was when they attempted to answer the question by using arguments relating to justifications for civil disobedience. The ideas of Gandhi, Martin Luther King and Thoreau cannot really be used to call for a complete overthrow of the system of government which is the common understanding of what a revolution seeks to achieve.

### **5 Analyse the most important characteristics of the modern state**

Many candidates did show an understanding of the important characteristics of the state, including sovereignty, territorial boundaries, and compulsory jurisdiction. Many however sought to answer the question through applying models of the purpose of the state. Whilst these do highlight some of the characteristics of the modern state they often do so implicitly. Candidates who did adopt this route did receive credit for their appreciation that the attitude towards what the duties of the state does vary dependent upon the ideological perspective.

### **6 Discuss where sovereignty is best located in a democratic state**

This proved not to be a popular question on the paper. Those that did attempt it did have a reasonable knowledge of aspects of internal sovereignty, although a number did tend to lose focus by writing lengthy discussions on aspects of external sovereignty. Few candidates really considered the democratic aspect to the question, thus not developing issues such as popular and parliamentary sovereignty.

### **7 Assess the need for a separation of powers in government**

The least popular question on the paper on an area of the specification that now will disappear from the syllabus content. Those that attempted it had some good understanding of arguments in favour relating to classical liberal thinkers such as Locke, Madison and Montesquieu. In considering the alternate perspective many related argument to traditional British attitudes towards accepting fused government with built in checks and balances.

### **8 Assess which is more important for democracy, government by the people or for the people**

Whilst this question proved very popular it often failed to fully comprehend the by and for aspects relating to democracy. Most were able to relate the ideas to direct and indirect democracy, but some saw it as an opportunity to answer a question on the models of representation. Whilst this could be made relevant, especially in taking the trustee model to be a form of interest representation (for) and the delegate model to directly link to serving the opinions directly of the people (by), many unfortunately produced lengthy descriptions of each. Too many candidates still refer to Plato, Hobbes, and Burke as advocates of democracy – enough to make each turn in their grave!



**Advanced GCE Government and Politics (3834/7834)  
January 2007 Assessment Series**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
<b>2595</b>	Raw	100	75	67	59	52	45	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2596</b>	Raw	100	71	63	55	47	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2597</b>	Raw	100	92	81	70	59	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
<b>2694</b>	Raw	90	71	63	56	49	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
<b>2695</b>	Raw	90	70	61	53	45	37	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0

**Specification Aggregation Results**

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
<b>3834</b>	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
<b>7834</b>	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
<b>3834</b>	23.8	52.4	66.7	90.5	95.2	100	23
<b>7834</b>	0	55.6	88.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	9

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see;  
[www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp](http://www.ocr.org.uk/OCR/WebSite/docroot/understand/ums.jsp)

Statistics are correct at the time of publication

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

(General Qualifications)  
Telephone: 01223 553998  
Facsimile: 01223 552627  
Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

