



General Certificate of Education

Government and Politics 5151

GOV2 Parties and Pressure Groups

Mark Scheme

2006 examination - June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Introduction

AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principles of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

Using a levels of response mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

Examiners should initially make a decision about which Level any given response should be placed in. Having determined the appropriate Level the examiners must then choose the precise mark to be given within that Level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the Level, where that Level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest whether the middle mark is unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the Level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?"

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (GOV1, GOV2, GOV3)**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 8 marks)**

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (3 – 4 marks) The candidate successfully demonstrates accurate or generally accurate knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p> <p>Where appropriate, the candidate is able to illustrate his/her answer with relevant evidence/example(s).</p>	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (2 marks) The candidate provides an appropriate analysis of political data, concept(s) or term(s) showing an awareness of differing viewpoints where appropriate.</p>	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary.</p>
	<p>Levels 1 – 2 (1 – 2 marks) The candidate demonstrates slight or basic knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p> <p>The candidate may illustrate his/her answer with evidence/example(s) of limited relevance.</p>	<p>Levels 1 – 2 (1 mark) The candidate provides a superficial or partial analysis of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p>	<p>Levels 1 – 2 (1 mark) The candidate communicates with limited clarity and effectiveness using a limited political vocabulary.</p>

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (GOV1, GOV2, GOV3)

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 22 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (10 – 11 marks) The candidate successfully demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing an answer that deploys relevant knowledge and understanding to address the requirements of the question and that demonstrates significant contextual awareness.</p> <p>The candidate’s answer includes relevant evidence and/or examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7 marks) The candidate evaluates political institutions, processes and behaviour, applying appropriate concepts and theories.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis which displays sound awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with valid and precise comparisons. The answer includes relevant and convincing interpretations or explanations.</p>	<p>Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate communicates clear arguments and explanations using accurate political vocabulary. The candidate produces answers with a clear sense of direction leading towards a coherent conclusion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (7 – 9 marks) The candidate demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing an answer that addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates adequate contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer provides evidence backed up by clear examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5 – 6 marks) The candidate evaluates political institutions, processes and behaviour, applying some concepts or theories.</p> <p>The candidate provides clear arguments and explanations and demonstrates awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with some sound comparison.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and explanations using some political vocabulary. A conclusion is linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (continued)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (4 – 6 marks) The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationship between them. He/she makes a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question, and may produce limited evidence and/or few examples.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3 – 4 marks) The candidate offers a simplistic evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour and begins to construct arguments which contain basic explanation.</p> <p>The candidate shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is recognition of basic parallels or simplistic comparisons.</p>	<p>Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate attempts to develop an argument using basic political vocabulary. Where a conclusion is offered, its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1 – 3 marks) The candidate demonstrates slight and/or incomplete knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationship between them.</p> <p>The candidate makes a very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the context of the question is evident and the few examples cited are often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 – 2 marks) The candidate makes a partial attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes and behaviour. Arguments offered are superficial. There is very limited awareness of parallels or comparisons.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The answer relies upon narrative which is not fully coherent and which is expressed without using political vocabulary. A conclusion is either not offered or it is not related to the preceding material.</p>

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

(a) Explain the term *candidate selection* used in the extract.

(8 marks)

Candidates may define candidate selection in terms of the political party function of recruitment. All MPs and most councillors are first nominated by political parties (which also recommend individuals for appointment to other posts such as school governors). Parties at all levels also play a role in candidate selection for leadership elections. The mechanics of candidate selection - likely candidates 'doing the round' of local parties in search for nomination. The interview; reselection; deselection.

(b) 'Power inside both the Conservative and Labour parties is concentrated in their respective leaderships.' Discuss.

(22 marks)

Candidates may argue, with examples, within the frameworks of Michels/McKenzie, Beer, etc and pursue an elitist or pluralist explanation. There is likely to be a description of party structures along with an assessment of whether or not conferences, policy fora, parliamentary parties, etc enhance the power of the leadership or membership. Some candidates might pick up on the stimulus content and discuss, for example, the use of internal party ballots - did William Hague's ballot represent an example of plebiscitary democracy which allowed the constituency parties to shape policy, or was it a device which strengthened (temporarily) his position in the party? Likewise for Tony Blair's ballot on replacing Clause Four of the party's constitution. Some candidates may refer to ideology or policy as the main focus of their argument contrasting 'moderate' leadership policy with more 'radical' grassroots positions, citing different forms of socialism and conservatism or specific policies. Some, alternatively, may portray factions or tendencies as vertical cleavages running from top to bottom of parties, rather than representing any horizontal split between the leadership and the rest. Actual policies may be referred to in support of arguments, notably current government policy on Iraq or welfare policies and Conservative policy on EU matters. There may be reference to the formal powers of party leaders - such as the power of Conservative leaders to appoint Cabinet/Shadow cabinet members, party chairmen and party treasurers, with parallels drawn with the Labour leader's powers regarding Joint Policy Committees, reduced trade union influence, appointment, OMOV, etc. Candidates might elaborate their answers with the detail of the changing role of parties' grassroots memberships with modern party organisations. The implications of declining numbers of non-representative, extremist (and ageing) memberships, possibly supplanted by polling, focus groups, media professionals, etc within the power structure. The absence of grassroots voices in the election of Michael Howard to the Conservative leadership may be referred to in this context. Both parties must be considered in the answer but not necessarily given equal weight. There should be a conclusion which assesses the accuracy of the question's quotation.

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

- (a) Explain the phrase *ideological rather than national groupings* used in the extract. (8 marks)

Candidates are likely to take their lead from the extract and argue that politically the European Parliament is organised into blocks of ideologically organised parties rather than national groupings. Examples might include those cited, or extend to European Liberals or Greens. Since these groupings are not as cohesive as national parties there is little formal discipline within the groups. There are a handful of non-attached MEPs, including the Rev Ian Paisley.

- (b) To what extent are Britain's major parties based on distinctive ideologies? (22 marks)

Candidates will refer to more than one party, but there need not be an equal balance of focus within answers on each party examined. Some candidates will explore the concept of ideology and present ideologies such as liberalism in terms of their core values (individualism, freedom, political/legal equality); Conservatism (values associated with traditional or neo-liberal tendencies) and/or socialism (old Labour values and third way) and draw parallels with the major parties. They may identify values or policies which connect with these distinctive ideologies. Others may argue that ideologies have converged and no longer offer the basis of different parties. It is possible that some candidates will draw the distinction between parties in opposition and parties in power, with the former having greater freedom to exhibit ideological purity. They may explore reasons why this situation comes about and argue that all parties are pragmatic, rather than ideological or programmatic. They may refer to policy changes which have occurred after a party moves from opposition to office, such as Labour's opposition policy of Britain's withdrawal from Europe compared with the Labour Government's (when the time is right) pro-Euro policy. Some may argue that conventional left-right differences on an ideological spectrum no longer apply and new dimensions now divide parties such as liberal/authoritarian inclinations or the propensity to intervene. A few might mention the 'end of ideology' and deny that ideology can separate catch-all parties. Some might refer to factors such as 'spin' and news and image management, and an emphasis on leadership, in the context of the parties' ideological decline. There should be a conclusion which makes a general or number of specific assessments on parties and their ideologies.

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

(a) Explain the term *civil disobedience* used in the extract.

(8 marks)

Candidates should be aware that civil disobedience involves protest which breaks the law, with the strongest responses aware that it is not normally associated with violence. Civil disobedience usually involves a moral protest, generally against government, which is open and overt but which breaks the law and accepts the resulting penalty as part of the protest. Examples might include the CND (past and relatively recent examples) or fox hunters who persist after the sport has been made illegal. The term ‘civil disobedience’ may be defined widely by candidates – many interpretations are acceptable although distinctions must be drawn between eg civil disobedience and terrorism.

(b) Why might different pressure groups use different methods in their attempts to influence government?

(22 marks)

Candidates are likely to answer within an insider/outsider or sectional/cause framework with different methods attributed accordingly. Others may analyse in terms of resources available to specific groups and draw parallels between different methods and different resources at hand. For example, the financial strength and organisational capabilities of the CBI facilitates methods of influencing government different from groups which possess fewer financial resources but have the ability to disrupt government or inconvenience the public (the Fuel Protesters). Other resources considered by candidates might include the size of membership or the number of activists this includes, links with parties or government, or the support of public opinion. Some may consider the role of professional lobbyists, the privileged position of some groups in their network/corporatist links, the development of new social movements as well as conventional pressure groups or focus specifically on use made of the mass media. Some candidates will pick up the different methods listed in the stimulus material and make this the starting point of their analyses. Case studies or examples will include, for example, the trade unions, environmental lobby, business groups and countryside groups. Others may consider pressure group in terms of the ‘reasonableness’ of their demands in the current political culture and assess how this influences the methods employed. It might be observed by some candidates that there is a trend of increasing activism even amongst previously ‘respectable’ groups such as the NFU (Farmers for Action). There should be a conclusion which explains why different groups do, or do not, use different methods in their attempts to seek influence.

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

- (a) Explain the term *pressure group pluralism* used in the passage. (8 marks)

Candidates will elaborate upon the brief reference in the extract by portraying pressure group behaviour as a competition to win political influence. Groups do not have equal resources but no group is powerless. Groups may be involved in coalition building and compromise. A few candidates may explain the concept through contrasts with elitism or corporatism or another rival framework. Pluralism might be defined by some candidates with reference to pressure group diversity rather than the distribution of power between different groups.

- (b) A Cabinet Minister once described pressure groups as creatures which strangle efficient government. How justified is this view of pressure groups today? (22 marks)

This question invites candidates to consider aspects of the frequently presented case against pressure group politics. It can be expected that many candidates will challenge the thrust of the Minister's views, but nevertheless the case alluded to should be considered before any rejoinder is made. For example, do pressure groups make Britain ungovernable as a result of the thousands of active vested interests which can block government and make policy unworkable? Do closed networks give pressure groups a privileged position which results in government becoming undemocratic and unresponsive to electoral and parliamentary influences, resulting in biased, unworkable policy-making? Does pressure groups politics allow small, wealthy groups to use their resources to promote selfish sectionalism and block otherwise crucial or popular policies? Can pressure groups block essential or desirable changes, thus contributing to social immobilisation or economic decay? Candidates may challenge the question and refer to the conventional case that pressure groups help governments to be efficient through consultation and the provision of advice and information which improves the quality of policy-making. Pressure groups also provide a dynamic element in government policy-making by bringing new concerns on to the political agenda and thus ensuring social or economic progress. Pressure groups improve the efficiency of government by strengthening the scrutiny, and accountability, of government policy-making. Candidates should provide examples to illustrate their arguments and provide a conclusion which evaluates the claim outlined in the set question.