



**General Certificate of Education**

**Government and Politics**  
**1151/2151**

**GOVP1      People, Politics and Participation**

**Mark Scheme**

*2010 examination - January series*

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

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

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

#### COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

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

*Dr Michael Cresswell*, Director General.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS**

### **Introduction**

AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in Section 4.2 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 mark 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.

There are no limits to the areas of knowledge that candidates may feel able bring to the discussion. Therefore the specification of requirements outlined in the mark schemes can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material presented in order to access the full range of available marks. At the same time they may successfully include material from their particular studies which is not indicated in the scheme.

### **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

### GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 5 marks)

<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>
<b>AO1</b>
<p><b>Level 4 (5 marks)</b> The candidate successfully demonstrates excellent 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><b>Level 3 (4 marks)</b> The candidate successfully demonstrates good 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><b>Level 2 (2–3 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates limited 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><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> The candidate demonstrates little 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 little relevance.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>

## AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

### GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 10 marks)

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
AO1	AO2	AO3
<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates an excellent knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes.</p> <p>The candidate deploys relevant knowledge and understanding to fully address the requirements of the question and produces accurate and/or relevant examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> The candidate applies an excellent range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3–4 (2 marks)</b> The candidate communicates clearly and effectively, in a structured and sustained manner, making excellent or good use of appropriate political vocabulary.</p> <p>There are few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and the response should be legible.</p> <p>The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes.</p> <p>The candidate addresses the requirements of the question and produces examples and/or evidence to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> The candidate applies a good range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.</p>	
<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes.</p> <p>The candidate makes a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question and produces few or inaccurate examples and/or limited evidence to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> The candidate applies a limited range of concepts and makes limited use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1–2 (1 mark)</b> The candidate communicates explanations or arguments with limited clarity and effectiveness using limited political vocabulary. The answer may lack either a clear focus on the question or a sense of direction.</p> <p>There are frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and legibility may be a problem.</p>

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

<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes. The candidate makes little attempt to address the requirements of the question and produces few examples and/or little evidence to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> The candidate applies few concepts and makes little use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1–2 (continued) (1 mark)</b> A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>	<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>	<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>

**AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS****GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (c) questions (Total: 25 marks)**

<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>A01</b>	<b>A02</b>	<b>A03</b>
<p><b>Level 4 (10–11 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 4 (5–6 marks)</b> The candidate communicates clear, structured and sustained arguments and explanations making excellent use of appropriate political vocabulary.</p> <p>The response should be legible with few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p> <p>The candidate produces answers with a clear sense of direction leading towards a coherent conclusion.</p>
<p><b>Level 3 (7–9 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> 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 recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with some sound comparison.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</b> The candidate communicates arguments and explanations making good use of appropriate political vocabulary.</p> <p>The response should be legible but there may be occasional errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar.</p> <p>A conclusion is linked to the preceding discussion.</p>



**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (c) questions (continued)**

<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Level 2 (4–6 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationship between them, making 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><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> The candidate offers a limited 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 limited comparisons.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> The candidate attempts to develop an argument using basic political vocabulary.</p> <p>There are frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and legibility may be a problem.</p> <p>Where a conclusion is offered, its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
<p><b>Level 1 (1–3 marks)</b> 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><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> The candidate makes a partial attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes and behaviour. Arguments offered are superficial or simplistic. There is very limited awareness of parallels or comparisons.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> The answer relies upon narrative which is not fully coherent and which is expressed without using political vocabulary.</p> <p>Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive and the response may not be legible.</p> <p>A conclusion is either not offered or it is not related to the preceding material.</p>
<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>	<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>	<p><b>0 marks</b> No relevant response.</p>

**NB:** whilst there is no requirement for candidates to make reference to the extract or passage provided when answering part 'c' questions, the use of such material can be credited on AO1 and AO2, where it is relevant to the question posed. Candidates may also be given credit for using relevant material drawn from the extracts or passages which accompany other questions on the paper.

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

(a) Explain the term *opinion polls* used in the extract.

*(5 marks)*

It is likely that the majority of candidates will be able to identify opinion polls as surveys of public opinion on issues such as voting intentions and the performance of party leaders. Given the context and the subject being examined, the main focus should be on political polls as opposed to commercial market research in more general terms. The extract focuses mainly on some of the debates surrounding polling and reference may be made to this material.

There is enormous scope for candidates to introduce their own knowledge when answering this question. Many will be aware that such polls are conducted regularly on behalf of newspapers and other media organisations. Some may also refer to the private polling conducted by political parties when preparing policies or planning election strategy. Others may focus on the mechanics of polling, referring to the companies involved (eg ICM) and issues such as sampling. Candidates may also demonstrate their knowledge by introducing statistical information taken from recent polls, or by distinguishing between regular polls taken during the course of the campaign and exit polls.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why it is often difficult to predict the outcome of elections.

*(10 marks)*

Most candidates will be able to identify one or more of the factors identified in the extract, eg the part played by voter uncertainty and volatility, or the way in which polls may serve to shape as well as reflect opinion. Candidates must make use of their own knowledge to identify additional factors (eg problems with how polls are conducted or voters not telling the truth) and/or to provide appropriate examples with which to illustrate those factors drawn from the extract, eg the Conservatives' surprise victory in the 1992 General Election.

The extract states that 'opinion polls can sometimes end up shaping, rather than simply reflecting, public opinion'. It is likely that candidates will develop this theme. Some may link early polling to a greater prevalence of tactical voting. Others may make the connection between opinion poll findings and turnout. Both lines of argument are valid when they are linked to the question, ie why they might result in unreliable predictions.

Whilst the question allows candidates to address 'elections' in general terms, it is likely that most will focus on the difficulty in predicting the outcome of general elections. Both approaches are valid and should be fully credited where supported with appropriate evidence.

In order to achieve the higher levels at AO1 and AO2 candidates will be expected to identify and offer developed analysis of two distinct factors. Answers achieving the higher levels on AO3 will be clearly communicated using appropriate political vocabulary, eg electoral volatility, late swing, 'bandwagon effect', 'boomerang effect', tactical voting, protest voting, differential turnout, margin of error, etc.

(c) 'Social class is still the main determinant of voting behaviour.' Discuss. (25 marks)

Responses at all levels are likely to make some reference to the established link between social class and voting. Some answers may focus almost entirely on class, barely touching on other influences on voting behaviour, whilst others may produce a more generic response on voting behaviour that fails to meet the precise demands of the question posed. Higher-level responses on AO1 and AO2 will be characterised by the way in which the candidate is able both to address the influence of class and put it into its proper context alongside other influences.

It is likely that the analysis of the influence of class will be rooted in the 1960s. Candidates may make reference to the oft-cited Pulzer quote ('class is the basis of British party politics; all else is embellishment and detail') as a way of setting up the debate, before considering the ways in which factors such as changes in the class system, the labour market, parties themselves and the broader nature of society can be said to have undermined the link between class and voting. Conversely, candidates may choose to argue that a clear correlation between class and voting remains, despite such developments.

Candidates will be expected to develop such arguments by deploying specific examples and ideas drawn from their own knowledge (AO1). Some may make use of voting statistics. Others may refer to the work of Ivor Crewe and others regarding the decline of the 'old working class' and the rise of a 'new working class'. There might also be mention of the way in which the Labour Party's traditional links with the unions and socialist societies made a close connection between class and party allegiance inevitable.

In order to achieve the higher levels on AO2, candidates will need to address the terms of the question more explicitly. Specifically, they will need to demonstrate an awareness that deciding whether or not social class is 'the main determinant' of voting behaviour will necessitate a consideration of other factors. The best answers will therefore offer a developed analysis of a range of primacy factors (eg social class, party identification, gender, age, etc) and short-term factors (eg issues, manifesto pledges, personalities, etc), ie placing class into its proper context alongside these other variables. At the very highest level, candidates are likely to be aware that many of these factors are inextricably linked. They may also make reference to different theoretical models of voting behaviour.

On AO3, particular credit will be given to responses possessing a clear analytical structure. Such higher-level responses will often be characterised by a clear sense of direction and by the presence of a conclusion: an explicit judgement substantiated by the discussion that has gone before. Top-level responses will also make effective use of appropriate political vocabulary, eg class alignment and dealignment, embourgeoisement, working class Tories, C2 voters, issue-voting, retrospective and prospective voting, etc.

2

Total for this question: 40 marks

(a) Explain the term *quota* as used in the extract.

(5 marks)

At the lower levels of response candidates are likely to simply describe how STV works without addressing the issue of the quota directly. The majority of candidates, however, will identify a quota as the total number of votes a candidate must win in order to win a seat under STV. Higher-level responses may identify the Droop Formula as the means by which this quota is calculated, though they will not be expected to explain precisely how this device works in practice. Some candidates may also offer an explanation as to why a quota is considered necessary under STV.

The extract introduces the idea of first preference votes and touches on the way in which votes are transferred under STV. Candidates may make use of this material when explaining the term in question. Candidates may also make reference to the data provided in the extract (ie on first preference votes). There is a good deal of scope for candidates to make use of their own knowledge when answering this question. Some candidates may comment on the likely effects of the use of such quotas on electoral outcomes. Such analysis, though not required, is worthy of credit where it serves to demonstrate higher levels of understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, identify **and** explain **two** likely consequences of adopting the single transferable vote (STV) system for use in Westminster elections.

(10 marks)

It is likely that responses at all levels will include an outline of the way in which STV works – either in general terms or with reference to elections in Northern Ireland or local elections in Scotland. Such knowledge should be credited, where accurate, under AO1. Candidates will not be expected to explain the workings of the Droop Formula.

Comments relating to the likely consequences of the introduction of STV in UK general elections can be credited on both AO1 and AO2. Candidates are asked to identify and explain two likely consequences of the introduction of STV for such contests. The extract highlights two broad consequences: firstly, that it is a preferential system (ie more voter choice); and secondly, that it appears to offer a more proportional outcome (from the data). Candidates should use their own knowledge either to develop or explain these areas or introduce other possible consequences.

Some candidates may discuss the likelihood of smaller parties being better represented under STV. Such an analysis may be based upon **actual** experience, either in the UK (Northern Ireland and Scotland) or beyond. Alternatively, candidates may wish to focus on the **likely** consequences in UK general elections (eg improved prospects for parties such as the LibDems and the Greens, a possible increase in the numbers of women and ethnic minority MPs returned, etc). Other responses may refer to the possibility of coalition government, either based upon the extract (which shows that no party won an absolute majority of seats in the 2007 elections to the Northern Ireland Assembly) or from own knowledge. Some candidates will choose to focus entirely on the question of ‘fairness’. Others may identify a more

comprehensive set of criteria as a means of affording their answers a clearer analytical structure, eg adopting Lord Jenkins' use of measures such as the likelihood of greater proportionality, stable government, better voter choice, and a clear MP–constituency link.

References to theoretical models of how STV might affect the outcome of UK general elections (eg 'the Essex Model') should be credited, though they have been somewhat overtaken by the actual experience in Northern Ireland and in Scottish local elections.

In order to achieve the higher levels at AO1 and AO2, candidates will be expected to identify and explain at least two distinct consequences of adopting STV in UK general elections. Answers achieving the higher levels on AO3 will be clearly communicated using appropriate political vocabulary, eg quota, preferential voting, coalition government, proportionality, voter choice, etc.

NB: candidates who only describe the workings of STV (either in generic terms or as used in Northern Ireland or Scotland) without relating such discussion to the terms of the question (ie potential impact if used in elections to the Westminster Parliament) will be limited to Level 2 on AO2.

<p>(c) Assess the impact of the electoral systems introduced in elections outside Westminster since 1997. <span style="float: right;"><i>(25 marks)</i></span></p>
--

Though the specification only requires a detailed working knowledge of STV, AMS and FPTP, candidates are expected to have a more general awareness of the debate surrounding electoral reform as well as the merits/demerits of various different types of systems: proportional, majoritarian, and mixed (hybrid).

The focus for this question is New Labour's introduction of a range of alternative electoral systems for use in elections outside Westminster since 1997: AMS in the case of the Scottish Parliament, the Welsh Assembly and the London Assembly; SV (London Mayor); and STV (various elections in Northern Ireland and Scottish local elections since 2007). Candidates may also refer to the regional party list system used in UK elections to the European Parliament since 1999.

In answering this question candidates can be expected to have some awareness of why and where some of these alternative systems have been employed since 1997. They should also be able to demonstrate knowledge (AO1) of how some of these systems work and be able to assess the nature and scale of their impact (AO2).

Lower-level responses on AO2 are likely to be overly descriptive. The focus may be on how systems work as opposed to the more central issue of the 'impact' of such systems since 1997. At the lowest level of response, candidates may simply offer a generalised and generic (perhaps pre-learnt) response focusing on the arguments for and against electoral reform. Higher-level responses may take a number of different forms. Some candidates may choose to take a theoretical approach, perhaps taking some of the criteria identified by Lord Jenkins (eg proportionality, voter choice, MP–constituency link, etc) and measuring the degree of impact accordingly. Others may opt to assess the impact of these systems by measuring their performance against what was intended and thereby making a judgement about success/failure, eg did the fact that there were so many spoilt ballots in the 2007 Scottish Parliament elections serve to undermine any anticipated impact in terms of greater voter choice and proportionality?

At the higher levels students will be expected to offer a developed assessment of the impact of at least two different systems, though the coverage need not be equal.

On AO3, particular credit will be given to responses possessing a clear analytical structure. Such higher-level responses will often be characterised by a clear sense of direction and by the presence of a conclusion: an explicit judgement substantiated by the discussion that has gone before. Top-level responses will also make effective use of appropriate political vocabulary, eg Jenkins Commission, proportionality, wasted votes, spoilt ballot papers, coalition government, threshold, etc.

3

**Total for this question: 40 marks**

(a) Explain the term *nationalist parties* used in the passage.

*(5 marks)*

Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the term by offering a clear and concise definition, ie those parties who seek to develop a greater sense of identity or independence for the 'nation' they represent. Most candidates will pick up on the examples given in the extract (the SNP and Plaid Cymru). Some may also make mention of parties in Northern Ireland (eg Sinn Fein), the BNP, or even the more regionally based nationalist parties in areas such as Cornwall. Higher-level candidates may recognise that as nationalist parties normally desire some degree of independence from the UK, they will often only contest seats in their chosen area.

The extract makes the point that nationalist parties have the best track record of all of the minority parties contesting elections in the UK. It is likely that many candidates will repeat this point. At the higher levels, candidates may demonstrate a more developed understanding by linking this outcome to the fact that support for such parties is often geographically concentrated. Some candidates may demonstrate their own knowledge by recognising the fact that in 2009 such nationalist parties were in government (either alone or in coalition) in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the passage, consider the roles that minority parties perform within the UK system.

*(10 marks)*

The extract identifies a number of different types of minority parties and it is likely that candidates will therefore be able to identify a similarly wide range of roles that such parties perform. At the lower levels of response candidates may simply provide a list of roles (AO1). Higher-level responses will be characterised by an ability to select two or more roles and offer a more developed explanation and analysis (AO1 and AO2).

The closing paragraph of the extract identifies two possible roles that minority parties perform: that of representing the interests of those left unrepresented as a result of the way in which the major parties have moved to the centre, and providing an opportunity for voters to protest, ie offering an opportunity for electoral participation. Candidates may well choose to use their own knowledge to develop these points further. Support for the BNP may be offered as evidence that the party is playing a role in representing those on the extreme right of the political spectrum. Support for UKIP in the 2004 European Parliament elections could be advanced as an example of a minority party facilitating protest.

At the higher levels on AO1 and AO2, candidates may develop the theme of representation further by considering the way in which regional parties look to represent the interests of particular geographic areas as well as holding policy positions which may be out of touch with those of the major UK parties. In the case of those regional parties who are or have been in 'government' in their respective nations, candidates may also suggest some of the roles more generally applied to UK political parties, eg political recruitment, policy formation, governing and agenda setting. The latter may also be applied to other parties, eg BNP, UKIP, Greens, Respect, Pro-life Alliance, etc. Candidates may even question whether some of these parties

should be seen more as pressure groups that simply use candidacy and campaigning in elections as part of their group methodology.

Answers achieving the higher levels on AO3 will be clearly communicated using appropriate political vocabulary (eg protest voting, single-issue parties, political spectrum, the end of ideology, etc).

<p>(c) 'The major UK parties have moved towards the centre of the political spectrum.' Discuss. (25 marks)</p>
--

This question focuses on the issue of party ideology and policy. Candidates are being asked to assess the extent to which the main UK parties have abandoned their traditional positions on the political spectrum and moved towards the centre.

At the lower levels of response on AO1 and AO2 it is likely that responses will be overly generalised. Candidates may make broad statements concerning 'the end of ideology' without offering any deeper analysis or evidence in support. Those responses which focus entirely on one party to the exclusion of all others are also likely to be limited both on AO1 and AO2. It is also likely that some candidates may also produce responses that are overly narrative in style. Though answering the question effectively will require an understanding of the historical positions taken by the main UK parties (and an awareness party origins, perhaps), plain chronological narrative will not be rewarded highly on AO2.

Higher-level responses on AO2 will address the precise terms of the question more directly. There will be an explicit awareness of the changes that the Labour Party has undergone since its defeat in the 1979 general election (in particular, the rise of New Labour and all that it entailed). Candidates will also be familiar with the path taken by the Conservatives in recent years (One Nation Tories, Thatcherism, and Cameron's 'New Tories'). Though there is no requirement for candidates to offer a similar analysis in respect of the LibDems, relevant material (eg Nick Clegg's impact on core party policies) will be credited fully.

It is likely that many candidates will take the command word 'discuss' as an invitation to explore the reasons why such changes have occurred. Some may also make reference to the way in which this ideological convergence has led to the rise of more extreme parties and single issue campaigns at the margins (eg BNP, UKIP, Respect, the Greens, etc). At the top level of response it is possible that candidates might well challenge the statement provided in the title. Candidates may question the merits of assessing party ideology/policy against the traditional left-right political spectrum. Candidates may also choose to draw a distinction between a party's underlying ideology and the policies it adopts in order to appeal to voters.

On AO3, particular credit will be given to responses possessing a clear analytical structure. Such higher-level responses will often be characterised by a clear sense of direction and by the presence of a conclusion: an explicit judgement substantiated by the discussion that has gone before. Top-level responses will also make effective use of appropriate political vocabulary, eg New Labour, third way, Clause 4, Thatcherism, neo-liberalism, New Tories, 'end of ideology', etc.



4

Total for this question: 40 marks

(a) Explain the term *lobbying* used in the extract.

(5 marks)

Most candidates will be to define lobbying as a process by which interested parties seek to directly influence the attitudes and behaviour of elected politicians and unelected officials, whether at local, national or supranational level. It is likely that many responses will seek to identify the kinds of activities that might fall within this broad definition, eg meeting one's MP in person, engaging in letter writing campaigns, mass protests at Westminster.

The extract refers specifically to the number of groups lobbying at Brussels. It is likely, therefore, that candidates may focus on lobbying at EU level. At the higher levels candidates may look to demonstrate their knowledge by identifying the targets of such lobbying (eg the European Commission) or the methods employed (eg through private consultation with senior Eurocrats).

It is possible that some responses, perhaps at the higher levels, will move onto a discussion of the work of paid lobbyists and the relationship between such individuals, leading politicians and civil servants. Though references to insider groups will be credited where they help to explain the term identified in the question, lengthy discussion of such groups is not required here.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, identify **and** explain **two** ways in which pressure group activity has changed in recent years.

(10 marks)

The extract identifies a number of ways in which pressure groups try to influence the policy-making process. Candidates may use their own knowledge to identify the ways in which some of these methods (eg mass demonstrations) have come to the fore. The extract also makes the point that lobbying at European level has grown in recent years.

At the lower levels on AO1 and AO2 candidates may simply identify (or even list) methods without offering the kind of explanation explicitly required by the question. Higher-level responses will be characterised by their ability to combine the material in the extract with examples drawn from their own knowledge, eg the rise of Brussels-based Eurogroups, or the mass protests against the Poll Tax (1990), the war in Iraq (2003) and world poverty (2005).

It is likely that many candidates will choose to focus on the activities of smaller, direct-action, single-issue groups such as Fathers4Justice and the environmental campaign group Plane Stupid. Lower-level responses may well be characterised by general description of the activities of such groups without any attempt to relate such protests to the question, ie the changing nature of pressure group activity. Such description can be credited on AO1; where such discussion is linked back to the question posed, candidates can be fully credited on both AO1 and AO2.

In order to achieve the higher levels at AO1 and AO2 candidates will be expected to identify and offer developed explanation of two distinct ways in which pressure group activity has changed in recent years. Answers achieving the higher levels on AO3 will be clearly communicated, using appropriate political vocabulary, eg direct action, Eurogroups, civil disobedience, eco-warrior, etc.

- (c) 'Only wealthy insider groups can ever hope to achieve their main aims and objectives.'  
Assess this view. (25 marks)

Although the question identifies financial resources (ie wealth) and group status (ie Wyn Grant's insider/outsider typology) as key variables in assessing the likelihood of group success, candidates will obviously be expected to weigh the importance of these factors against other variables, eg group aims, methodology, other resources (eg human/material) and the political context/public mood.

Lower-level responses on AO2 may take the form of a string of pressure group case studies presented in a narrative as opposed to an analytical style, eg lengthy description of the Stop the War protests in 2003 or the activities of groups such as Fathers4Justice. Such responses may be credited on AO1, where candidates demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding. Answers which are overly theoretical or conjectural (ie not properly substantiated) are equally unlikely to achieve the higher levels on AO1 or AO2.

Higher-level responses will address the issue of group status as well as identifying two or more other variables that can affect a group's prospects (see above). It is likely that such responses will combine a theoretical discussion of each factor supported with appropriate examples drawn from the candidates' own knowledge. For example, the relative merits of being an 'insider' as opposed to an 'outsider' group could be explored by comparing the activities and apparent influence of insider groups such as the British Medical Association to outsiders such as the environmental campaign group Plane Stupid or Fathers4Justice.

At the top level of response on AO2, candidates will be able to demonstrate some of the links that exist between some or all of the factors they have identified, eg by demonstrating an explicit understanding that a group's resources (eg quality of membership, financial reserves) will have a bearing on how it is perceived (and therefore its status) and on the number and nature of campaigns it can manage. Such responses may also challenge the statement provided in the title, perhaps noting the way in which outsider groups have far greater freedom to act than those afforded the much coveted insider status. Alternatively, candidates may question the merits of the insider/outsider typology when even some of its chief proponents have chosen to question its relevance in recent years.

On AO3, particular credit will be given to responses possessing a clear analytical structure. Such higher-level responses will often be characterised by a clear sense of direction and by the presence of a conclusion: an explicit judgement substantiated by the discussion that has gone before. Top level responses will also make effective use of appropriate political vocabulary, eg core insider, public opinion, direct action, consultation, Green Paper, etc.

**ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVES GRID**

<b>AS Assessment Objective</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective Part (a) question</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective Part (b) question</b>	<b>Marks allocated by Assessment Objective Part (c) question</b>	<b>Total Marks by Assessment Objective</b>
<b>AO1</b>	5	4	11	20
<b>AO2</b>	0	4	8	12
<b>AO3</b>	0	2	6	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>40</b>