

Edexcel GCE

# Government and Politics 6491

January 2007

advancing learning, changing lives

Confidential Mark Scheme

## INTRODUCTION TO UNIT MARK SCHEMES

1. The Assessment Matrix on the next page indicates the level of attainment characteristic of the given grade at Advanced GCE. It gives a general indication of the required learning outcomes at each specified grade. The descriptors should be used in conjunction with the content indicators within the mark scheme to decide on the level of performance achieved by any given candidate. The grade awarded will depend in practice upon the extent to which the candidate has met the assessment objectives overall. Shortcomings in some aspects of the examination may be balanced by better performances in others.
2. Within each Unit mark scheme a grid shows the allocation of marks by Assessment Objective. It should be noted that, wherever there are optional questions within a unit, the assessment objectives are allocated identically across those questions.
3. Marks for assessment of the quality of written communication (Assessment Objective Three) are embedded in the Assessment Matrix and the grade descriptors for each question.
4. The mark schemes try to provide a range of likely relevant responses to the questions set. All relevant responses are worthy of marks, it is important to reward good work which is not referred to explicitly in the mark scheme. Valid original responses should be credited.
5. Marks should not be awarded on the basis of a 'tick list' of factual content, but on the overall response as it relates to the indicative content shown in the mark scheme, the balance of criteria as indicated in the assessment matrix, and the marks available for the question in terms of the assessment objective weightings.
6. There should be no reluctance to use the full mark range, and if warranted award maximum marks. The candidates are working under great pressure; ask what might be considered excellence in such circumstances.
7. Responses should be marked positively. Differentiation is by outcome, and in the evidence presented it should be considered whether the candidate has answered the question and has appreciated the issues involved.

## GENERAL MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

8. Marking of levels should be 'top down'. Examiners should look for the highest level of response achieved by the candidate. Use ticks in the body of the script when awarding marks.
9. Only sub-totals and totals must appear in the right-hand margin. Question totals must be ringed and transferred to the front of the script. Mark in red ink.
10. Annotate your script so that your thought processes may be followed. A comment at the end of an answer may be made to explain why a certain level was awarded.
11. A marking grid (based on performance level descriptors) is available at the back of this mark scheme to assist examiners in allocating marks within each level. This should be used in conjunction with the content indicators in the mark scheme and the Assessment Matrix as a guide to the allocation of marks within each level.

## ASSESSMENT MATRIX

	AO1 Knowledge and understanding	AO2 Analysis, interpretation and evaluation	AO3 Quality of Written Communication
	Recall, select and deploy their knowledge of Government and Politics accurately showing an understanding of relevant political concepts and theories.	Analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences between aspects of the political systems studied.	Communicate arguments and explanations in a clear and structured manner, making use of a range of relevant evidence and appropriate political vocabulary.
<i>Level 3</i>	Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationships between them producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrating excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers that include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations and provide accurate evidence and up to date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.	Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well-developed concepts and theories, using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses, which display a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections or similarities and differences are identified together with well-developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.
<i>Level 2</i>	Candidates demonstrate good knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationships between them producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrating sound contextual awareness. They produce answers that include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.	Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories, using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct clear arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses, which display awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is clear recognition of parallels and connections or similarities and differences together with some good comparisons. There is good evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.
<i>Level 1</i>	Candidates demonstrate outline knowledge of political institutions and processes and some relationships between them producing answers with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce essays which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples to illustrate points.	Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider political information and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis, which shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is recognition of basic parallels and connections or similarities and differences together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.

**Mark Scheme  
Unit**

1(a)	What is a pressure group?	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	---------------------------	-----	-----	-----

5

A pressure group is an organised association that aims to influence the policies or actions of government. It. Pressure groups are distinguished by three main factors.

- First (unlike political parties), they seek to exert influence from outside, rather than to win or exercise government power. Pressure groups do not usually therefore put candidates up for election.
- Second, pressure groups typically have a narrow issue focus, and sometimes a single issue focus, and seldom have the broader programmatic features that are generally associated with political parties.
- Third, the members of a pressure group are bound together by a shared concern for a political cause or a common (usually material) interest, rather than by support for a shared ideological perspective.

A further feature is that pressure groups usually exert influence through the formal constitutional and representative processes. Pressure groups are usually categorised as either sectional (or interest) groups or as promotional (or cause) groups, or as 'insider' groups or 'outsider' groups.

**Level three** responses should provide a clear and full definition of a pressure group that highlights two or more key features, supported by at least one accurate example. An awareness should also be demonstrated of different kinds of pressure groups.

**Level two** responses should provide a limited to sound definition of a pressure group, which highlights at least one key feature. An awareness may be demonstrated of different kinds of pressure groups.

**Level one** responses will demonstrate a weak or confused understanding of pressure groups. Some understanding of pressure groups may be demonstrated, but there are serious misunderstandings in relation to other key features.

*In marking this question, take account of the following factors:*

- Knowledge of the nature and features of pressure groups. (AO1)
- Awareness of differences between and amongst pressure groups. (AO1)

1(b)	Explain three ways in which pressure groups exert influence.	AO1	AO2	AO3
		10		5
	<p>Pressure groups exert influence in a wide variety of ways, depending upon the resources available to them and the nature of the issue or issues they are concerned with. These include the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Insider' groups exert influence through regular, privileged and usually institutionalised access to government, involving routine consultation with senior civil servants or ministers, or representation on government bodies. Such status is usually restricted to pressure groups that play a key role in the economy as producers, investors and employers, or which possess specialist knowledge which can assist the policy-making process. Many pressure groups may seek 'insider' status, but not all are granted it. 'Insider' methods of exerting influence are attractive because they enable pressure groups to be involved in the process of policy formulation, where the greatest influence can be exerted. However, 'insider' status is only granted if a group's objectives broadly correspond to those of the government.</li> <li>• Pressure groups can also exert influence by lobbying parliament, often through representations made by professional lobbyists, whose numbers have significantly increased in the UK in recent decades. Most of the groups that use this method are business groups, who possess the financial strength and/or organisational capabilities to conduct professional lobbying campaigns. The attraction of this means of exerting influence is that changes may be made to government legislation as it passes through Parliament, particularly in the committee stage, and that the prominence of a political issue may be affected by questions that are asked through Question Time.</li> <li>• Pressure groups also exert influence is through political parties. In the UK, this is done most prominently through the financial and institutional links between affiliated trade unions and the Labour Party. The attraction of this method is that it gives pressure groups an opportunity to influence party policy, in the hope that the party may further the objectives of the pressure group either in Parliament or in government. The disadvantage of this method is that the party concerned may be opposition, weakening the pressure group's influence on the government of the day, or that the political party may be resistant to the policy preferences of the pressure group. Trade union influence within the Labour Party has reduced significantly in recent years.</li> <li>• Pressure groups seek to exert influence indirectly via the mass media and public opinion campaigns. Tactics here range from petitions, protests and demonstrations to the production of specialist reports and the use of high-profile experts or celebrities. Such methods are either used because of a group's inability to gain direct access to policy-makers, or because the nature of the group's objectives or the make-up of its activist base suits the politics of protest. A common aim of 'outsider' methods is to attract media attention and stimulate public awareness and sympathy, exerting influence on government by altering the wider political agenda.</li> <li>• Some Pressure Groups do take direct action which can be considered as illegal in order to gain influence and raise their profile</li> </ul>			

Level 3 responses should provide a clear and full explanation of three ways in which pressure groups exert influence, supported by appropriate examples. The methods should be explained in terms of the mechanisms and methods that are used, or in terms of how and why the method has been selected.

Level 2 responses should either explain two methods fully and clearly and make some reference to a third, or provide a limited to sound explanation of three ways. Examples will show less detail.

Level 1 responses provide only weak or poor understanding of the different methods used by pressure groups, or do little more than list three correct methods.

*In marking this question, take account of the following factors:*

- Knowledge and understanding of ways in which pressure groups exert influence. (AO1)
- Awareness of different ways in which pressure groups exert influence. (AO1)
- Ability to explain the ways in which pressure groups exert influence. (AO2)

1(c)	To what extent do pressure groups promote democracy in the UK?	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	--	-----	-----	-----

Pressure groups promote democracy in the UK in a variety of ways. These include the following. First, pressure groups strengthen representation by articulating interests and advancing views that are ignored or only given limited attention by the major political parties. This occurs in particular because of the 'catch all' nature of UK parties, stemming from the majoritarian electoral system and single-party government.

10 15 5

For example, people concerned about environmental issues are likely to be able to advance these more effectively through pressure group politics rather than through party politics. Second, political parties enable the general public to exert influence between general elections, which in the UK generally take place every four or five years. Elections facilitate democracy only irregularly, while pressure groups provide an ongoing democratic link between government and the people. Third, pressure groups promote democracy through encouraging debate and discussion, thus creating a better-informed and more educated electorate. This can be seen in the UK (and elsewhere) in the use of specialists and experts and in public awareness campaigns. Fourth, pressure groups broaden the scope of political participation, both providing an alternative to conventional party politics and offering opportunities for grass-roots activism. This has been particularly significant in the UK as pressure groups have become in recent decades an increasingly important vehicle for promoting political participation. While voter turnout and party membership has declined, the number of promotional pressure groups, and especially single-issue groups, have significantly increased, as has the size of their membership. The RSPB, for example, is reputed to have a membership larger than the combined membership of the major UK political parties.

However, pressure groups have also been said to limit or undermine democracy in the UK. Once again this can happen in a variety of ways, including the following. First, pressure groups entrench political inequality by strengthening the voice of the wealthy and privileged, those who have access to financial, educational, organisational or other resources. In particular, pressure group politics strengthens the political influence of business groups, especially in a context of economic globalisation when transnational corporations can easily relocate investment and production from one state to another. It is thus a myth that pressure groups broaden access to political power and promote democratic responsiveness. Second, pressure groups exert non-legitimate power, in that their leaders, unlike elected politicians, are not publicly accountable and their influence bypasses the representative process. Pressure group power can thus be seen as a threat to the structures of representative democracy. This particularly occurs when 'insider' pressure groups bypass Parliament and exert influence through methods and by ways that are in no way subject to public scrutiny. Third, pressure groups may be inadequate in promoting democracy because they are deficient in internal democracy. Very few pressure groups have a meaningful and effective mechanism for ensuring that their leaders are responsive and accountable to their members, in which case they may exert influence on the bogus basis of their groups and membership size.

Pressure groups can also section and polarise society rather than heal it.

Level 3 responses should construct a balanced argument that shows an awareness of a range of ways in which pressure groups promote democracy and their limitations in so doing, leading to an overall evaluation or conclusion rather than a listing of points. The various arguments should be explained in terms of how the democratic process is affected by the particular aspect of pressure group politics, appropriate examples should be used to support arguments.

Level 2 responses should demonstrate a limited to sound understanding but will be deficient in terms of an awareness of the breadth of arguments, the

degree of evaluation or the adequacy of explanation.

Level 1 responses will demonstrate a weak or poor understanding of the links between pressure groups and democracy, or fail to address one or other side of the argument.

*In marking this question, take account of the following factors:*

- Knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups promote democracy in the UK. (AO1)
- Knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups limit democracy in the UK. (AO1)
- Evaluation and analysis of the impact of pressure group politics on democracy in the UK. (AO2)



2(a)	Outline two functions of a general election.	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	--	-----	-----	-----

A general election is a full parliamentary election involving the re-election of all seats in the House of Commons, and takes place within five years of the previous general election. General elections have several key functions. 5

- They are a mechanism for making governments and, possibly, for the transfer of power from one government to the next. They also renew existing governments can remove them. This happens in the UK through the strength of parties in the House of Commons, governments typically being formed from the leading members of the party that 'wins' the general election, in that it has gained an overall majority of seats in the House of Commons.
- Other functions of a general election is to provide representation. This is based on the assumption that general elections are fair and competitive, and serve as a means through which demands are channelled from the public to the government. In the UK this is often linked to the idea that the winning party in a general election has gained a public mandate to carry out the policies outlined in its election manifesto. General elections can also be said to be a way of recruiting politicians, a means of influencing public policy, a mechanism for educating voters and a means of fostering legitimacy for the political system.

Level 3 responses should provide clear and full descriptions of two functions of a general election, showing an awareness of its larger role within the political or governmental system.

Level 2 responses should demonstrate a limited to sound understanding of two functions of a general election or a good understanding of one function.

Level 1 responses will demonstrate a limited or poor understanding of the nature of a general election and the functions it is associated with.

*In answering this question, take account of the following factors:*

- An awareness of the nature of general elections. (AO1)
- Knowledge and understanding of the functions of a general election. (AO1)
- Knowledge of two functions. (AO1)

2(b)	How does the electoral system for the House of Commons differ from the other electoral systems used in the UK?	AO1	AO2	AO3
		10		5

The electoral system for the House of Commons is the single-member plurality system, often known as 'first past the post'. It is a system that exaggerates support for larger parties and parties with geographically concentrated support, and minimises support for other parties. Its key features are as follows.

- First, the country is divided into single-member constituencies, roughly of equal populalium.
- Second, voters select a single candidate, marking his or her name with a cross on the ballot paper.
- Third, the winning candidate needs only to achieve a plurality of votes (the 'first past the post' rule).
- Time determined by the Prime Minister.

Four other electoral systems are used in the UK. These are:

- The Additional Member System (AMS), used for the Scottish Parliament, the Welsh Assembly and the Greater London Assembly
- The Single Transferable Vote system (STV), used for the Northern Ireland Assembly
- The 'closed' regional party list system, used for the European Parliament
- The Supplementary Vote (SV), used for the London mayor.

The general difference between these systems and the simple plurality system is that they are, to a greater or lesser extent, proportional electoral systems, in which parties are represented more in line with the proportion of votes they receive in the election. Each of these other systems has its own features, and in the case of AMS, one is a hybrid system that incorporates features of the single-member plurality system and the 'closed' regional party list system. Differences in features between the single-member plurality system and the other systems include the following.

- In the party list system voters choose not between candidates but between parties.
- In STV and SV voters select not a single candidate, but vote preferentially, ranking the candidates they wish to support in order (in SV they only have two votes).
- The party list system is based on regional divisions rather than constituencies.
- STV is based not on single-member constituencies but on multi-member constituencies.
- The most significant difference, however, is in the level of support needed to elect a candidate. Instead of a plurality (the largest single number of votes, or a 'relative' majority), this is either a quota (STV), an 'absolute' majority (SV), all seats are allocated on the proportion of votes each party gains (party list).
- Fixed term for all PR systems - house of Commons has a flexible electoral mechanism.

Level 3 responses should provide a clear and full explanation of how and why the electoral system for the House of Commons differs from three other electoral systems, in terms of both their impact and their key features. This will be demonstrated by clear and informed examples.

Level 2 responses should show a limited to sound understanding of the differences between the systems, showing an awareness of 'other' electoral systems. The examples in this level will be less clear and lack full detail.

Level 1 responses will demonstrate a weak or confused understanding of both the electoral system for the House of Commons and of other electoral systems used in the UK.

*In answering this question, take account of the following issues:*

- Knowledge and understanding of the electoral system for the House of Commons. (AO1)
- Knowledge and understanding of the other electoral systems used in the UK, including the range of systems. (AO1)
- Evaluation of differences between the electoral system for the House of Commons and the other electoral systems.

2(c)	Discuss the impact of the use of proportional electoral systems on UK politics.	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	---	-----	-----	-----

Proportional electoral systems are used in the UK for elections to the devolved bodies in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, the Greater London Authority, and the European Parliament. These systems have had an impact on UK politics in a variety of ways.

10                      15                      5

First, they have altered party representation and the party systems that operate in parts of the UK. In particular, they have allowed parties that have no representation in the House of Commons to win seats elsewhere, and they have boosted the representation of parties that have only a 'minor' party status in the House of Commons. This can be seen in the case of UKIP, which gained 12 seats in the 2004 European Parliament elections. The Green Party has two seats in the European Parliament, seven seats in the Scottish Parliament and two seats in the Greater London Assembly. The Scottish Nationalist Party and Plaid Cymru, minor parties in the House of Commons, are the second largest parties, respectively in the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Assembly. This wider representation of parties arguably improves the effectiveness of representation and, in the process, improves political engagement and participation.

Second, the proportional electoral systems have changed the nature of government, in that in all the institutions where they are used coalition administrations, rather than single-party administrations, govern. In Scotland and Wales, for instance, there are labour-liberal democrat coalitions, and in the Northern Ireland Assembly there is a complex process of power sharing intended to include both Unionist and Nationalist parties. The impact of this on UK politics is that it has created a different style of politics, based on consensus-building and compromise rather than adversarialism.

A further implication of the use of proportional electoral systems is that the content of public policy has altered as a wider range of pressures are brought to bear on the policy-making process. This is evident in ways in which the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Assembly have pursued policies different from those endorsed by the UK Parliament, for example, over issues such as tuition fees, hunting with dogs, school league tables and funding for care for the elderly.

Level 3 responses should demonstrate a clear and full understanding of ways in which the use of proportional electoral systems have affected UK politics, being also able to explain how and why the systems have the implications they do. Points should be supported by appropriate examples.

Level 2 responses should show a limited to sound understanding of the impact of proportional electoral systems, either limited by the range of implications examined or by the depth or fullness of the explanations offered.

Level 1 responses will demonstrate a weak or inadequate understanding of the impact of the use of proportional electoral systems.

*In answering this question, take account of the following factors:*

- Knowledge and understanding of the implications of the use of proportional electoral systems for UK politics. (AO1)
- Awareness of the range of implications of the use of proportional electoral systems. (AO1)
- Evaluation and analysis of the impact of proportional systems on UK politics. (AO2)



Direct democracy is based on the direct, unmediated and continuous participation of citizens in the tasks of government. This means that, through whatever mechanisms, the public *makes* public policy, rather than merely chooses who will make policy on its behalf. Direct democracy thus obliterates the distinction between the government and the governed and thus between the state and civil society. It is a system of popular self-government. In so-called Athenian democracy, it operates through a form of government by mass meeting; however, its most modern manifestation is in the use of referendums. 5

Level 3 responses should provide a clear and full definition of direct democracy that shows a reliable understanding of the nature of direct popular participation. An appropriate example of direct democracy should be offered.

Level 2 responses should provide a limited to sound definition of direct democracy that shows an awareness of the nature of direct popular participation.

Level 1 responses will demonstrate a weak or inadequate understanding of direct democracy, possibly by just defining democracy or by confusing direct democracy with representative processes.

*In marking this question, take account of the following factors:*

- Knowledge of the nature of direct democracy. (AO1)
- Awareness of examples of direct democracy. (AO1)

3(b)	How has direct democracy been more widely used in the UK in recent years?	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	---	-----	-----	-----

10

5

The main way in which direct democracy has been more widely used in the UK in recent years is in the wider use of referendums, which are devices of direct democracy used to supplement a system of representative democracy. Examples of referendums used in recent years include the following:

- Referendums were held in 1997 on the issue of devolution.
- A referendum was held in 1998 on the establishment of the Greater London Authority.
- A referendum was held in 1998 on the Good Friday Agreement and the establishment of a Northern Ireland Assembly.
- A referendum was held in 2004 on elected regional assembly for north-east England.

Other ways in which direct democratic mechanisms have been more widely used in the UK include the increasing use of focus groups to gauge public reaction to policy proposals, and the development of 'e-government', which also allows citizens to express their views about public policy issues. However, such mechanisms do not amount to full direct democracy as they are more means through which the government can gauge public opinion rather than allow the public to make policy decisions.

Level 3 responses should demonstrate a clear and reliable understanding of the link between referendums and direct democracy, and of the wider use of referendums since 1997.

Level 2 responses should demonstrate a limited to sound understanding of the wider use of referendums, but may fail to demonstrate clearly the link between referendums and direct democracy.

Level 1 responses will show a weak or poor understanding of the wider use of direct democratic mechanisms.

*In marking this question, take account of the following issues:*

- Knowledge and understanding of the wider use of referendums since 1997. (AO1)
- Awareness of the range of referendums since 1997. (AO1)
- Explanation and analysis of the link between referendums and direct democracy. (AO2)

3(c)	Do the advantages of referendums outweigh the disadvantages?	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	--	-----	-----	-----

Referendums can be seen to have a number of advantages. These include the following:	10	15	5
--	----	----	---

- Referendums provide a channel of communication between government and people, enabling governments to stay in line with, and respond to, public opinion, particularly between elections.
- They widen the opportunities for citizens to participate in politics, thus helping to create a more educated and better informed electorate.
- They enable the public to express views about particular political issues, something that is impossible through elections, when the public, at best, choose a slate of policies from the party manifestos and have no way of ensuring that they carry out their manifesto promises.
- They are particularly suited to settling major constitutional issues, and endorsing significant constitutional reforms, these matters being particularly important because they affect the political system and therefore the location of policy-making power.
- They strengthen legitimacy by providing the public with a way of expressing their views about specific issues, which they are therefore more likely to accept or support.

However, referendums are associated with a number of disadvantages. These include the following:

- They place political decision-making in the hands of the general public, who do not have the specialist knowledge, experience, education or time to reflect meaningfully upon them and to make sensible decisions in the public interest.
- In view of this, referendum outcomes often reflect less genuine public opinion and more the influence of the mass media and of leading politicians.
- They provide, at best, only a snapshot of public opinion at one point in time, and are therefore less suitable for making long-term, constitutional decisions.
- They allow politicians to manipulate the policy-making process, through their ability to decide which issues to put to referendums, decide when they are held, and determine the question asked, as well as to use public money to support their preferred outcome.
- They tend to simplify and distort political issues, reducing them to questions that have a yes/no answer.

Level 3 responses will demonstrate a good to excellent knowledge of both sides of the argument, evaluating the contrasting views and offering a balanced but clear conclusion.

Level 2 responses will demonstrate a limited to sound understanding of key arguments in favour of referendums and against them.

Level 1 responses will demonstrate an inadequate understanding of the relevant arguments, possibly having inadequate balance to their answer.

*In answering this question, consider the following issues:*

- Knowledge and understanding of the advantages of referendums. (AO1)
- Knowledge and understanding of the disadvantages of referendums. (AO1)
- Evaluation and analysis of the two sides of the argument. (AO2)



4(a) Define, using an example, consensus politics.

AO1

AO2

AO3

A consensus is a general agreement, an agreement about underlying or fundamental principles, as opposed to a precise or exact agreement. A consensus thus permits disagreement, so long as it is on matters of emphasis or detail. Consensus politics therefore refers to an overlap of the ideological positions of two or more political parties, reflected in agreement about broad policy goals. In this context, disagreement between parties is narrowed to issues of detail and emphasis, although these may be nevertheless matters of fierce dispute. 5

Examples of consensus politics in the UK include the 1950s and 1960s, the period of the so-called social democratic consensus, when Labour and Conservative Parties broadly accepted ideas such as a mixed economy, economic management and an enlarged welfare state. Consensus politics can also be said to have existed in the UK since the mid 1990s, in the form of the Thatcherite or post-Thatcherite consensus, an agreement between major parties on the importance of market economics, including low taxes, privatisation, labour flexibility and so on.

Level 3 responses should provide a reliable and clear definition of consensus politics, supported by an example that illustrates the features of consensus politics.

Level 2 responses should offer a limited to sound definition of consensus politics, supported by an appropriate example.

Level 1 responses will provide a weak or inadequate definition of consensus politics. It may also fail to identify an appropriate example.

*In answering this question, take account of the following issues:*

- Knowledge and understanding of the key features of consensus politics. (AO1)
- Knowledge and understanding of an appropriate example of consensus politics. (AO1)

4(b)	Explain three ways in which 'new' Labour differs from 'old' Labour.	AO1	AO2	AO3
------	---	-----	-----	-----

The term 'new' Labour is generally used to distinguish the shift in Labour Party policies, ideas and goals that occurred as a result of the modernisation process that started in the late 1980s and is particularly associated with Blair's leadership of the Party since 1994 and his premiership since 1997. Differences between 'new' Labour and 'old' Labour can be highlighted in terms of key policy shifts. These could include the abandonment of nationalisation and the acceptance of the 'rolled back' state inherited from the Conservatives; an emphasis on low inflation, for example illustrated the wider role, since 1997, the Bank of England has played in setting interest rates; cuts in income tax and a refusal to return to the more steeply progressive income tax rates of the 1970s; cuts in some benefits and an eagerness to press ahead with market reforms of the welfare state. Alternatively, 'new' Labour can be distinguished from 'old' Labour on broader ideological grounds. This could, for instance, be done by contrasting 'old' Labour's emphasis on social justice and the redistribution of wealth with 'new' Labour's belief in meritocracy and individual advancement. Similarly, 'new' Labour's conversion to constitutional reform could be highlighted.

10

5

Old Labour had a more focused class or distinct social appeal than New Labour. The relationship of Old Labour and New Labour differs with regard to the Trade Unions.

Level 3 responses should clearly highlight three ways in which 'new' Labour differs from 'old' Labour, and provide an explanation of the nature of the differences.

Level 2 responses should provide either three limited to sound explanations of differences between 'new' Labour and 'old' Labour, or provide two sound explanations of differences and show an awareness of a third difference.

Level 1 responses will either not show an understanding of three differences, or will fail adequately to explain the nature of the differences.

*In answering this question, take account of the following issues:*

- Knowledge and understanding of the policy or ideological positions of 'new' Labour. (AO1)
- Knowledge and understanding of the policy and ideological positions of 'old' Labour. (AO1)
- Analysis and evaluation of the nature of the difference between these policy and ideological stances. (AO2)

4(c)	To what extent has the Conservative Party moved towards the centre ground of UK politics in recent years?	AO1	AO2	AO3
		10	15	5

Each leader of the Conservative Party since Margaret Thatcher has made some attempt to shift the party towards the 'centre ground' of UK politics. For example, John Major attempted to do this over Europe, William Hague briefly embraced a more socially inclusive agenda, and both Ian Duncan Smith and Michael Howard showed sympathy, at times, for a more inclusive agenda. However, each of these attempts were either abandoned or had marginal significance, as Thatcherite ideas based on free-market economics, linked to Euroscepticism and a 'tough' stance on law and order continued to dominate within the party. This was largely a consequence of the make-up and ideological preferences of the Conservative parliamentary party, the membership and activist base and the party's core 'support'. There has been greater evidence of a move towards the centre ground of UK politics since David Cameron became party leader in December 2005. This has nevertheless been more evident in the rhetoric that Cameron and other leading Conservatives have used than, so far, in the emergence of 'hard' policy positions.

Shifts in policy or ideological emphasis under David Cameron have included the following:

- The party has embraced green issues much more clearly, showing a concern in particular about the issue of climate change linked to controlling carbon emissions, the possibility of green taxes and so on.
- A greater emphasis has been placed on social justice and a concern to alleviate poverty, by contrast with the emphasis on self-help and individual responsibility within Thatcherism. For example, there has been a greater emphasis on public services and on the national health service in particular. This has been linked to a changed view of society. Instead of the atomistic Thatcherite belief that there is no such thing as society, Cameron has stressed that there is such a thing as society (suggesting the importance of social responsibility), but he added that 'it's just not the same thing as the state'.
- An acceptance of the bulk of Labour Constitutional reform.

However, such ideas have yet to be turned into clear policy commitments, and there is evidence of a continuing commitment to certain Thatcherite ideas. This can be seen, for example, in the emphasis on society rather than the state, and also in the refusal to rule out a tax cutting agenda, even if economic stability now comes before the commitment to cut taxes. A more hostile anti EU position is evident:

- Tougher rhetoric on immigration policies
- Divisions still exist in the Conservative Party which make moves to the centre ground problematic.

Level 3 responses should provide a balanced and up-to-date account of policy and ideological developments in the Conservative Party which provides an evaluation of the extent to which they differ from Thatcherism.

Level 2 responses should show a limited to sound understanding of the nature and significance of key modern shifts within the Conservative Party.

Level 1 responses will provide a weak or poor account of recent policy and ideological shifts within the Conservative Party, or fail adequately to address more recent developments.

*In answering this question, take account of the following issues:*

- Knowledge and understanding of recent policy and ideological shifts within the Conservative Party. (AO1)
- Explanation of how these shifts have moved the party towards the 'centre ground' of UK politics. (AO2)
- Evaluation of the extent or significance of recent changes within the Conservative Party. (AO2)

