



# Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In Politics (9PL0)  
Paper 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

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

Summer 2022

Publications Code 9PL0\_01\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

# **Principal Examiner Feedback**

## **Summer 2022**

### **Pearson Edexcel Advanced Level in Politics (9PL0/01) Paper 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas**

#### **Introduction**

This summer saw a return to a full summer examination series for the first time since 2019. This period has been extremely difficult for teachers and students alike, as they coped with the extensive disruption that the Covid-19 pandemic brought to the classroom. Whilst this summer's exam series was not without its challenges, we want to thank teachers for all their diligence in preparing students to return to the exam hall, and we also want to congratulate students for their hard work and commitment in what was their first high-stakes assessment experience.

This summer was made unusual with the introduction of Advance Information (AI), to help students manage their exam preparation. Whilst the AI was broad in scope, owing to the nature of the specification structure, overall it met its aims and many students were able to target their revision effectively. There was much to praise in how teachers had prepared their students and the progress made since 2019.

In addition, the sitting of the A level Politics examination in 2022 was only the second full running of a summer series since the new specification was first examined in 2019. Although resit papers were sat in November 2020 and November 2021, the entries for these were very small (less than 100), and we therefore did not receive the usual feedback on the level of demand of those papers. After every full series, we review how our papers have performed to understand what adjustments may be required for future series; in light of feedback from teachers about this summer's papers, we will take additional care in our review process this autumn.

Examiners would like to encourage use of contemporary examples in both essay and source questions (although students can rest assured that all appropriate examples will be credited).

For if history teaches us about our yesterday, politics furnishes us with a view on today. This was evident on all questions, with up-to-date detail provided on political parties, devolved election results, current media events, contemporary pressure groups or recent issues with human rights.

Although there were many positives, it is also evident that exam technique and timing are crucial to success, and teachers should encourage students to practice both these things. Examiners also commented on the relatively low standard of handwriting, which appears to have been a consequence of lack of practice, especially in timed conditions.

### **Source Questions**

Source questions showed some improvement on approach since 2019, with the need to construct responses based on the framework and content of the source rather than treating the response as a freestyle essay question. This produced dividends for many.

There was some improvement on appreciation of the scope and application of the Assessment Objectives. This was based on two fronts. Firstly, the decline in an over-reliance on AO1 (demonstrating knowledge and understanding) and secondly an improvement in the development of AO3 (constructing arguments and making substantiated judgements) as a full and equal partner to the other two Assessment Objectives.

### **Essay Questions**

Essay questions have an improved structure - for although there is no prescribed format to be adopted, it is important that students show a strategic direction or plan of thought throughout the essay. Students flipping from one viewpoint to another occurred less frequently than in 2019.

### **Ideas Questions**

This was the question that it was most common for candidates to either not attempt at all or not complete. Teachers are encouraged to further support students with their time management in the exam hall to give them the best chance of answering all three questions and boosting their overall score.

We are exploring the possibility of providing separate source booklets for Paper 1 and Paper 2 to support students with time management. More information will follow on this shortly.

Importantly, the standard of political ideas answers has improved since 2019. Most students now focus on the question of agreement and disagreement.

Few students were limited by not citing key thinkers, although conversely a few relied too heavily on thinkers in place of strands, which is to be avoided. Teachers should remind students that it is essential to include both agreement and disagreement in their answers.

**Q1a Using the source evaluate the view that 'pick-and-mix' politics is replacing 'Left-Right' politics and parties are becoming more internally divided than ever.**

This question was less popular than 1b. We acknowledge that we received complaints about the term 'pick-and-mix' in the question, which may have put students off answering this question; however, question 1b was on a topic that is popular with many students, and this may have also influenced their choice of question.

Most students who attempted this question had a good idea of what 'pick-and-mix' meant and how it contrasted to 'Left-Right' politics. However, many struggled with then applying this to the internal division of parties as well. For many students, the two elements of the question became blurred. Too many only looked at one area, usually the 'Left-Right' politics, and left out the internal divisions.

Weaker answers were over-reliant on the source, with little attempt to bring in their own information, analysis and judgement. They attempted to answer the question without really getting to grips with what the question was getting at. Responses tended to focus on the phrase 'pick-and-mix' politics and give lots of different examples, therefore repeating the same point, rather than addressing the different points raised in the source. Some weaker students were side-tracked away from the source, particularly over descriptions of party policy.

However, the vast majority of students were able to use the source in the correct way and knew to base their points on specific issues from it. The best structures took 'Left-Right' v 'pick-and-mix', and then dealt with party divisions as a separate point, relating it back to their 'pick-and-mix' points. Most candidates offered a clear line of argument which matched their conclusion, but it was rare for candidates to evaluate the relative strength of different arguments.

Some of the contextual knowledge was consistent and impressive - Brexit, Red Wall voters etc, with the majority of successful answers citing Brexit as a central demonstration of the breakdown of established party alignments. Not many then followed through to an effective discussion of the consequent outbreak of factionalism within the Conservative Party. Knowledge on Labour splits (Starmer/Corbyn) was excellent, and there was also good use of the 2010 coalition as an example.

As the source states, traditional 'left-right' politics has been replaced with a newer model of 'pick-and-mix' politics. This means that, rather than subscribing fully to one party's ideology, voters are now free to support policies from either party due to their own personal freedom. This is due to greater divisions within parties, the rise in policies which cross the political divide and issues which lie outside of party lines; although Westminster itself is still primarily concerned with the left-right debate, pick-and-mix politics is on the rise.

#### Examiner Comment

A good intro which defines the idea of 'pick-and-mix' politics, links this to the idea of party unity and comes to the conclusion that 'pick-and-mix' politics is on the rise.

A weaker argument from the source is that parties "remain united in opposing each other." This is <sup>only</sup> partially true; recent examples of legislation such as Labour's opposition to the conservative government cutting universal credit by £20 demonstrates how the two major parties exist in opposition to each other. This example is also useful as it demonstrates the clear difference between left wing welfare and right wing lowering taxes, suggesting that these factors are still influential. However, this overall argument is weak as, during the covid-19 pandemic, there were strong levels of agreement

between the government and the opposition. Labour supported the furlough scheme and ~~mandat~~ the concept of vaccine passports, suggesting that the two parties aren't completely opposed. A stronger argument from the source is that parties are now "unstable and internally split." Kier Starmer's reversal of a "New Labour" economy with policies such as a \$5.10 minimum wage is at odds with the left wing faction of his party, Momentum who want to see it raised to \$15. Furthermore, although Johnson holds a large majority, he still faced dissent from backbenchers regarding lockdowns. This rise in party disunity has encouraged the electorate to instead draw ideas from other parties sources as the traditional left/right parties are so divided, they cannot create a singular idea.

### Examiner Comment

An excellent section where the candidate addresses the issues of 'pick-and-mix' and party unity using good examples to justify their view.

The source argues that policies fit within "the left-right model." This is again partially accurate as Starmer's idea to reintroduce some elements of nationalisation could only have come from a left wing agenda as the right typically prefer ~~for~~ laissez-faire capitalism. This suggests that the divide still exists when it comes to policy.

areas. However, this has again been weakened by covid which forced the right wing to make pragmatic rather than ideological decisions, such as ~~as~~ whilst they are traditionally seen as financially conservative, the current deficit of \$200 billion shows even the conservative party can take a left wing approach. The source reveals states that the electorate now want policies from across the spectrum, such as "rail nationalization and cutting the top rate of income tax." This suggests that the public can draw across the divide for their ideas, such as demanding more money for the NHS whilst demanding that taxes stay low due to the cost of living crisis. Although these policies may not be realistic they accurately reflect the views of the public, showing that "pick and mix" politics is replacing the left & right divide in the public consciousness.

#### **Examiner Comment**

Throughout their answer they are using content from the source on both sides of the argument, comparing competing views which they develop and maintain their view that Left-Right politics is being replaced by 'pick-and-mix' politics.



The source <sup>states</sup> ~~argues~~ that "on many issues there is still a left/right divide". A recent example of this is the government's recent policy of sending ~~these~~ asylum seekers to a detention centre in Rwanda which received support from the right whilst being condemned by the left. This shows that some

issues, such as foreign policy or education, can still fall within typical party lines. However, this argument is somewhat weakened by recent legislation that has received cross party support, such as the banning of conversion therapy for gay people in 2022, suggesting some issues can cross party lines. A contrasting argument is that issues such as "the EU and the environment cloud the issue, this is because these were traditionally seen as free vote issues and thus gained support from across the political spectrum. For example, both Nigel Farage and Jeremy Corbyn have both made anti-EU statements despite them belonging to the far right and the far left respectively. The inability to unite the conservatives about the EU was one of the reasons Cameron announced the

referendum in 2014. Furthermore, an individual's view on the environment is more likely to be formed by minor parties, such as the Green Party, or pressure groups such as Extinction Rebellion. Although they are traditionally viewed as Left wing, their campaigning has also influenced right wing policies, such as the attempt to reach net zero energy emissions by 2030. Although some policies are clearly amongst party lines, a greater number exist across the spectrum suggesting that

pick and mix politics are becoming more relevant.

#### **Examiner Comment**

Here we see the student considering cross-party views on the environment and Brexit to illustrate their view that 'pick-and-mix' politics is on the rise.

In conclusion, pick and mix politics is replacing "left right politics" as well as political parties becoming increasingly divided. Although some issues and policies are clearly either left or right wing, the electorate want for policies from either side, internal divisions within parties as well as issues which exist outside of parties suggest this is the case. The strongest factor is the internal split within parties as this has weakened the clear left-right divide within Westminster.

**Examiner Comment**

All that is left for the student to do here is to reassert the argument they have been making throughout the answer. This was awarded Level 5.

The 'left - Right' ideology has been a continuous ideology within politics with the ~~the~~ left ~~constantly~~ being at war with the right (excluding issues like Brexit and so forth) but the 'pick - and - mix' approach has been increasingly finding its way into politics with many of the ~~the~~ left and right abandoning their traditional values in order to satisfy the voters. Using the source and outside information I will evaluate whether <sup>the</sup> pick - and - mix approach is or isn't replacing the ~~the~~ traditional left - Right.

#### **Examiner Comment**

'Pick-and-mix' is explained well in the introduction; however, no clear view is expressed from the outset.

'The choice facing the electorate remains simple: you support the 'Left' or the 'Right'. Traditionally as a voter you only have the choice of the 'left' or the 'Right'. The left and right both have distinct opposing views and supporting both views is seen as something that is not possible but with the power that a voter has many of ~~both~~ both the right and ~~the~~ left are willingly to compromise their opposing views.

in order to not lose voters. This was seen in 2016 when UKIP pressured the Conservatives into the ~~the~~ EU referendum as they were at risk of losing voters an example of how voter choice is affecting the left-right ideology and although the EU referendum is seen as a neutral ground for the left and right it still compromises the ideology due to the demands of the voters. That being said most voters adhere to the left-right ideology has that has traditionally been the way voters have been voting and the pick-and-mix approach has a long way to go in order to replace the left-right ideology.

**Examiner Comment**

The first section on 'pick-and-mix' politics is quite descriptive and the Brexit issue is not well used to illustrate the point.

Internal party affairs plays a big role in the left-right ideology vs the pick-and-mix approach. 'Although internal party factions quarrel, they still play by the 'left-right' rules.' Even when there is a divide within a party the 'left-right' ideology is still adhered to by the party members. When ~~Jeremy~~ Jeremy Corbyn had a divide within Labour although the

party were at a stalemate they were still able to come together in order to oppose the right and their lack of covid regulations. ~~When~~ this goes from to portray how sacred the 'Left-Right' ideology is and that although a party is divided it will still come together to battle the opposition. Contrast to that the pick-and-mix approach is able to curme against internal party affairs as Labour is split between ~~the left and the right~~ ~~hard-left~~ ~~liberal left~~ hard-left and liberal left, having lost some working-class support while new parties try to replace it. This shows how the party divides essentially costs the party its voters and a great example of that would be during John Major's tenure as prime minister the Conservative party was more divided than ever before which cost the Conservatives many votes in the 1997 election who switched to voting for the left, <sup>costing conservatives</sup> <sup>the election</sup> ~~and~~ all excellent example of how the pick-and-mix approach ~~is~~ excels under internal party affairs.

#### Examiner Comment

The analysis of Corbyn's Labour party to show a Left-Right divide as well as 'pick-and-mix' is a bit confused and not well explained.

The pick-and-mix approach is very much ~~edging~~ edging closer and closer to replacing the 'left-Right' ideology as 'left and right have no meaning in politics any more, it's simply a matter of getting things done', and to a certain extent this is true many of ~~them~~ both the 'left-Right' compromise their views in order to 'get things done'

**Examiner Comment**

This quotes the source and repeats the point without taking the point forward.

To sum up everything that has been stated throughout this essay the view that pick-and-mix is replacing 'Left-Right' is not yet justified as the 'left-Right' ideology is too strong and implemented for it to be replaced that being said the pick-and-mix approach is gaining ground on the 'Left-Right' ideology especially through the use of the party divides.

**Examiner Comment**

The conclusion does come to a view that Left-Right politics is still dominant although it is not very clear throughout the answer. This received Level 3.



**1b Using the source, evaluate the view – with specific reference to at least one devolved region using an alternative electoral system – that the case for PR to replace the Westminster FPTP voting system has now been established**

This was by far the more popular choice and students tended to respond to this question at length.

Almost all students showed a clear grasp of both sides of the argument presented in the source and were obviously very familiar with first-past-the-post (FPTP) and all related arguments. Students engaged with the source and identified points that aided their arguments, and there was good use of students' own knowledge from across the past three decades to extend and challenge the points in the source, especially electoral statistics, and examples of different governments. There were many references to UKIP in 2015.

The vast majority of students gave a very clear line of argument, and there was a generally high level of evaluation throughout answers, although this still varied between students and affected marks awarded for AO3 accordingly.

However, a majority of students failed to get to grips with the full demands of the question and there was much greater variety in the extent to which they engaged with the instruction in the question about 'at least one devolved region', when there was a significant amount of source content related to PR in the devolved regions. This emboldened statement was included in the question to give students additional support, so they were not wrongfooted and wrote only about FPTP, ignoring the second section of the source. We received some feedback from teachers concerning the use of bold in the question. As part of our review of the papers we will reflect on this approach and issue updated guidance accordingly.

Far too many students wrote out a planned answer of 'Should FPTP be replaced?' Others used the references in the source to STV and AMS but added very little other than to repeat what the source had said; others just outlined generic PR strengths and weaknesses, rather than how specific systems have been working for the last 20+ years in the UK. Many did little more than mention devolution or the specifics of how these systems work, which did little to answer the question.

Some students discussed a system of PR in comparison to FPTP, but no justification was offered as to why the PR system was successful where FPTP failed. Often students would provide a paragraph on FPTP and then a paragraph on an alternative system but fail to actually compare the two, which affected their ability to come to a substantiated judgement.

There was often a general acceptance by students that coalitions should be avoided, with little analysis of the relative success of the 2010-15 coalition government in the UK, or of coalitions in the devolved regions, or that overly powerful party government delivered by FPTP might be less desirable than a coalition resulting in compromise. There was some confusion with STV in Northern Ireland and the creation of coalitions: many students suggested that the reasons for the disruptions in NI were down to coalitions caused by STV, when in fact it is down to the requirements of the Good Friday Agreement. In

addition, some students showed confusion over SV, claiming it was proportional. There was also confusion over AMS in Scotland, with many believing that it had helped the SNP gain a majority when in fact they would do better under FPTP. There was also a tendency to describe Farage's UKIP as extremist (even the Greens in some cases). However, some used the example of the BNP in 2010.

The strongest students discussed the actual use of AMS in Scotland and Wales and STV in Northern Ireland, with some good up-to-date knowledge of recent elections and political crises in the latter. Reference to Wales was much rarer and to devolution in London even more so.

There were some lovely comparisons of how AMS had helped the Conservatives in Scotland and some students had superb knowledge of STV and AMS, including election data and seat wins across time. There was some excellent knowledge displayed of the recent Northern Irish elections, and developments such as the SNP/Scottish Greens coalition or the recent success of Sinn Fein and the collapse of Stormont. Many correctly understood that STV was chosen for the NI Assembly because it provided wider representation across the different parties.

FPTP is an electoral system used for UK general elections, but many criticisms have been made of it for decades now, yet ~~is~~ it has never been replaced. The source ~~exp~~ details the benefits and drawbacks of the political electoral system, ~~the~~ system, and why it ~~has~~ continues in use today. Ultimately, the case for reforming FPTP has been ~~in motion~~ established for a while, and still not successful, however its criticisms and the use of its replacements are becoming more well-known so it is indeed possible that the plan to replace FPTP with PR has now been established.

### Examiner Comment

Good (if a bit long) intro which sets out the views expressed in the source and comes to a view that FPTP should be replaced.

One of the first points made in the source is FPTP's lack of proportionality. By using a ~~FPO~~ PR system, the problem of voters ~~not~~ demands not being properly heard is resolved. ~~The~~ The election results of the 2019 general

election show this disproportionality, as the Conservative government only won 44% of the vote whilst achieving 56% of seats. Furthermore, over ~~50~~ 50 MPs were elected without 40% of the vote, a clear drawback of the FPTP system being safe seats and winners' bonus. A different system, such as STV mentioned in the source would be 'more faithfully reflect how the people vote'. In the UK, this is used in Northern Ireland and in the 2022 elections to Stormont produced a highly proportional result; Sinn Féin won 27% of the votes, and 30% of the seats, while the DUP won 25% and 28% respectively. Nevertheless, a criticism of PR is the fact that it cannot create strong and stable governments, as N.I. is always in a coalition. The instability of this is mainly by the dissolving of Stormont from 2002 to 2007. FPTP on the other hand has produced '18 working majorities in the last 20 elections', which gives them a very clear

mandate. But ultimately, ~~the~~ the reason for unstable coalitions in Northern Ireland may not be due to the system used, and more due to the polarisation of Irish politics. As the same system, STV, has been successful in creating majorities for Scottish councils on more than one occasion. Therefore the use of PR could be beneficial to elections to Westminster, ~~and~~

**Examiner Comment**

A very good start. Here the candidate is using the source to consider both views, has excellent knowledge of a devolved assembly and is using their knowledge effectively, concluding with the view that FPTP should be replaced.

Another argument outlined by the ~~so~~ extract is how FPTP negatively affects smaller parties, and it is ~~true that the~~ accurate that there have only been two parties with a viable chance of winning an election since 1922. The view that the source delivers is that FPTP is in place because it benefits the Labour and Conservative parties. This can be demonstrated by ~~that~~ considering the fact that in 2019, it took 26,000 votes to elect one Conservative MP on average, whereas it took over 866,000 votes to elect a Green MP, showing that

votes are clearly unequal, leading to tactical voting. ~~over 8~~ 80% of the seats are held by the two major parties, and around 70% of ~~the~~ voters elected them, more than two thirds of them choosing to vote tactically. The Liberal Democrats, for example, despite having 11.5% of the vote only have 1.7% of seats, and UKIP in 2015, had 12.5% of the vote and only one seat. The problem here is clearly voters have little choice and will always end up voting tactically.

N.I., however, has a number of parties, ~~as~~ including DUP, Sinn Féin, Alliance etc. Admittedly, an argument for retaining FPTP is that it is a great deal ~~simple~~ ~~is~~ were 'simple and quick to operate', showing that perhaps a system like PR could be far too complicated ~~as there are some 39 parties in Australia~~, for instance Australia, that uses STV, has some 39 parties, and voters must choose between candidates as well as parties. This could potentially lower

turnout even more, and increase apathy. Considering turnout was already at 67% in 2009, making it even lower would be very undemocratic. But with the growing of single issues being more important such as the environment, or in 2015 Brexit, people may want a party in power to represent these ~~demands~~<sup>needs</sup> more concisely, so demands for PR may be growing.

**Examiner Comment**

While the reference to Australia is not overly helpful, it is identifying a contrast to the simplicity of FPTP.



The final argument in the source is that PR delivers 'takes power away from parties and to voters', meaning under PR, voters are fully free to decide and parties are adapting their methods to appeal to voters rather than voters making sacrifices in their decisionmaking. A system like AMS, also outlined in the source, ~~gives~~ is a hybrid system that maintains the aspects of FPTP that are beneficial to voters, but corrects those that are beneficial to parties. It is used in Scotland, and creates two types of

MP, local ones and party list ones. This means voters are able to have a link with their MP, but can also have their views represented proportionately. As of 2021, the SNP holds 62/73 of local MP seats, with 48% of the vote. Had it been purely FPTP, they would have had an absolute majority, but the party list balances this out, providing them with only 2 more seats, even though they would have gained more. The counter-argument for this is that <sup>in the extract</sup> FPTP delivers 'clearer accountability', as the SNP is usually in a supply and confidence coalition, currently with the Greens. Clear links to accountability are important in further elections but even the 'loser' can win, as happened in 1951 and 1974.

#### **Examiner Comment**

The point about "takes power away from parties..." is well explained, and then the point is developed by using the example of AMS in Scotland.

overall, the view that the replacement of FPTP has been established is somewhat convincing; clear successes in places like Scotland and very evident failures of FPTP, like lack of voter choice and proportionality mean many people favour reform, but the fact that Labour and Conservative continue to benefit from it makes it difficult.

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

**Examiner Comment**

Although the A03 is probably weaker than the other two AOs, this answer does enough overall to be put in L5.

FPTP is a simple plurality system\*, this means the winner is the party with the most votes. It is used in UK ~~etc~~ general elections. It could be argued that PR doesn't need to replace FPTP as it usually produces a strong and stable government. However on the other hand this system isn't representative of the nation so perhaps a PR system should be used, for example AMS (additional member system) which is used in the Scottish and Northern Irish Assembly. ~~in this system~~ Therefore the case for PR replacing FPTP is ~~weak~~ not established.

#### Examiner Comment

The introduction sets out the different views reflected in the source but doesn't reference the source. It ends with the view that FPTP should not be replaced.

FPTP has 'weathered the test of time and proved it works', which shows how over the years there haven't been many issues that arise as a result of using this system. <sup>(\*1)</sup> If we did decide to ~~etc~~ use PR, the results would be unpredictable so would be better to stick with what we know. ~~the~~ FPTP has also produced strong and stable governments with 'working majorities in 18 out of 20 elections'.

~~which shows that~~ with a majority government they have a mandate, so therefore laws that are stated in can be passed. ~~Therefore~~

The ~~cabinet~~ have people have confidence in the government to deliver their needs.

However this system didn't produce a strong and stable government in the years of the 2010 coalition government and ~~in~~ in 2017. If

AMS is used this might lead to coalition governments or minority governments so would be less desirable. Therefore ~~PR~~

the case for PR to replace FPTP is weak as there is uncertainty with AMS and at least with FPTP <sup>usually</sup> producing a majority government laws can be passed which benefit the electorate.

\* Furthermore there has been a strong case to keep the FPTP system, shown by the majority not in favour of a proportional system like AV (alternative vote) in the 2011 AV referendum.

### Examiner Comment

The answer begins by using a reference from the source. While the answer goes on to namecheck AMS and refers generically to PR in the section, it does not really include sufficient knowledge of how these systems are working in any devolved assembly.

Furthermore FPTP 'secures a close and productive links between MPs and constituents' so constituents know who to talk to when they and can raise issues, so the government can make changes to benefit the people. Also with

there being only one MP for each constituency, this holds them accountable to the electorate. When MPs are in Parliament they would most likely debate ~~most pertinent~~ issues that are in the interests of their constituents, so it ensures constituency ~~ts~~ are represented and their voices are heard. However if a PR system such as AMS was used, due to electorate having 2 votes, one ~~for~~ constituency vote and one party list vote, if they have ~~contrasting~~ different ideas then it wouldn't be fair to the constituents if they can't make agreements. Also there ~~is~~ raises the issue of accountability, who are the constituents hold accountable for different issues?. Therefore ~~the~~ FPTP would be the most desirable system in terms of accountability, so it shouldn't be replaced by a PR system such as AMS as with FPTP there is a strong MP-constituency link.

### **Examiner Comment**

Again, in the next section, the answer refers to generic PR and shows knowledge of how AMS works in principle; there is no specific knowledge displayed of how it works in any devolved assembly.

On the other hand, FPTP produces an unproportionate result and does not ~~represent~~ ~~the~~ 'reflect how people vote' ~~both~~ so doesn't represent the public - you could say it leads



to a tyranny of the majority. Furthermore it <sup>maintains</sup> ~~benefits~~ a 2 party system which, 'benefits the Labour and Conservative parties' which isn't democratic as smaller parties views are not heard, and there is <sup>evidence</sup> the ~~existence~~ of other parties in the UK such as the SNP and Lib Dems. They do not get their proportional vote share, under PR they would have won 11 more seats, this would allow 'the voice of other parties into political debate and government, which would make democracy fairer and more inclusive. ~~With PR~~ ~~used~~ ~~How~~. Therefore the case for PR to replace ~~the~~ the FPTP system is established on the basis that it reflects the voters' political ideas and is fairer to all the other ~~the~~ emerging parties.

In conclusion, it is evident that ~~PR~~ ~~is~~ ~~PR~~ would be a better option in terms of a PR system such as AMS would be a better option in terms of fairness <sup>and representation</sup>. However the case against reforming the FPTP system in Westminster is stronger as it usually produces a strong and stable government, there is

clear accountability, ~~and would be~~  
~~dangerous~~ provides a mandate to  
govern, and is quick and easy to calculate.  
Therefore the view that PR should replace  
FPTP is weak and FPTP ~~with~~ should be  
unchanged.

**Examiner Comment**

This answer was typical of many scripts, where the instruction to provide 'specific reference to at least one devolved region using an alternative electoral system' has been largely ignored and is very FPTP heavy. As such, this answer achieved a Level 3 mark.

## **Q2a Evaluate the view that it is the media not pressure groups that has the greater influence on governments.**

This was the more popular of the two essay questions, with students having a good understanding of both pressure groups and the media.

Students were clearly well prepared on how pressure groups influence governments, with many having a good range of examples and understanding how various methods might impact on government policy and decision making. Many students were able to consider how the media impacted on general election outcomes, but fewer wrote about the impact of the media on governments more widely. We received some queries from teachers as to whether this question was 'on spec'. Questions can make linkages between sub-sections, and the specification cites 'the role of the media in politics', which provides a broad licence for the influences of the media on all aspects in the component.

There was extensive use of examples, although some students over-relied on older ones for the media: the 'Kinnock turning out the lights' and 'The Sun wot won it' examples (1992) were particularly hard-worked and, although perfectly acceptable, would have benefited from support from more recent elections. For pressure groups, the Gurkha campaign, Fathers4Justice and Stop the War were surprisingly still present in many answers, despite the last two being active around 20 years ago. Some candidates did utilise more contemporary material, such as the Rashford Free School Meals campaigns, the Greensill scandal, Extinction Rebellion, Insulate Britain, Black Lives Matter, Nazanin Zaghari-Ratcliffe, Hillsborough etc. Although 'partygate', the resignation of Hancock, the tax affairs of Sunak's wife etc did feature in a number of answers, it was surprising that students didn't make more of these and other scandals and the impact the media can have by driving a story. Nonetheless, older examples were preferable to those responses that did not use any at all.

Many answers made the assumption that because an event had happened, it had impacted government policy. For example, with F4J and Stop the War they wrote that the public campaign impacted the government even though it had no impact. Better answers showed that these were the evidence of pressure groups not impacting government policy, but these seemed to be in the minority.

Many students did not break down 'the media', using it as a broad a term and making it difficult to handle – they would almost always have profited from distinguishing more clearly between media types. Very good answers were able to compare the different influences each had, enabling a more nuanced answer. For example, the media are more influential at election time, but pressure groups are better at influencing legislation. Also, there were some excellent answers which made some good distinctions between insiders and outsider pressure groups and how they influence governments. There were also occasional excellent links drawn between think tanks and media.

Some students spent too long on definitions at the expense of argument, for example getting side-tracked into definitions of different kinds of media or pressure groups. Others got side-tracked into discussions of 'success factors' or the pros and cons of pressure groups and democracy.

Many answers were let down by the way they structured their answer, with sections for and against pressure groups followed by sections for and against media. This limited AO2 marks, as there was little actual debate about which was the most influential on governments. Other answers looked at one way in which pressure groups influenced government and then one unrelated way in which media would influence government and then repeat the process without the relative strengths or abilities of the two until a conclusion. Again, this limited AO2 marks and, subsequently, AO3 marks.

Some excellent answers adopted a themed approach, looking at how the media and pressure group influenced government policy, held governments to account and supported/promoted the election of a government. They looked at each theme from the perspective of media and then pressure group, coming to a judgement at each stage.

Most students offered a clear line of argument which matched their conclusion, although evaluation throughout the response was more variable, affecting AO3 marks accordingly, and it seems clear that centres are training their students on ways to ensure that they carry out evaluation. Many use standard phrases to 'top and tail' paragraphs. This approach leads to solid AO3 marks, but students need to do more than just copy and paste evaluative sentences to get into higher levels for AO3, they need to be genuinely engaging and showing how one side of an argument is stronger.

The media has the greatest influence on governments due to its ability to build social pressure, influence the voting decisions of its readership and also portray government policy in the light it wishes to which influences the actions of government. Pressure groups are able to do similar but have less power to influence as the media involves and reaches more people, especially through social media.

The media can be viewed to have greater influence on the government due to its ability to rally social pressure which can force the hand of government to act a certain way. Many TV debates spoke of the party gate scandal during the covid lockdowns which was internalised by its viewers who widely expressed opinions through social media. This created lots of pressure on government to explain their actions and also delegated more power to the Labour party to hold the government to account as the public was behind them in great force. This coverage by the media undoubtedly aided and sped up the governments response which suggests that the media has the greatest influence on the government ever.

pressure groups. It should however, be noted that pressure groups are able to act similarly in creating social pressure to influence government. Insulate Britain demonstrations have blocked main roads in the UK, including motorways, which causes disruption and forces the government to address them, suggesting potentially greater influence. This is particularly flawed however, as the government hasn't implemented action as a response to such activity ~~which~~ which suggests they are not a bigger influencer of government. Pressure groups don't have the same number of followers to create as much social pressure as the media do. This is also because creating a negative reaction off the public boosts media engagement so there is usually a majority of media firms creating pressure. Therefore, the media clearly have more influence over government due to their greater power than pressure groups to create social pressure, a catalyst of influence.

### **Examiner Comment**

Here the answer is focusing on the pressure both media and pressure groups can bring on government to hold them to account. It makes effective use of interim judgements.

A further argument in favour of the media being the greatest government influencer is their ability to alter how the public portray policy adopted by government. This can influence governments away from making certain changes. In 2017, May's tax on houses with spare bedrooms was labelled a

'dementia tax' as the media concluded is targeted the elderly with such conditions. If the government fears their policy is being portrayed in a bad light, their electoral success could be damaged which may lead to policy being revoked. This suggests they are a lot greater in influence on government as the pressure groups don't have the same ability to reach as many people. A caveat to this however, is that pressure groups can also have success on influencing government through altering how the government is portrayed, and to a greater extent than the media can. Extinction Rebellion moored a pink boat to Oxford Circus during a huge demonstration which had words on the side reading "Tell the truth". This suggests influence on the government as in 2019, Johnson announced his net zero by 2050 policy, a push for green energy. The government was equally influenced by how it was portrayed over the climate due to pressure groups such as extinction rebellion, leading to this new policy. This is ~~just~~ <sup>very</sup> weak argument however, as there were many other sources of influence on the government over the climate, such as the green party and also, the government are attempting to pass a bill aiming to



cap disruptive pressure group activity which suggests if anything, they were unlikely to have been influenced by Extinction Rebellion as they commonly use disruptive tactics such as gluing themselves to trains. Therefore, it is evident that the media has the greatest influence on government due to pressure groups hindering their capability to influence through disruptive methods. Also, the media has a larger viewing ~~audience~~ and, lots of pressure group activity which raises social pressure and government influence is covered by the media which undeniably shows that the media has the greater influence.

**Examiner Comment**

Here the candidate is discussing pressure groups and media's ability to change government policy, concluding that the media has greater influence.

\* The media can also arguably be seen as the greater influence on governments due to social media's huge growth and how that can influence people's views on what ~~policy~~<sup>policy</sup> is most desirable, meaning government must change to suit the people's interest in order to remain electable. Out rages on social media over the governments plan to scrap school meals when the pandemic had caused financial issues for many was met with huge backlash with people messaging ~~govt~~<sup>members</sup> of government and voicing their views. This was

even picked up by Manchester United and England football player Marcus Rashford who also illustrated his outrage. Such ~~media~~ disgust from social media led to the eventual U-turn of plans suggesting the media have a greater influence on government as they are able to get direct change from governments due to the threat of the government losing public confidence which is easily demonstrable through social media, at the click of a button. This argument could be perceived as weak as pressure groups also have the tools of social media but more importantly, can directly lobby government for influence, suggesting they are the greater government influence. This is demonstrated through Matt Hancock's <sup>ex</sup> neighbour receiving a £40 million PPE contract after he contacted him for the opportunity via WhatsApp. This suggests pressure groups can achieve more direct influence on government which the media can't. This argument fails as it relies on one of few successful pressure group lobbies. Crumpler United have lobbied the government for justice against cladding companies and received little to no help and also, pressure groups regularly use social media

programs to get in touch with government to  
influence them, suggesting they still rely  
on media coverage, do not have greater  
government influence than the media.

### Examiner Comment

In this final paragraph, the candidate is discussing whether social media is more effective than lobbying when trying to get the government to change its mind.

To conclude, arguments that social media  
is the biggest government influencer has  
a relatively strong degree of merit to it  
however, pressure groups often achieve  
influence on the government through TV  
coverage or through social media. Considering  
they rely on the media to have their influence  
it is conclusively justifiable to state that  
the media does have greater government  
influence than pressure groups.

### Examiner Comment

Overall, a thorough, detailed response which is organised effectively and makes good use of interim judgements. It achieved a Level 5 score.

The media has a significant influence on governments specifically in formation due to role of media in elections however once elected pressure groups have a greater influence on the actual working of governments.

**Examiner Comment**

While it is reasonable to accept that media and pressure groups are better at different things, it is important to come to a final judgement rather than sit on the fence.

The most significant influence which the media has on a government is in its composition, which is of course intrinsically linked to its function. Media perception of a party can make or break a campaign, for example the dislike of Jeremy Corbyn was a large factor in his inability to win either the 2017 or 2019 general election. As well as this in 1997, Tony Blair's ability to convince Rupert Murdoch's allegiance to Labour was a key turning point for the New Labour campaign and is certainly a factor in the 179 seat majority which no government enjoyed. Time and time again the media have had a prominent effect on the outcome of elections in a way that pressure groups cannot because of strict laws on things like campaign finance within the UK. Therefore the media arguably hold in a chokehold the most important facet of influencing the actions of a government: the creation of the government itself.

**Examiner Comment**

The answer makes an important point that media is most influential over the composition of the government, but no reference is made to pressure groups and the role they play.

As well as this social media is ~~of~~ gaining important ground as an influence over government decisions in recent years. This is particularly significant as social media is becoming more and more a tool to facilitate the work of pressure groups. Therefore not only ~~is~~ ~~the~~ media a significant influence on government by itself but also in conjunction with the function of pressure groups. For example, Extinction Rebellion, an environmental pressure group which rose to prominence in the late 2010s, used twitter and instagram to help organise their protests more effectively by encouraging greater participation, spreading key information and livestreaming events. This gave them greater influence as it combined a strengthened-thanks-to-media protest with massive media influence which made their cause more visible to the government. Similarly Marcus Rashford's campaign on free school meals

was as successful as it was because of the amount of media attention it received. Media and specifically social media allow campaigns to reach more people and facilitate the work of pressure groups because of it. Media's influence on the government must therefore not only be considered on its own merit but also the merit which it provides for pressure groups in the modern age.

**Examiner Comment**

This section does include discussion of both pressure groups and media, and there is a discussion of the role the media plays in supporting pressure groups.



However it must be noted that pressure groups have a significant influence on government and in some cases more so than media though this is largely dependant on circumstance. Unlike media or social media, pressure groups benefit from a few key differences: the tight single-issue focuses of pressure groups can make them far persistent and persuasive in their aims than the comparatively fickle media, unlike media some pressure groups benefit from having the ear of the government, ~~each~~ composition of pressure groups to ~~comping~~ contain experts and most significantly - money. The way in which pressure groups can be distinguished from media can make them much more effective in their aims. For

example, the British Medical Association (BMA) is composed of experts who as an insider group often consulted by government have a much higher potential to influence government than a media campaign on the same issue. As well as the funds which are pumped into pressure groups are hard to compete with by media sometimes giving them the influential advantage. All this to say that in certain circumstances a pressure group is able to do more than the media because of the nature of each thing.

In conclusion, whilst generally speaking media has a larger sphere of influence including on elections and visibility of issues (particularly on social media), in specific instances the nature of pressure groups will still give them the upper hand to influence governments.

#### **Examiner Comment**

This answer engaged with both the media and pressure groups and makes a good attempt to compare their relative influence; however, it was weak on AO3, leading to an overall Level 3 score.

**Q2b Evaluate the view that neither individual rights nor collective rights in the UK are adequately protected and guaranteed.**

This is not as popular as 2a – but many candidates did this question well and many answers were confident and well-rounded with a good range of examples and knowledge.

Candidates clearly had a strong idea of what is meant by individual rights, although less idea of what is meant by collective rights. The latter enjoyed a wide range of definitions and examples from the reasonable to the very tenuous, including the attempted prorogation of parliament as an example of a breach of rights.

Most answers did not distinguish between collective and individual rights, often merging them together throughout the entire answer. Stronger students distinguished between collective and individual rights and others also recognised the tensions between them, often with the use of high-quality examples around terrorism, privacy, covid etc.

Abu Qatada was still a regular presence in examples, as was the Belmarsh case. More recent examples like Shamima Begum were also used effectively. In some answers there was excellent knowledge of recent laws like the Coronavirus Act 2020, the Police Crime and Sentencing Act 2022, the Nationality and Borders Act 2022 and the proposals by the current government to repeal the Human Rights Act, which was pleasing to see.

There was a better understanding than previously that the HRA and the ECHR were not to do with the UK's former membership of the EU, although a significant number did not recognise the link between ECHR and HRA, which meant they treated them separately, effectively repeating the same point twice.

Weaker responses failed to distinguish between the different ways in which protection occurs, instead merely giving a list of the different rights that exist in the UK with some examples. Good answers tended to structure their answers based on how rights are protected and then evaluated them - commonly legislation/Parliament, Courts, and pressure groups. Parliamentary sovereignty was also used well, with some linking this to a lack of a codified constitution and checks and balances. However, this was not done in the majority of answers, and many responses chose to lead their paragraphs with examples of rights being, and then not being, protected, with no clear commonality between the examples chosen, and this undermined analysis.

Some students used this question to examine pressure groups and their influence on the protection of rights, but this tended to drift off towards a success/failure of pressure groups answer. Others focused just on legislation, writing paragraphs about the HRA, the Equality Act and Freedom of Information. Both these approaches were more limited in their scope than answers that covered a wider range of rights protection.

As with other questions, most students set out a clear line of argument matching a clear conclusion, but relatively few evaluated strongly throughout. The stronger answers were the answers that offered a view and a justification

throughout the whole essay.

in the UK there are systems in place to protect both individual and collective rights. These include legislation passed by parliament, the work of pressure groups in upholding both individual and ~~para~~ collective rights and the Human Rights Act and the work of the courts in upholding rights. However, although these do protect rights to a certain extent, the fact that parliament is sovereign, the government can be strong enough to ignore pressure and individual rights can be set aside in favour of the collective displays that rights are not entirely guaranteed. Although both collective and individual rights have been upheld at some times, the fact that the government can, and does, restrain individual rights in favour of the collective <sup>suggests</sup> ~~and~~ ~~that whilst collective rights may be protected in the UK,~~ ~~at other times seemingly limit collective rights as~~ ~~individual rights are neither guaranteed, nor protected, so it is~~ ~~suggests that collective and individual rights are not~~ ~~adequately~~ ~~protected and guaranteed in the UK~~ ~~are adequately protected and guaranteed.~~

#### Examiner Comment

An excellent introduction, but one that could have been made shorter and still been effective.

On one hand, there is a vast body of legislation in the UK that has been passed by parliament to protect individual rights. This includes the 1998 Human Rights Act, which brought into UK law the European Convention on Human Rights. Additionally,

the 2010 Equality Act secured the right of individuals from freedom <sup>from</sup> discrimination. ~~It has~~ <sup>These have</sup> been successful in upholding individual rights, as seen in the ~~2018~~ ~~2017~~ ~~Court~~ ~~in which the~~ ~~Supreme~~ ~~Court~~ ~~ruled~~ ~~that~~ ~~a~~ ~~loophole~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~Equality~~ ~~Act~~ ~~2010~~ ~~was~~ ~~closed~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~2018~~ ~~case~~ ~~in~~ ~~which~~ ~~the~~ ~~Supreme~~ ~~Court~~ ~~ruled~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~exclusion~~ ~~of~~ ~~heterosexual~~ ~~couples~~ ~~from~~ ~~anti~~ ~~discrimination~~ ~~legislation~~ ~~was~~ ~~incompatible~~ ~~with~~ ~~the~~ ~~UK~~ ~~Human~~ ~~Rights~~ ~~Act~~, ~~therefore~~ ~~upholding~~ ~~their~~ ~~individual~~ ~~right~~ ~~to~~ ~~anti~~ ~~discrimination~~ ~~legislation~~. This ~~case~~ ~~suggests~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~UK~~ ~~Human~~ ~~Rights~~ ~~Act~~ ~~is~~ ~~well~~ ~~protected~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~UK~~, ~~as~~ ~~they~~ ~~are~~ ~~protected~~ ~~in~~ ~~law~~. However, ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ ~~that~~ ~~parliament~~ ~~has~~ ~~legislated~~ ~~to~~ ~~protect~~ ~~rights~~, ~~it~~ ~~has~~ ~~also~~ ~~passed~~ ~~legislation~~ ~~to~~ ~~limit~~ ~~rights~~, ~~particularly~~ ~~individual~~ ~~rights~~. The fact that parliament is sovereign means that it can legislate on any area, and therefore has the ability to limit rights if it wishes, clearly showing that rights are not guaranteed. This is clear in the fact that legislation has been passed in parliament that has seemingly limited individual rights, such as the 2016 Investigatory Powers Act which limited individuals right to privacy <sup>from data collection</sup> online. Further more, the fact that the Conservative party government are attempting to repeal the Human Rights Act for a British Bill of Rights further demonstrates the fact that rights

are not guaranteed. Although the passing of the HRA protected rights, it can easily be repealed due to a conservative majority and parliamentary sovereignty. Clearly, parliament has both upheld and threatened individual rights in the UK. The passage of legislation to protect rights would suggest that they are adequately protected and guaranteed, but the fact that parliamentary sovereignty allows parliament to pass legislation that limits <sup>individual</sup> rights or repeal legislation intended to protect rights suggests that ~~the~~ rights, particularly individual rights are neither <sup>adequately</sup> protected nor guaranteed by parliament as they are not fixed or stable and there is no guarantee ~~or~~ requirement that parliament will protect rights.

### **Examiner Comment**

In the first section, the candidate is reviewing how well rights are protected by legislation, highlighting examples on both sides before coming to the judgement that they are not well protected.

Furthermore, pressure groups in the UK work to protect and uphold the rights of both individuals and the collective. This can clearly be seen in the case of Liberty, a pressure group that has fought to uphold the rights of individuals. In 2020 they represented a Welsh man in a <sup>case</sup> where it was made the use of facial recognition technology in a public space breached his right to privacy. Clearly in this case Liberty were successful in guaranteeing that his right to privacy was protected. Furthermore, Liberty have campaigned extensively against the



2016 Investigatory Powers Act, suggesting that even when parliament fails to uphold individual rights, pressure groups will play a role in pressuring parliament to reverse legislation or recognise the infringement on individual rights. Clearly, the work of pressure groups in the UK does much to ~~protect~~ <sup>ensure rights are</sup> protected. However, this does not adequately guarantee rights. Although pressure groups may campaign to protect rights, a determined government can often ignore them and go ahead with limiting both collective and individual rights. This can be seen in the fact that despite Liberty's campaigning, the 2016 Investigatory Powers Act has not been repealed, as the government is determined to keep it. Furthermore, many pressure groups spoke out against the 2012 Police Crime Sentencing and Courts bill, suggesting that it limited the individual right to protest, however the government was determined to implement the policy, and did so in 2012 with the bill becoming law. ~~This also applies to collective rights~~ When the government wishes to limit individual rights to maintain collective rights, they will do so, even if they face extreme pressure from pressure groups. This was evident when the government limited individual rights to freedom in lockdown in 2020 in favour of

the collective right to freedom from disease/death, despite all the criticisms and pressure they faced. Clearly, although pressure groups do work to protect rights by challenging breaches of rights incurred and advocating for individual rights to be upheld, the fact that a determined government can ignore pressure group criticism to continue with their policy to limit individual rights. Sometimes in favour of collective rights suggests that pressure groups are not able to adequately protect or guarantee individual rights in particular.

**Examiner Comment**

In the second section, the candidate deploys a similar approach looking at pressure groups.

Finally, the courts want to protect and guarantee rights in the UK. The passage of the HRA allowed the Supreme Court to issue declarations of incompatibility, therefore giving it an opportunity to uphold rights. <sup>They can also declare the</sup> This was clearly seen in 2010 when the Supreme <sup>excuse to be</sup> Court attempted to uphold individual rights in <sup>achieve</sup> <sup>ultra</sup> <sup>vires.</sup> *Murray v Ahmed* by ruling that the freezing of suspected terrorists assets by the UK government was ultra vires. In this case, they upheld the rights of individuals. Furthermore, <sup>in 2017 Liberty</sup> the ~~2018 case in which~~ the court ruled the exclusion of heterosexual couples from the ~~brought a case to the court in~~ <sup>successfully</sup> which they challenged alcoprove in the Equality Act that



**Examiner Comment**

An excellent answer which scored highly across all three AOs and achieved an overall Level 5 score.

The weaker argument is that individual and collective rights are protected and guaranteed in the UK. This can be seen through the development of legislation. However, the stronger argument is that judicial review, a main way of ~~the~~ protecting rights, as decreased in effectiveness and ~~the~~ also legislation is ~~weakened~~ <sup>in</sup> the power of ~~from~~ the government, ~~where they come~~ ensuring our rights are not guaranteed.

**Examiner Comment**

Not the most effective start to an answer, but it does outline the view that rights are not well protected.

The weaker argument is that individual and collective rights are guaranteed and protected in the UK. This can be seen through the development of legislation.

For example, the Human Rights Act of 1998, freely incorporated the European Convention into British Law. This allowed for the public to know and freely understand their rights, such as right to a fair trial. This ensured a collective protection of rights as the public know what they are ~~legally~~ legally entitled to. In addition, the freedom of

Information Act 2000, which came into effect in 2005, allowed for individuals to see how public bodies, such as the NHS, held information about them. This has been a significant development, as in 2009, the MP's Expenses Scandal was uncovered because a journalist was able to demand information. This ensured the rights of the collective public to be guaranteed as even MP's were being held accountable and held accountable. When Furthermore, the Equality Act of 2010, developed the principle of equality before the law. This act made discrimination in a key areas illegal, such as gender, race and ~~disabilities~~ religion. This has allowed individual rights to be protected in all aspects of life, such as in the workplace, with allowing equal opportunities for all. Therefore, individual and collective rights are protected and guaranteed in the UK as the development of legislation has further enhanced rights throughout the UK. It has allowed increased protection of rights throughout the UK through ensuring every individual is



~~These~~ are aware and accountable to their rights, even those in government and ensure discrimination does not affect any area of an individual's life, all because easy access to a list of positive rights the UK is collectively entitled to. However, this is the weaker argument because the government enforced and made all these developments to rights individuals and collective rights in the UK laws. This means that due to parliamentary sovereignty, the government can overturn any law they wish. This was seen in 2004 Belmarsh case where Blair overturned Article 5, right to liberty, after 9/11, allowing terrorist suspects to be held for up to 90 days without charge. Therefore, this is the weaker argument because although rights are currently protected in the UK, they are not guaranteed, as the government can work in its own interest and completely abandon all collective and individual rights that have been put in place.

**Examiner Comment**

Here we have the view outlined in detail that rights are protected through law, followed by a short critique, concluding that rights aren't protected.

On the other hand, the stronger argument is that individual and collective rights are not protected or guaranteed in the UK. This can be seen through the decreased effectiveness of judicial review.

~~In recent years~~ ~~judicial~~ ~~review~~ ~~cases~~ ~~have~~ ~~been~~ ~~used~~ ~~to~~ ~~challenge~~ ~~government~~ ~~bodies~~ ~~and~~ ~~protect~~ ~~rights~~, through setting a precedent, since 1200's. For example, ~~clinging~~ ~~on~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~way~~ ~~back~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Magna~~ ~~Carta~~ ~~in~~ ~~1215~~. However, in recent years the success of these cases have decreased. For example, in 2014, 36% of ~~cases~~ judicial review cases were successful, by 2020 only 12% were successful. This shows a lack of acknowledgment for collective and individual rights, demonstrating how the government has ~~over~~ ~~seen~~ ~~control~~ ~~once~~ ~~again~~. This decreased effectiveness can also be seen through the number of judicial review cases taking place. For example, in 2019 there were 3,400 cases but ~~by~~ ~~in~~ 2020 there were only 2,300 cases. This ~~was~~ ~~also~~ ~~a~~ ~~decrease~~ ~~of~~ ~~18%~~ from

2021. This shows the lack of demand for forcing the protection of individual and collective rights and also displays to the government that they may face minor backlash for oversteering laws. In addition, the ~~ineffectiveness~~ ineffectiveness of judicial review also means that there is a lack of strength in setting a precedent, ~~not guaranteeing~~ ~~guaranteeing~~ meaning that there is no process of guaranteeing our rights. Therefore, this is the stronger argument as judicial review is becoming less and less ineffective, decreasing a chance to develop our rights in the UK through setting a precedent and creating ~~not~~ no opposition to ~~get~~ government if threat to government to stick to legislation that protects our rights. This ensures a lack of guarantee throughout the whole process of protecting individual and collective rights.

In addition, the stronger argument is that individual and collective rights are not protected or guaranteed in the UK. This can be seen through government power

**Examiner Comment**

This lengthy explanation of judicial review makes few valid points about the role of the courts in protecting rights.

2021. This shows the lack of demand for forcing the protection of individual and collective rights on and also displays to the government that they may face minor backlash for oversteering laws. In addition, the ~~ineffectiveness~~ ineffectiveness of judicial review also means that there is a lack of strength in setting a precedent, ~~not guaranteeing~~ ~~guaranteeing~~ meaning that there is no process of guaranteeing our rights. Therefore, this is the stronger argument as judicial review is becoming less and less effective, decreasing a chance to development any rights in the UK through setting a precedent and creating ~~not~~ ~~no opposition to government if~~ threat to government to stick to legislation that protects our rights. This ensures a lack of guarantee throughout the whole process of protecting individual and collective rights.

In addition, the stronger argument is that individual and collective rights are not protected or guaranteed in the UK. This can be seen through government power

making the role of legislation ineffective. <sup>Due to parliamentary</sup> ~~Parliamentary~~ sovereignty the government can overturn any law / act that is in place. For example, the Conservative 2019 manifesto included a commitment to replace the Human Rights Act 1998 with a British Bill of Rights. This means that the government would be able to cherry-pick which rights they wanted. This shows a lack of consideration and care for the individual's rights, reversing the development of rights in the UK. This was also seen in ~~2004~~ the 2004 Belmarsh case where Blair overturned Article 5, right to liberty, which meant that the right of an individual was overturned. Therefore, this is the stronger argument because although legislation has protected our rights, this protection is not guaranteed. The government holds power to ~~overturn~~ <sup>overturn</sup> these laws whenever they wish, meaning these rights, collectively & individually or may perhaps protected and never guaranteed.

### **Examiner Comment**

This final argument discusses the role of the government in protecting rights, concluding that it doesn't.

making the role of legislation ineffective. <sup>due to parliamentary</sup> ~~For example,~~  
sovereignty the government can overturn any law / act  
that is in place. For example, the Conservative 2019  
manifesto included a commitment to replace the Human  
Rights Act 1998 with a British Bill of Rights. This  
means that the government would be able to cherry-pick  
which rights they wanted. This shows a lack of  
consideration and care for the individual's rights, reversing  
the development of rights in the UK. This was also  
seen in ~~2004~~ the 2004 Belmarsh case where  
Blair overturned Article 5, right to liberty, which  
meant that the right of individuals was overturned.  
Therefore, this is the stronger argument because although  
legislation has protected our rights, this protection  
is not guaranteed. The government holds power  
to ~~create~~ <sup>overturn</sup> these laws whenever they wish, meaning  
these rights, collectively & individually or only  
partially protected and never guaranteed.  
Overall, the stronger argument is that individual  
and collective rights are not guaranteed or  
protected. Although protection of rights has  
developed, this development can easily be reversed  
demonstrating a lack of clarity and also the main way  
rights have been recently protected, judicial review, is  
now decreasing in relevance / effectiveness. (Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

**Examiner Comment**



Overall, although this answer focuses on three valid areas, there is a great deal of irrelevance in parts, and it lacks analysis in others. It received Level 3 overall.

### **Q3a To what extent are conservatives united in their attitude towards the state?**

The question, unlike 3b, required students to look specifically at a particular theme, that of the state, and most were able to do this.

Many students did this question well. The 'state' was a broad topic that allowed students to bring in areas such as law and order, organicism, hierarchy, paternalism and the state's role in the economy. Many students were able to link this to the different strands and use the thinkers to back up these strands.

However, a significant number fell into the trap of discussing the economy or human nature without making a clear, direct link to how this related to the state. They showed significant knowledge, but it was not made relevant to the question. Better answers structured their answers into themes or areas of agreement and disagreement: some popular ones were the existence of the state / role of the state in society / role of the state in the economy.

Most responses identified the different strands of conservatism, and most answers had a good mix of strands and thinkers. Traditional, One-Nation and New Right conservatism were generally reasonably well understood by candidates, and a good number identified the contradiction within the New Right between neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism, which allowed an even greater level of comparative analysis. Many grouped traditional and One-Nation conservatives together as if they had the same ideas. This then made it difficult to develop valid arguments on similarities/differences. Some omitted traditional conservatism completely, which was puzzling.

Many students recognised a level of unity on the existence of and law and order role of the state, although some were inclined to overstate differences on the economy - again implying more of a 'large state vs no state' disagreement than a more nuanced understanding. There was also some confusion amongst candidates as to how large a state different branches favoured. Although most students understood this reasonably well, some over-simplified, bunching traditional and One-Nation conservatives together.

Students knew their thinkers well on conservatism and there was lots of clear focus on them, although there are still far too many candidates who are focusing too much on thinkers' views rather than strands. Answers should be 'strand driven' rather than 'thinker driven', with thinkers being used to exemplify a strand's view. Some answers simply compared and contrasted different thinkers' views on the state, without any reference to strands. This approach did not score as highly as one's which led with strands and is to be avoided.

There was great use of short quotes, "nasty, brutish, and short" featured regularly! However, sometimes, students used quotes without explanation of their meaning, context, or link to the question. Ideally, quotes should be used to enhance the explanation of the point being made.

It was pleasing to see far less storytelling - where students write one paragraph on each strand without any comparison - this year, compared to 2019. Most

candidates compared strands in each paragraph, which enhanced their AO2 marks. Some, however, as mentioned above, compared thinkers, and not strands. If students don't compare strands within the paragraphs, their AO2 will be limited and as a consequence, their ability to come to substantiated judgements, which is credited as AO3. Stronger responses compared similarities and differences between the strands and made judgements upon these.

AO3 was weaker in Ideas answers than UK Politics answers. Most responses identified differences between strands, without realising that the judgement they needed to come to was whether the similarities were greater than the differences (or vice versa). Others identified the 'to what extent' aspect of AO3 in the introduction and conclusion but didn't engage with it throughout the response.

Arguably, conservatism is a divided ideology due to the differing schools of thought which make it up. While all conservatives agree that the state is necessary, they are not united in their beliefs on the extent to which the state should intervene. This is due to disagreements within the ideology regarding human nature, the economy and state welfare. Therefore, conservatives are ~~not~~ not united and are divided to a significant extent over the state.

#### **Examiner Comment**

A great start, short, snappy intro which does everything it needs to do and ends with a view that the divisions over the state are greater than the similarities.

Conservatives are united reasonably in the sense that they all agree that the state is necessary. This is because the majority of traditional and one nation conservatives are sceptical about human nature. For example, Hobbes claimed that humans are "nasty, brutish and short" and that the state of nature is one of anarchy without a state creating strict boundaries. This is why all conservatives are largely united in the sense that they believe the state is paramount in ensuring law and order in society. Nozick, a neo liberal conservative, claimed that humans are "freedom loving pack animals", and without the state imposing limitations on our freedoms, society would fall apart. This also explains why all conservatives advocate for

the ownership of private property, not state ownership. This is because, owning property is like having a stake in society so this makes people less likely to rise up and overthrow the state or create anarchy. This demonstrates how conservatives are largely united in their views on the state's role in law and order. However, traditional and one nation conservatives believe that the state's actions should be rooted in tradition. For example, Oakeshott compared the state to a plant in how a plant grows from its roots so the state should act ~~based on~~ <sup>to preserve</sup> tradition and pragmatically as "one who forges the past is doomed to repeat it." Whereas neo liberals like Rand advocate for empiricism, suggesting that there is no use in tradition but we should act based on science. Therefore, ~~some~~ conservatives are more divided than united over the state as their disagreements over ~~the~~ tradition outweigh their fundamental agreements.

### **Examiner Comment**

A paragraph that begins outlining clearly and in detail where there are areas of unity, but adding, towards the end, how there are still differences. Many candidates identified these areas of agreement.

the ownership of private property, not state ownership. This is because, owning property is like having a stake in society so this makes people less likely to rise up and overthrow the state or create anarchy. Thus demonstrating how conservatives are largely united in their views on the state's role in law and order. However, traditional and one nation conservatives believe that the state's actions should be rooted in tradition. For example, Oakeshott compared the state to a plant in how a plant grows from its roots so the state should act ~~based on~~ <sup>to preserve</sup> tradition and pragmatically as "one who forged the past is doomed to repeat it." Whereas neo liberals like Rand advocate for empiricism, suggesting that there is no use in tradition but we should act based on science. Therefore, ~~therefore~~ conservatives are more divided than united over the state as their disagreements over ~~the~~ tradition outweigh their fundamental agreements.

Furthermore, conservatives are divided over the state's role in the economy. Arguably, traditional and one nation conservatives agree that the state must play a role in the economy as they are "sceptical" of the free market as it is unpredictable and volatile. As Oakeshott said, conservatives merely wish to "stay afloat", so traditional and one nation conservatives advocate for pragmatic state intervention in the economy as needed.

For one nation converges after WW2, this took the form of Keynesian economics. Whereas, now right conservatives advocate for an unfettered free market. Rand claimed that "the small state is the strong state" and that it should merely act as a "watchman" rather than actively intervening in the economy. Therefore, conservatives are largely divided rather than united over their views on the state's role in the economy.

**Examiner Comment**

A briefer paragraph, which doesn't go into a great deal of detail, but is strongly linked to the state, and does correctly identify areas of disagreement.

Lastly, conservatives are considerably divided over state welfare. One nation conservatives will broadly advocate for noblesse oblige - a form of paternalism. This is due to the traditional conservative beliefs from Hobbes that some are "born to rule" and that there is a natural hierarchy in society. Therefore, we nation conservatives believe that the top of the hierarchy have a duty to provide ~~for~~ the poor so should be taxed by the state. Whereas, new right neo liberals ~~also~~ reject noblesse oblige as they claim that humans are rational so advocate for voluntarism. This is <sup>kind of</sup> ~~the~~ idea that those who have more money will rationally opt out that our <sup>without the state forcing them to</sup> ~~will~~ provide for these poorer in society and in turn neo liberals reject the idea of a "nanny state" based on dependency culture. Therefore, conservatives are extremely divided over their views on the state's role regarding welfare.

### Examiner Comment

Here the candidate elaborates on what they had begun on the previous paragraph on conservative views of state welfare. It does lack a strong connection back to the state (although welfare clearly implies state involvement).



In conclusion, conservatives are more divided than united in their views on the state. While earlier traditional conservatives advocate for a stronger state which enforces law and order and acts pragmatically in the economy, new right conservatives advocate for a small state as the free market. This demonstrates how conservatives are not united over the state.

### **Examiner Comment**

An excellent answer which is strand driven, uses thinkers throughout, clearly identifies both agreement and disagreement, concluding that disagreement is greater. It was awarded Level 5.

Conservatives have 3 different types, Traditional one nation and new right and with these types they have key thinkers which have opinions on the state and how it should be controlled. The ~~3 types~~ conservative are not all fully united within their views on the state but there is some parts in which they do hold the same idea.

#### **Examiner Comment**

A basic introduction which outlines the conservative strands, but not a view.

Firstly a traditional conservative has a view that the state should be under strict control and have high involvement within the state. This is due to their idea of ~~human~~ people being inherently selfish and then needing to be controlled. A traditional thinker who spoke about this was Thomas Hobbes and he said without a autocratic state there would be 'natural chaos' and that societies will be 'poor and short' this view is in large contrast to the new right view which views that state to succeed by having minimal control over the people in order for it to

Succeed this was spoken about by Robert  
Nozick who said ~~control~~ the state should  
have as little as possible ownership and  
control ~~in the~~ on the people <sup>to allow success</sup> which is  
very much what Margaret Thatcher had done  
when she was prime minister and she was  
known to be a strong new right conservative  
and she ~~sold~~ privatised many industries.  
This overall shows clear evidence that between  
the new right and traditional there is no part  
~~agreement~~ of them being united.

#### **Examiner Comment**

This paragraph is quite descriptive in places, and, although the New Right are mentioned in the second part of the paragraph, limited comparisons are made.

However there may be other parts of Conservatism whose views may align be partly united with each other and this is between traditional and one nation conservatives, this is because as traditionalists do believe in a strong and stable state to ~~dictate~~<sup>control</sup> over the country ~~that~~ which has ~~meant that~~ ~~is~~ allowed the people to achieve their goals in the best possible way which was spoken about by Edmund Burke who is known as the father of conservatism which he wrote his work in response to the French Revolution, he said that the state needs to have complete control over the people

as this is the only way for them to achieve their goals due to the idea that humans are irrational. <sup>he said "and</sup> ~~they~~ need to achieve bigger than what they can" which means ~~toward~~ people US and achieve to go for it. This is why they need ~~strength over~~ control by the state. The one nation view on state is fairly similar to this as they believe that there is a need for strength and control over the people which was spoken about by the one nation thinker of Michael Oakeshott who spoke about states have a strong control as people do not have the correct direction in how to achieve and as he ~~is~~ believed in a pragmatic approach it showed how we need to stick with control over people overall this. Shows how there is possible similarities in the conservative views on state but due to the ~~fact~~ the idea of a state being run in an autocratic manner for traditionalists rather than democratic ~~manner~~ regime in which one nations are as we see today with the current conservative party who is one nation mainly. This shows how they went United.

**Examiner Comment**

Again, correct content, but not particularly comparative or analytical in its approach.

Lastly to show how the Conservative view is not united on the state we can talk about the 2 key thinkers of Edmund Burke and Adam Smith. These 2 have far distant views on the state and this occurs because of their views on human nature, they both see humans as naturally selfish but Burke believes this is bad and we need to have a strict state to control people but on the other hand Smith thinks that being selfish is a positive as we are rational naturally so therefore his view on the state is to be very weak and allow the people to strive for success without help or control by the state. This shows clearly how some conservative thinkers are not at all united and view that state to play completely different roles.

#### **Examiner Comment**

Up till this point, the answer had been strand driven. In this paragraph it switches to being thinker driven. It would have been better to have identified the strands here.

To conclude the Conservative view on the state is not particularly united with each other this is because ~~they~~ they all have different ideas on Human nature with Rand and Burke so this makes it hard to be able to agree

on how a state should be ~~run~~ run. But also with their views on ~~a~~ leadership and as ~~they~~ the traditional believe in their being a autocratic state and new right thinking it should be democratic but this may be due to times of which these thinkers wrote their work as in the 1600 and 1700s there was far far less democracies which is why traditional are not united with new right on view of ~~the~~ the state.

#### **Examiner Comment**

Overall, a correct but relatively simple answer which lacks effective comparative analysis. It was awarded Level 3 overall.

### **Q3b To what extent is socialism more disunited than united?**

This question allowed for a very wide range of points and most students took advantage of this as there was plenty of scope for students to show their understanding of the topic.

This question seemed a little better answered than 3a, possibly due to the freedom in terms of the themes that could be used for the arguments. The breadth of this question gave students an opportunity to demonstrate how well they could structure an answer and many students chose different themes for each paragraph. Common themes were human nature, revolution/evolution, the economy, the state, equality, view of capitalism, etc.

It was very common for students to recognise common concerns about capitalism as an area of some agreement, and then to explore the nature, degree and solutions involved for different branches as an area of disagreement. Human nature was also widely recognised as an area of some consensus.

Most students demonstrated sound knowledge of the strands of socialism referenced in the specification. Revolutionary Socialism, Social Democracy and the Third Way were generally reasonably well understood by students. As in the last live summer series in 2019, a number of students continue to confuse Marxist Revolutionary Socialism with Soviet state socialism, failing to recognise the “wither away” aspect of Marx’s view of the state. In the main, all three strands were discussed by students, with a slightly greater focus on Revolutionary Socialism; however there was greater inaccuracy on Revolutionary Socialism than the other two strands, for example confusing the dictatorship of the proletariat with nationalised industries. Some candidates discussed Democratic Socialism at length (often by excluding Social Democracy). Although Beatrice Webb is a key thinker on socialism, Democratic Socialism is not a named strand on the specification and students should be reminded of this.

However, although students were able to write with confidence about the range of views held by the three strands, they sometimes did this without commenting on the significance of this for the dis/unity of the ideology. Most students argued that socialists were more divided than united, but their knowledge and understanding of divisions was greater than that which unites socialists.

As with 3a, the strongest answers clearly focused on comparing the strands rather than being thinker led. The very strongest answers demonstrated a clear and strong understanding of the topic, were able to draw out similarities and differences between the strands, exemplified with knowledge of relevant thinkers, and showed the interplay of the issues between the strands and the extent of dis/agreement, making regular comparative points and evaluative judgements.

With this question, more so than 3a, there was a tendency to fall foul of balance, as a good number of essays only did disagreement, or had a fleeting nod to agreement, despite there being a number of areas of agreement to be identified. Students with no agreement in their answer were limited to Level 2.



There were several, though, who still look at the ideology as an extension of a party question and relate to the extent of unity within the Labour Party. This approach is to be avoided. Though not as extensive as in 2019, several did rely on a narrative approach and had clearly been taught or learnt an extensive history of the ideology and the historical context of the ideas, which they related in a narrative approach that made analysis and comparison difficult to credit.

There were still a few students who did not reference any or only one of the key thinkers and were capped as a result. However, the overwhelming majority were able to write well about the key thinkers with accuracy and relevance.

As with 3a, the 'extent' of dis/unity was not necessarily addressed throughout the response, often just in the introduction and conclusion. Sustained AO3 judgement requires students to discuss this throughout the answer.

Socialism is more disunited than united to a very large extent. Although all socialists are united <sup>in their</sup> ~~agree on~~ <sup>more</sup> positive position on human nature, and ~~how~~ <sup>more</sup> impactful ~~can~~ socialists fundamentally disagree on ~~the~~ ~~na~~ ~~na~~ how to achieve equality as well as the end goal for socialism, <sup>and so are disunited.</sup>

All socialists agree that human nature ~~is~~ <sup>is</sup> positive, based on fraternity and care for each other with Marx, as a revolutionary socialist, claiming that human nature originally was ~~a~~ focused on working together and equality. Similarly, Third Way socialist, Giddens agreed that human nature is positive with a desire for social cohesion and care for each other whilst still working towards fulfilling personal goals. In this way, all socialists have a united view <sup>revolutionary socialist</sup> on human nature with Luxemburg, <sup>agreeing</sup> that whilst human nature has been impacted by capitalism in a negative way, ~~but~~ human nature remains positive and focused on fraternity and unity. However, whilst this agreement between socialists <sup>should not</sup> ~~should~~ be overlooked, it is ~~not~~ a superficial agreement and does not convincingly show socialism to be united.

**Examiner Comment**

A paragraph that looks effectively at the way socialists agree over human nature, but concluding that despite this agreement, they are still more divided than united.

Socialism is fundamentally divided in its ideas regarding how to deal with the state in ~~a socialist~~ <sup>order to progress</sup> towards equality. Socialists heavily disagree about the state as Marx and Engels, along with Luxemburg argue that revolution is needed to overthrow the state along with what Marx terms 'class ~~consciousness~~ <sup>consciousness</sup>'. According to Marx this revolution must happen immediately and after the current capitalist state is overthrown ~~the~~ the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' ~~will~~ will replace it'. Contrastingly, Revisionists like Third Way revisionist Giddens and Social Democrat Crosland argue that the state needs reform only, no revolution is needed as in fact the state, once reformed can be utilised to achieve socialist values. This is a huge disagreement as whilst revolutionary socialists argue to society is so 'sick' that the state must be overthrown in order to achieve socialist goals, revisionists take a very different approach, as does ~~to~~ Webb as a ~~the~~ Democratic Socialist who argues that the state needs extended reform over a long period of time. In

this way, socialism is very disunited to a huge extent in regards to the state and how the state can be utilized to move towards the socialist goal of equality

**Examiner Comment**

Here the candidate is addressing how socialists are divided over the role of the state, looking at all three strands and Webb, with some excellent Marxist key terminology on display.

5

5

A further reason why socialism is fundamentally more divided than united is due to their differing end goals for socialism. Revolutionary socialist Marx argued that the state will eventually 'withers away', according to his 'Communist Manifesto' leading a stateless communist society, with equality of outcome guaranteed for all. This is completely different to reformists such as Third Way socialists like Giddens who argued that the state, along with capitalism can be used to move towards a ~~so~~ more socialist society. ~~For~~ Furthermore, whilst Marx ~~and~~ and Luxemburg focused on the need for equality of outcome, Giddens, along with Cranford to a more limited extent, focused on equality of opportunity. According to Giddens, equality of opportunity will lead to more equality as people can lift themselves out of poverty once provided with the same opportunities as everyone else. Giddens ~~at~~ went as far as to openly disagree with Marx,

Claiming that equality of outcome is not possible in practice as a flourishing economy <sup>needs</sup> ~~under~~ capitalism <sup>which</sup> will always ~~lead~~ lead to <sup>inequalities regarding</sup> inequality of outcome. Therefore socialists are heavily disunited regarding the end goals of socialism, particularly regarding whether the goal should be equality of outcome or equality of opportunity.

#### **Examiner Comment**

The final paragraph focuses on disunity over end goals with a focus towards the end on equality.

Overall, ~~the~~ socialism is more disunited than united to a very large extent. Although all socialists ~~are~~ superficially agree that human nature is ~~partite~~ and we, as humans, are fraternal ~~and community~~ in nature, this is the limit to socialists being united. Socialists are heavily disunited in their view of how to get rid of the state or whether in fact the state only needs reform as well whether the end goal of socialism is equality of ~~of~~ outcome or equality of opportunity. In this way, due to their fundamental disagreements, socialism is more disunited than united to a large extent.

#### **Examiner Comment**

A simple conclusion which ties everything together. Overall, an excellent answer with high-level knowledge, very effective comparative analysis and good evaluation, achieving a Level 5 score.



Socialists are seen to be more disunited due to the extreme variety of views accepted as socialist, ranging from Karl Marx's ideas of classless communism to the third way's views of accepting capitalism and refusing top down state ~~intervention~~ intervention. The wide variety of ranges and the fact most socialists would likely not agree with each other due to revolutionary vs evolutionary changes and acceptance/rejection of the state as a whole clearly displays that socialism is more disunited than united.

Beginning with Karl Marx and his view that society will move to a classless, communist society with no state at the end completely contrasts the majority of other socialist views. His belief as a ~~revolutionary~~ revolutionary socialist <sup>was</sup> that the working class would unite and fight against the bourgeoisie exploiting them. He believed this class conflict would overthrow the existing elites in society and lead to a communist utopia. He believed first the working class would need to achieve class consciousness, the belief that they will all see themselves

as workers in ~~the~~ society and this would occur via dialectical change. This is where class ~~conflict~~ conflict after class conflict would eventually lead to the complete overhaul of the state itself and the implementation of classless communism. This ~~also~~ is agreed by other socialist thinkers such as Rosa Luxemburg, who advocated for a socialist revolution as necessary to the socialist beliefs itself. She believed a workers revolution would occur and the elites to be overthrown however this disagrees with both social democrats and democratic socialists.

Democratic socialists such as Beatrice Webb believed that the key to achieving socialism was via democratic reforms and elections. She believed this was the most effective, a route called evolutionary socialism, with no need for violence and done via the democratic process. This clearly contrasts with Marx's and other revolutionaries views as they believe the only way to achieve socialism is via a workers revolution and hold no interest in achieving it via democratic routes. This evolutionary and gradual change is much slower route to socialism than a very quick revolution, and also regards a need for the state as Webb believed in an almost paternalistic socialist elite to look after the workers, whereas Marx

holds no regard for the state as a necessity.

Furthermore, the development of social democracy views post 1945 displays an acceptance of capitalism, disregarding Marx, Webb and Luxemburg as they completely reject capitalism and view capitalism as the root of all problems in society, generating extreme inequality and why many are unhappy. Instead, social democracy accepts capitalism as a tool which was very efficient at generating wealth, but poor at redistributing it, with much going to the top 1%. They argued to 'humanise' capitalism, with Keynesian economic views to operate the economy, provide welfare for all (cradle to grave welfare) and favoured high, progressive income taxes to balance society. This also saw creation of national free healthcare, such as the NHS in the UK and welfare to help the poorest in society. This acceptance of capitalism goes completely against fundamental socialists, like Marx and Webb, who cannot accept capitalism as it exploits the workers and provides only to an elite. Furthermore, social democrats argued the ~~the~~ elite had now turned into business managers who cared for the wellbeing of <sup>their</sup> workers and wanted them to be happy. These revisionist socialist ideas go completely

against fundamentalist views who predominantly reject the state, reject capitalism and some call for revolution too.

In addition, the development of 'third way' policies, ~~the~~ neo-revisionists, used by Blair and new Labour in the UK, accept a market based economy, going one step further than social democracy ideas, displaying the extreme divisions within socialism. Marx and other fundamental socialists would not even remotely agree with the majority of neo revisionists, as they promote capitalism and don't advocate strongly for the redistribution of wealth. Neo revisionists favour a social-investment state and investment in public services, predominantly education, to benefit society. They would reject the high taxation of social democrats, but there is a broad consensus between revisionists and neo revisionists to accept capitalism due to its strength of generating wealth. However, neo revisionists would partly reject Keynesian economic theories of 'tax and spend' and favour globalist societies and support privatisation of companies, such as BT which was nationalised under social democracy ideas.

Overall, it is clear that socialists are far more ~~more~~ disunited than united due to the high tensions and completely different fundamental beliefs between each group. Fundamentalist socialists will disagree on how to achieve it, and the level of acceptance of the state and if it would 'with away' as Marx wished, ~~they cannot~~ there is only acceptance of rejecting capitalism as it is exploitative. There is a clear extreme difference between revolutionary and evolutionary beliefs, as revolutionaries see the need for a workers revolt whereas evolutionaries will believe the state can be reformed democratically to achieve socialism. And there is the clear difference between fundamentalists and neo-revisionists / revisionists who cannot see eye to eye on capitalism as either being the root of all problems or the greatest tool at generating wealth. Almost all socialist factions will disagree with one another in near-fundamental differences, clearly showing it to be more disunited.

### Examiner Comment

Sadly, despite excellent knowledge, this answer was scored at Level 3. The answer primarily discusses each strand on its own in separate paragraphs and does not really address the issue of whether there is more unity or disunity within socialism. It does include a comparative sentence or two within each paragraph, but this is nowhere near enough to score highly in AO2 marks, or to be able to make a substantiated judgement throughout the answer. Centres are asked to remind students to avoid this approach.



## **Paper Summary**

The following key points should be taken away from this exam series:

- Keep in focus the demands of the different Assessment Objectives, as none outweigh the others, and to reach the higher levels all have to be included.
- Wherever possible use current and contemporary political examples, for this brings insight and helps to engage students with the subject. The focus of the qualification is on the present-day political situation and it pays dividends. This means preparing students by using events that arise as you teach through the specification, as we all know the political world is far from static.
- This need is especially relevant when looking at the election outcomes of various electoral systems. Devolved assembly elections, now well-established, must be taught with a degree of substance, not generic coverage.
- Legible writing is an assumed prerequisite, ideally in a narrative that is set in steps which shows a logical and consistent series or path of reasoning. We recognise that many students these days use electronic devices almost exclusively and do not often handwrite extended pieces of writing. If you identify students whose handwritten work you struggle to read and understand (and therefore an examiner will too), it may be worth building in opportunities for these students to practice writing in timed conditions ahead of the exam, or even consider access arrangements, such as a word processor.
- Building on the above, creating any political response always benefits from planning and preparation. A few moments to construct the direction of travel and the framework of a response really does make a difference and enhances performance.