



**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2018**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit AS 2

assessing

The British Political Process

[SGP21]

MONDAY 4 JUNE, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to demonstrate:

- AO1** Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and debates.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and theories; identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences between the political systems studied.
- AO3** Construct and communicate coherent arguments making use of a range of appropriate political vocabulary.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce, in the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for tasks or questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of response

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all tasks and questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These tasks and questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 5: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Inadequate): The candidate makes only a very limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack any clarity and coherence. There is very little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is consistently unclear.

Level 2 (Limited): The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 3 (Satisfactory): The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (Good): The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 5 (High standard): The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Section A: The UK Parliament and Executive

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

1 Two marks for each type of peer identified. Candidates may refer to Hereditary, Life, Spiritual, Crossbencher. **(AO1: 4 marks)** [4]

4

2 Background

Departmental Select Committees are considered by many to be a key mechanism in checking the power of the executive. There are many reasons why they are generally held in high regard. They have a longer life than Public Bill Committees; their members develop considerable expertise in the policy area covered by the committee; their meetings are televised; Ministers, officials and prominent individuals feel compelled to attend and be questioned; the lack of Whip control; the independence shown by members; recent reforms in the election of committee members; the power to call for persons and papers.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid strength with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation of a valid strength. There will be some supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of a valid strength. Relevant evidence will support the response.

Apply criteria for other relevant strength.

(AO1: 2 × 5 marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

(AO1: 10 marks)

[10]

10

3 (a) Background

The idea that the executive now effectively dominates the legislative process in the UK is one that has been frequently expressed and is the basis of the argument that Parliament is now just a ‘rubber stamp’ where legislation is concerned. Candidates should seek to provide argument and evidence for both sides of this debate.

Those who argue that Parliament has largely lost its role in legislating would state that the vast majority of legislation is created by the executive and almost all this legislation is passed unchanged. A government with a sound majority can call upon party loyalty and discipline to ensure that its proposals become law. Public Bill Committees are weak, tightly whipped and subject to executive control. Private Members Bills have only a small chance of succeeding and require executive support to do so. The Lords has seen its powers reduced and has become little more than an arena for pointless objections to the “steamroller” that is the government’s legislative programme.

On the other hand, it is argued that Parliament can have a powerful influence on legislation. Governments have seen their legislative plans frustrated by

small majorities, by coalition, by backbench rebellions, by Lords opposition. Candidates should seek to provide some evidence of examples where government Bills have been significantly altered by Parliamentary action.

- If an answer is totally unbalanced a maximum of L4 can be awarded.
- If an answer contains no evidence/examples a maximum of L3 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether Parliament is a legislative ‘rubber stamp’ and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is inadequate. An argument, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

Level 2 ([7]–[11])

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether Parliament is a legislative ‘rubber stamp’ but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([12]–[16])

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether Parliament is a legislative ‘rubber stamp’ but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

Level 4 ([17]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether Parliament is a legislative ‘rubber stamp’ and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([22]–[26])

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate

knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether Parliament is a legislative 'rubber stamp' and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. [26]

(b) Background

Prime Ministers in the UK achieve their position as leader of the party that has a majority of seats in the House of Commons. Given the strength of party discipline, party loyalty and the careerist aspirations of many MPs, the PM can generally count upon the support of their party colleagues and, as a result, enjoys a great deal of power. However, the very basis of the PM's strength is also a potential source of weakness: if they lose the support of their party they are finished. It has been argued that British PMs are, as a rule, brought down by dissension and opposition within their own party ranks, rather than by any action of their official opponents. Even powerful leaders, such as Thatcher and Blair, were forced out by their own party. Brown's period as PM was marked consistent attempts by his own party to dislodge him and contributed to his electoral defeat. The lessons of Cameron's demise are self-evident.

On the other hand, it would be a mistake to discount the power over their party that the PM enjoys. Their MPs fate is often tied to that of their leader; MPs are, as a rule, party animals; without the support of their party, few MPs can retain their seat; the PM has a great deal of patronage to dispense to those who are loyal.

Weaker answers will be limited in terms of understanding of the arguments about the factors affecting the power of the PM and will lack evidence. Stronger answers will display understanding of the range of factors involved and be able to support this with a range of evidence.

- If an answer is totally unbalanced a maximum of L4 can be awarded.
- If an answer contains no evidence/examples a maximum of L3 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the PM's relationship with their party and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is inadequate. An argument, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

Level 2 ([7]–[11])

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the PM's relationship with their party but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant

irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([12]–[16])

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the PM’s relationship with their party but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

Level 4 ([17]–[21])

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the PM’s relationship with their party and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([22]–[26])

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the PM’s relationship with their party and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

[26]

26

Section A

40

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

Section B: The Judiciary in the UK

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

4 Judicial Inquiries have been criticised because it is the government that decides whether an inquiry will take place; the government establishes the terms of reference of the inquiry; the government appoints the chair; governments have used the Official Secrets Act to withhold evidence from inquiries; governments have not always agreed to fully apply the recommendations made by inquiries; inquiries can be time-consuming; inquiries can be very expensive.

Any other relevant criticism.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid criticism with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation of a valid criticism. There will be some supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of a valid criticism. Relevant evidence will support the response.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

(AO1: [5] marks)

[5]

5

5 Background

An independent Supreme Court was established with the passage of the Constitutional Reform Act in 2005. In the view of many, this has resulted in the judiciary being a much more effective check on executive power. The creation of a separate court that is not part of the Lords, the establishment of an independent appointments process for justices and the changes in the powers of the Lord Chancellor have all contributed to an enhanced role for the Court. Just as significant has been the effect that the creation of the Court has had upon its members. Supreme Court justices have apparently come to see their role as ‘guardians’ of the British Constitution and as a result have been more willing to act as a check on executive power. The incorporation of the Human Rights Act of 2008 into British law has enhanced the power of the Court.

Weaker answers will be limited in range and evidence. Stronger answers will have a broader range of reasons and evidence.

- If an answer contains no relevant evidence/examples a maximum of L3 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the effect of the creation of the Supreme Court upon the role of the judiciary and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is inadequate.

An argument, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the effect of the creation of the Supreme Court on the role of the judiciary but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the effect of the creation of the Supreme Court on the role of the judiciary but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the effect of the creation of the Supreme Court on the role of the judiciary and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the effect of the creation of the Supreme Court on the role of the judiciary consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

[15]

Section B

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

15

20

Section C: Pressure Groups in the UK

AVAILABLE
MARKS

- 6 Interest and Pressure groups are frequently categorised as cause and sectional groups. The latter are groups that represent an organised interest, typically a professional group, a trade union or a group of employers. Sectional groups exist, primarily, to defend the interests of their members across a broad range of possible areas. They are, in a sense, defensive organisations. The former, by contrast, are organisations that are not directly concerned with the interests of their members. They have a much narrower focus on a particular issue. They can be both defensive organisations and also radical, reforming groups that want to change policy significantly.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid difference with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation of a valid difference. There will be some supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of a valid difference. Relevant evidence will support the response.

(AO1: [5] marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

7 Background

'Headline-grabbing' refers to the tactics adopted by some pressure groups in which they engage in high profile activities such as demonstrations, public disobedience or 'spectacular' events. The rationale behind such tactics is to raise awareness of their cause and to try to gain popular support. This is an indirect way of trying to influence policy makers. Such tactics are generally, but not always, an indicator that the group is not particularly powerful, in terms of its capacity to influence policy makers. The fact that it has to try to influence public opinion is evidence of this. By contrast, those groups that do have considerable influence do not need to engage in publicity seeking tactics. Their 'insider' status means they already have the ear of policy makers and do not have to rely on the much less direct methods of persuading popular opinion.

This is, of course, something of a generalisation and candidates may note that not all high profile groups are ineffective and insider groups are not always successful.

- If an answer contains no relevant evidence/examples a maximum of L3 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the rationale behind pressure group tactics and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is inadequate. An argument, if present, is ill-informed

and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the rationale behind pressure group tactics but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the rationale behind pressure group tactics but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the rationale behind pressure group tactics and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the rationale behind pressure group tactics and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

[15]

Section C

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

15

20

60