



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2019**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit AS 2

assessing

The British Political Process

[SGP21]

TUESDAY 21 MAY, 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 function identified. Candidates may refer to organising party business, issuing voting instructions to party members, disciplining rebellious backbenchers communicating between the back and front benches and any other relevant function.
(AO1: 4 marks) [4]

4

2 Background

MPs can perform their representative function on several levels and all are legitimate responses to this question. They can represent their constituents, their party, outside interests and Parliament. Most candidates will probably choose to identify the first form of representation. Candidates may distinguish between representation outside Parliament (surgeries, communicating with other state agencies, public appearances) and representation inside (Questions, debates, Private Members Bills, rebellion).

Any other relevant form of representation.

Level 1 ([1])

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

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

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

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

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

Apply criteria for other relevant strength.

(AO1: 2 × 5 marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

If an answer contains no valid evidence, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 10 marks)

[10]

10

3 (a) Background

The view that the UK Parliament has been in long-term decline over the past century is frequently expressed by observers. In this view the Commons has become executive dominated and reduced to a legitimising body. Party discipline has enabled executives to dominate legislation and to avoid effective scrutiny. The mechanisms intended to enable Parliament to check the Executive have become increasingly ineffective. MPs have become party drones doing the bidding of their leaders. The Lords has been progressively weakened and has been left with no real powers of scrutiny.

Recently some have suggested that there has been a revival of Parliament. Backbenchers have shown a greater willingness to disobey their party leaderships and to vote according to their conscience or the interests of their constituents. The Executive is being more effectively scrutinised and its actions questioned. The revised Lords has been given a new lease of life and is making full use of its powers.

Weaker answers will be limited in terms of argument and especially evidence. Stronger answers will display understanding of the issues and be able to support this with evidence.

If an answer contains no evidence/examples, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If an answer is totally unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the debate about Parliament’s effectiveness as a scrutiny body 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 poor. 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 Parliament’s effectiveness as a scrutiny body 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 Parliament’s effectiveness as a scrutiny body 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 Parliament’s effectiveness as a scrutiny body 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 Parliament’s effectiveness as a scrutiny body 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 consistently 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 Cabinet colleagues and, as a result, enjoys a great deal of power.

However, it has long been recognised that political parties in the UK are invariably made up of different factions and that the divisions within parties are often as significant as those between parties. The task of any PM is to form a Cabinet that represents these different factions: failure to do so can result in the PM's position coming under attack from their own colleagues.

Candidates should seek to demonstrate that Cabinets are coalitions of different interests. Balance can take the form of arguing that what unites Cabinets is often greater than what divides them.

Weaker answers will be limited in terms of understanding and will lack evidence. Stronger answers will display understanding and be able to support this with a range of evidence.

If an answer contains no evidence/examples, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If an answer is totally unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the extent to which all Cabinets are coalitions 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 poor. 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 extent to which all Cabinets are coalitions 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 extent to which all Cabinets are coalitions 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 extent to which all Cabinets are coalitions 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 extent to which all Cabinets are coalitions 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 consistently 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]

Section A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

26

40

Section B: The Judiciary in the UK

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

4 Background

A number of mechanisms exist to ensure the independence of the Judiciary from political influence that may prejudice their decisions. Judges are now chosen through an independent judicial appointments process; they have security of tenure and cannot be arbitrarily removed by the Executive; they are well paid: their salaries are paid out of the Consolidated Fund and are free from political interference.

Level 1 ([1])

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

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation of a way.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of a valid way.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

(AO1: [5] marks)

[5]

5

5 Background

The major means by which the Judiciary can act as check on the Executive have been criticised as being ineffective in practice. Judicial Review is criticised because the expense involved deters many applicants. Most applications are refused and most judicial decisions are in favour of the Executive. Even when the judiciary do rule against the Executive, the government can change the law, thus negating the decision. Judicial Inquiries have been criticised on the grounds that it is the government that decides if an inquiry is to take place; the terms of reference; the judge who will preside over the inquiry. Finally, the government can decide which, if any, of the recommendations of an inquiry that it will implement.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of judicial checks upon the Executive 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 poor. 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 effectiveness of judicial checks upon the Executive 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 effectiveness of judicial checks upon the Executive 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 effectiveness of judicial checks upon the executive 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 effectiveness of judicial checks upon the executive 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 consistently 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 Background

The term “insider group” is seen to be the opposite of “outsider group” and both form part of an attempt to classify pressure groups in terms of their level of access to key decision makers. Insider groups are those that have direct access to decision makers. They are consulted continuously by Ministers and Senior Civil Servants and have direct input into the formulation of policy. Such groups do not employ tactics that bring them to the attention of the public because they already enjoy privileged access. There are different reasons why a group may be an insider and different interpretations of these reasons.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a valid explanation with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

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

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

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

(AO1: [5] marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

7 Background

Some, such as Marxists, would be extremely critical of pressure groups because they argue that wealthy groups are able to exercise a disproportionate influence on the formation of policy. This results in policies that reflect and protect the interests of the wealthy and powerful, to the disadvantage of the rest of society. Pro-capitalist groups are much more likely to have insider status with the result that capitalist interests remain paramount. The middle classes are also much more likely to be involved in pressure groups that have insider status. Public policy is, therefore, consistently distorted, undermining the principle of democracy.

Some on the right are equally critical of pressure groups, particularly trade unions. Such groups act as a brake on the economy, maintaining outdated practices and rules and preventing economic development and innovation. At crisis times, pressure groups can virtually hold the rest of society to ransom, again threatening democracy.

Any other relevant arguments.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of pressure groups 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 poor. 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 criticisms of pressure groups but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response

