



**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2023**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit AS 2

assessing

The British Political Process

[SGP21]

THURSDAY 8 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 Executive and Legislature

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

- 1** Candidates may refer to Public Bill, Departmental Select, Non-Departmental, Liaison or any other relevant committee.
(AO1: 4 marks)

[4]

4

2 Background

Whips have a range of both positive and negative powers that they are able to use to maintain party discipline. On the positive side are offering opportunities for advancement, enhanced party support and positive reports to the party leadership. On the negative side are the use of warnings, withdrawal of the whip, denial of opportunities to advance and unfavourable reports to the party leadership and constituency association.

Any other relevant way.

If no example is given, a maximum of [8] can be awarded.

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 way.

(AO1: 2 × 5 marks)

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

(AO1: 10 marks)

[10]

10

3 (a) Background

Weaker responses to this question will likely identify the main scrutiny mechanisms available to MPs and Lords. The strengths and weaknesses of the mechanisms will be discussed and the breadth of discussion and the quality of supporting evidence will differentiate responses. Better responses will take account of the “no longer” element of the question. This suggests that scrutiny is less effective than in the past and the executive is more dominant. The reasons why this may be so should be considered. For balance, candidates may question whether scrutiny really was so effective in the past and/or argue that scrutiny of the executive has actually improved.

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 no example/evidence is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
If an answer is unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of Parliamentary scrutiny 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 effectiveness of Parliamentary scrutiny 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 effectiveness of Parliamentary scrutiny 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 effectiveness of Parliamentary scrutiny 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 effectiveness of Parliamentary scrutiny 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

The context of this question is the debate over whether the UK has a system of Cabinet Government or a system increasingly dominated by the Prime Minister. Those who support the latter view argue that there has been a steady growth in the powers of the PM and a consequential decline in the significance of the cabinet. This is due to institutional changes, the expansion of the number of advisers, the increasing personalisation of politics and other factors. Those who take the alternative view argue that the PM does indeed need and depend upon their colleagues as losing cabinet backing is the surest way in which a PM can end their career. Some have suggested that Johnson's decision to appoint a cabinet of "lightweights and loyalists" is evidence that the cabinet is potentially very significant when composed of party heavyweights.

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 no example/evidence is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
If an answer is unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the relationship between the PM and cabinet 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 relationship between the PM and cabinet 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 relationship between the PM and cabinet 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 relationship between the PM and cabinet 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 relationship between the PM and cabinet 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]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

26

Section A

40

Section B: The UK Judiciary

AVAILABLE
MARKS

4 Background

Judicial Independence is the idea that the judiciary should be free from interference from other bodies, especially the executive, but also from Parliament and the media. Candidates may legitimately refer to the separation of powers in order to illustrate the meaning and importance of independence. It is also acceptable if candidates refer to examples of interference to explain the idea. It is anticipated that candidates may refer to the ways in which judicial independence is achieved and some content on this is appropriate. However, an answer that focuses on these ways but does not explain the concept itself can not achieve 5.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers an explanation with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation of the term.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of the term.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

5 Background

Critics of Judicial Inquiries often argue that they are only set up when a government is under extreme pressure to be seen to be acting in response to an event. However, the government usually wants to 'bury' the issue rather than do anything concrete about it. A government is able to achieve this outcome because it is able to determine the remit of any inquiry and has control over who chairs it. Inquiries are criticised for being slow, expensive and retrospective – 'bolting the door after the horse has already escaped' in the view of one commentator. Finally, a subsequent government may choose to ignore the findings of an inquiry.

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

An answer that contains no example/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is limited to one substantial point can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the limitations of Judicial Inquiries 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 limitations of Judicial Inquiries 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 limitations of Judicial Inquiries 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 limitations of Judicial Inquiries 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.

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the limitations of Judicial Inquiries 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. [15]

Section B

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

15

20

Section C: Pressure Groups in the UK

AVAILABLE
MARKS

6 Background

One classification of pressure groups divides them into cause and sectional groups. The latter are groups that explicitly represent the interests of a particular section of society. Cause groups, by contrast, exist to promote an issue and are not explicitly concerned with the self-interests of members. Cause groups campaign on a wide range of issues and can be both conservative and radical in nature.

If no example is given, a maximum of [4] can be awarded.

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 a relevant example.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation. A relevant example will support the response.

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

7 Background

An insider pressure group is one that enjoys close contact with those who make decisions within the executive. Insider status gives a group ready access to those determining policy. The views of the group will be listened to and will often influence those making decisions. Other factors that may give a group insider status include: financial 'muscle', the socio-economic nature of the membership, close personal ties with the political elite and having objectives that are in line with those of the executive. The size of a group does not necessarily grant insider status.

Any other relevant reasons.

An answer that contains no example/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is limited to one substantive point can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups achieve insider status 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 how pressure groups achieve insider status 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 how pressure groups achieve insider status 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 how pressure groups achieve insider status 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.

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups achieve insider status 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.

[15]

15

Section C

20

Total

60

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**