

## Government and Politics

Advanced GCE A2 7834

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS 3834

# Combined Mark Schemes And Report on the Units

---

**June 2005**

**3834/7834/MS/R/05**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme.

© OCR 2005

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annersley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622  
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### Advanced GCE Government and Politics (7834) Advanced Subsidiary GCE Government and Politics (3834)

#### MARK SCHEMES FOR THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
2595	Elections, Electoral Systems and Voting Behaviour in the UK	1
2596	Politics of the UK	5
2597	Government of the UK	9
2694	US Government & Politics	19
2695	Political Ideas and Concepts	25
2698	Government & Politics (US Option)	31
2699	Government & Politics (Political Ideas and Concepts Option)	41

#### REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit	Content	Page
*	Chief Examiner's Report	52
2595	Elections, Electoral Systems and Voting Behaviour in the UK	53
2596	Politics of the UK	55
2597	Government of the UK	57
2694	US Government & Politics	60
2695	Political Ideas and Concepts	63
2696	Research Essay	66
2698	Government & Politics (US Option)	67
2699	Government & Politics (Political Ideas and Concepts Option)	70
*	Grade Thresholds	73



**Mark Scheme 2595  
June 2005**

1a) Explain what is meant by a 'manifesto' and a 'mandate'. [4]

b) Using Source A and your own knowledge, describe the impact that campaigns can have on general elections. [6]

(Specifications: Campaigns, manifestos)

	AO1	A02	AO3
<b>Maximum</b>	8		2
<b>Level 4</b>	7-8		2
<b>Level 3</b>	5-6		2
<b>Level 2</b>	3-4		0-1
<b>Level 1</b>	0-2		0-1

AO1: Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of manifestos, mandates and campaigns. There are two marks each for 'manifesto' and 'mandate' – there are clear hints in the Source on both so look for a very clear explanation for the full two marks for each. For (b) there has to be both Source use and own knowledge for L4. General points, which affect all elections, or specific points referring to a particular election are perfectly valid. Think in terms of 3:3 marks split between Source and own knowledge. The AO3 marks allocate either overall or 1 for each part question.

2 Using Source B and your own knowledge, describe the principal factors behind voting behaviour in the UK. [20]

(Specification: Voting behaviour: models)

	AO1	A02	AO3
<b>Maximum</b>	16		4
<b>Level 4</b>	13-16		4
<b>Level 3</b>	9-12		3
<b>Level 2</b>	5-8		2
<b>Level 1</b>	0-4		0-1

AO1: Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the information available in the Source. Go to L3 for candidates who are able to explain very clearly the models etc offered in the Source, but reserve L4 for those who can add sensibly to those given and provide a good description as well. There are only AO1 marks going, so if there is a debate, make sure that it is looked at closely for relevant AO1 type points.

**3 Using Source C and your own knowledge, make out a case for UK general elections using similar methods of voting to those used for Scottish and European Parliamentary elections. [30]**

*(Specification: UK Parliamentary elections: Scottish parliament elections: European Parliament Elections)*

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	12	12	6
<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	10-12	5-6
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	7-9	4
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	4-6	2-3
<b>Level 1</b>	0-3	0-3	0-1

AO1: Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the information available in the Sources. The proportionality of the EU elections and the additional choice and proportionality is evident in both. There are other points about the benefits to 'minor' parties etc. Go to the top of L2, possibly even low L3 for sensible use of the Source, but for the middle L3 upwards there has to be a relevant focus on the merits. It would be quite appropriate to bring in demerits of the current UK system under 'own AO1 knowledge'.

AO2 : Make sure the focus is on the case 'for'. Beware the standard merit and demerits of PR essay. For the L4 there has to be very clear and focussed case. Reward those who prioritise their points, any candidate who argues that one factor is much more important than another and gives reasons should be highly rewarded.

**4 Using all four sources and your own knowledge, explain why Labour won the general elections of 1997 and 2001. [40]**

*(Specification: UK Parliamentary elections, Campaigns, Voting Behaviour)*

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	16	16	8
<b>Level 4</b>	13-16	13-16	7-8
<b>Level 3</b>	9-12	9-12	5-6
<b>Level 2</b>	5-8	5-8	3-4
<b>Level 1</b>	0-4	0-4	0-2

AO1: Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of both the many points made in the Source and other factors which have led to a Labour victory. For L4 insist on clear use of at least three of the Sources, although there are obvious points there in all of the Sources. For really good use of the Sources there is no reason why L3 cannot be reached but do not go to L4 unless there is obviously some clearer evidence of 'own' knowledge. If the sources are ignored, then 10 AO1 marks are the maximum possible.

AO2: Always reward those prepared to debate. Those who argue that it was the failings of the Conservatives as much as anything else should be rewarded just as much as those who argue possibly for the ability of the Labour 'machine' or the changes of 'new' Labour. Look carefully at detailed lists of reasons for any sign of an argument. If you have to work hard to find any view being expressed, then it is not going to get more than L2. There has to be a clear sign of analysis/debate/argument to get L3 here.

**Mark Scheme 2596  
June 2005**

**1 Briefly explain, with an example, what is meant by:**

- (a) an insider group
- (b) an outsider group
- (c) a sectional group
- (d) a cause group

[10]

(Specification: Pressure groups; types)

	AO1	AO2	AO3
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>2</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	7-8	-	2
<b>Level 3</b>	5-6	-	2
<b>Level 2</b>	3-4	-	0-1
<b>Level 1</b>	0-3	-	0-1

Give 2 marks for each point and 2 marks for AO3.

- (i) An insider group is one that is accepted by the government such as the NFU.
- (ii) An outsider group is excluded from the government decision making process. The Animal Liberation Front is an example,
- (iii) A sectional group seeks to look after its own members. An example would be the British Medical Association,
- (iv) A group seeks to promote their particular view. Shelter or Friends of the Earth are examples.

**2 Describe four ways in which a citizen can seek redress for a grievance.** [20]

(Specification: Redress of grievances)

	AO1	AO2	AO3
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>16</b>	-	<b>4</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	13-16	-	4
<b>Level 3</b>	9-12	-	3
<b>Level 2</b>	5-8	-	2
<b>Level 1</b>	0-4	-	1

With 10-12 minutes available 2 or 3 sentences are required. Suggestions could include:

- (i) using an MP or local councillor
- (ii) the courts
- (iii) the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (Ombudsman)
- (iv) the ECHR or ECJ
- (v) the media
- (vi) pressure groups

Allow 4 marks for each point according to the degree of detail. Reward use of examples.

**3 Discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the current methods of funding British political parties. [30]**

*(Specification: Political parties; funding)*

	<b>A01</b>	<b>A02</b>	<b>A03</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	12	12	6
<b>Level 4</b>	10-12	10-12	6
<b>Level 3</b>	7-9	7-9	4-5
<b>Level 2</b>	4-6	4-6	3
<b>Level 1</b>	0-3	0-3	0-2

For AO1, candidates should explain how political parties are funded and should include some of the following:

- (i) membership subscriptions
- (ii) fund raising events
- (iii) individual donors
- (iv) corporate and trade union donations
- (v) state funding

Give L1 or L2 for a list and L3 or L4 for the points with explanation and examples.

For AO2, candidates should evaluate how satisfactory each of these methods are.

- (i) Membership subscriptions are democratic but as membership numbers are falling they are not a sufficient source of funds;
- (ii) Fund-raising events such as quizzes, dinners, dances, fetes as well as corporate sponsorship can produce funds and increase involvement from both members and non-members but tend to place the burden on the same people, and may leave parties open to accusation of conflicts of interest;
- (iii) Individual donors whether Lord Sainsbury, Lord Ashcroft or Lord Kalms can be a good source of income but the donations may come with strings or donors may expect personal returns;
- (iv) Corporate (e.g. Fifth Avenue) or Trade Union funding again can produce a good income but again may harness the party to particular policies;
- (v) State funding increases equality between the parties and gives smaller parties a chance but it is a burden on the taxpayer who may resent money being used for a party of which he disapproves.

Reward examples and overseas comparisons. L1 or L2 for generalised and unfocused comments and L3 where there is explanation and L4 for some detail and balance.

**4 Critically examine the ways in which outsider groups can seek to influence government. [40]**

*(Specification: Pressure groups; methods used; examples of and reasons for success or failure)*

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	13-16	13-16	7-8
<b>Level 3</b>	9-12	9-12	5-6
<b>Level 2</b>	5-8	5-8	3-4
<b>Level 1</b>	0-4	0-4	0-2

For AO1, candidates should include some of the following methods:

- (i) petitions
- (ii) advertisements and letters in the press
- (iii) demonstrations
- (iv) stunts
- (v) strikes
- (vi) direct action
- (vii) use of violence
- viii) litigation

Give L1 or L2 for a list. L3 and L4 for explanation and examples.

For AO2, each of the methods identified should be evaluated:

- (i) Petitions can attract public attention and show the government the degree of feeling in the country but they can be and usually are ignored.
- (ii) Advertisements and letters in the press similarly can rouse interest but are ignored with impunity by governments providing it is not near an election or is particularly emotive.
- (iii) Demonstrations attract the media and public attention but rarely change anything,
- (iv) Stunts such as boarding an oil rig can gain world wide publicity and possibly an outcome but can be counter productive. For example the Brent Spa rig probably caused more environmental damage being dismantled than it would have done if sunk,
- (v) Strikes particularly those that are skilfully led and have public support can achieve their objective but ill timed, badly led or poorly funded strikes frequently fail,
- (vi) Direct action such as spiking a product or boycotting can produce results but frequently causes a backlash,
- (vii) Violence such as used by Animal Rights Groups has possibly contributed to the fall in fur sales but again can produce a backlash.

Award L1 and L2 for basic or limited evaluation and L3 or L4 for understanding and balance.

**Mark Scheme 2597**  
**June 2005**

1. a. Explain what is meant by ‘the sovereignty of parliament’. [20]  
 b. Discuss the view that parliament is no longer sovereign. [20]

(Specification: *The Constitution: principles.*)

(a) **AO1: Candidates must display a knowledge and understanding of what is meant by ‘the sovereignty of parliament’, and may include some of the following points:**

- Parliamentary sovereignty is the principle that, within a state, the legislature possesses the ultimate power to make, interpret and enforce laws binding upon all members of the community.
- It follows from this that:
  - there is no higher legal authority than parliament
  - an act of parliament is superior to all other law
  - there is no special constitutional law which can only be enacted by different procedures
  - parliament cannot be bound by its predecessors
  - there is no body that can declare an Act of Parliament illegal or unconstitutional.
- Candidates may use both examples and contrasts to make their point and may also set their explanation within the broader context of sovereignty generally, but they should not confuse parliamentary sovereignty (internal sovereignty) with national sovereignty (external sovereignty).
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on what is meant by ‘the sovereignty of parliament’.
- Credit candidates who are able to use a range of contemporary examples.

(b) **AO2: Candidates must be able to discuss the view that parliament is no longer sovereign and may cover some of the following:**

- Parliament is not an independent body but is controlled by the executive which can usually rely on its parliamentary majority to force through any proposals it wants NB Hailsham “the sovereignty of parliament has become the sovereignty of the executive”.
- Parliament is bound by international treaties, in particular the EU treaties which gave the European Commission and Council powers to legislate for the UK without the need for parliament’s approval and created law superior to statute law.
- The logical paradox that parliament cannot bind its successors.
- The view that devolution and the greater use of referendums, albeit consultative ones, have undermined the principle of parliamentary sovereignty should be treated with caution. Constitutionally this is not the case, though politically it might be.
- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis.
- Level 4 answers will offer a discussion that is clearly focussed on the view that parliament is no longer sovereign and display an awareness of both sides of the argument.
- Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

**AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

2. a. Describe the main features of the membership of the House of Commons. [20]  
 b. Discuss the view that the Commons should be more representative of British society. [20]

*(Specification: The UK Parliament: membership)*

- (a) **AO1: Candidates must display a knowledge and understanding of the main features of the membership of Commons, and may include some of the following points:**

- Elected (mention can be made of the qualifications for membership)
  - Mainly male, middle-aged and white
  - Overwhelmingly educated to degree level
  - Bias towards the professions and business
  - Party allegiance.
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on the main features of the membership of the Commons.
  - Credit candidates who are able to use a range of contemporary examples and data.

- (b) **AO2: Candidates must be able to discuss the view that the Commons should be more representative of British society, arguing that a more representative house would:**

- Be better able to represent both minorities (regional, religious) and majorities (women)
  - Be more representative of the diversity of British society generally
  - Contain a wider range of views
  - Be more legitimate, therefore claiming greater allegiance and perhaps encouraging increased participation.
- But that:
    - There is no particular virtue in having a house which reflects accurately the cultural, social, economic and demographic profile of the UK.
    - The problem of deciding which characteristics should be represented – gender, disability, sexual orientation, height?
    - The obligation such representatives might feel to represent only that characteristic, thus turning debates into factional disputes.
    - The practical problems of achieving a more accurate representation.
  - Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis.
  - Level 4 answers will offer a discussion that is clearly focussed on the view that the Commons should be more representative of British society and display an awareness of both sides of the argument.
  - Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

### **AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

3. a. Describe what is meant by 'prime ministerial style'. [20]  
 b. Discuss the style of prime ministers since 1979. [20]

*(Specification: The Prime Minister and Cabinet: different styles; debate over prime ministerial power)*

**(a) AO1: Candidates must display a knowledge and understanding of what is meant by 'prime ministerial style', and may include some of the following points:**

- Each prime minister as their own 'style' which is a product of a number of factors including their personalities and political skills, but also the circumstances in which they find themselves.
- Prime ministerial style may be thought of as the way a prime minister runs their government and has at least two dimensions:
  1. their personal style: their personalities and political skills
  2. their organisational style: how operate within the existing structures, and, sometimes, the structures they develop.
- Particular styles of leadership (innovators, reformers, egoists and balancers)
- Particular styles of government (prime ministerial, presidential, cabinet).
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on what is meant by 'prime ministerial style'.
- Credit candidates who are able to use a range of contemporary examples.

**(b) AO2: Candidates must be able to discuss the style of prime ministers since 1979 and may cover some of the following:**

- The more dominant (prime ministerial/presidential) style associated with Thatcher and Blair
- The more collegial (collective/cabinet) style associated with Major
- The personal style of Thatcher, Major and Blair
- The organisational style of Thatcher, Major and Blair
- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis.
- Level 4 answers will offer a discussion that is clearly focussed on the style of prime ministers since 1979.
- Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

**AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

4. a. **Outline the functions of a government department, a government agency and a quango.** [20]  
 b. **Discuss the role of the higher civil service in policy-making.** [20]

*(Specification: Delivery of Government Policy through Ministers, Civil Servants, quangos and agencies: relationship between; individual ministerial responsibility; civil service reform since 1979)*

- (a) **AO1: Candidates must display a knowledge and understanding of the functions of a government department, a government agency and a quango, and may include some of the following points:**

- The responsibility of government departments for the administration of a particular area of public policy including the initiation and development (with the relevant ministers) of policy, preparing legislation and putting it into effect and assisting ministers generally.
- The functions of government agencies as semi-autonomous bodies responsible the day-to-day delivery of government policy within policy objectives set by the relevant minister.
- The functions of quangos as a non-departmental public body responsible for the spending of public money. They may regulate a particular area of the law, disseminate information or distribute funds, for example, the CRE, the Learning and Skills Council, act in an advisory capacity, examining specific problems and make recommendations or perform a quasi judicial role, for example tribunals.
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on the functions of a government department, a government agency and a quango.
- Credit candidates who are able to use a range of contemporary examples.

- (b) **AO2: Candidates must be able to discuss the role of the higher civil service in policy-making and may cover some of the following:**

- Constitutionally civil servants have no responsibility or role distinct from that of the minister. The determination of policy, therefore, is the responsibility of the minister and the minister alone;
- The constitutional role of the civil service is to give the minister honest and impartial advice without fear or favour and whether the advice accords with the minister's view or not;
- When the minister has taken a decision, it is the duty of the civil service to carry out the decision with the same energy and good will, whether they agree with it or not;
- Better candidates will appreciate that the actual relationship is likely to be different as civil servants are permanent and experts in their field while ministers are always not the latter and certainly not the former; that ministers have other commitments to their party and constituents; that ministers are outnumbered by civil servants.
- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis.
- Level 4 answers will offer a discussion that is clearly focussed the role of the higher civil service in policy-making and display an awareness of both sides of the argument.
- Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

### **AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

5. a. **Outline the main powers of the prime minister.** [20]  
 b. **Discuss the view that the limits on the power of the prime minister are too few and too ineffective.** [20]

*(Specification: The Prime Minister and Cabinet: powers of PM; debate over prime ministerial power)*

**(a) AO1: Candidates must display a knowledge and understanding of the main powers of the prime minister, and may include some of the following points:**

- The right to exercise the prerogative powers, including the right to declare war, sign treaties and cede territory, advise the monarch on the dissolution of Parliament, appoint and dismiss members of the government and other powers of patronage;
  - Chairmanship of the cabinet with all the powers that flow from this;
  - Head of the civil service;
  - But also the power that follows from (normally) being leader of the majority party in parliament.
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on the main powers of the prime minister.
  - Credit candidates who are able to use a range of contemporary examples.

**(b) AO2: Candidates must be able to discuss the view that the limits on the power of the prime minister are too few and too ineffective and may cover some of the following:**

- The absence of any formal restraints on the prime minister in the form of a constitution though specific laws have some impact e.g. the need to call a general election at least once every five years
- The effectiveness, or not, of the need for prime ministers to retain:
  - the support of their government colleagues NB Thatcher and Major
  - the support of their party NB Thatcher, Major, Blair
  - the support of parliament, both Commons and Lords NB Callaghan vote of confidence, 1979 and more specifically particularly support for particular legislation and policies
  - the confidence of the electorate NB Major 1997
- And, more broadly:
  - the impossibility for a prime minister to dominate all aspects of policy and administration
  - limitations on specific powers e.g. appointment and dismissal
  - political circumstances beyond the control of the prime minister
- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis.
- Level 4 answers will offer a discussion that is clearly focussed on the view that the limits on the power of the prime minister are too few and too ineffective and display an awareness of both sides of the argument. Interpret the phrase 'too few and too ineffective' broadly.
- Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

**AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

6. a. Describe the role of the judiciary in the British system of government. [20]  
 b. Discuss the view that the executive exercises too much control over the judiciary. [20]

(Specification: Relationship between executive and judiciary: appointment to the higher judiciary; judicial review. The Constitution: principles)

- (a) **AO1: Candidates must display a knowledge and understanding of the role of the judiciary in the British system of government, and may include some of the following points:**

- Its role in:
  - interpreting and applying the law in specific cases (interpretation and enforcement)
  - deciding whether the government has exceeded its powers or acted unlawfully (judicial review)
  - their responsibilities under the *Human Rights Act*
  - conducting enquiries into difficult or controversial matters at the request of the government
  - acting as a 'constitutional court' in disputes between regional and central government
- More generally:
  - making law through interpretation
  - acting as a check on the other branches of government.
- The role of some members of the judiciary in other branches of government e.g. the lord chancellor and the law lords
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on the the role of the judiciary in the British system of government.
- Credit candidates who are able to use a range of contemporary examples.

- (b) **AO2: Candidates must be able to discuss the view that the view that the executive exercises too much control over the judiciary. and may cover some of the following:**

- The formal powers of appointment exercised by the executive and the opportunities this provides
  - The overlap of personnel, especially the lord chancellor
  - The lack of protection that a written constitution might provide
  - The sovereignty of parliament (and effectively of the executive?)
- But
- The formal independence of the judiciary so that the legal system operates independently as an autonomous system, free from the dictates of central government.
  - The practical consequences of this:
    - ministers do not direct a judge as to what the outcome of a case should be or what is an appropriate sentence
    - cases before a court are not discussed publicly (the *sub-judice* rules)
  - Judges can only be dismissed on an address by both houses of parliament
  - Judge's pay is fixed by statute
  - The powers of statutory interpretation and judicial review exercised by the judiciary
  - The superiority EU law and the incorporation of the ECHR into British law both of which limit, in different ways, the power of the executive.

- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis.
- Level 4 answers will offer a discussion that is clearly focussed on the view that the executive exercises too much control over the judiciary and display an awareness of both sides of the argument.
- Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

**AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

**7. Discuss the view that there is a ‘democratic deficit’ in the European Union. [20]**

*(Specification: The relationship between the United Kingdom and the EU; impact of EU institutions on the UK; debate about future development of EU (federalism; EMU; enlargement))*

- For **AO1 marks** candidates must display knowledge and understanding of what is meant by ‘the democratic deficit’, broadly speaking that the EU is:
  - Unrepresentative
  - Unaccountable
  - Secretive
  - Bureaucratic
  - Remote
  - And stimulates only low levels of participation
- And more specifically:
  - The inter-governmental nature of the Council
  - The Commission acting as both the executive and legislature
  - Appointed and therefore unaccountable commissioners
  - The existence of only one chamber in the parliament
  - The limited role for the elected EP
  - Secrecy/lack of transparency of the decision-making process
  - MEP’s lack of accountability
  - The influence of pressure groups and special interests
- But candidates will also be aware that the EU has a number of ‘democratic’ features, for example:
  - the way in which the EP is chosen
  - the powers of the EP
  - the legislative process
  - the checks and balances built into the system e.g. the ECJ
- For **AO2 marks** candidates must be able to discuss the view that there is a ‘the democratic deficit’ in the EU.
- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis, but do reward both. Better candidates will appreciate that much depends upon what is meant by ‘democratic’ in this context.
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on whether there is a ‘democratic deficit’ in the EU. Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

**AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

**8. Discuss the view that the Maastricht Treaty has been the most important development in the European Union since the Single European Act. [20]**

*(Specification: The relationship between the United Kingdom and the EU: impact of Maastricht and Amsterdam treaties; impact of EU institutions on the UK; debate about future development of EU (federalism; EMU; enlargement))*

- For **AO1 marks** candidates must display some knowledge and understanding of:
  - The Maastricht treaty: creation of the EU, agreement on EMU, social charter etc
  - Developments in the EU since 1986, including the SEA and the treaties of Amsterdam and Nice.
  - They may refer to enlargement, the introduction of EMU, human rights and proposals for a constitution but not the treaties associated with these developments.
- NB As the specification only requires knowledge of Maastricht and Amsterdam post-1990, do not penalise students who make no reference to subsequent treaties. However they should be aware of issues surrounding the development of the EU and this should include enlargement, federalism and proposals for a constitution.
- For **AO2 marks** candidates must be able to discuss view that the Maastricht treaty has been the most important development in the European Union since 1986, focusing perhaps on some of the following points:
  - The importance of what Maastricht did
  - The importance of other developments e.g. Amsterdam, introduction of EMU, enlargement, new constitution, federalism.
- Reward focus and balance. In particular, do not mistake description for analysis, but do reward both.
- Level 4 answers will clearly focus on the view that the Maastricht Treaty has been the most important development in the EU since 1986. Answers that only refer to Maastricht and do not attempt to assess its relative importance will not reach Level 4.
- Credit candidates who are able to use contemporary examples.

**AO3**

- Two marks should be used to credit spelling, punctuation and grammar where a full answer is provided.
- Two marks should be used to credit the ability to identify correctly points and to present an argument clearly where a full answer is provided.
- A very short answer which meets the above criteria should not be awarded full marks for AO3.

**Mark Scheme 2694  
June 2005**

The following assessment matrix will apply to all questions.

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 4	10-12	10-12	5-6
Level 3	7-9	7-9	4
Level 2	4-6	4-6	2-3
Level 1	0-3	0-3	0-1

- 1 **Discuss the factors which have influenced voting behaviour in recent American elections.** [30]

*(Specification: Presidential Elections: general election campaign; theories of voting behaviour)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of recent American elections regarding voting behaviour. This may include: results of recent elections; statistics concerning who voted for whom; statistics regarding voter turn-out; theories of voting behaviour; 'short term' and 'long term' issues. Reward those who display knowledge and understanding of the 2004 elections.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to discuss a range of factors regarding voting in recent American elections and come to balanced and well-argued conclusions. This may include voting by: race; gender; religion; party affiliation; wealth; geographic region. Also look for discussion of the role of parties, pressure groups, money, the media, issues/policies, campaign and individual candidates.

- 2 **Analyse the claim that America *still* has a two-party system.** [30]

*(Specification: Political Parties: philosophy and ideology, 'organisation', role of third parties)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the two-party system which may include: a definition; the extent of the Democrats' and Republicans' domination of presidential, congressional and state elections and the roles played by their parties; party philosophy and ideology. They will also display knowledge and understanding of factors likely to lead to a two-party system including the electoral system and the all-embracing nature of the major parties.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to analyse the claim in a balanced fashion. On the one hand the domination of American politics by the two major parties and the usually minimal role played by third parties; on the other hand the importance of federalism in creating a decentralised party system - '50 party systems' - as well as the recently enhanced importance of third parties. Reward candidates who also analyse the theory of party decline and who suggest that America therefore may have a candidate- and issue-centred system, even a 'no-party' system.

**3 Assess whether pressure groups have too much influence on the functions of Congress. [30]**

*(Specification: Pressure Groups: roles and functions; types; methods used; examples of success or failure; implications for the democratic process. Congress: functions)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of pressure groups that may include: a definition; types of pressure groups; functions of pressure groups; methods used. They will also display knowledge and understanding of the legislative, scrutiny and representative functions of Congress as well as of the access points that groups may use such as committees and staff. They may also display knowledge and understanding of the role of pressure groups and congressional elections. Reward candidates who include a good range of up-to-date and well-worked examples.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to assess the effect that pressure groups have in terms of legislation, congressional scrutiny of the executive branch as well as in its representative function. Look for a balanced answer which assesses both the merits and demerits of pressure group influence on Congress. This may include analysis of such issues as: the influence of PACs; 'iron triangles'; the 'revolving door syndrome'.

**4 Examine the claim that the checks and balances between the president and Congress inevitably lead to gridlock. [30]**

*(Specification: The Constitution: separation of powers and checks and balances. Congress: oversight of the executive branch. The Presidency: relations with Congress)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of 'gridlock' and 'separation of powers' as well as a range of checks and balances between the president and Congress. This may include the president's powers to recommend, sign and veto legislation, as well as his powers as commander-in-chief of the armed forces. This may also include congress's powers to: amend or block the president's proposed legislation; override presidential vetoes; control the budget; confirm nominations (Senate only); ratify treaties (Senate only); declare war; investigate, impeach and remove the president from office. Reward candidates who use a good range of up-to-date examples.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to examine the inevitability of these checks and balances leading to gridlock. Look for candidates to examine some of those factors and circumstances which may help to avoid gridlock: bipartisanship; presidential persuasion, consultation and bargaining; effective liaison between the two branches especially by the president's congressional liaison staff; skills of party leaders in Congress; a clear presidential mandate; clear and realistic policy priorities set by the president; coincidence of party control between both branches of government; times of national emergency and crisis.

**5 Evaluate the importance of the roles played by committees in the legislative process. [30]**

*(Specification: Congress: functions; committees/ legislative process)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the types of committees which play a role in the legislative process in Congress and of the process itself. This will largely revolve around the standing committees (and their sub-committees) at the committee stage but may also include the House Rules Committee and conference committees. Look for up-to-date examples.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to evaluate the importance of the roles played by committees in the legislative process including: the detailed scrutiny of legislation through the hearings conducted at the committee stage; the standing committees' powers of pigeon holing and of amendment; role of timetabling played by the House Rules Committee; the role of reconciling the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill played by the conference committees. Better candidates will weigh the importance of committees against the role played by the two chambers, suggesting that final decisions are rarely made in committee.

**6 Examine the claim that most presidents make little use of the cabinet. [30]**

*(Specification: The Presidency: Cabinet. Executive Office of the President)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the president's cabinet. This may include: a definition; membership and appointment process; functions of cabinet meetings; tasks and roles of individual cabinet officers; the Executive Office of the President. Reward candidates who use a good range of up-to-date examples.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to examine the usefulness of the cabinet - both as individuals in running Departments and acting as policy advisers, and as a collectivity in advising the president. Candidates should use the experience of different presidents to illustrate the point that some presidents (e.g. Reagan, Bush) make more use of the cabinet as a collectivity than others (e.g. Nixon, Clinton). Look for an examination of reasons why the cabinet as a collectivity cannot be all that useful to the president and for an appreciation that presidents often feel that they have better sources of advice, especially in the Executive Office.

**7 Discuss the extent to which a president can influence the Supreme Court. [30]**

*(Specification: The Supreme Court: membership and appointment process)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the membership and appointment process of the Supreme Court. This may include the role of the president; the ABA (though President Bush has demurred on this); the Senate and especially the Senate Judiciary Committee. They may also display knowledge and understanding of judicial philosophy - strict and loose construction, judicial activism. Reward candidates who illustrate their answers with well-worked and up-to-date examples.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to discuss the potential for, but also the limitations upon, the president to influence the Supreme Court. Look for well-argued answers that reach a balanced conclusion. The president's power to nominate judges who he believes to be of a like-minded philosophy, balanced against such limitations as: failure of vacancies to arise; failure of Senate to confirm appointments; difficulty of predicting judge's future behaviour once on the Court; life tenure of judges.

**8 Examine the reasons for recent changes in the balance of power between the federal and state governments. [30]**

*(Specification: The Constitution: development of federalism)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of federalism. This may include: a definition; exclusive and concurrent powers of the federal and state governments; different types of federalism. Also look for knowledge and understanding of: the dynamic nature of the relationship between federal and state governments; the increased responsibility and activity of state governments; the trend of decentralisation from Washington to the states; unfunded mandates; the attitudes of the two major parties.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to examine a range of reasons for recent changes in the federal-state relationship including: difficulties caused by budget deficits both in the federal and state governments; conservative reactions to the growth of the federal government up to 1980; policy failures of the federal government; anti-Washington attitudes; increased importance of state Governors; the states as policy incubators; decisions of the Supreme Court; the effects of 9/11 and the war on terrorism.



**Mark Scheme 2695**  
**June 2005**

The following assessment matrix will apply to all questions.

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 4	10-12	10-12	5-6
Level 3	7-9	7-9	4
Level 2	4-6	4-6	2-3
Level 1	0-3	0-3	0-1

**1 Discuss the relationship between representative government and participatory government. [30]**

*(Specification: the nature of representative government; forms of participation, including political parties and group politics; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concepts of representative and participatory government. They should explore the meaning of the two concepts. Different forms of representation – e.g. representative vs. delegate, characteristic representation – and of participation – e.g. direct and indirect – should be explained. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples, including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Burke, Mill

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the possible relationships between representative and participatory government, including the exclusion of representative government by the direct form of participation; the effect of different political contexts on the relationship; various ideological perspectives on the relationship.

**2 Analyse the different interpretations of the concept of power. [30]**

*(Specification: explanations of power, political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concept of power. They should explore the meaning of power and how it has been defined. There should be knowledge of different forms of power, e.g. decision-making, agenda-setting and thought control, and of the exercise of power by different groups, e.g. government and the electorate, and by individuals, e.g. political leaders. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples, including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Marx, Dahl, Lukes.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the extent to which different interpretations make impossible a common definition; the distinction between legitimate and illegitimate government power; the criteria for defining power; the different contexts in which power can be used, e.g. peace and war; different ideological perspectives on power and authority.

**3 Discuss whether conservatism is an ideology. [30]**

*(Specification: the principle elements of conservatism; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concept of (a) conservatism and of the main forms of conservatism, viz. authoritarian, paternalistic and liberal (New Right) and (b) the concept of ideology. They should explore the meaning of conservatism and of ideology and how they have been defined. They should identify possible key features of conservatism, e.g. preference for pragmatism over theory, belief in the organic society, in the imperfectability of man. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples, including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Burke, Oakeshott.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the differences between the main types of conservatism; the extent to which differences between various types of conservatism are greater than the similarities; the extent to which the relative importance of similarities and differences make conservatism an ideology; the changing intellectual context within which conservatism has developed.

**4 Analyse the relationship between liberty and equality. [30]**

*(Specification: how liberty and equality are variously interpreted and justified; the concepts of negative and positive liberty; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concept of liberty and equality. Candidates should explore the different forms of liberty, e.g. negative and positive, and the different meanings of equality e.g. of opportunity and of outcome and how they have been defined. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples. These will include references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Hobbes, Locke, Green, Rawls and Berlin.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the possible relationships between liberty and equality; the effect of different definitions of rights upon liberty; the effect of different political contexts on the relationship, e.g. peace and war; the effect of different ideological perspectives on the concept of rights, including the anarchist view as well as the Marxist, liberal and conservative.

**5 Examine the nature of the obligation that citizens owe to their state. [30]**

*(Specification: political obligation; the nature of the state; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concept of obligation. They should explore the meaning of obligation and how it has been defined. There should be knowledge of the different types of obligation, e.g. moral, contractual, pluralist. Candidates should also consider the different types of state and especially the contrast between a democracy and a dictatorship. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples, including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Hobbes, Locke, Burke.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the extent to which the nature of the obligation is affected by the type of state and by the context within which the state and by the context within which that state exists; different ideological perspectives on the different forms of obligation.

**6 Evaluate the different interpretations of the role of the state. [30]**

*(Specification: different views on the role of the state; the characteristics of the state; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concept of the state. They will explore the meaning of the state and how it has been defined. There should be knowledge of the main elements of the state, e.g. sovereignty, coercive power, territoriality, public as opposed to private, popular consent (over the long term). Candidates should also consider different interpretations of the role of the state, e.g. 'night watchman', developmental, authoritarian. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Hobbes, Locke, Marx.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the main differences between various interpretations; the extent to which these different interpretations are contingent on context, either historical and/or intellectual; different ideological perspectives on the role of the state.

**7 Analyse the concept of external sovereignty. [30]**

*(Specification: the meaning of sovereignty; external ... sovereignty; different types of rule; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concepts of sovereignty, both external and internal. They should explore the meaning of sovereignty and how it has been defined. There will be knowledge of different aspects and implications of external sovereignty, e.g. freedom *to* act independently in international affairs and freedom *from* intervention in its affairs by other states. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Hobbes, Clausewitz.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the nature of external sovereignty; the relationship between external and internal sovereignty; the extent to which external sovereignty is limited by the sovereignty of other states and their exercise of power, whether financial, economic or military; the tension between idealism and realism in international affairs; different ideological perspectives on the sovereignty of the state.

**8 Evaluate the main criticisms of dictatorship. [30]**

*(Specification: different types of rule; the characteristics of dictatorship; justifications and criticisms; political ideology.)*

**AO1** Candidates will display knowledge and understanding of the concept of dictatorship. They will explore the meaning of dictatorship how it has been defined e.g. traditional or totalitarian. There should be knowledge of the characteristics of these types of government, e.g. one-person rule, lack of popular accountability, limited rights. Knowledge should be illustrated with appropriate examples including references to relevant political theorists, e.g. Hobbes, Rousseau and (for the dictatorship of the proletariat) Marx.

**AO2** Candidates should examine some of the following: the criticisms of dictatorship, e.g. the abuse of executive power; the absence of checks and balances; the personification of the state; the problem of succession; the inefficiency of the state; different ideological perspectives on dictatorship.



**Mark Scheme 2698**  
**June 2005**

The following assessment matrix will apply to all questions.

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 4	19-24 marks	19-24 marks	10-12 marks
Level 3	13-18 marks	13-18 marks	7-9 marks
Level 2	7-12 marks	7-12 marks	4-6 marks
Level 1	0-6 marks	0-6 marks	0-3 marks

1. **Discuss the view that no single theory of voting behaviour can account for how people vote in elections.** [60]

*(Specification 2595: Campaigns; 2694: Presidential elections (role of money and media); 2698: Elections: issues concerning the media and campaign finance.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will show knowledge of election results and theories of voting behaviour. There may be specific knowledge of the results of recent elections. There may be knowledge of class-dealignment and partisan-dealignment, consumer choice theories, issue theories, and sociological theories of voting behaviour. There may be knowledge of the shortcomings of theories of voting behaviour in a volatile, post-modern age.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to analyse the view offered, arguing perhaps that old patterns of political socialisation have broken down, and social formations such as social class have become more fluid, and less likely to determine voting choice. There may be analysis of the exploitation by modern politicians of this volatility, by advancing 'third-way' policies and emphasising the image of candidates. Expect candidates to demonstrate the weakness of any individual theory of voting behaviour as an explanatory or predictive model.

Better answers will attempt to balance the analysis, offering the view perhaps, that substantial proportions of certain social classes still vote for one party and not another. Other theories may be defended using different arguments.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**2. Discuss the relevance of political parties to modern politics. [60]**

*(Specification 2596: Political parties: ideology; 2694: Political parties: philosophy and ideology; 2698: Political parties: the role of ideology.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will display knowledge of the role of parties in political systems. There may be knowledge of their various roles, such as choosing candidates for political office, as organising principles in elections and in legislative assemblies, in fund-raising and fighting elections.

There may be knowledge of the decline of political parties in the estimation of voters as a means of expression, or influence over politicians. There may be knowledge of other vehicles of political expression such as interest groups. There may be knowledge of certain concepts which may be helpful in understanding these developments, such as post-modernism, or the end of ideology.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect analysis of the role and relevance of parties in political systems. There may be analysis of parties' decline in membership, or the fluidity of party membership and affiliations in legislative assemblies. There might be analysis of the decline in relevance of parties within a post-modern conceptual framework.

Better answers will balance the analysis by arguing that, despite the decline of political parties in organising politics, it is difficult to see what structures could replace them. There may be analysis of the success of independent candidates, arguing that while these seem to be increasing in number, for the most part it is still necessary for serious politicians to belong to one party or another. There may be analysis of the signs of a revival of interest in ideology.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

3. **Examine the view that, in practice, the most important features of constitutions are to be found in statutes, conventions and judicial precedent.** [60]

*(Specification 2597: The Constitution; 2694: The Constitution; 2698: Constitutions.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will show knowledge of constitutions, written and unwritten. There may be knowledge of the classical sources of the constitution in Britain, in the various statutes, conventions and case law precedents. Candidates may provide illustration of all these. There may be knowledge of other constitutions, which are in written form, and which provide the basis for political organisation. There may be knowledge of an informal constitutional penumbra in statute law, conventions and court rulings (for example, the convention that nine justices sit on the US Supreme Court, any number of their rulings in constitutional questions, and congressional laws such as the Budget Control and Impoundment Act, War Powers Resolution).

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to analyse the extent to which the most important features of constitutions are to be found in statute law, conventions and court rulings. Expect candidates to demonstrate this in the case of the UK. In the case of the US, or other systems where a written constitution is present, there may be analysis of the importance of the role of the primary document itself, and also of the informal working arrangements that surround the formal document.

In balancing their argument, candidates may advance the importance of written constitutional documents, such as the US Constitution, or the proposed draft for the EU. Candidates may also recognise the importance of changes to Britain's traditional constitutional organisation with the introduction of the ECHR, or perhaps the new EU constitution.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**4. Discuss the need for institutional reform within legislatures in different political systems. [60]**

*(Specification 2597: The UK Parliament; 2694: Congress; 2698: Legislatures.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will show knowledge of legislatures, and the need for reform within them. There may be knowledge of shortcomings in their role in legislating, in scrutinising the executive, in their composition, or in their internal organisation which diminishes their efficiency. For example, there may be knowledge of the powers of committees, or of procedures. There may be knowledge of steps already taken to improve efficiency, such as reforms to the hours kept by the UK Parliament, or the reforms to limit the number of committee chairs which can be held by US Congressmen.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect analysis of the need for institutional reform within legislatures. This may involve analysis of the effectiveness of committees in scrutinising the executive.

Analysis may include examination of the internal organisation of legislatures and other procedures which have an impact on their effectiveness.

Balanced answers may suggest that institutional reform is more urgent or necessary for some legislatures than others, arguing that the US Congress has all the powers necessary for a proper scrutiny of the executive, while select committees of the UK Parliament are not powerful or committed enough. Analysis of the legislative function might suggest that the US Congress is poorly organised for proper consideration of much legislation. Reward candidates who discuss the shortcomings of the EU Parliament, and possible reforms.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

5. Discuss the view that effective formulation and delivery of policy requires a strong, decisive executive. [60]

*(Specification 2597: PM and Cabinet, Delivery of government policy; 2694: The Presidency, Powers of the President; 2698: Executives: power and functions of chief executives, issues concerning the efficient delivery of government policies.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will show knowledge of the role of executives in the delivery and formulation of policy, in the passage of legislation, in providing leadership. There may be knowledge of specific case studies in which a powerful or decisive executive was lacking, or in which there were too many constraints upon the power of the executive to act. There may be knowledge of the realities, for example, of foreign policy making, in which it is important that executives act with expedition, decisiveness, and consistency. There may be knowledge of the various powers of executives, and their relationships to people and institutions which constrain them – cabinets, legislatures.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to analyse what the effective formulation and delivery of policy in this context means. Candidates may also address themselves to what it is for an executive to be strong and decisive. Analysis should centre on whether there is a need for executives to be strong and decisive – free from certain constraints and not held in check by colleagues or legislatures.

Better candidates may make a distinction between the foreign and domestic policy, arguing, perhaps, that it is more important for executives to have a freer rein in foreign policy, and it would be too undemocratic for executives to have the same freedom in domestic policy. Expect analysis of case studies. Reward candidates who analyse the organisation of the executive of the EU, how it impacts upon the policy making of the EU, and who suggest that, for example, a stronger CFSP process needs a more streamlined decision-making structure.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**6. Examine the view that federal and devolved systems of government enhance democracy. [60]**

*(Specification 2597: Constitutions; 2694: Constitutions and federalism; 2698: Constitutions.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will show knowledge of federal and devolved systems of government, and their advantages and disadvantages. There may be knowledge of other systems, in which there is a different relationship between centre and periphery. Expect knowledge of the way in which federalism, devolved and other central/local systems, break up power and responsibility between different levels of government.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to analyse the merits of federal and devolved systems of government in comparison with systems with other relationships between the centre and the periphery. There may be analysis of the extent to which they allow self government, while preserving a system of government at the centre to be responsible for economic policy, and a foreign and security policy. Analysis may suggest that federal and devolved systems enhance democracy. On the other hand, there may be a more critical analysis of federal and devolved systems suggesting that the looser organisation of states allows policy to diverge, and this might be unhealthy. Analysis may discuss the relative merits of federal or devolved systems over unitary systems. Reward candidates who discuss the EU as a burgeoning federal entity, and the merits and appropriateness of this as a system. Reward candidates who discuss the merits of English regionalism.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**7. Discuss whether judiciaries should be involved in political issues. [60]**

*(Specification 2596: Civil Rights and Liberties; 2697: Judicial Review; 2694: The Supreme Court: issues concerning judicial review; 2698: Civil Rights and Liberties, Judiciaries: political influence.)*

**AO1:** Candidates will show knowledge of the role of judiciaries in different political systems. There may be knowledge of the underlying constitutional frameworks in which judiciaries operate, and which allow them to become involved in political issues, or not. There may be knowledge of the appointment or election process. There may be knowledge of certain courts which become activist in nature, and enter the political thicket. There may be well-worked case studies as illustration.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2:** Expect candidates to analyse the merits of judiciaries becoming involved in political questions, such as deciding on the extent or interpretation of human rights. Analysis may include a discussion of whether it is right that unelected judges (or judges who have been appointed for political reasons) should have a political role, or whether it is better, and more democratic that legislatures enjoy this role. Better answers will be balanced, and such analysis may include discussion of constitutions, arguing that a written constitution needs interpretation, but that this will inevitably draw a court into political questions.

There may be analysis of the activity of European courts, and candidates may discuss the impact of the incorporation of the ECHR into British law, or the role of the ECJ.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

8. **Contrast the ways in which citizens may seek a redress of grievances in different political systems.** [60]

*(Specification 2596: Civil Rights and Liberties; 2694: The Supreme Court; civil rights and liberties; 2698: Civil Rights and Liberties, Judiciaries.)*

**AO1** Candidates will show knowledge of the ways in which citizens achieve a redress of grievances in different political systems. Knowledge may include formal complaints procedures, ombudsmen, writing to representatives. It may also include being active in interest groups or political parties, writing to the newspapers, and using legal procedures. There may be knowledge of the use of tribunals in different countries. There may be well worked examples, using specific case studies.

Where appropriate, candidates should draw upon the knowledge of different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.

**AO2** Expect candidates to analyse the different ways in which citizens seek redress of grievances in different contexts. Analysis may include discussion of the extent to which that society resorts to legal process. There may be references to the political culture of that country. Candidates may analyse the difference made by having a Bill of Rights to refer to. Analysis may develop the fact that the US is a more litigious society, and group membership is higher, whereas in the UK, use is made of ombudsmen and quasi-legal procedures such as tribunals. Reward candidates who refer to the ECHR or the ECJ as new ways in which European citizens may seek a redress of grievances.

Where appropriate, candidates should analyse relevant features of, and make connections between, different political systems studied in other parts of the AS and A2 course.



**Mark Scheme 2699**  
**June 2005**

The following assessment matrix will apply to all questions.

	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 4	19-24	19-24	10-12
Level 3	13-18	13-18	7-9
Level 2	7-12	7-12	4-6
Level 1	0-6	0-6	0-3

1. Examine what makes a political system democratic. [60]

*(Specification: module 2595-97 democracy and representation; 2695 representation, participation and consent and forms of government; 2699 defining democracy and the models of democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates should show knowledge and understanding on the nature of democracy. References to its origins in Athens and to the meaning of the word should be rewarded. Evidence on the basis of the concept and examples of how this operates in practice is to be expected (themes of majoritarianism and degree of public participation with updated examples – elections, representation, government accountability etc). Expect also a range of specific examples from a variation of types of democracy ranging from direct to indirect and protective to peoples democracy. Reference to how democracy is applied to British politics – role of Parliament, elections and political pluralism should be anticipated. Weak answers will only show a limited/ basic appreciation of democracy and have little evidence of its practical application. Better answers will have a sophisticated understanding of the concept allied to a range of appropriate examples from a variety of differing styles of democracy. Reward further those answers that have examples drawn from a range of different democratic states.

**AO2** Candidates are expected to develop criteria for analysing the basis of democracy – this could be based on purposes, conditions, characteristics, processes and outcomes. Recognition of a variety of differing theorists attitudes to democracy are expected (Rousseau, Marx, Mill etc) explaining the variety of differing models and systems in operation. There should also be recognition of why some systems can be considered more democratic than others and how the concept has become a value laden concept of which most, if not all regimes aspire. The above may be achieved through analysis of the operation of the British political system. Weak answers will have a limited/ basic appreciation of the range and complexities contained in the concept. Better answers will require an appreciation of the difficulties in reaching a single definition and provide evaluation of the variety of models available.

**2. Assess the suitability of direct democracy to modern politics. [60]**

*(Specification: 2595 elections and voting behaviour; 2695 representation, participation and consent; 2699 models of democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates are expected to show knowledge and understanding of methods used for direct participation in the decision making process – these may include the use of referendums, electronic voting and the internet. Specific examples of their use in practice are to be expected (referendums in Britain and Europe, Town Hall democracy in the US etc). Evidence on topics such as apathy and a decline in the use of traditional sources of representative access (membership of parties etc) should also be rewarded. Expect also evidence on the limitations of direct access and problems with methods used (referendum turnout etc). Some candidates may write extensively about the prospect of ‘e-thenian democracy’ and these should be well rewarded as long as consideration of other methods is also made. Weak answers will only seek to explain what is meant by direct democracy and use a limited range of examples of how it operates in practice. Better answers will show a good/ thorough understanding of the extent of direct democracy still in operation and provide specific evidence of its effectiveness. Further reward those that go beyond the use of direct democracy in Britain.

**AO2** Candidates are expected to analyse the effectiveness of direct democracy in relation to the demands of modern society (time limitations, complexities of issues, apathy etc). Expect comments on the value of direct public participation (eg Rousseau) and also the dangers that may result (eg Talmon and totalitarian or plebiscitary democracy). Consideration may also be given to developmental theorists (eg. Tom Bottomore) as well as elitist ideas on the inability of direct public participation (Schumpeter etc). Some recognition may further be given to the undermining of representative politics and parliamentary sovereignty. Weak answers will tend to only describe either the value or limitations of direct democracy. Better answers will provide a more balanced assessment. Reward highly those that show a sophisticated recognition of the varying needs of different societies and the changing nature of political decision making.

**3. Discuss what checks and balances need to be placed upon governments. [60]**

*(Specification: 2597 Government of the UK; 2695 forms of government and power, authority and legitimacy; 2699 responsible government and democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates are expected to show knowledge and understanding on the various types of checks and balances used to limit executive actions. Expect reference to constitutional restraints such as separation of powers as in the US (Madison/Montesquieu) and the notion of the rule of law (AV Dicey). Locke's twin treatise on consent should also be rewarded. Consideration also should be given to electoral limitations upon the power of an executive (fixed term rule etc) as well as other external public checks (role of the media and pressure groups etc). Examples drawn from a range of different countries should be given - ranging from the less formal constitutional restraints upon parliamentary systems such as the British Prime Minister and Cabinet where the executive is drawn from the legislature (expect examples relating to the flexibility of PM power in Britain), to the more formalised limitations upon US, French and other presidential and semi-presidential systems (reference may be made to role of Congress and Supreme Court as separate sources of power). Weak answers will tend to list constitutional restraints with few effective contemporary examples. Better answers will tend to show understanding of the varying principles of limiting executive powers allied to appropriate specific examples drawn from a variety of differing regimes.

**AO2** Candidates should show analysis of the need to make executives responsible to the citizen. Candidates may wish to discuss issues relating to elective dictatorship in Britain or unchecked executive power leading to military style dictatorships relying upon coercion. The views of Montesquieu and/ or Rousseau may be introduced in order to support the view that an unchecked executive will lead to absolutism and a loss of popular sovereignty. Expect also an awareness that too many checks and balances upon executive power may lead to indecision and weakness in decision making. Weak answers will tend to only discuss some aspects of the need to restrict executive powers. Better answers will tend to recognise a more balanced approach as well as show appreciation of the role played by executives and their source of power. The best answers will be sophisticated in their appreciation of the variation in limitations upon existing executives and show appreciation of the dangers in both overly powerful and weak executives.

**4. Discuss the view that political parties damage democracy. [60]**

*(Specification: 2596 Politics of the UK; 2695 Representation, participation and consent; 2699 representation and participation in a democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates are expected to show knowledge and understanding of the role performed by political parties and how this links in with the operation of representative politics. Expect candidates to provide contemporary examples of their negative drawbacks (sectionalism, lack of internal democracy, loss of individual perspectives etc), as well as their positive benefits (mobilisation of electorate, recruitment and, organisation of government etc). Details upon declining turnout and membership (contrasts with pressure groups may be made), as well as corruption, may be used to show a decline in the effectiveness of political parties. Weak answers will tend to provide individual incidents of problems relating to specific parties without any attempt to link to the theme to the impact on democracy. Better answers will show understanding of the role parties perform in a democracy and provide evidence as to whether they are continuing to perform this role adequately. Reward further candidates who use a comparative range of evidence.

**AO2** Candidates are expected to show analysis of the dangers to democracy of parties. They may wish to highlight the views of Rousseau and Jefferson in seeing them as encouraging sectional interests above the General Will (national interest) or the views of Mill as seeing them suppressing freedom of thought. There may well be some attempt to distinguish their role in one party or one party dominant system whereby their role suppresses political pluralism in contrast to multiparty systems. Award also those students who distinguish between the different types of democracy and highlight their necessity and hence usefulness in representative politics in contrast to the dangers of their role under direct democracy. Weak answers will tend to only list a few criticisms of parties or merely discuss their utility. Better marks should be given for a more balanced appreciation of their usefulness as well as an understanding of their differing roles dependant upon the system of democracy in place.

**5. Assess how effective codified constitutions are in upholding human rights. [60]**

*(Specification: 2596 Politics of the UK and 2597 Government of the UK; 2695 Rights, liberty and equality; 2699 Rights, liberty and democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates are expected to show knowledge and understanding of the ways in which codified constitutions uphold human rights. Expect reference with illustrative examples to entrenched bills of rights and a clear explanation of the role of the Courts in enforcing these. Understanding of how negative rights are enshrined into constitutions allied to the promotion of positive rights should also be rewarded. There may also be reference to the UK Human Rights Act as a half way house to codifying the ECHR into British law as well as discussion of a codified EU convention of Human Rights. Reward highly those that provide good detail on the debate over the EU constitution. Weak answers will tend to show a basic/ limited understanding of the nature of rights protection and have only a few, if any, examples of the workings of written constitutions. Better answers will have a detailed understanding of the workings of codified constitutions and provide a series of examples of human rights protection through the courts, upholding 'higher' constitutional law. Reward highly candidates that make reference to more than one codified constitution.

**AO2** Candidates are expected to show analysis of the arguments for and against the role of codified constitutions in upholding human rights. These may include limiting the power of the state, clarifying available rights, establishing judicial independence, and protecting minority rights. Negative arguments may examine inflexibility, out datedness, power of the judiciary etc. There may be some comparison with human rights protection in non codified constitutions in Britain for example, as well as the argument that the importance of rights protection stems more from the political climate of the regime than from the laws themselves. Weak answers will tend to focus on either the benefits or drawbacks of codified constitutions, or merely rehearse arguments for and against codified constitutions. Better answers will produce a more balanced analysis of benefits and problems of rights protection and reward highly answers that also recognise the antagonisms between the moral abstract nature of human rights in contrast to legal neutrality (legal positivism).

**6. Examine the impact of New Right ideas upon modern conservatism. [60]**

*(Specification: 2696 Politics of the UK; 2695 Political ideologies; 2699 Political ideologies and democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates should show knowledge and understanding on the views of New Right thinkers such as Friedman and Hayek, and how this has had an impact upon conservative parties. Expect factual examples to draw upon the role of New Right ideologies in shaping the policies of governments such as those of Thatcher and Reagan. Expect also consideration of the legacy of the New Right ideas post 1980s and 90s impacting upon the direction of the Conservative Party post Major (alternatively Bush junior and neo conservatives in the US). Some reference may be given to how New Right ideas have had a legacy on New Labour. There should also be an attempt to contrast the New Right with traditional mainstream conservative thought (eg attitudes to reform and state intervention). Weak answers will have only a limited/ basic understanding of the ideas behind the New Right and may only seek to link them to some of the policies pursued by Thatcher. Better answers will highlight a change in the ideological direction of mainstream conservatism and further reward those that illustrate this with examples drawn from Britain and beyond.

**AO2** Candidates should analyse the key themes behind the new right ideology and consider its compatibility with other conservative traditions (Burke, Disraeli etc). There may be some discussion of whether the New Right is actually not in the conservative heritage but actually classical liberal in origins. Candidates may also wish to consider how the New Right have extended the influence of the free market and consumer capitalism, as well as social conservatism, beyond just conservative parties but shaping the political agenda in many different countries. Weak answers will only tend to see the question in terms of the relative shape of the modern Conservative Party, or offer a personal critique upon the validity of New Right ideas. Better answers will provide a good/ thorough evaluation of the legacy of the New Right and consider if modern conservatism has now moved beyond unfettered capitalism.

**7. Discuss the view that in practice there is a democratic deficit at the centre of liberal democracy. [60]**

*(Specification: 2595 Elections and voting behaviour, 2697 Government of the UK; 2695 Representation, participation and consent and power authority and legitimacy; 2699 Responsible government and democracy, Liberal democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates are expected to show knowledge and understanding on what is meant by a democratic deficit. They may give examples of a lack of public and electoral accountability either in British Politics and/ or alternative liberal democratic regimes such as those in the EU. Understanding of the basis of Liberal democracy is also required with illustrative examples outlining the central aspects of the system. Expect specific examples of failures of accountability (these may include references to the institutions of the EU). Weak answers will tend to only list evidence of unaccountable regimes. Better answers will tend to understand the various types of accountability and also be able to provide a wide range of relevant illustrative examples. Further reward candidates that draw examples from a range of liberal democracies.

**AO2** Candidates are expected to analyse the basis of liberal democracy. Candidates may wish to examine the protective nature of the system in trading off limited democratic input for protection of individual liberties (limited government). Candidates may refer to notions of elective dictatorship to highlight a lack of accountability and also may wish to raise the representative nature of the system in limiting the input of the citizen in the decision making process (for example Rousseau's critique of representation). Reward those students that look at the reverse argument by highlighting the essence of political pluralism as a central feature of liberal democracy, allowing accountability to be exerted beyond electoral and parliamentary processes (eg Dahl). Weak answers will only tend to provide a general explanation of the idea of a democratic deficit without linking it to the nature of liberal democracy. Better answers will provide a more balanced analysis raising the various facets of liberal democracy that both limit democratic input whilst also serving to guarantee checks upon political decision making. Also further reward candidates who successfully are able to examine the concept of liberal democracy from a range of political perspectives, highlighting for instance a Marxist or elitist critique on the lack of popular input into decision making within the system.

**8. Assess whether the trustee model of representation best describes the role of elected representatives. [60]**

*(Specification: 2697 Government of the UK; 2595 Representation, participation and consent; 2699 Representation and participation in a democracy)*

**AO1** Candidates are expected to show knowledge and understanding of the role of representatives with illustrative examples on the relationship between representatives and their constituents and/ or political parties. Understanding of the meaning of representation is required, especially relating to Burke's usage of the term and evidence should be given of how it operates in practice. Reward well those students who make comparisons between different ideas of representation used in various assemblies, as well as different approaches adopted by MP's within a single system. Reward also those that give details on party interests conflicting with constituency duties. Weak answers will tend to only produce a list of the roles performed by MP's and only have a few, if any, specific illustrative examples. Better answers will tend to understand the variation in models of representation and display specific knowledge of representatives utilising different approaches. Reward further those that provide some degree of comparative evidence.

**AO2** Candidates are expected to analyse the trustee model, as well as test the validity of other models - resemblance, mandate and delegate. Expect evaluation of the debate over MPs as trustees of constituency opinion but acting as party delegates. Students may use elitist theories to highlight the necessity to limit popular participation into the decision making process (see views of Mill and plural voting, or Schumpeter). Consideration of the extent MPs reflect the socio-economic makeup of society and the operation of the democratic mandate may also be given. Weak answers will tend to only list and describe the various models of representation, whereas better answers will critically evaluate the trustee model by contrasting it with the operation of the alternate models



# **Report on the Units**

## **June 2005**

## **Chief Examiner's Report**

### **General Comments**

The overall performance of candidates in this session did not show any fundamental difference from the past two years, although as ever, there were variants between papers. However, there is still a fairly significant 'Centre effect', in that some Centres do very much better than others if they have briefed and trained their candidates well.

At AS level some candidates stood out, as their Centres had clearly taken great care to train them in the requisite techniques. These candidates did use the Sources intelligently in 2595; they had good exemplar material for 2596 and did not try and write full essays for questions 3 and 4; they knew how marks were allocated in 2597 etc. At times examiners sensed that there had been a huge focus on content, too much in some cases, and very little on technique.

The feature, which stood out most at A2, was a simple failure to answer the question set - again a technique issue that needs to be addressed. Candidates in 2694, for example, chose to spend a lot of time writing a prepared essay on third parties for question 2 - and ignore the word 'still', or simply choose to leave out the final key phrase in the very popular questions 3 and 5. There were many similar examples in 2698 and 2699.

Again it should be strongly emphasised that candidates for those papers check the rubric very carefully and really demonstrate that they had studied the subject at AS Level. The suggestion that Centres contact the Principal Examiner for Coursework (2696) is well worth taking up, to ensure that candidates choose a topic/question in a way that ensures the highest marks are attainable.

## **2595: Elections, Electoral Systems and Voting behaviour in the UK**

### **General Comments**

This examination produced responses covering the full ability range. Three features stood out this year.

The first was the growing reluctance to actually use the Sources at all. There seems to be a very odd correlation between ability (judged by maturity, fluency and clarity of the writing and depth of 'own knowledge') and inability to use the information in the Sources.

The second feature was the number of candidates who ran out of time, and invariably it was because they wrote huge amounts on Questions One and Two. A couple of sides on both were not unusual. Some candidates do not fall into this trap; they write in their answer booklet - 6, 12, 18, and 24 (minutes to allocate to each question, for example) - and they never run out for time. Allocating time according to the marks is a good idea.

The third is the 'ageing' of knowledge. While we did not expect expertise on 2005, we did expect more on the 2001 election. A lot of candidates did not seem to know much after 1992.

### **Question One**

- a) Most candidates could manage 'manifesto' and picked up an easy two marks there. Quite a lot simply left the mandate out - whether they did not know the answer or did not spot the question was never clear. There were some inspired guesses on mandate, making intelligent use of the Source; 'winners' gave a clue. It did appear as if some candidates had never heard of the word at all.
- b) Some candidates did little more than just copy the Source (it was the one question where it was used a fair amount). Two marks were allocated for Source use and two for own knowledge. Some candidates produced lengthy responses. This is always a problem if there is a question on an area the candidates feel confident about. Candidates should be reminded that the length of their response should be proportionate to the number of marks available for that particular question. Debates are not needed, there are no Assessment Objective 2 (AO2) marks going for Question One. Note the key word 'describe'.

### **Question Two**

Again there were problems as candidates wrote too much. There was a strong tendency to make the answer unnecessarily complex and argue the merits of the Curtice view as opposed to the Denver view. There were two successful approaches to the question. The first and most popular one was to take the six fairly helpful headings in the Source, and then flesh them out with the candidates' own knowledge -such as the proportion of ABs voting Conservative etc. The second was to briefly explain what the terms in the Source meant, and then move into other factors for their 'own knowledge' bit. The least successful approach was to ignore the Source altogether.

### **Question Three**

In the main this was well done and there were some pretty knowledgeable answers. Again there were too many candidates who simply failed to utilize the data in the two Sources. As always with such questions there were candidates who wrote passionately about the need to retain the current electoral system and ignored the case for change.

It was also surprising how many candidates wrote first rate answers and were awarded either full or nearly full marks, but could not resist the temptation to getting in a final paragraph about the case against. Several who had got full marks to this point did not get it on Question 4 as they simply had not enough time. However this usually was a well done question and candidates are getting good at making out a case clearly which makes it so much easier to be awarded high AO2 marks.

### **Question Four**

On the whole this question produced some disappointing responses. Many candidates were short of time to an extent that had not been seen in the past. There is a powerful case for really training candidates in writing answers in the allocated time. Too many built answers based uneasily on the 1992 election and there was a surprising lack of knowledge on 2001. Some responses made no mention of 2001 at all. Invariably the role of the Sun newspaper seemed to be given a prominent part. Was it that vital?

The very good responses debated as to the extent it was Conservative failings that were the issue rather than Labour's strengths. One or two overworked a single point - be it media influence or de-alignment. The approach that always worked was the systematic one. The first paragraph looked at the Labour 'plus' factors using the Sources (candidates did not necessarily refer to all on all four) such as the campaign-the voting context, the bias of the electoral system, the team of leaders etc.

The second was based on own knowledge - the abandonment of 'old' Labour ideas and the appeal of 'New' Labour being popular.

The third on Conservative 'failings' from the Sources and the fourth on the Conservatives based on own knowledge - Hague and Major were popular here.

There were some excellent debates which were well rewarded. Another successful approach was to argue which were the key reasons and why, mixing Source use with own knowledge - but making it clear which Sources were being used and when. Keeping it simple and keeping it clear invariably works (with some Source use as well).

**2596/01: Politics of the UK**

**General Comments**

Virtually every candidate attempted all the questions but some showed technique problems with an inappropriate balance between short answers to questions 1 and 2 but more time devoted to questions 3 and 4. Between them, questions 3 and 4 carry 70% of the marks on the paper. In particular, for question 1 (definitions and examples of pressure group types) it is possible to earn full marks with just two sentences for each definition.

Again on technique, this paper does not require candidates to write essays. Consequently, candidates do not need to write an introduction / background paragraph to their answers – they can get straight to the question e.g. for question 2, an answer might start, “Citizens can obtain redress of grievance through contact with an MP .....

In general, candidates seemed reluctant to offer examples of such things as donors to political parties or pressure groups in action. Those who did tended to be achieving Level 4 marks.

Candidates might be reminded that this is a stimulus rather than source paper and as such, candidates cannot expect more than a general context to be provided in the sources.

**Question 1 (Pressure group definitions)**

A straightforward question that enabled many candidates to achieve the maximum mark. Examiners anticipate that candidates will spend no more than 6/7 minutes on question 1 and the degree of detail in answers will reflect this. Lower scores were caused by an absence of specific example(s) as requested by the question or where candidates merely repeated the term from the question in their definition with no elaboration (e.g. ‘A cause group argues for a cause’). Candidates were much stronger on the definitions of insider / outsider groups than on sectional / cause groups.

**Question 2 (Redress of grievance)**

Again, a question that largely produced successful answers, with a good number of maximum mark awards. Good answers identified four strategies and provided some development / detail of each strategy (perhaps with an example).

The question asked for four ways of seeking redress and candidates who offered five or more were awarded marks on the basis of the best four. Some candidates suggested that applying for judicial review was an alternative strategy to using the courts and examiners marked this point as one strategy.

As has been the case in the past, there was some confusion over the European Court of Justice (top court for EU law with binding decisions) as opposed to the European Court of Human Rights (overseeing the Council of Europe’s convention on human rights). Some candidates assumed wrongly that the ability to appeal to the ECHR only emerged out of the Human Rights Act.

**Question 3 (Party funding)**

This question produced most variety in terms of standard of answer. Better responses gave several sources of funds for the main parties and could provide some detail and examples. The nature of the question deliberately steers candidates to evaluate the merits and demerits of each method and better answers provided this evaluation systematically.

Many candidates scored well in terms of Assessment Objective 1 (knowledge) but fared less well for Assessment Objective 2 (evaluation). The assessment matrix refers to the need for balance and where this appeared, answers tended to score in Level 4.

Candidates were often not aware of the existing forms of public funding to parties. Those who chose to interpret the question exclusively as an opportunity to consider the merits of public funding, scored modestly because of the limit to their range of considerations. The same consequence applied to those who concentrated on expenditure rather than funding.

**Question 4 (Outsider pressure group methods)**

A question where candidates again showed good or very good knowledge of possible strategies for outsiders. Better answers discussed a range of possibilities, discussed some examples and provided a balanced appraisal. Weaker answers either had a very limited range, perhaps focusing on violence / illegality, or they merely described the method (scoring in Assessment Objective 1) with very little attempt to evaluate in the context of influencing government.

Answers had a notable skew towards illegality without sufficient appreciation of more constitutional (and more common) approaches such as action in the courts. Candidates also tend to conceive that any action that produces publicity equals direct action without appreciating that direct action has immediacy to the cause of the dispute.

This question produced more use of examples than any of the other questions, particularly the heavily publicized actions of Father4Justice and the Countryside Alliance.

A small number of candidates chose to focus on insider approaches and in the absence of a discussion of outsider methods, they scored modestly.

## 2597: Government of the UK

### General Comments

The impression of most examiners was that the overall performance of candidates this year was much the same as in previous years.

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 5 proved to be the most popular in *Section A*, and were on topics which might be regarded as central to the specification, but while there were many good answers to questions on whether parliament is still sovereign (1.b), the style of recent prime ministers (3.a) and the powers of the prime minister (5.a) this was offset by poor responses to those on what is meant by the sovereignty of parliament (1.a) and prime ministerial style (3.a).

The questions in *Section B* were often done well, but a large minority of candidates seemed to lack any detailed knowledge of the European Union and therefore were unable to gain high marks.

Advice on how best to answer questions on this paper has been given in reports on previous exams, but it may be worth emphasising to candidates that they should:

- **answer the question set.** For example, if asked to describe the membership of the House of Commons (Question 2.a), they shouldn't describe its functions.
- **write 200-250 words on each part answer.** If they can only write 50 words on what is meant by the sovereignty of parliament (Question 1.a), they will not get high marks - even if they can discuss the view that parliament is no longer sovereign in Part (b);
- **learn the treaties and issues for *Section B*;**
- **prepare for the exam by using previous question papers and, more importantly, their associated mark schemes.** This will show them exactly what the examiners are looking for.

Finally, candidates should be aware that poor spelling, grammar and punctuation loses marks: soverienty, sovrignty, sovirenty were some of the many inventive spellings of a term that was printed on the exam paper in front of them.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### 1. Sovereignty of parliament/parliament is no longer sovereign

A surprisingly popular question, but the vast majority of candidates were unable to write enough to gain more than a 'limited' (Level 2) mark on Part (a). Most candidates were aware that the sovereignty of parliament referred to the legal supremacy of parliament and the House of Commons in particular, but beyond that they were unable to describe other aspects of the principle or to provide sufficient examples, comparisons or contrasts to develop the point. As a result, many answers were very short, amounting to no more than three or four sentences. Part (b) was much better argued and candidates often provided a genuine and sophisticated discussion of the view that parliament was, or was not, still sovereign. Candidates who focused entirely on the EU rarely got into Level 3.

### 2. Membership of the Commons/Commons should be more representative of British society

A popular question amongst candidates, but rarely done well in its entirety. When describing the membership of the Commons, candidates tended to restrict themselves either to the political aspects or the social/demographic aspects, but rarely both. A minority described the functions of the House of Commons which was clearly irrelevant. In Part (b) most candidates appreciated that the Commons was not typical of the electorate, politically or socially, but, unlike answers to Question 1, few tried to discuss the view that the Commons should be more representative along the lines "*The Commons should be more representative of British society because . . .*". Fewer still were able to argue the opposite case and thus many answers lacked balance.

### 3. Prime ministerial style/style of prime ministers since 1979

A popular question, but in Part (a) a minority of candidates mistook 'prime ministerial style' for 'prime ministerial government'. 'Prime ministerial style' is a distinct element on the specification and is covered by several major textbooks and it is therefore likely therefore that candidates made the mistake under the pressure of the exam. Teachers may wish to emphasise the difference when preparing their candidates, though the perennial confusion between the ECHR and the ECJ suggest that Part (b) was generally well done, with virtually all candidates able to write about Thatcher, Major and Blair, though some provided a potted history of the period since 1979 rather than a discussion of 'style'.

### 4. Departments, agencies and quangos/the role of the higher civil service in policy-making

Rarely done, and never well done. Although this question has featured on previous exam papers, few candidates who answered it were able to distinguish clearly between a department, an agency and a quango. The role of the civil service in policy making was poorly understood.

### 5. Powers of the prime minister/limits are too few and too ineffective

A popular question, usually done well, though there was a tendency for candidates to confuse powers with power, role and function in Part (a). As in Question 2.b, answers to 5.b often provided useful information which might be used to answer the question rather than a discussion that answered the question. Where candidates did try to discuss whether the limits on the power of the prime minister were too few or too ineffective, as opposed to simply listing the limits, they scored highly.

## **6. Role of the judiciary/executive control over the judiciary**

Rarely done, but often done well by centres who had clearly prepared for questions on the judiciary. The role of judges, both in the narrow and broader senses, was well known as was the control exercised over the judiciary by the executive which allowed candidates to discuss whether there was too much control.

## **7. 'Democratic deficit' in the EU**

A minority of the candidates did not know what the 'democratic deficit' was, though the term has appeared in previous papers and is widely used in textbooks. Few candidates tried to explain what the term meant in general before discussing the evidence for and against it the view that there was such a deficit in the EU.

## **8. Maastricht Treaty the most important development in EU since the SEA**

Candidates fell into three categories: those who knew about developments in the EU since 1986 and were therefore able to discuss how important Maastricht was in this context; those who knew the terms of the Maastricht treaty, but who did not discuss its wider importance; those who knew nothing. The question asked for a discussion, and those who provided it, together with some detail of the Maastricht treaty and other developments, scored highly. Those who simply described the Maastricht Treaty did not get beyond Level 3. Although traditionally candidates confuse the role of the ECJ and the ECHR, this year mention of the Amsterdam treaty was linked to the passage of the Human Rights Act as a significant event in the history of the EU.

## 2694: US Government & Politics

### General Comments

The overall standard of candidates' answers on this paper was not as impressive as in June sittings in recent years. Given the amount of published material to assist both teachers and candidates both in their courses and in revision and exam preparation, this was especially disappointing.

There was too much evidence in many scripts of those errors which are so easily corrected: failing to answer the question set; failure to give examples – and when examples were given, they were often historic. On this latter point, one really is rather weary of reading about the Kennedy-Nixon debates of 1960 and Eisenhower's appointment of Earl Warren to the Supreme Court in 1953! This is *not* a course in American history.

The standard of written English was, in too many cases, sloppy and careless. Only a minority of candidates would correctly spell the word "separation" – as in "separation of powers". One candidate informed us that "Kerry was from Masitusits". Illegibility was an issue in a small minority of scripts.

That said, the best candidates showed an impressive level of both knowledge and understanding and used this to analyse questions with a commendable level of insight and scholarship.

### Comments on individual questions

#### 1. Factors affecting voting behaviour in recent elections

This was the most popular question on the paper and elicited a very wide range of answers. This topic is well covered in textbooks and revision guides and many candidates had made good use of these. Many showed an impressive knowledge of the 2004 presidential election. Weaker candidates had no figures to back up their argument and tried to get away with generalisations such as "women vote for Democrats whilst men vote Republican", and the like. Some candidates got side-tracked onto issues concerning voter turn-out. Few candidates seem to have picked up the fact that in 2004, the Republicans won the majority of the Catholic vote despite the fact that the Democratic candidate was himself a Catholic.

#### 2. Two-party system

This was a prime example of the question where too many candidates decided to answer the question which hadn't been asked. As a consequence, we read numerous answers which focused mainly or exclusively on "Why third parties are not successful in US elections." But this does *not* in itself answer the question as to whether America still has a two-party system. There was little knowledge of the philosophies of the two main parties. Some even seemed unaware that the Democrats' Solid South had been consigned to the history books for at least a decade. Too many candidates failed to discuss the effects of federalism on the party system.

### **3. Pressure groups' influence on the functions of Congress**

Again a popular question, and again very few candidates answered the specific question which had been asked. Clearly, in order to answer this question, one needed to clearly establish: "what are the functions of Congress?" Then, having established maybe three – legislation, scrutiny of the executive branch and representation – candidates should have been able to analyse whether or not pressure groups have too much influence within these three areas. As it was, most candidates either ignored the functions of Congress altogether, or just repeated the phrase "the functions of Congress" as a kind of magic formula, hoping thereby to make their answer relevant. As most failed to identify these specific functions, most also failed for example to address the influence of pressure groups in the Senate's role of confirming the president's appointments to the federal courts. Many candidates managed to write the entire answer without mentioning a single pressure group, or only the NRA.

### **4. Gridlock between president and Congress**

The main difficulty with this question was that most of those who attempted it failed to establish what "gridlock" means. Too many just presumed that it was synonymous with checks and balances, which it clearly is not and thus, as with question 3, a failure to clearly define the terms used in the question got candidates into all kinds of difficulties. Some candidates had a very patchy knowledge of checks and balances and few up-to-date examples to illustrate them. What one was looking for here was an understanding that to avoid gridlock, both sides in the equation have to look towards compromise and bipartisanship. Furthermore, the avoidance of gridlock will display leadership skills both on behalf of the president and of the congressional leadership.

### **5. The role of committees in the legislative process**

In order to evaluate the role of *committees*, one had to set their role against that of other players in the process – namely the House and Senate chambers. As in other questions, there was a paucity of good, up-to-date examples. Many candidates could not correctly name a single standing committee of either house. Likewise, few could give examples of recent bills going through the legislative process – such as Bush's education reforms or the campaign finance reform legislation, both of which have been quite widely written about.

### **6. The use made by presidents of the cabinet**

This was quite well answered with most candidates showing good knowledge of the potential functions – and the potential pitfalls – of cabinet meetings. Equally, candidates seemed well able to examine the difference between the cabinet as a collectivity and the cabinet as individuals, running large and important executive departments and having one-on-one meetings with the president. A few overplayed the role of EXOP in this answer, but generally this particular pitfall was avoided.

### **7. Presidential influence on the Supreme Court**

It was, of course, a shame that Justice Sandra Day O'Connor could not have timed her retirement announcement rather better! (Why did she have to wait until the Friday after this paper was sat?) Nonetheless, this was still a popular question and many candidates answered it well and in a balanced fashion. Many, indeed, even used in their answers the likelihood of President Bush being able to fill vacancies on the Court in the coming months or years. (One or two even predicted an O'Connor retirement!) Centres should note that President Bush has made it clear that he will disregard the ABA rating of those whom he nominates, preferring instead to consult the Federalist Society, a much more conservative group. (Examiners nonetheless still accepted analysis of the ABA as having been traditional for Bush's predecessors.) An example of the most impressive answers that one reads at this level was the candidate who correctly observed that were Bush to replace Rehnquist with another conservative justice, the President's influence on the Supreme Court would be far less than were he to replace O'Connor with a conservative.

**8. Reasons for recent changes in federal-state balance of power**

This was not a very popular question and a number who attempted it failed to notice the word “recent”, spending far too much of their answer on an historic trek through the development of federalism from the 1780s! The focus of this answer had to be the changes in the federal-state balance of power from the 1980s and the reasons for them. Again, too few candidates gave *reasons*, presenting answers which were merely narrative. Surprisingly few made any reference at all either to the possible effects of ‘9/11’ or to the increase in the role of the federal government under Bush 43 – a *Republican* president – especially in such areas as national security and education.

### **2695: Political Ideas and Concepts**

Candidates are now displaying better signs of comprehending the demands of the question paper. Centres appear to have acquired copies of relevant text books including the Heywood series, Harrison and Boyd, and Goodwin. Definitions, examples and theorists used by candidates tended to reflect those used in the above text books. Centres are also encouraging students to use the ideas of specific theorists and/ or differing ideological perspectives. Candidates also are beginning to use specific factual evidence as a means to analyse and evaluate the issues raised in their answers. This is fine as long as the answers do not become an imitation of the synoptic 2699 approach where candidates are expected to apply theory to modern politics. Such illustration should be kept to short sharp examples and must not replace the focus on ideas and concepts.

With approximately 200 candidates entered for the summer module the range of quality varied considerably. At the top answers were sophisticated in their understanding of the appropriate theory and were able to analyse a range of differing perspectives on the different question areas. Discriminating at the A/B boundary was the quality of analysis relating to the specific question set and the range of theories / interpretations used. Some candidates however appear to have learnt a great number of potted summaries of different theorists and were determined to use them at every appropriate opportunity. Whilst this is fine it often leads to a descriptive approach rather than actual analysis or evaluation. The weakest candidates displayed little effective comprehension of the relevant theory and often struggled to go beyond very superficial descriptions of the subject matter. It is not surprising that in a module focused upon abstract political ideas and concepts that the key discriminator for the E/U boundary is that of understanding. Centres have however improved the preparation of the large majority of their candidates with a significant proportion of candidates writing what almost amounted to centre prepared answers to various questions. This can cause problems when the focus of the question set is not necessarily what the candidates have been prepared for.

#### **Comments on the Individual Questions**

##### **1 Discuss the relationship between representative government and participatory government**

Not one of the more popular questions and one that when attempted by candidates often tended towards a generalised description of the two systems. In particular candidates often heavily focused upon representative government and either misunderstood the meaning of participatory government, or were only able to make vague references to Athenian democracy. Better answers focused upon the link between representation and participation, highlighting criticisms of both systems and the opportunities for elements of greater participation to be incorporated into modern representative politics (e.g. referendums, developmental ideas – communitarianism etc, pressure group involvement).

**2 Analyse the different interpretations of power**

A popular question amongst candidates and one that showed a wide variation in the quality of responses. The better answers were able to analyse key interpretations ranging from Luke's 3 faces of power, through to Boulding's analysis of the carrot, stick and kiss. Weaker answers were often confused between power and authority writing as much about the latter as the former. Whilst it was appropriate to refer to legitimate power being referred to as authority the answer should not have focused upon Weber's 3 models of authority. This question showed the potential pitfalls of students repeating pre-prepared answers on the topic of power and authority.

**3 Discuss whether conservatism is an ideology**

The large majority of candidates were able to highlight a number of key principles that underpin differing strands of conservative thought. Those that were able to apply these to the concept of ideology were far fewer. The best answers had sophisticated definitions of what is meant by an ideology and were able to apply these to the main principles inherent within conservative thought, appreciating the variance in ideological coherence between the differing strands (e.g. one nation, authoritarian and New Right conservatism).

**4 Analyse the relationship between liberty and equality**

Candidates who attempted this question mostly displayed a sound understanding of the differing forms of liberty (usually articulated as Berlin's negative and positive concepts) and equality (formal, opportunity and outcome). Variations in response tended to come from the way in which the two concepts were analysed. Weaker answers tended to only describe what was meant by each with only a cursory attempt to compare the links between the two. Better answers tended to identify the links between formal and to a limited extent equality of opportunity to negative aspects of liberty and equality of outcome, with elements of opportunity also to positive liberty. The best answers were able to also identify the variation in the balance between the emphasis placed on each concept by differing types of regimes.

**5 Examine the nature of the obligation that citizens owe to the state**

Most candidates were able to define obligation appropriately, although a small proportion wanted to talk more about rights than obligation. Weaker answers tended to produce random lists of specific examples of obligations owed by citizens to a state – these included voting, conscription and jury service. Better answers appreciated differing perspectives on obligation ranging from social contract theories to natural duty/ moral obligation theories. Candidates who took a theoretical approach tended to focus particularly on contractual theories, ranging from Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Rawles. There was also some good use of Aristotle's citing of the death of Socrates and conservative notions of an organic society in illustrating natural duty theories. Some candidates did stray onto the topic of the extent of obedience through considering arguments over the legitimacy of civil disobedience – this did receive credit as long as it did not become the main focus of a candidates answer.

**6 Evaluate the different interpretations on the role of the state**

Candidates largely displayed appropriate knowledge and understanding of the different perspectives ranging from the night watchman approach of classic liberals through to more interventionist states in developmental and social democratic (welfare state) models and finally collectivist states seen in communist and totalitarian models. Good answers focused particularly on the role of the state in each model, rather than just describe the models themselves. Weaker answers tended to consist of generalised descriptions of some of the above models or failed to focus at all upon the role of the state, instead concentrating upon the nature of the state itself. Overall a popular question and one in which the great majority of candidates were able to display some understanding of the models.

**7 Analyse the concept of external sovereignty**

Whilst this proved a reasonably popular question the level of understanding of external sovereignty varied enormously. Weaker answers had only the most basic of understanding, resulting in answers that confused internal and external sovereignty and/ or consisted of a general discussion of the impact of the EU on the location of sovereignty in the UK. Better answers focused upon the status of nation states within the international community and were able to highlight threats to the continuation of a territory's external sovereignty through the impact of globalisation, international aggression, and membership of international organisations. Good answers gave some interesting case studies on factors affecting the recognition of a nation's external sovereignty by the outside world. This answer tended to lend itself more to the short sharp focused use of examples and these were rewarded as long as they were used to illustrate the relevant concepts.

**8 Evaluate the main criticisms of dictatorship**

Once again a popular question, although one that invited weaker answers to give generalised descriptions of former and current dictatorships. Better answers did highlight key criticisms (often making distinctions between totalitarian and authoritarian style dictatorships) and not only described them but also evaluated their validity. Some answers produced arguments in a 'for and against' approach suggesting pre-prepared set answers, but as the question suggests the focus should be on the criticisms and their validity. A significant number of candidates used the ideas of Rousseau as advocating a dictatorial regime basing this assumption upon the role he ascribes to the Law giver/ legislator. Rousseau argued that the Law giver should establish the constitution for a given state, thus determining the general will but then retreat from that society leaving the citizens themselves to uphold the general will through direct participation in the legislative assembly. Talmon's critique of Rousseau as an advocate of totalitarian dictatorship was based upon the presumption that one man alone could not determine the general will and instead of retreating from society continued to impose their personal concept of the general will upon the masses.

**2696: Government and Politics (Research Essay)**

There were some excellent research essays this year on a wide range of topics. As always, good candidates had chosen contemporary topics which invited analysis and evaluation. Indeed, many included references to the 2005 election. It was pleasing to note that these essays had grasped the nettle of undertaking independent research and had successfully combined journalistic sources, internet sites with books and articles from journals such as Talking Politics. Candidates successfully used this material to write sophisticated, original and perceptive essays that retained a sharp focus throughout to produce a balanced answer to the actual question.

Once again a “Centre effect” was evident. Some Centres did not adhere to the word limit “en masse”. Whilst examiners tried to be as positive as possible, marks could not be awarded for all assessment objective 1 marks.

Some essays did not have a question for their title that inevitably hindered the application of analysis and evaluation. It must be stressed that almost half of the marks allocated are for analysis and evaluation. Teachers and students would do well to devote considerable time to and effort in order to ensure that their title allows the student to access these marks with a realistic and focussed question. One, which automatically invites arguments for and against, will do this as a matter of course. Many weaker essays only displayed a one sided discourse of the topic. Centres are advised that they can seek approval of their titles via e-mail from the Principal Examiner at [MPS@bradfordgrammar.com](mailto:MPS@bradfordgrammar.com). There were some that focused on economic or sociological issues and whilst the international comparisons can aid analysis and evaluation and are generally welcome, it should be noted that essays entirely based upon a foreign political topic are likely to present difficulties to the student and are generally best avoided. Complicated “double questions” tended to not be effectively answered.

Similarly some Centres applied too great an emphasis on primary research, such as questionnaires circulated between friends, which again failed to reach the higher levels for assessment objective 2. A surprising but common failing was the inability of students to answer their own question. Sometimes, if they had rephrased their title to match what they had actually written about, they would have attained a higher mark.

Students should provide a bibliography and the use of footnotes is encouraged to display the breadth of reading.

### 2698: Government & Politics (US Option)

All the questions were attempted, although as usual some were more popular than others. In the past the entry to this paper was marked by the absence of many really poor answers, but this year it seems this phenomenon was less marked, and there was more of a 'tail' than in previous years.

The better candidates were again those who think flexibly, and instead of deploying well-rehearsed answers to similar questions, answered the question offered. A few moments' thought before beginning is often all that is necessary to get 'on-message'. It was dispiriting to read knowledgeable essays - the evidence of committed revision and hard work - only to find the analysis peripheral to the question at issue. This feature was the big discriminator on this paper.

As ever, the better candidates were those who:

- kept a careful focus on the question throughout;
- began with a well organised analytic framework, and hefted their theories and hypotheses with illustration (rather than vice versa);
- paragraphed their answers, marking a new idea with a new section;
- made a clear effort to apply their understanding to political situations as they arose in the two years of their studies, and then had the courage to incorporate the results in their answers.

In addition to these perennial points, examiners felt that Centres might consider spending more time honing essay skills in preparation for this paper – and that, amongst these might be:

- using an essay plan to help with focus;
- concentrating on balance in argument so that answers to questions beginning: 'Evaluate the view' explore all sides;
- offering a point of illustration for every generalisation made, and so on.

All the examiners commented on some lamentable standards of punctuation and spelling- there were examples of apostrophised plurals, and mis-spellings of 'amendment', 'separation', 'prerogative' 'principle/principal' and so on. Many candidates still claim to find a right to 'bare arms' in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment of the American Constitution, and claim that British MPs 'tow the line' in divisions. This feature of scripts has not improved.

#### Comments on the Individual Questions

##### 1. Discuss the view that no single theory of voting behaviour can account for how people vote in elections.

This question was very popular, and as with many voting behaviour questions, seemed to attract the weaker candidates. As ever, it was the properly referenced answers, blending a mixture of theory and concrete empirical illustration that did well. Candidates who were not prepared, or thought that a few generalisations would answer the question were invariably mistaken. Candidates need to be equipped with a sophisticated mixture of theories, an acute awareness of the background and conduct of elections, and the principal reasons for electoral outcomes. This question asks for an evaluation of *theories* of voting behaviour, so those that trawled through the various factors influencing electoral behaviour (race, gender, the media, image of candidates) were missing the point, and unless those factors were used to make a wider point about the adequacy of theories, they did not do well.

The better candidates were those who located their answer within an awareness of long-term volatility of electorates in some countries, and who understood that new theories have been advanced precisely because earlier models have been shown to have shortcomings.

The better candidates incorporated the results of the American Election of 2004, and the British Election of 2005.

## **2. Discuss the relevance of political parties to modern politics.**

This was another popular question that also attracted some weaker answers. The better candidates were those who got to grips with the notion of *relevance* straightaway: are parties the preferred method of political expression in modern politics, or are pressure groups; what is the extent and cause of disengagement from formal politics; have politicians themselves conspired in this, creating catch-all parties with little ideological centre – and so on. ‘The Party’s Over’ thesis in America, and new methods of voter-outreach, such as the internet and blogging, might have been expected, but were rarely to the fore. A few intelligent flourishes were rewarded – Live8 was mentioned as a new means of expression and political engagement. The weaker candidates launched rehearsed answers to earlier questions about the functions of parties, and these were given credit insofar as they could be relevant to this question.

## **3. Examine the view that, in practice, the most important features of constitutions are to be found in statutes, conventions and judicial precedent.**

This was a reasonable popular question, but one which again enticed many candidates who were clearly hoping for quite a different angle. The debate over written/codified and unwritten constitutions, or: flexibility/inflexibility is of marginal relevance to this question. The better candidates identified the main operational details of constitutions are indeed found in these sources – even in the USA, most of the constitutional arrangements take these forms. Some features do not, of course, such as the separation of powers, or federalism. There was a variety of possible routes that candidates could take in answering this question, but in the end, the main discriminator was again *focus*. This might have been a more challenging question than most, but the better candidates were those who met it directly, rather than dodging it with other material.

## **4. Discuss the need for institutional reform within legislatures in different political systems.**

This was not a popular question, but it was relatively competently done. Some candidates answered it by discussing composition, and reform of the House of Lords. This was accepted as a possible answer to the question, although it was hoped that candidates would focus on committees, and other organisational arrangements. In the run up to the exam, there was much talk in the US about the Senate filibuster, and its use in judicial appointments, but only a few candidates mentioned it as a contender for reform. Most weaker candidates were content to discuss the relationship between the legislature and executive in general terms. The better candidates were those who discussed the systems used by legislatures in scrutiny of the executive, or legislating, and were able to suggest that some legislatures have the powers, resources, arrangements they need, or that others need better systems. A few mentioned the co-decision powers of the European Parliament, or its powers to confirm appointment of Commissioners, which had again been to the fore in the appointment of Rocco Buttiglione in 2004. These were rewarded.

**5. Discuss the view that effective formulation and delivery of policy requires a strong, decisive executive.**

This was a popular question, and it found some strong answers and some weaker ones. The weaker answers contrasted the parliamentary system in the UK and elsewhere with the system of separated powers in the US, and focussed on the formulation of policy in the form of legislation, and passing bills through legislative chambers. Some stronger candidates discussed the ability of Congress to legislate independently, and the problems of 'elective dictatorship' in the UK, as a way of balancing the argument. Some of the better candidates correctly saw that this question admitted discussion of foreign policy, and were able to explore rich seams of material and illustration accordingly – the use by British Prime Ministers of the Royal Prerogative, the formal constraints on a US President, and the several ways in which executives can be organised/advised. It was hoped that more might have seen the relevance of planned changes in the organisation of the European Union (president, and Union minister for foreign affairs) in this connection.

**6. Examine the view that federal and devolved systems of government enhance democracy.**

There were many strong and weak answers to this question. Most candidates were able to discuss ideas of representation and responsibility, accommodation of cultural diversity, and most were able to discuss the drawbacks of federal and devolved systems – the divergence of policy, cost, confusions that may arise, and so on. There was good knowledge of differing systems around the world – asymmetric devolution in Spain, and federal systems in Brazil, and elsewhere, case studies in India, Tasmania and so on. There were some attempted references to the EU, but few that worked terribly well. As ever, the better candidates were those who remained focussed on the question.

**7. Discuss whether judiciaries should be involved in political issues.**

There were many good answers to this question, which focussed on the merits of judiciaries being involved in political questions. Weaker answers tended to argue simply *that* judiciaries take political decisions, or that appointments in some systems are highly politicised, or that judiciaries have independence – the focus which the question required was on the word: 'should' – which should have directed candidates to arguments about the unelected, unrepresentative, out-of-touch character of judges/courts, or the idea that some legislatures are often unable or unwilling to address political questions, or that elected politicians and politicians alone should tackle questions such as abortion, or racial discrimination.

**8. Contrast the ways in which citizens may seek a redress of grievances in different political systems.**

This was not a popular question, and the answers were, by and large, disappointing. The most common approach to this question was to treat 'redress of grievances' as synonymous with 'protection of rights and liberties'. There is, of course, much overlap, but there is a whole area of grievance which lies beyond the scope of rights and liberties, which was left untouched by this approach, and candidates focussing on rights denied themselves possible marks for case studies, and methods which are part of the wider grievance procedures. Also, if the question begins with the word: 'contrast' – candidates are expected to draw such differences as they can between systems. They might, for example, have said that appeal to trans-national organisations (ECHR, ECJ) are obviously not features of the grievance procedures in the USA, or that the USA is a more litigious society, and has higher group membership.

## **2699: Government and Politics (Ideas and Concepts Option)**

### **General Comments**

Performance by candidates was largely in accordance with last year with nearly all able to answer two questions with some degree of understanding based upon knowledge of democratic theory and contemporary politics. The quality of answers varied greatly with those achieving high marks adopting an appropriate synoptic style, integrating effectively knowledge of political theory alongside evaluation of contemporary British and EU politics. Centres are reminded that in order to achieve the highest marks it is essential that candidates adopt an appropriate synoptic style. Weaker answers tended to either focus on answering questions from either purely a political theory perspective or relying solely upon knowledge acquired from their AS Units. A large number of candidates were unfortunately unable to deploy any specific contemporary examples to illustrate their arguments, instead adopting often hypothetical examples. Candidates are further reminded that where appropriate, they should extend the range of their illustrative material beyond the UK to at least covering relevant events relating to the European Union and/or member states, or other modern democratic countries. The best answers did provide specific factual illustrative evidence drawn from a range of modern democratic states.

A significant number of candidates were able to integrate into their answers the work of a wide range of political theorists. Candidates unfortunately had a tendency towards listing potted summaries of the ideas of a number of theorists without any attempt to evaluate these. Also a significant number of candidates were relying upon 17<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century political thinkers (Hobbes, Locke, Burke, Rousseau, Mill and Marx) and describing them as advocates of various forms of modern democracy. Whilst each of the above are highly influential in framing modern political ideas it is somewhat spurious to refer to Hobbes and Burke as advocates of modern democracy. It was good to see the use of a wider range of theorists this year with in particular, Rawles, Beetham, Dahl and Fukuyama all receiving widespread usage. Another worrying trend was the apparent number of pre-prepared style answers based upon topics similar to those asked, but lacking direct correlation to the questions set. This was particularly apparent in questions relating to liberal democracy and referendums where some students appeared determined to write their prepared responses on how liberal democratic is the UK and what are the arguments for against the use of referendums.

### **Comments on the Individual Questions**

#### **1 Examine what makes a political system democratic**

A popular choice with candidates and overall most were able to identify some central characteristics of democracy. In particular there were many examples of candidates focusing on the key concepts behind Liberal Democracy (a number wanted to answer another question on how democratic is liberal democracy). In order to achieve the highest marks comments linking to other forms of democracy were required. There were plenty of opportunities to utilise a range of theorists and theories in candidates' answers as well as illustrative evidence drawn from modern and classical forms of democracy. Weaker answers tended to be highly descriptive only raising the most obvious aspects of democracy, e.g. rule by the masses and the use of some electoral process.

**2 Assess the suitability of direct democracy to modern politics**

A very popular question and one that produced a wide variation in quality. Whilst nearly all candidates were able to discuss the origins of direct democracy fewer were able to highlight its continued relevance. Those that did often wrote essays on the arguments for and against the use of referendums. Whilst this device is certainly one of the key ways in which direct democracy is still used there were other areas to consider, ranging from town hall democracy and initiatives in the US to citizen's juries and 'e' democracy as advocated by some in the UK. Whilst it was possible to achieve good marks with a focus on the appropriateness of referenda in modern representative democracies, it was disappointing how few candidates were willing to illustrate their arguments with evidence of their usage in the UK or Europe beyond 1975 (EEC entry sic!) and Scottish and Welsh devolution. There are a wealth of local and international examples ranging from the recent rejections of the EU constitutions in France and Holland to local referendums over elected mayors and other regional and local issues.

**3 Discuss what checks and balances need to be placed on governments**

A significant proportion of answers failed to write synoptic style essays, tending to focus on methods of holding the executive to account in the UK. Whilst there was plenty of scope to utilise knowledge of executive scrutiny through parliamentary and non parliamentary means, better answers related their arguments to the theory of separation of powers and constitutional restraints upon executive actions. There were also some impressive answers that adopted an elitist perspective in arguing for limited checks upon executive power due to the necessity of elite rule, and also others that adopted a liberal perspective on the need for limited government.

**4 Discuss the view that political parties damage democracy**

Whilst this proved to be a popular question, there were a significant proportion of answers that failed to address the question, instead focussing narrowly upon scandals and corruption within modern political parties. Better answers did attempt to relate the question to the needs of democracy and produced effective arguments over the narrowing of political debate, the substitution of sectional interest for the common good, and problems over the lack of internal party democracy in modern political parties. Some answers did raise the issue as to whether parties are essential to representative democracy, thus providing a response to the criticisms required in answering the question.

**5 Assess how effective codified constitutions are in upholding human rights**

Most candidates who attempted this question displayed a reasonable degree of knowledge on what is meant by human rights and the definition of a codified constitution. Weaker answers however, tended to produce very generalised descriptions of human rights violation especially in the UK. There were however a good proportion of answers that recognised both the advantages of constitutional rights protection as well as the drawbacks relating to inflexibility and out datedness. Some very good answers considered the impact of the 1998 Human Rights Act in changing rights protection in the UK, providing a half way house to a codified Bill of Rights.

**6 Examine the impact of New Right ideas on modern conservatism.**

Weaker answers to this question either exclusively summarised the policies of the Thatcher Government and/ or looked at political problems in the recent Conservative party. More effective answers did try and compare New Right ideas to traditional conservative principles, questioning its credentials as a conservative based theory. The best answers appreciated both the neo liberal and neo conservative aspects of New Right thought and applied it to changing conservative domestic and foreign policy agendas in countries such as the UK and US.

**7 Discuss the view that in practice there is a democratic deficit at the centre of liberal democracy.**

Another popular question, as many candidates wanted to answer a question related specifically to liberal democracy. Unfortunately many wanted to answer the question how liberal democratic is the UK. There appeared to be in many cases a very loose understanding of the term democratic deficit and as a result many attacked liberal democracies for not being liberal enough as opposed to being deficient in its democratic credentials. Better answers did highlight problems with issues such as representation, particularly trustee usage, as well as electoral problems in the UK with FPTP. Some very good answers investigated pluralist versus elitist arguments over the extent of popular input into the decision making process in liberal democracies.

**8 Assess whether the trustee model of representation best describes the role of elected representatives.**

A very popular question and mostly candidates were aware of the key models; particularly trustee, delegate and mandate. Better answers also focused upon reflective representation giving appropriate evidence over the failure of the Commons in particular to be a microcosm for society in general. What tended to distinguish the quality of answers was the propensity of the candidate to go beyond pure descriptions of the models to determine how and where they operate in modern representative systems. Most answers tended to conclude by supporting the continued relevance of the trustee model, particularly dismissing the reflective and delegatory models, however the best answers took into account issues relating to party discipline and the nature of back bench rebellions. Many candidates displayed good understanding of a range of theorists including Burke and Paine in discussing the various models.

**Advanced GCE Government and Politics (3834/7834)  
June 2005 Assessment Session**

**Unit Threshold Marks**

Unit		Maximum Mark	a	b	c	d	e	u
2595	Raw	100	77	69	61	53	46	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2596	Raw	100	74	67	60	53	46	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2597	Raw	100	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2694	Raw	90	68	61	54	47	40	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2695	Raw	90	70	63	56	49	42	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2696	Raw	90	72	64	56	48	41	0
	UMS	90	72	63	54	45	36	0
2698	Raw	120	84	75	66	57	48	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
2699	Raw	120	89	80	71	62	53	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0

**Specification Aggregation Results**

Overall threshold marks in UMS (i.e. after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
3834	300	240	210	180	150	120	0
7834	600	480	420	360	300	240	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
3834	26.8	48.6	66.8	80.2	89.1	100	1116
7834	28.0	54.6	76.5	91.5	98.4	100	900





**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
1 Hills Road  
Cambridge  
CB1 2EU**

**OCR Information Bureau**

**(General Qualifications)  
Telephone: 01223 553998  
Facsimile: 01223 552627  
Email: [helpdesk@ocr.org.uk](mailto:helpdesk@ocr.org.uk)**

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

**For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance  
programme your call may be recorded or monitored**

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations  
is a Company Limited by Guarantee  
Registered in England  
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU  
Registered Company Number: 3484466  
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)  
Head office  
Telephone: 01223 552552  
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2005

