



National  
Qualifications  
2019

---

**2019 Politics**

**Higher Paper 2**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2019

These marking instructions have been prepared by examination teams for use by SQA appointed markers when marking external course assessments.

The information in this document may be reproduced in support of SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is reproduced, SQA must be clearly acknowledged as the source. If it is to be reproduced for any other purpose, written permission must be obtained from [permissions@sqa.org.uk](mailto:permissions@sqa.org.uk).



## General marking principles for Higher Politics

*Always apply these general principles. Use them in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidates' responses.*

- (a) Always use positive marking. This means candidates accumulate marks for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding; marks are not deducted for errors or omissions.
- (b) If a candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed marking instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your team leader.
- (c) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.
- (d) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (e) The detailed marking instructions are not an exhaustive list. Award marks for other relevant points.

### Marking principles for each question type

For each of the question types the following provides an overview of marking principles. The types of questions used in this paper are

- To what extent . . . [20-mark information-handling question]
- Compare . . . [8-mark information-handling question]

#### Source-based compare question that assesses information-handling skills (8 marks)

- Candidates will have two sources at an appropriate SCQF level
- Credit candidates who synthesis information between sources
- For full marks candidates must refer to both sources in their answer

#### Source-based interpreting electoral data question that assesses information-handling skills (20 marks)

- Candidates will have up to seven sources at an appropriate SCQF level
- Credit candidates who synthesis information both within and between sources
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer

General marking guidelines for source-based questions (compare) – 8 marks

	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks
<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>Identification of relevant points of comparison.</p> <p>Award up to <b>3 marks</b>.</p>	<p>One accurate point of comparison identified from two sources.</p>	<p>Two accurate points of comparison identified from two sources.</p>	<p>Three accurate points of comparison identified from two sources.</p>
<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>Comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements.</p> <p>Award up to <b>3 marks</b>.</p>	<p>One relevant analytical comment based on one point of comparison.</p>	<p>Two relevant analytical comments based on two points of comparison.</p>	<p>Three relevant analytical comments based on three points of comparison.</p>
<p><b>Overall conclusion</b></p> <p>Award up to <b>2 marks</b>.</p>	<p>Straightforward overall conclusion about the comparison based upon analysis of evidence.</p>	<p>Detailed overall conclusion about the comparison based on analysis of evidence.</p>	

General marking guidelines for source-based question (interpretation of electoral data) – 20 marks

		1 mark	2 marks	3 marks
Interpretation of data linked to the first part of the viewpoint	Component 1	One aspect of data is interpreted accurately and linked to the first component of this part of the viewpoint.	All relevant aspects of data are interpreted accurately and linked to the first component of this part of the viewpoint.	In addition, all identified aspects of data are synthesised to provide a commentary linked to this component.
	Component 2	One aspect of data is interpreted accurately and linked to the second component of this part of the viewpoint.	All relevant aspects of data are interpreted accurately and linked to the second component of this part of the viewpoint.	In addition, all identified aspects of data are synthesised to provide a commentary linked to this component.
Interpretation of data linked to the second part of the viewpoint	Component 1	One aspect of data is interpreted accurately and linked to the first component of this part of the viewpoint.	All relevant aspects of data are interpreted accurately and linked to the first component of this part of the viewpoint.	In addition, all identified aspects of data are synthesised to provide a commentary linked to this component.
	Component 2	One aspect of data is interpreted accurately and linked to the second component of this part of the viewpoint.	All relevant aspects of data are interpreted accurately and linked to the second component of this part of the viewpoint.	In addition, all identified aspects of data are synthesised to provide a commentary linked to this component.
	Component 3	One aspect of data is interpreted accurately and linked to the third component of this part of the viewpoint.	All relevant aspects of data are interpreted accurately and linked to the third component of this part of the viewpoint.	In addition, all identified aspects of data are synthesised to provide a commentary linked to this component.
Evaluation of extent of validity of the viewpoint	Evaluation of first part of the viewpoint	An overall evaluative comment is made on the validity of one component of the first part of the viewpoint with supporting justification.	An overall comment is made on the validity of both components of the first part of the viewpoint with supporting justifications.	
	Evaluation of the second part of the viewpoint	An overall evaluative comment is made on the validity of one component of the second part of the viewpoint with supporting justification.	An overall evaluative comment is made on the validity of two components of the second part of the viewpoint with supporting justifications.	An overall evaluative comment is made on the validity of all components of the second part of the viewpoint with supporting justifications.

## Marking instructions for each question

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
1.	<p>Candidates must demonstrate they can make accurate comparisons and draw valid conclusions.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must refer to all sources and also say to what extent the evidence supports the viewpoint.</p>	8	<p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question.</p> <p><b>Source A</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hobbes articulates that human nature is evil and that only an unlimited and sovereign monarch can maintain order against our inherent tendency to evil</li> <li>• Hobbes used the idea of society before the establishment of governmental authority. He called this the state of nature. He argued that life in this state of nature would be ‘solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short’. Hobbes argued that the only way out of this position, would be for people to accept some dominant power to enforce peace and order on everybody</li> <li>• Hobbes argued that there was a stark choice facing society, either accept the unlimited rule and power of the state or face chaos and war. The people would agree to accept the unquestioned rule of a sovereign state.</li> </ul> <p><b>Source B</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locke trusts in the goodness of human nature. For Locke, man was a social animal but he accepted that disputes could arise and therefore a state with limited powers would be required to resolve these</li> <li>• Locke felt that humans could live peacefully in a state of nature and were governed by ‘natural law’ and that all humans were entitled to the god-given natural rights to life, liberty and property. Locke did however acknowledge that there was a risk of conflict where there was unlimited freedom and that some might try to limit the rights of others. As a result there would need to be an arbiter to ensure that the rights of citizens could not be encroached by others</li> <li>• for Locke the social contract existed between the individual and the state as long as the state protected the natural rights of life, liberty and property. This was the extent of the obligation to obey the government. Where the state failed to do so Locke argued that individuals had the right to remove and replace the system of government and laws.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant comparisons.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
	<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>Comparisons involve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identifying areas of differences</li> <li>identifying areas of similarity</li> <li>making evaluative comments on the extent of these differences/ similarities.</li> </ul> <p>For full marks, candidates must use both sources and make three points of comparison.</p> <p>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for each accurate point of comparison and analytical comment.</p> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 6 marks</b> for accurate comparisons with associated analysis.</p> <p>Award <b>up to 2 marks</b> for an overall conclusion.</p>		<p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>Candidates may make individual evaluative comments as they address each part of the viewpoint, or they may produce a summative evaluation of each part of the viewpoint in the conclusion to their answer – award marks for both approaches.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it identifies one point of comparison from two sources. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>Hobbes articulates that human nature is evil and that only an unlimited and sovereign monarch can maintain order against our inherent tendency to evil. Locke trusts in the goodness of human nature. For Locke, man was a social animal but he accepted that disputes could arise and therefore a state with limited powers would be required to resolve these.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it identifies one point of comparison from two sources <b>(1 mark)</b> and makes a relevant analytical comment. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>Hobbes articulates that human nature is evil and that only an unlimited and sovereign monarch can maintain order against our inherent tendency to evil. Locke trusts in the goodness of human nature. For Locke, man was a social animal but he accepted that disputes could arise and therefore a state with limited powers would be required to resolve these.</i></p> <p><i>Hobbes and Locke therefore have very different views on human nature. Hobbes believed an unlimited state was needed, alternatively Locke believed a state with limited powers was required.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it makes a straightforward overall conclusion. <b>(1 mark)</b></p>

Question			General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
					<p><i>Overall, Hobbes and Locke have quite different views on the proper role of the state.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it makes a detailed overall conclusion. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>Overall, Hobbes and Locke have quite different views on the proper role of the state.</i></p> <p><i>Hobbes thinks that we must accept an all-powerful and unlimited state to provide order. On the other hand Locke argues that the role of the state should be limited to protecting basic rights and should be based on the consent of the people.</i></p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
2.	<p>Candidates must demonstrate that they can interpret and evaluate electoral data.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must refer to all sources and also say to what extent the data supports the statement made.</p> <p><b>Analysis/evaluation</b> Award <b>up to 3 marks</b> for answers that correctly interpret electoral data that links to an individual component of the viewpoint.</p>	20	<p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question.</p> <p><b>Interpretation of data</b></p> <p><b>First part of the viewpoint – the performance of Democrats and Republicans</b></p> <p><b>Component 1</b> ‘The Democrats clearly won the 2012 elections by convincingly defeating the Republicans at every level....’</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award <b>2 marks</b> if they address all three aspects of data.</p> <p><b>Aspect 1 (presidential level)</b> – Source A: the Democrat candidate easily won the Presidential election with 332 to 206 electoral college votes. Obama won with over 50% of the votes compared to Mitt Romney’s 47.2%.</p> <p><b>Aspect 2 (Senate results)</b> – Source B: the Democrats defeated the Republicans to keep control of the Senate by winning 55 seats to the Republicans 45. They made a net gain of 2 seats to increase their majority.</p> <p><b>Aspect 3 (House of Representatives)</b> – Source B: although the Democrats made a net gain of 8 seats in the House of Representatives they were still behind the Republicans. The Republicans won the election for the House of Representatives beating the Democrats by 234 to 201 seats.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
	<p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for an evaluation of the validity of each individual component.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must address both parts of the viewpoint.</p>		<p><b>Component 2</b> ‘...their performance in 2012 was almost as impressive as in 2008.’</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award <b>2 marks</b> if they address all three aspects of data.</p> <p><b>Aspect 1 (presidential results)</b> – Source A: in 2008 the Democrats won the Presidency by a bigger margin than in 2012. They had a greater share of the vote (52·9%) and won by a bigger margin in the electoral college votes by 365 to 173 compared to 332 to 206.</p> <p><b>Aspect 2 (Senate results)</b> – Source B: the Democrats performed more strongly in 2008 – they elected a higher number of Senators, 59 compared to 55, and they also made bigger gains – 8 in 2008 compared to 2 in 2012</p> <p><b>Aspect 3 (House of Representatives results)</b> – Source B: the Democrats easily won the House of Representatives in 2008. The Democrats had 257 members compared to 178 for the Republicans. They also made 21 gains compared to only 8 gains in 2012 when they did not even win the House of Representatives.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p><b>Second part of the viewpoint – performance of the candidates among different types of voters in the 2012 and 2016 elections</b></p> <p><b>Component 1</b>  ‘In the 2012 presidential election Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent by decisive margins across every area...’</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award <b>2 marks</b> if they address both aspects of data.</p> <p><b>Aspect 1 (region)</b> – Source C: Obama easily beat Romney in both the East and the West although he did get less than half the votes in the West. He beat Romney by a closer margin in the Midwest but he was easily defeated by Romney in the South.</p> <p><b>Aspect 2 (community)</b> – Source C: Obama easily defeated Romney in big and mid-sized cities but Romney beat Obama in towns and suburban/rural areas.</p> <p><b>Component 2</b>  ‘In the 2012 presidential election Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent...in all sections of society.’</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award <b>2 marks</b> if they address all four aspects of data.</p> <p><b>Aspect 1 (gender)</b> – Source D: Obama won female voters by a sizeable margin (55% to 44%) however, Romney defeated Obama easily among male voters though by not as large a margin (52% to 45%).</p> <p><b>Aspect 2 (age)</b> – Source D: Obama won all three voter groups under 40 by significant margins, for example he won 18–24 year olds by 60% to 36%. Romney won all three voter groups 40 and over. He performed most strongly in those voters aged 65+, winning this group by 56% to 44%.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p><b>Aspect 3 (ethnicity)</b> – Source D: Obama won the Black, Hispanic and Asian vote by huge margins, for example he won Blacks with over 90% of the vote. Romney however beat Obama among White voters by 20%.</p> <p><b>Aspect 4 (income)</b> – Source D: Obama beat Romney easily in voters with income under \$50,000, winning those under \$50,000 by over 30%. Romney won all voter groups with income \$50,000 and over although those between \$200,000 and \$249,999 was relatively close.</p> <p><b>Component 3</b>  ‘The Republican candidate in 2016, Donald Trump, performed significantly better among all voter groups compared to Mitt Romney in 2012.’</p> <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award <b>2 marks</b> if they address all four aspects of data.</p> <p><b>Aspect 1 (gender)</b> – Sources D &amp; E: in 2016 Trump won the majority of male votes with 53% and got 42% support from females. In 2012 Romney got 52% support from males and 44% from females.</p> <p><b>Aspect 2 (age)</b> – Sources D &amp; E: Romney performed better among voters aged 18–24, 30–39 and 65+ but Trump performed better than Romney among 25–29 and 50–64 year olds, while they both got similar levels of support from 40–49 year olds</p> <p><b>Aspect 3 (ethnicity)</b> - Sources D &amp; E: Romney got better support than Trump from White voters but Trump performed better than Romney among Black, Hispanic and Asian voters. However, among other groups Romney performed better than Trump.</p> <p><b>Aspect 4 (income)</b> – Sources D &amp; E: Trump performed better than Romney among those with income under \$50,000 particularly those below \$30,000, Trump also performed much better than those earning between \$200–249,999 but Romney did better than Trump in all the other groups.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p><b>Synthesis</b></p> <p><b>First part of the viewpoint</b></p> <p><b>Component 1 synthesis – 1 mark</b>            In terms of both the Presidency and the Senate, the Democrats clearly won the 2012 election but in some ways it was tight in terms of the share of the vote in the presidential election and so it might not be seen as convincing. However, despite making gains the Democrats lost the House of Representatives.</p> <p><b>Component 2 synthesis – 1 mark</b>            By every measure the performance of the Democrats was less impressive than in 2008, they got a smaller share of the vote in the presidential election and also won a smaller proportion of the electoral college. They had a smaller majority in the Senate and won less seats than in 2008. They also lost the House of Representatives and had fewer seats.</p> <p><b>Second part of the viewpoint</b></p> <p><b>Component 1 synthesis – 1 mark</b>            Obama’s support was strongest in the East and Midwest and he also won the West. He clearly won big and mid-sized cities, but Romney beat him in the South, towns and suburban/rural areas.</p> <p><b>Component 2 synthesis – 1 mark</b>            Obama’s support was strongest among females, minorities, the young and lower income groups but Romney beat Obama among males, Whites, older voters and higher income groups.</p> <p><b>Component 3 synthesis – 1 mark</b>            Trump did perform better than Romney in some voter groups – for example, males, the very poorest, some minority groups and some age groups but in others Romney actually performed better than Trump.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p><b>Evaluation of the first part of the viewpoint</b></p> <p><b>First part of the viewpoint</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation of one component – 1 mark</b>  The Democrats clearly won the Senate in 2012 and were also victorious in the presidential election although President Obama won with just over 50% of the vote. However, Obama still convincingly won the electoral college. On the other hand, the Democrats lost the House of Representatives to the Republicans and so this was a defeat at this level. As a result, it cannot be said that the Democrats convincingly defeated the Republicans at all levels, they were victorious at some levels but not in others and the presidential election can be seen in some ways to have been not quite convincing in terms of the share of the vote.</p> <p><b>Evaluation of both components – 2 marks</b>  The Democrats clearly won the Senate in 2012 and were also victorious in the presidential election although President Obama got just over 50% of the vote. However, he still convincingly won the electoral college. On the other hand, the Democrats lost the House of Representatives to the Republicans and so this was a defeat at this level. As a result, it cannot be said that the Democrats convincingly defeated the Republicans at all levels, they were victorious at some levels but not in others and the presidential election can be seen in some ways to have been not quite convincing in terms of the share of the vote.</p> <p>The performance of the Democrats can be said to have been less impressive as in the presidential race they got fewer votes and won by a smaller margin in the electoral college than they did in 2008. In the Senate and House of Representatives they also won fewer seats than they did in 2008 and made fewer gains. In 2008 they won all three elections but in 2012 they only won two. Therefore, this is not as impressive as it is a worse performance than 2008 where they lost the House of Representatives to the Republicans and only just won the Presidency.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p><b>Second part of the viewpoint</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation of one component – 1 mark</b>  The viewpoint states that Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent Mitt Romney, by decisive margins across every area. In the East and West he decisively beat Romney but in the Midwest it was much closer and although he still beat him by 5% this was not as decisive. However, in the South, Romney easily beat Obama so it cannot be said that Obama beat him in every area – he beat him in most areas but not the South. Also, Obama decisively beat Romney in big and medium sized cities, but he narrowly lost suburban/rural areas and was heavily defeated in towns. So, Obama did not beat him decisively in every area – he again lost to Romney in some areas. So overall the statement is not correct.</p> <p><b>Evaluation of two components – 2 marks</b>  The viewpoint states that Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent, Mitt Romney, by decisive margins in every area. In the East and West he decisively beat Romney but in the Midwest it was much closer and although he still beat him by 5% this was not as decisive. However, in the South, Romney easily beat Obama so it cannot be said that Obama beat him in every area. Also, Obama decisively beat Romney in big and medium sized cities, but he narrowly lost suburban/rural areas and was heavily defeated in towns. So Obama did not beat him decisively in every area – he again lost to Romney in some areas. So overall the statement is not correct.</p> <p>In addition, the view states he decisively beat his opponent in every section of society. Obama did record decisive victories among minorities, the poorest income groups, younger voters and females but in every age group above 40 Romney beat him. Romney also easily beat Obama among male voters as well as white voters and he beat Obama in every income group \$50,000 and above. As a result, this part of the statement is also not correct. Obama beat Romney in certain groups of voters but Romney beat Obama among other groups.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p><b>Evaluation of all components – 3 marks</b></p> <p>The viewpoint states that Barack Obama defeated his Republican opponent, Mitt Romney, by decisive margins in every area. In the East and West he decisively beat Romney but in the Midwest it was much closer and although he still beat him by 5% this was not as decisive. However, in the South, Romney easily beat Obama so it cannot be said that Obama beat him in every area. Also, Obama decisively beat Romney in big and medium sized cities, but he narrowly lost suburban/rural areas and was heavily defeated in towns. So Obama did not beat him decisively in every area – he again lost to Romney in some areas. So overall the statement is not correct.</p> <p>In addition, the view states he decisively beat his opponent in every section of society. Obama did record decisive victories among minorities, the poorest income groups, younger voters and females but in every age group above 40 Romney beat him. Romney also easily beat Obama among male voters as well as white voters and he beat Obama in every income group \$50,000 and above. As a result, this part of the statement is also incorrect. Obama beat Romney in certain groups of voters but Romney beat Obama among other groups.</p> <p>The view states that the Republican candidate in 2016 Donald Trump, performed significantly better among all voter groups compared to Mitt Romney in 2012. There are some groups that Trump performed much better than Romney did – those earning under \$30,000 and those earning between \$200,000–249,999 but in other groups Romney actually did better than Trump – for example among females. In addition, in some groups Trump performed only slightly better than Romney such as Blacks, males and 25–29 year olds. This means that the statement is not correct – he did not perform better than Romney among all voter groups – he did so in some and not in others. Also in some of the groups where he did better than Romney it was only slightly better and not significantly better.</p>

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]