



National  
Qualifications  
2022

**2022 Politics**

**Paper 1**

**Higher**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2022

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) Where a candidate does not comply with the rubric of the paper and answers more than one optional question, mark both responses and record the better mark.
- (d) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.
- (e) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (f) The detailed marking instructions are not an exhaustive list. Award marks for other relevant points.
- (g) Award marks only where points relate to the question asked. Where candidates give points of knowledge without specifying the context, award marks unless it is clear that they do not refer to the context of the question.
- (h) To gain knowledge/understanding marks, points must be:
  - i. relevant to the issue in the question
  - ii. developed (by providing additional detail, exemplification, reasons or evidence)
  - iii. used to respond to the demands of the question (for example, evaluate, analyse)

## 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:

- Statement or given view. Discuss . . . [20 mark extended response]
- To what extent . . . [20 mark extended response]
- Analyse . . . [12 mark extended response]
- Evaluate . . . [12 mark extended response]
- Compare . . . [12 mark extended response]

## Extended response questions (12 or 20 marks)

**For 12 mark responses:** award up to a **maximum of 8 marks** for knowledge and understanding (description, explanation and exemplification); award the remaining marks for demonstration of the higher-order skill of analysis. Where a candidate makes more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of **4 marks**, these can be awarded as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

**For 20-mark responses:** award up to **8 marks** for knowledge and understanding (description, explanation and exemplification); award the remaining marks for demonstration of the higher-order skills of analysis **and** evaluation **and** structured argument. Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, these can be awarded as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

**Analyse questions**

- Candidates identify parts of an issue, the relationship between these parts and their relationships with the whole; draw out and relate implications.

**Compare questions**

- Candidates identify differences and/or similarities.

**Evaluate questions**

- Candidates make a judgement based on criteria; determine the value of something.

**Discuss questions**

- Candidates communicate ideas and information on the issue in the statement; candidates gain marks for analysing and evaluating different views of the statement/viewpoint.

**To what extent questions**

- Candidates analyse the issue in the question and come to a conclusion or conclusions which involve an evaluative judgement which is likely to be quantitative in nature.

General marking guidelines for extended response (20 marks)

|  | 1 mark   | 2 marks   | 3 marks   | 4 marks   | 5 marks  | 6 marks |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|---------|
| <p><b>Knowledge and understanding scope</b></p> <p>Award up to <b>5 marks.</b></p>   | One aspect with some description.  | Two aspects, each with some description.<br><b>OR</b><br>One aspect with detailed description.  | Three aspects, each with some description.<br><b>OR</b><br>Two aspects with detailed description.   | Four aspects covered, each with some description.<br><b>OR</b><br>Three aspects with detailed descriptions. | Four aspects with detailed descriptions.   |         |
| <p><b>Knowledge and understanding development</b></p> <p>Award up to <b>5 marks.</b></p> <p><b>A total of 8 marks overall awarded for knowledge and understanding.</b></p> | One aspect is developed with some explanations and/or exemplification.   | Two aspects are developed, each with some explanation and/or exemplification.<br><b>OR</b><br>One aspect is developed with detailed explanation and/or exemplification. | Three aspects are developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification.<br><b>OR</b><br>Two aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification. | Three or more aspects are developed, with extended explanation and/or relevant exemplification.             | Three or more aspects are developed, with extended and accurate explanations and development of points (showing where relevant a high level of theoretical/ conceptual understanding) with relevant exemplification. |         |
| <p><b>Analysis*</b></p> <p>Award up to <b>6 marks.</b></p>   | <p>Award <b>1 mark</b> for each analytical statement which analyses the aspects in terms of the question.</p> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 2 marks</b> for an analytical statement which is developed further or has additional supporting justification or evidence.</p> <p>Award a <b>maximum of 4 marks</b> for multiple comments which only focus on an individual aspect.</p> |   |   |   |  |         |

|  | 1 mark  | 2 marks   | 3 marks  | 4 marks   | 5 marks | 6 marks |
|--|---|---|--|---|---------|---------|
| <b>Structure</b><br>Award up to <b>2 marks.</b>    | Clear structure that addresses the issue identified in the question.            | Structure that clarifies the issue, presents evidence and develops a clear and consistent line of argument. |  |   |         |         |
| <b>Conclusions*</b><br>Award up to <b>4 marks.</b> | A straightforward conclusion that deals with the central issue in the question. | A straightforward conclusion that deals with and evaluates the central issue in the question.               | A developed conclusion that directly addresses and provides an evaluation of the central issue(s) in the question. | A developed and well-argued conclusion with justifications that directly address and evaluate the central issue(s) in the question. |         |         |

\*Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

General marking guidelines for extended response (12 marks)

|  | 1 mark  | 2 marks  | 3 marks  | 4 marks  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>Knowledge and understanding scope</b></p> <p>Award up to 4 marks.</p>  | <p>One aspect, with some description.</p>                                     | <p>Two aspects, each with some description.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>One aspect, with detailed description.</p>   | <p>Three aspects, each with some description.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>Two aspects, one with detailed description.</p>  | <p>Three aspects, two with detailed description.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>Two aspects, each with detailed description – these should include the key points.</p>  |
| <p><b>Knowledge and understanding development</b></p> <p>Award up to 4 marks.</p> <p><b>A total of 8 marks overall awarded for knowledge and understanding.</b></p>  | <p>One aspect is developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification.</p> | <p>Two aspects are developed, each with some explanation and/or exemplification.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>One aspect is developed with detailed explanation and/or exemplification.</p> | <p>Three aspects are developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>Two aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification.</p>                             | <p>Three aspects developed, two with detailed explanation and/or exemplification.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>Two aspects are developed, with extended explanation and relevant exemplification.</p>   |
| <p><b>Analysis</b></p> <p>Comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | <p>One relevant and accurate analytical comment.</p>                          | <p>Two different relevant and accurate analytical comments.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>One extended and/or justified/exemplified relevant analytical comment.</p>                         | <p>Three different relevant and accurate analytical comments.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>Two different relevant and accurate analytical comments, at least one of which is extended and/or justified/exemplified.</p> | <p>Three relevant and accurate analytical comments, at least one of which is extended and/or justified or exemplified.<br/><b>OR</b><br/>Two different relevant and accurate analytical comments, both of which are extended and/or justified/exemplified.</p> |

Marking instructions for each question

Section 1 – Political theory

| Question |     | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|-----|---|----------|--|
| 1.       | (a) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of political concepts, ideologies or theories as appropriate to the question, and any links between them.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to the works of appropriate theorists to gain full marks; otherwise award no more than <b>13 marks</b>.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 8 marks</b> for knowledge and understanding.</p> | 20       | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• key features of direct democracy, such as: it heightens the control of citizens, the public can express a view and interest without having to rely on self-serving politicians, it creates a better informed and more politically knowledgeable group of citizens, it ensures rule is legitimate – decisions will be accepted since the people made them</li> <li>• key features of representative democracy, such as: more practical than direct democracy, ordinary citizens don't have to be directly involved, allows government to be in the hands of those with expert knowledge, voters choose representatives to make decisions on their behalf</li> <li>• the work of appropriate theorists, such as Schumpeter, Plato, Madison or Rousseau.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b><br/>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>Direct democracy involves citizens themselves participating in the decision-making process rather than choosing representatives to do this. Representative democracy is an indirect form of democracy. It involves citizens voting infrequently to select representatives to make decisions on their behalf.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with some description <b>(1 mark)</b> and limited development with some exemplification or explanations. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>Direct democracy involves citizens themselves participating in the decision-making process rather than choosing representatives to do this. Representative democracy is an indirect form of democracy. It involves citizens voting infrequently to select representatives to make decisions on their behalf. Under this system, the public do not exercise power themselves but transfer decision-making power to their representatives.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|--|----------|--|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> </ul> |          | <p><i>This creates a link between the government and the governed known as the electoral mandate.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed descriptions (<b>2 marks</b>) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>Direct democracy involves citizens themselves participating in the decision-making process rather than choosing representatives to do this. This approach was first used in ancient Athens where all citizens were involved in making key decisions. Recent examples of this include the use of propositions and voter initiatives in a number of US states. For example, voters in California had the opportunity to decide the position of the state on gay marriage. This was a decision they took directly and was not in the hands of their elected representatives. Representative democracy is an indirect form of democracy. It involves citizens voting infrequently to select representatives to make decisions on their behalf. Under this system, the public do not exercise power themselves but transfer decision-making power to their representatives. This creates a link between the government and the governed known as the electoral mandate. Most western democracies follow this model, this includes Scotland where the Scottish people elect three types of parliamentary representatives. An example of this is the election of local councillors to the 32 local authorities in Scotland which is now done once every five years.</i></p> <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>6 marks</b> for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary, for example:</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical statement. (<b>1 mark</b>)</p> <p><i>In a system of direct democracy everyone is directly involved in making decisions on a regular basis. Representative democracy is significantly different as participation by the public is infrequent (possibly once every four or five years) and most decisions are made by a small group of elected representatives. Therefore, there are major differences in the level of participation by the public.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> due to additional justification and supporting evidence. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|---|----------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks provided, they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence</li> <li>• the relative importance of factors</li> <li>• counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations</li> <li>• the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together.</li> </ul> |          | <p><i>In a system of direct democracy everyone is directly involved in making decisions on a regular basis. Representative democracy is significantly different as participation by the public is infrequent (possibly once every 4 or 5 years) and most decisions are made by a small group of elected representatives. Therefore, there are major differences in the level of participation by the public.</i></p> <p><i>In large scale societies having everyone participate directly will be impractical as most countries today have complex systems of government and decisions need to be made quickly. On the other hand, representative democracy ensures that legislation can be made and passed very quickly. As a result, it can be argued that purely for practical reasons representative democracies can respond more effectively to emergency situations.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion</b><br/>Award up to <b>4 marks</b> for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it provides a straightforward if limited conclusion which attempts to deal with the central issue as identified by the question. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the key features of direct democracy are superior to those of representative democracy.</i></p> <p>The following would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it provides a straightforward conclusion which deals with the central issue and also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the key features of direct democracy are far superior to those of representative democracy. Although representative democracy provides an easily</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|--|----------|--|
|          | <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers, and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> |          | <p><i>administered and more timely system of government, direct democracy offers a better system of government. This is because direct democracy offers the electorate many more opportunities to participate in the decisions that have an effect on them.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it provides a developed and well-argued conclusion with justifications that directly address and evaluate the key issue in the question. <b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the key features of direct democracy are far superior to those of representative democracy. Although representative democracy provides an easily administered and more timely system of government, direct democracy offers a better system of government. This is because direct democracy offers the electorate many more opportunities to participate in the decisions that have an effect on them.</i></p> <p><i>Direct democracy allows individuals to participate directly in the decision-making process, and in so doing express their own opinions and desires without any need to elect what may become self-serving politicians. This prevents the development of an elitist system and therefore means that, unlike representative democracy, direct democracy is much more closely linked to the traditional concept of democracy. This highlights that direct democracy is a much better system even if it is more difficult to implement.</i></p> <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for structure as well as development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>For example, award high marks to answers which define the central issues(s) in the introduction and have a clear structure with a developed line of argument. Award low or <b>0 marks</b> to answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question, or which are poorly structured, jumping between different parts of the question and therefore failing to develop a coherent line of argument.</p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark  | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|---|-----------|---|
| (b)      | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of political concepts, ideologies or theories as appropriate to the question, and any links between them.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to the works of appropriate theorists to gain full marks; otherwise award no more than <b>13 marks</b>.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 8 marks</b> for knowledge and understanding.</p> | <b>20</b> | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>For example, if a candidate chooses socialism and liberalism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• background: the development of the two ideologies – for liberalism, the impact of the enlightenment and the development of rationalism. For socialism, the Marxist critique of the impact of the Industrial Revolution and development of ideas of wealth equality</li> <li>• attitudes towards human nature – that is rationalism for liberals and environmental determinism for socialists</li> <li>• the key features associated with socialist ideology (community, collectivism, social class, equality and common ownership)</li> <li>• the key principles associated with liberal ideology (freedom, individualism, toleration, constitutionalism and equality of opportunity)</li> <li>• the ideas of relevant theorists, such as John Locke as outlined in Two Treatises of Government and the ideas of Karl Marx as outlined in Das Kapital.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>Liberals believe that we are born equal and have a strong commitment to equal rights for all individuals which is sometimes referred to as equality of opportunity. Whereas socialists have a strong belief in social and economic equality which is sometimes referred to as equality of outcome.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed description. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>Liberals believe that we are born equal and have a strong commitment to equal rights for all individuals which is sometimes referred to as equality of opportunity. For example, liberals believe in toleration of different political and religious ideas. Whereas socialists have a strong belief in social and economic equality which is sometimes referred to as equality of outcome. Socialists therefore believe in improving the condition of the poor.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|---|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> </ul> |          | <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed descriptions (<b>2 marks</b>) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>Liberals believe that we are born equal and have a strong commitment to equal rights for all individuals which is sometimes referred to as equality of opportunity. For example, liberals believe in toleration of different political and religious ideas and were associated with legislation passed in the UK emancipating Catholics and ensuring rights for women. Also, whilst in coalition between 2010-15, the Liberal Democrats pressed for increased funds for education as they argued that this protected freedom of opportunity. Whereas socialists have a strong belief in social and economic equality which is sometimes referred to as equality of outcome. Socialists therefore believe in improving the condition of the poor. For example, during the Cold War, citizens in socialist controlled East Germany were given guaranteed employment and wage equality. Socialists would argue that these measures were important in reducing poverty and therefore promoting equality by reducing the gap between rich and poor.</i></p> <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>6 marks</b> for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary, for example:</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical statement. (<b>1 mark</b>)</p> <p><i>Both ideologies have some similarities in outlook because they both espouse some form of equality, but there are clear differences in the aims and ends of this equality.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> due to additional justification and supporting evidence. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>Both ideologies have some similarities in outlook because they both espouse some form of equality, but there are clear differences in the aims and ends of this equality. Both socialists and liberals support equality of opportunity. However, for socialists the real aim is equality of outcome as they believe that inequalities in wealth is the main cause of divisions within society. Liberals do not support the idea of equality of outcome as they would argue that this would have the effect of</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|---|----------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence</li> <li>• the relative importance of factors</li> <li>• counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations</li> <li>• the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together.</li> </ul> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates develop detailed</p> |          | <p><i>demotivating citizens to achieve their full potential and also limit the rights of the individual to benefit from their own labour.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Award up to <b>4 marks</b> for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it provides a straightforward if limited conclusion which attempts to deal with the central issue as identified by the question. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, there are some major differences between socialism and liberalism.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it provides a straightforward conclusion which deals with the central issue and also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, there are some major differences between socialism and liberalism. However, there are some areas where they are quite similar as it could be argued that both ideologies are progressive to an extent. For example, on the idea of equality. On the other hand, it could be argued that socialism is more progressive than liberalism because socialists believe in equality of outcomes whereas liberals</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|---|----------|--|
|          | <p>conclusions throughout their answers, and you should award marks to these accordingly.</p> <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> |          | <p><i>believe only in equality of opportunity.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it provides a developed and well-argued conclusion with justifications that directly address and evaluate the key issue in the question. <b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, there are some areas where liberalism and socialism are quite similar as it could be argued that both ideologies are progressive to an extent. For example, on the idea of equality. However, it could be argued that socialism is more progressive than liberalism because socialists believe in equality of outcomes whereas liberals believe only in equality of opportunity. Although liberalism was attempting to move towards individual freedom and away from feudalism and hierarchy with its' ideas of lordship and kingship, socialism aspires to progress further towards full equality through collective action and the fair distribution of wealth. Socialists see free market capitalism as unfair and the source of inequality whilst liberals justify the existence of free market capitalism as long as freedom of opportunity is offered. Liberals focus on the freedom of the individual whereas socialists support collectivist approaches and on actions in particular to improve the conditions of the working classes. In addition, they also have different views on human nature and on ownership of private property. So overall there are major differences between the key features of the two ideologies.</i></p> <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for structure as well as development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>For example, award high marks to answers which define the central issues(s) in the introduction and have a clear structure with a developed line of argument. Award low or <b>0 marks</b> to answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question, or which are poorly structured, jumping between different parts of the question and therefore failing to develop a coherent line of argument.</p> |

Section 2 – Political systems

| Question |     | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|-----|--|----------|---|
| 2.       | (a) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of two political systems, adopting a comparative approach as appropriate to the question.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 8 marks</b> for knowledge and understanding.</p> | 12       | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:<br/>For example, if a candidate chooses the UK and the US:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the UK constitution being uncodified, and the US Constitution being codified</li> <li>• the process of amendment in both the UK and US Constitutions</li> <li>• the ability of the judiciary to interpret constitutional provisions.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b><br/>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In the US there is a clear but complex process for amending the Constitution which has resulted in very few changes over the years. However, in the UK the constitutional arrangements can be changed simply by passing an Act of Parliament.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it contains one relevant aspect with detailed description. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In the US there is a clear but complex process for amending the Constitution which has resulted in very few changes over the years. There are two clear routes for amendments to the Constitution, but both require very high levels of support from both Congress and the States. However, in the UK the constitutional arrangements can be changed simply by passing an Act of Parliament. As the UK constitution is significantly comprised of legislation it is possible for major changes to take place as a result of the support of a bare majority in Parliament.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications. Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> </ul> |          | <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (<b>2 marks</b>), and detailed development with exemplification and explanation. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>In the US there is a clear but complex process for amending the Constitution which has resulted in very few changes over the years. There are two clear routes for amendments to the Constitution, but both require very high levels of support from both Congress and the States. As a result, there have only been 27 amendments made to the Constitution and a number of proposed changes such as the Equal Rights Amendment and balanced budget proposals have failed to be ratified. However, in the UK the constitutional arrangements can be changed simply by passing an Act of Parliament. As the UK constitution is significantly comprised of legislation it is possible for major changes to take place as a result of the support of a bare majority in Parliament. For example, the Scotland Act 1998 was all that was required to set up the Scottish Parliament.</i></p> <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for analytical comments that compare the flexibility of constitutions. To gain <b>4 marks</b> candidates must make analytical comparative comments on each of the aspects covered in their answer, otherwise award a maximum of <b>3 marks</b>.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical comment. (<b>1 mark</b>)</p> <p><i>The US Constitution is much more difficult to amend than its UK counterpart as a new statute can be passed quickly in the UK, whereas the amendment process in the US is more complex. Therefore, the UK constitution is more flexible.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it is a more detailed analytical comment with supporting evidence provided. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>The US Constitution is much more difficult to amend than its UK counterpart as a new statute can be passed quickly in the UK, whereas the amendment process in the US is more complex. Therefore, the UK constitution is more flexible. This means that the UK constitution can respond more quickly to events which the time-consuming process in the US may not allow. However, it may also be the case</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 4 marks</b> for analysis.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on all aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> |          | <p><i>that this ability to change quickly could enable an authoritarian government to quickly remove rights from individuals.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark  | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|-----------|---|
| (b)      | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of two political systems, adopting a comparative approach as appropriate to the question.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 8 marks</b> for knowledge and understanding.</p> | <b>12</b> | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>For example, if a candidate chooses the UK and US:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• control of the legislature</li> <li>• options to dismiss the executive</li> <li>• legislative constraints such as Human Rights Act in the UK, Freedom of Information Act in US</li> <li>• constitutional limits such as Separation of Powers, Federalism</li> <li>• role of the judiciary.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In the US the Federal Judiciary has the power of Judicial Review and can block executive actions on the basis that these contravene the US Constitution. In the UK the courts do not have the same power due to the principle of parliamentary sovereignty.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it as it contains one aspect with detailed description. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In the US the Federal Judiciary has the power of Judicial Review and can block executive actions on the basis that these contravene the US Constitution. In particular the US Supreme Court can block executive orders or even strike down legislation on this basis. In the UK the courts do not have the same power due to the principle of parliamentary sovereignty but the courts in the UK can limit the actions of the government based mainly on existing legislation. However, the government can pass legislation that limits the ability of the courts in the UK to do this.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|------------------------------|----------|---|
|          |                              |          | <p>The following response would be awarded <b>3 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed <b>description (2 marks)</b> and development with exemplification. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In the US the Federal Judiciary has the power of Judicial Review and can block executive actions on the basis that these contravene the US Constitution. In particular the US Supreme Court can block executive orders or even strike down legislation on this basis. In 2017, Federal Courts in the US blocked the implementation of an executive order from President Trump creating a travel ban affecting a number of countries.</i></p> <p><i>In the UK the courts do not have the same power due to the principle of parliamentary sovereignty but the courts in the UK can limit the actions of the government based mainly on existing legislation. However, the government can pass legislation that limits the ability of the courts in the UK to do this.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one relevant aspect with detailed description <b>(2 marks)</b> and detailed development with exemplification and explanation. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In the US the Federal Judiciary has the power of Judicial Review and can block executive actions on the basis that these contravene the US Constitution. In particular the US Supreme Court can block executive orders or even strike down legislation on this basis. In 2017, Federal Courts in the US blocked the implementation of an executive order from President Trump creating a travel ban affecting a number of countries. This forced the Trump administration to revise the ban.</i></p> <p><i>In the UK the courts do not have the same power due to the principle of parliamentary sovereignty but the courts in the UK can limit the actions of the government based mainly on existing legislation. However, the government can pass legislation that limits the ability of the courts in the UK to do this. In 2019 the UK Supreme Court ruled that the prorogation of Parliament by Boris Johnson's government was unlawful and quashed this. As a result, parliament resumed sitting the next day, but since then the government announced plans to pass legislation to limit the court's abilities to review the actions of the government.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications. Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 4 marks</b> for analysis.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> |          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for analytical comments that compare the limitations on the power of the executive. To gain <b>4 marks</b> candidates must make analytical comparative comments on each of the aspects covered in their answer, otherwise award a maximum of <b>3 marks</b>.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical comment. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>The judiciary in the US is able to limit the actions of the executive as they have broad powers to interpret the policy and actions of the executive against the Constitution, including the ability to block legislation signed by the President. In the UK the courts have less scope to do this and cannot directly invalidate the government policy that is in an Act of Parliament.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it is a more detailed analytical comment with supporting evidence provided. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>The judiciary in the US has a much greater ability to limit the actions of the executive as they have broad powers to interpret the policy and actions of the executive against the Constitution, including the ability to block legislation signed by the President. For example, many Democrats were worried that key aspects of President Obama’s health care policy would be struck down by the Supreme Court. In the UK the courts have less scope to do this and cannot directly invalidate the government policy that is in an Act of Parliament. Even when the courts have blocked the actions of the government, they can use their majority in parliament to pass new legislation to overrule the courts. For example, in 2021 the Conservative government announced plans to introduce legislation to limit the ability of the courts to challenge the government.</i></p> |

| Question |  |  | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question |
|----------|--|--|--|----------|---|
|          |  |  | For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on all aspects of the issue identified in the question. |          |   |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| (c)      | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of two political systems, adopting a comparative approach as appropriate to the question.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> | 12       | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>For example, if a candidate chooses the UK and the US:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the role of Parliamentary Committees in the UK and Congressional Committees in the US in scrutinising the actions of government</li> <li>• the powers of the House of Lords in the UK and the significance of Senate approval in the US</li> <li>• the extent of government control of Parliament compared to the autonomy of representatives in Congress</li> <li>• opportunities to question and investigate the actions of the executive.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In the UK Prime Minister's Questions is held every Wednesday at 12pm. This gives all MPs the chance to question the government and put the Prime Minister under pressure. In the US, as a result of separation of powers, they do not have a similar question time but administration officials can be questioned during Congressional hearings.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it as it contains one aspect with detailed description. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In the UK Prime Minister's Questions is held every Wednesday at 12pm. This gives all MPs the chance to question the government and put the Prime Minister under pressure. It will normally begin with a question regarding the future engagements of the Prime Minister, before being followed up with a question of topical political relevance. In the US, as a result of separation of powers, they do not have a similar question time but administration officials can be questioned during Congressional hearings. Members of the executive branch can be compelled to answer questions under oath or hand over information.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications. Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example, of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> </ul> |          | <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (<b>2 marks</b>), and detailed development with exemplification and explanation. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>In the UK Prime Minister’s Questions is held every Wednesday at 12pm. This gives all MPs the chance to question the government and put the Prime Minister under pressure. It will normally begin with a question regarding the future engagements of the Prime Minister, before being followed up with a question of topical political relevance. For example, in 2019, the leader of the opposition Jeremy Corbyn asked the Prime Minister Theresa May about negotiations in relation to Brexit. Questions can either be oral or submitted in writing and will encapsulate a wide range of topics. In the US, as a result of separation of powers, they do not have a similar question time but administration officials can be questioned during Congressional hearings. Members of the executive branch can be compelled to answer questions under oath or hand over information. For example, Congress held hearings on the policy of the Trump administration to detain illegal immigrants and investigated the conditions that they were being held in.</i></p> <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for analytical comments that compare the effectiveness of legislatures in scrutinising the work of government. To gain <b>4 marks</b> candidates must make analytical comparative comments on each of the aspects covered in their answer, otherwise award a <b>maximum of 3 marks</b>.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical comment. (<b>1 mark</b>)</p> <p><i>In the UK, although MPs can question the Prime Minister this is often ineffective. Whereas in the US, hearings in Congress can be very effective in holding the executive to account.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it is a more detailed analytical comment with supporting evidence provided. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>In the UK, although MPs can question the Prime Minister this is often ineffective. This is because there are limits to the number of questions that can be asked and often the Prime Minister will not address the issue directly. Whereas in the US hearings in Congress can be very effective in holding the executive to account.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|---|----------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 4 marks</b> for analysis.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on all aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> |          | <p><i>Members of Congress can question the administration in detail and also have additional resources such as staff members to support their enquiries.</i></p> |

Section 3 – Political parties and elections

| Question |     | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|-----|--|----------|---|
| 3.       | (a) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key campaign management strategies.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to all mandatory campaign management strategies to gain full marks; otherwise award no more than <b>13 marks</b>.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 8 marks</b> for knowledge and understanding.</p> | 20       | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• press strategies such as David Cameron’s attempt to woo the press and the use of media advisors and spin doctors</li> <li>• the impact of party political broadcasts and the leaders’ TV debates</li> <li>• use of social media</li> <li>• traditional grassroots campaigning strategies, for example canvassing, mobilising local turnout and the ‘ground game’</li> <li>• the use of new technology, for example voter databases, online advertising and video sharing platforms.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b><br/>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>The first leaders’ TV debates started in 2010 when David Cameron, Nick Clegg and then Prime Minister Gordon Brown debated the main issues of the time. The debates continued in the 2015 general election with the addition of another four main political parties. These debates attracted high viewing figures though the 2015 audience was smaller than in 2010.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed description. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>The first leaders’ TV debates started in 2010 when David Cameron, Nick Clegg and then Prime Minister Gordon Brown debated the main issues of the time. The debates continued in the 2015 general election with the addition of another four main political parties. These debates attracted high viewing figures though the 2015 audience was smaller than in 2010. Across the three main channels 8.8 million people watched at least some of the debates. The main political parties received a chance to push their message to the electorate and several of the parties had success. A snap poll after the debate on ITV on 2 April 2015 showed Nicola Sturgeon in the lead with 28%, ahead of Nigel Farage with 20%.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|---|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> </ul> |          | <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed description (<b>2 marks</b>) and a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>The first leaders' TV debates started in 2010 when David Cameron, Nick Clegg and then Prime Minister Gordon Brown debated the main issues of the time. The debates continued in the 2015 general election with the addition of another four main political parties. These debates attracted high viewing figures though the 2015 audience was smaller than in 2010. Across the three main channels 8.8 million people watched at least some of the debates. The main political parties received a chance to push their message to the electorate and several of the parties had success. A snap poll after the debate on ITV on 2 April 2015 showed Nicola Sturgeon in the lead with 28%, ahead of Nigel Farage with 20%. An ICM poll taken after the debate asked respondents who performed well and who performed badly. The net score for Nicola Sturgeon was +48 which was the highest by 20 points. After the debate Google reported a spike in people searching for information on non-residents of Scotland voting for the SNP. The TV debates are a useful tool for political parties in getting their message across to the electorate.</i></p> <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>6 marks</b> for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary, for example.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical statement. (<b>1 mark</b>)</p> <p><i>It could be argued that party election broadcasts can still be important at a national level as it enables parties to reach a large number of voters. This also applies to televised leaders' debates. This means that parties can reach many millions of voters more effectively than other approaches such as grassroots canvassing.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> due to additional justification and supporting evidence. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>It could be argued that party election broadcasts can still be important at a national level as it enables parties to reach a large number of voters. For example, Labour's broadcast directed by Ken Loach reached over four million people when broadcast on TV. The same applies to televised leaders' debates.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|--|----------|--|
|          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence</li> <li>• the relative importance of factors</li> <li>• counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations</li> <li>• the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together.</li> </ul> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers, and you should award marks to these accordingly.</p> |          | <p><i>This means that parties can reach many millions of voters more effectively than other approaches such as grassroots canvassing. However, it has been argued that party election broadcasts and televised debates do not have the impact that they once did. Younger voters in particular may access political information through the use of social media sites, video platforms or online news sources. Therefore, these voters may never be influenced by the use of televised strategies.</i></p> <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Award up to <b>4 marks</b> for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it provides a straightforward conclusion which attempts to deal with the central issue as identified by the question. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion the use of media strategies in election campaigns is an essential component to winning any election. Today's electorate are used to having information given to them via the media and any campaign that ignores the media is destined to fail.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it provides a straightforward conclusion which deals with the central issue and also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the use of media strategies in election campaigns is an essential component to winning any election. Today's electorate are used to having information given to them via the media and any campaign that ignores the media is destined to fail. However, there are other strategies which are more effective at winning votes, most importantly through the use of new technology.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|---|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> |          | <p>The following response would be awarded <b>4 marks</b> as it provides a developed and well-argued conclusion with justifications that directly address and evaluate the key issue in the question. <b>(4 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the use of media strategies in election campaigns is an essential component to winning any election. Today's electorate are used to having information given to them via the media and any campaign that ignores the media is destined to fail. Although, there are other strategies which are more effective at winning votes, most importantly through the use of new technology, media strategies are definitely part of the recipe to winning elections. Parties can have the biggest impact when they adopt a co-ordinated approach that makes use of all the various strategies available to them. For example, in 2019 the Conservatives promoted their key policy of 'getting Brexit done' via its approach to the press, its use of television and social media. It reinforced this through targeting of constituencies and allocation of grassroots resources in the North of England. This was seen as a key reason for their large majority in this election.</i></p> <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for structure as well as development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>For example, award high marks to answers which define the central issues(s) in the introduction and have a clear structure with a developed line of argument. Award low or <b>0 marks</b> to answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question, or which are poorly structured, jumping between different parts of the question and therefore failing to develop a coherent line of argument.</p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark  | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|-----------|---|
| (b)      | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key models of voting behaviour.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to all 3 mandatory models of voting behaviour to gain full marks; otherwise award no more than <b>13 marks</b>.</p> <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b><br/>Award marks for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the breadth of knowledge covered</li> <li>• the level of detail and description of these points</li> <li>• the accuracy of descriptions and explanations</li> <li>• how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided.</li> </ul> <p>Award up to a <b>maximum of 8 marks</b> for knowledge and understanding.</p> | <b>20</b> | <p><b>Knowledge and understanding</b></p> <p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• key features of the sociological model such as: the role of social class in influencing voting behaviour, factors leading to class dealignment, the importance of other socio-economic factors such as age, gender, region</li> <li>• the rational choice model, for example self-interest and consumer voting, issue voting, party leadership and campaigning</li> <li>• the party identification model, for example long term attachment to political parties and affiliation to political parties.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant points.</p> <p><b>Possible responses</b></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it contains one aspect with some description. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>The sociological model is the theory that voters decide who to vote for based on social groupings such as class, area or region. For example, Labour tends to do better in large cities, particularly cities where there is a large University such as Lancaster, while the Conservatives tend to do better in rural areas.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed description. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>The sociological model is the theory that voters decide who to vote for based on social groupings such as class, area or region. For example, Labour tends to do better in large cities, particularly cities where there is a large University such as Lancaster, while the Conservatives tend to do better in rural areas. For many years it was thought that social class was the key factor in explaining voting behaviour. The Conservative party secured very high levels of support from the middle classes and Labour's support was concentrated in the working classes. This pattern held true for many years after the Second World War. For example, in the UK constituencies surrounding Greater Manchester, out of 27 seats Labour (in favour of higher taxes) won all but three in the 2017 general election.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|------------------------------|----------|---|
|          |                              |          | <p>The following response would be awarded up to <b>4 marks</b> as it contains one aspect with detailed description (<b>2 marks</b>) and a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations. (<b>2 marks</b>)</p> <p><i>The sociological model is the theory that voters decide who to vote for based on social groupings such as class, area or region. For example, Labour tends to do better in large cities, particularly cities where there is a large University such as Lancaster, while the Conservatives tend to do better in rural areas. In all demographic groups the Conservatives are more popular than Labour in the rural heartlands of the UK. A YouGov poll on behalf of the Fabian Society confirmed that people in rural areas see Labour as a party of the cities, by the cities and for the cities. In the last general election, the Conservatives dominated in the rural heartland of the UK.</i></p> <p><i>For many years it was thought that social class was the key factor in explaining voting behaviour. The Conservative party secured very high levels of support from the middle classes and Labour's support was concentrated in the working classes. This pattern held true for many years after the Second World War. Region of the UK is another major factor in voting behaviour. Labour used to dominate Scottish politics in all areas of public life be it Scottish Parliament, Westminster, Europe or local councils. However, the SNP now dominate Scottish Politics with the most MPs, MSPs and local Councillors compared to the other Scottish Parties. This shows that region is an important factor in voting behaviour. The other parties do well in other parts of the country with Labour traditionally winning the majority of seats in the North-East, South Wales and the West Midlands.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|--|----------|--|
|          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>Award an analysis mark where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (for example of an idea, theory, argument) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• links between different components</li> <li>• links between component(s) and the whole</li> <li>• links between component(s) and related concepts</li> <li>• similarities and contradictions</li> <li>• consistency and inconsistency</li> <li>• different views/interpretations</li> <li>• possible consequences/implications</li> <li>• the relative importance of components</li> <li>• understanding of underlying order or structure.</li> </ul> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, you may award these as knowledge and understanding marks, provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> |          | <p><b>Analysis</b><br/>Award up to <b>6 marks</b> for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary, for example:</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it is a straightforward analytical statement. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>Although class was seen as the most important factor for many years, it is now not as relevant as it was in the past. In the 2017 general election the Conservatives made their biggest gains in working class groups and Labour made its biggest gains in middle class groups. Also, the level of absolute class voting has declined to historic lows.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> due to additional justification and supporting evidence. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>Although class was seen as the most important factor for many years, it is now not as relevant as it was in the past. In the 2017 general election the Conservatives made their biggest gains in working class groups and Labour made its biggest gains in middle class groups. Also, the level of absolute class voting has declined to historic lows. This was further reinforced in the 2019 general election when large numbers of traditional Labour working class seats in the North of England fell to the Conservatives. The existence of these former “red wall” seats further gives support to the idea that class is no longer as significant as it was. In these seats voting appeared to have been affected by key issues such as Brexit.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions   | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question   |
|----------|--|----------|---|
|          | <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence</li> <li>• the relative importance of factors</li> <li>• counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations</li> <li>• the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together.</li> </ul> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers, and you should award marks to these accordingly.</p> |          | <p><b>Conclusion(s)</b><br/>Award up to <b>4 marks</b> for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>1 mark</b> as it provides a straightforward conclusion which attempts to deal with the central issue as identified by the question. <b>(1 mark)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the sociological model of voting is still relevant in today's elections. Many people still vote based on a group that they belong to.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>2 marks</b> as it provides a straightforward conclusion which deals with the central issue and also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question. <b>(2 marks)</b></p> <p><i>In conclusion, the sociological model of voting is still the dominant model in explaining voting behaviour. Many people still vote based on a group that they belong to. The relevance of social class has decreased in recent years but the importance of other social groups such as age and region has increased. This makes the model still relevant today, but it is no longer the dominant model like it was in the past.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded <b>3 marks</b> as it provides a developed conclusion that directly addresses and provides an evaluation of the central issue(s) in the question. <b>(3 marks)</b> However, it is not well argued as it fails to reflect the party identification model.</p> <p><i>In conclusion, the sociological model of voting is still the dominant model in explaining voting behaviour. Many people still vote based on a group that they belong to. The relevance of social class has decreased in recent years but the importance of other social groups such as age and region has increased. This makes the model still relevant today, but it is no longer the dominant model like it was in the past.</i></p> |

| Question | General marking instructions  | Max mark | Specific marking instructions for this question  |
|----------|---|----------|--|
|          | <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> |          | <p><i>The relevance of the rational choice model has increased in recent years. People are more likely to look at short term factors such as party leader when deciding who to vote for. This was particularly evident in the 2010 general election when Gordon Brown was rejected by the electorate for fresh faced Nick Clegg and David Cameron. However, the failure of Jeremy Corbyn in 2017, despite running what many saw as a better campaign, shows the limits of the rational choice model and therefore the sociological model remains dominant.</i></p> <p><b>Structure</b><br/>Award up to <b>2 marks</b> for structure as well as development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>For example, award high marks to answers which define the central issues(s) in the introduction and have a clear structure with a developed line of argument. Award low or <b>0 marks</b> to answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question, or which are poorly structured, jumping between different parts of the question and therefore failing to develop a coherent line of argument.</p> |

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]