



National
Qualifications
2023

2023 Politics

Paper 2

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2023

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.



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 question (compare) – 8 marks

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

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 reach an overall conclusion.</p>	8	<p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question.</p> <p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tony Blair’s election victories and his success in winning the Labour leadership created legitimacy which enhanced his ability to advance his agenda • Blair was seen to have both rational legal authority and charisma. This authority over his MPs meant the Blair government was only defeated four times in the House of Commons in ten years and managed to get controversial legislation through parliament • Blair was seen as a particularly powerful Prime Minister. He was able to use the powers of the Prime Minister to implement his own agenda. His style of government was often referred to as ‘presidential’. <p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gordon Brown lacked legitimacy. He did not gain a mandate from voters as he did not contest any general elections as Prime Minister and he did not face any competition to be chosen as leader of the Labour Party • Brown lacked charisma and he did not have authority over his MPs. In under three years he had three defeats and was in frequent conflict with his own MPs • Brown was not viewed as a powerful Prime Minister. He had to bring in rivals to his cabinet to help improve his position. <p>Award marks for any other relevant comparisons.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
	<p>Analysis Comparisons involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying areas of differences • identifying areas of similarity • making evaluative comments on the extent of these • differences/similarities. <p>For full marks, candidates must use both sources and make three points of comparison.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for each accurate point of comparison and analytical comment.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 6 marks for accurate comparisons with associated analysis.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for an overall conclusion.</p>		<p>Analysis Candidates may make individual evaluative comments as they address each point of comparison, or they may produce a summative evaluation of each part of the viewpoint at the conclusion to their answer – award marks for both approaches.</p> <p>The following response would be awarded 1 mark as it identifies one point of comparison from two sources.</p> <p><i>Source A states that Tony Blair had legitimacy to make changes as a result of his election victories. However, as Source B says, Gordon Brown lacked legitimacy as he did not come to power as a result of a general election.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded 2 marks as it identifies one point of comparison from two sources (1 mark) and makes a relevant analytical comment. (1 mark)</p> <p><i>Source A states that Tony Blair had legitimacy to make changes as a result of his election victories. However, as Source B says, Gordon Brown lacked legitimacy as he did not come to power as a result of a general election. This shows that gaining legitimacy through elections enhances a Prime Minister’s ability to enact their agenda.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded 1 mark as it makes a straightforward, overall conclusion.</p> <p><i>Overall, Tony Blair was a much more successful Prime Minister than Gordon Brown.</i></p> <p>The following response would be awarded 2 marks as it makes a detailed, overall conclusion.</p> <p><i>Overall, Tony Blair was a much more successful Prime Minister than Gordon Brown. His personal qualities enhanced his authority, he had a greater sense of legitimacy and was able to use the full range of powers. These all contributed to his success in comparison to Gordon Brown.</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>Analysis/evaluation Award up to 3 marks for answers that correctly interpret electoral data that links to an individual component of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an evaluation of the validity of each individual component.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must address both parts of the viewpoint.</p>	20	<p>Award marks where candidates refer to the following aspects of the question.</p> <p>Interpretation of data</p> <p>First part of the viewpoint – the performance of parties in Scotland (SNP and Labour)</p> <p>Component 1 ‘The 2019 general election in Scotland was a fantastic victory for the SNP and was clearly their biggest ever improvement on a previous general election in the 21st century.’</p> <p>Award 1 mark if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award 2 marks if they address both aspects of data.</p> <p>Aspect 1 (seats won in Scotland) – Source A The SNP secured a big increase in seats (13) and easily won the election in Scotland by winning 48 seats compared to only 6 for their nearest competitor. However, although they did win most seats in 2019 they didn’t win as many as in 2015 when they won 56.</p> <p>Aspect 2 (share of vote won in Scotland) – Sources A and B The SNP easily achieved the biggest share of the vote (45%) in 2019 and a big increase compared to the previous election (just over 8%) but this was not as big as the huge increase of over 30% in 2015.</p> <p>Component 2 ‘In Scotland, Labour performed dreadfully in 2019 compared to the previous election.’</p> <p>Award 1 mark if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award 2 marks if they address all three aspects of data.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p>Aspect 1 (Scotland wide seats) – Source A Labour lost almost all their seats, falling from 7 seats in 2017 to only 1 in 2019.</p> <p>Aspect 2 (Scotland wide share of the vote) – Source A Labour saw a big drop-in support and their share of the vote fell more than any other party from 27.1% to 18.6%.</p> <p>Aspect 3 (Scotland loss of deposits) – Source C Labour saw a large increase in lost deposits, losing 7 deposits in 2019 compared to none in 2017.</p> <p>Second part of the viewpoint – performance of parties UK wide</p> <p>Component 1 ‘The UK results in 2019 were the biggest disaster for the Labour Party and they suffered significant losses across every part of the country.’ Award 1 mark if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award 2 marks if they address all four aspects of data.</p> <p>Aspect 1 (% of votes nationally) – Source D Labour saw a big drop in its share of the vote as it fell by nearly 8% though it did have a better share of the vote than in 2010 and 2015.</p> <p>Aspect 2 (seats won nationally) – Source D Labour lost a huge number of seats. It won 202, its lowest number of all the years shown.</p> <p>Aspect 3 (nations) – Source E In 2019 Labour lost seats in all the nations that it contest and at least 8% of the vote in each nation.</p> <p>Aspect 4 (regions) – Source E Labour lost votes in every single English region. Although they lost votes in London and the South East, they did not lose any seats in these regions. They did lose seats in every other region, including 13 in the North West.</p> <p>Component 2 ‘On the other hand, the Conservatives secured a resounding victory and very large increases in every single area.’</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p>Award 1 mark if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award 2 marks if they address all four aspects of data.</p> <p>Aspect 1 (seats nationally) – Source D The Conservatives easily won the election and gained nearly 50 seats to comfortably get a majority in 2019.</p> <p>Aspect 2 (share of votes nationally) – Source D The Conservatives increased their share of the vote to 43.6%, which was higher than any of the years indicated.</p> <p>Aspect 3 (nations) – Source E The Conservatives gained votes and seats in England and Wales as well as a small amount of votes in Northern Ireland, but they lost 7 seats and 3.5% of votes in Scotland.</p> <p>Aspect 4 (regions) – Source E The Conservatives gained seats and votes in most English regions. However, they lost 1.1% of votes in London and failed to gain a seat there. Also, in the South East they only gained 0.2% of the vote and in the South West they only gained 1 seat, so not very large increases.</p> <p>Component 3 'The performance of the UKIP candidates in the 2019 general election was the worst performance compared to all other parties' candidates.'</p> <p>Award 1 mark if candidate only addresses one aspect of data, award 2 marks if they address all three aspects of data.</p> <p>Aspect 1 (number of candidates retaining deposits) – Source F UKIP had 0 candidates retain their deposit this was the worst figure out of all the parties.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p>Aspect 2 (number of candidates losing their deposit) – Source F UKIP had 44 candidates lose their deposit however three other political parties lost more including the Greens and the Lib Dems.</p> <p>Aspect 3 (total value of deposits) – Source F UKIP were nowhere near the worst when looking at value of lost deposits. They lost £22,000 but other parties lost much more with the Greens losing over £230,000, more than ten times the value that UKIP lost.</p> <p>Synthesis</p> <p>First part of the viewpoint</p> <p>Component 1 synthesis – 1 mark The SNP easily won the election in Scotland and saw an increase in seats and share of the vote compared to 2017 but for both measurements it was lower than in 2015.</p> <p>Component 2 synthesis – 1 mark Labour lost nearly all their seats and also lost the biggest share of the vote in addition to an increase in lost deposits.</p> <p>Second part of the viewpoint</p> <p>Component 1 synthesis – 1 mark Labour lost a large percentage of votes and had the lowest number of seats of all elections in the 21st century, additionally they also lost votes in both nations and regions but maintained seat numbers in two regions.</p> <p>Component 2 synthesis – 1 mark The Conservatives saw a big increase in seats and achieved their best share of the vote in the 21st century, but they did not see increases everywhere and in some areas it was marginal increases in support.</p> <p>Component 3 synthesis – 1 mark In terms of the number of candidates retaining deposits, UKIP were the worst whereas in the total value and number of candidates losing deposits, the UKIP did not have the worst performance.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p>Evaluation of the validity of the viewpoint</p> <p>First part of the viewpoint</p> <p>Evaluation of one component – 1 mark The 2019 general election in Scotland was a fantastic result for the SNP - they won by far and away most of the seats and saw an increase in their share of the vote as well, however it was not their biggest ever improvement this century as they had bigger improvements in seats won and share of the vote between 2010 and 2015.</p> <p>Evaluation of both components – 2 marks The 2019 general election in Scotland was a fantastic result for the SNP - they won by far and away most of the seats and saw an increase in their share of the vote as well, however it was not their biggest ever improvement this century as they had bigger improvements in seats won and share of the vote between 2010 and 2015. Labour in Scotland on the other hand performed dreadfully in 2019 - they lost almost all their seats, their share of the vote dropped the most and they saw a big increase in lost deposits.</p> <p>Second part of the viewpoint</p> <p>Evaluation of one component – 1 mark The 2019 general election was the biggest disaster for Labour as they fell to their lowest number of seats this century. However, they did get a higher percentage of the UK vote than in some other elections. While they suffered vote losses in every nation and region, they maintained seats in two regions and in others their losses were not significant.</p> <p>Evaluation of two components – 2 marks The 2019 general election was the biggest disaster for Labour as they fell to their lowest number of seats this century. However, they did get a higher percentage of the UK vote than in some other elections. While they suffered vote losses in every nation and region, they maintained seats in two regions and in others their losses were not significant. It was definitely a resounding victory for the Conservatives with big increases in seats and an easy win in the election. They also increased their votes to the highest this century. However, they didn't improve significantly in every single area. They did improve in many but in some areas it was only by a small amount and in other areas they actually lost support.</p>

Question	General marking instructions	Max mark	Specific marking instructions for this question
			<p>Evaluation of all three components – 3 marks</p> <p>The 2019 election was the biggest disaster for Labour as they fell to their lowest number of seats this century. However, they did get a higher percentage of the UK vote than in some other elections. While they suffered vote losses in every nation and region, they maintained seats in two regions and in others their losses were not significant. It was definitely a resounding victory for the Conservatives with big increases in seats and an easy win in the election. They also increased their votes to the highest this century. However, they didn't improve significantly in every single area. They did improve in many but in some areas it was only by a small amount and in other areas they actually lost support. The UKIP candidates' performance in the 2019 general election was not the worst compared to other parties. They were the worst only in the number of candidates retaining their deposit. In regard to the number of candidates losing their deposits and the value of the loss, UKIP were not the worst. Parties like the Lib Dems and Greens could be seen to be worse than UKIP in these measures.</p>

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]