



## General Certificate of Education

# Government and Politics 6151

### *GOV8 Synoptic Unit*

## Mark Scheme

### *2006 examination – June series*

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

## **CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS**

### **Introduction**

AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principles of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

### **Using a levels of response mark scheme**

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

Examiners should initially make a decision about which Level any given response should be placed in. Having determined the appropriate Level the examiners must then choose the precise mark to be given within that Level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the Level, where that Level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest whether the middle mark is unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the Level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid 'bunching' of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking: 'Is it

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?'

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

**A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS SYNOPTIC UNIT – GOV8****GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (Maximum 40 marks)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them.</p> <p>The candidate selects material from the full range of the specification subject content with discrimination and shows that he/she clearly understands the links between the various elements. The candidate confidently demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the holistic nature of politics and identifies, and shows advanced understanding of, subsystems contained within the political institutions and processes identified in the specification.</p> <p>The candidate fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates a high level of contextual awareness. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations and provides accurate evidence and up-to-date, wide-ranging and imaginatively chosen examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</b> The candidate confidently applies a wide range of fully developed concepts and theories. The candidate demonstrates that he/she fully understands the question and recognises the need for a synoptic perspective in their analysis. The candidate constructs cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. The candidate provides analysis that displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of contemporary issues. Parallels and connections are identified with creativity and imagination, together with well-developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations. The candidate demonstrates advanced ability to draw upon relevant material from the whole range of the specification content and uses it to inform their discussion and to construct arguments that cover the subject in the broadest sense. The candidate may integrate advanced knowledge derived from his/her wider study and appreciation of politics. Although taking a synoptic perspective, the candidate ensures that all material presented is directly relevant to the discussion. The essay shows evidence of imagination and flair.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</b> The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions with sophisticated style and complete clarity, using a political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information. There is a precise sense of logical progression flowing throughout the essay, leading to a clearly argued conclusion that logically derives from the preceding analysis.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (GOV8) (continued)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them.</p> <p>The candidate selects material from a good range of the specification content and shows understanding of the links between the various elements. The candidate generally recognises the holistic nature of politics and identifies, and shows sound understanding of, subsystems contained within political institutions and processes identified in the specification.</p> <p>The candidate soundly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates a competent level of contextual awareness. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations and provides clear evidence and well-chosen examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</b> The candidate applies a good range of concepts and theories, demonstrating a grasp of the question and recognising the need for a synoptic perspective in his/her analysis. The candidate constructs sound arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis that displays awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of contemporary issues. Parallels and connections are competently identified, together with viable comparisons.</p> <p>There is a clear and reasonably full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates the ability to draw upon relevant material from much of the specification content and uses it to inform their discussion and to construct arguments that cover the subject broadly. The candidate may integrate accurate knowledge derived from his/her wider study and appreciation of politics. Although taking a synoptic perspective, the candidate ensures that material presented is largely relevant to the discussion.</p> <p>The essay shows evidence of advanced study and some use of imagination.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</b> The candidate communicates explanations and conclusions within a structured argument, using a political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information.</p> <p>There is a sound logical progression flowing throughout the essay, leading to a clearly argued conclusion that logically derives from the preceding analysis.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (GOV8) (continued)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates an outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them.</p> <p>The candidate selects material from a limited range of the specification content and shows incomplete understanding of the links between the various elements.</p> <p>The candidate shows a limited grasp of the holistic nature of politics and little understanding of subsystems contained within the political institutions and processes identified in the specification. The answer includes a partial but reasonably effective approach to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a limited but useful level of contextual awareness. The use of examples is limited and the choice is not entirely appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (5–8 marks)</b> The candidate uses a restricted range of partly developed concepts and theories, demonstrating a limited grasp of the question, and is not entirely clear about the need for a synoptic perspective in analysis.</p> <p>The candidate constructs only embryonic arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis that displays some awareness of differing viewpoints and a limited recognition of contemporary issues. There is a recognition of some basic parallels and connections, together with some limited comparisons. There is a simplistic attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate draws upon material from a limited range of the specification content. This may be used in a general way to inform their discussion and to construct arguments. It is not always clear that a synoptic perspective is being taken and not all material presented is strictly relevant to the discussion. Where a synoptic perspective is offered, there is a tendency towards a series of disjointed points of unequal relevance and a lack of logical progression.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3–4 marks)</b> The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions adequately, with a straightforward narrative and/or explanation, using a limited political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion may be offered, but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit. The answer is loosely structured.</p>

**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for all questions (GOV8) (continued)**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select &amp; Deploy</b>	<b>Skills: Analysis &amp; Evaluation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b> The candidate demonstrates slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and a limited awareness of the relationships between them. There is a very limited approach to addressing the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a low level of contextual awareness and there is little understanding of the concept of synopticity. Few examples are introduced and these are often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1–4 marks)</b> The discussion is not adequately supported by the use of concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations are not well constructed and there is virtually no attempt to apply a synoptic perspective. Analysis shows little, if any, awareness of differing points of view and very few parallels and connections are used to establish comparisons.</p> <p>Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial and naïve. Arguments and explanations are undeveloped.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1–2 marks)</b> The answer relies upon narrative that is not fully coherent, with little or no use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>The conclusion is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

---

**Section A: Power****A1****Total for this question: 40 marks**

'In the exercise of power some governments lead public opinion, others merely follow it.' Discuss.  
(40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question, there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key concepts such as political leadership, power, influence and authority.
- Styles of governance: strong, weak, vacillating, pragmatic, ideological, populist, dominant.
- Bases of power such as office, wealth, religion, charisma, tradition, electoral legitimacy.
- Other relevant concepts such as elitism and pluralism and non-political forms of power such as the use of violence.
- Examples of power positions within the state at various levels (eg central, provincial, local, federal).
- Patterns of power beyond the formal positions in the state, such as the power of various types of pressure group, the media and business, global economic actors.
- Power of international and supranational organisations.
- Leadership of the new devolved institutions in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
- Material for comparison from other systems such as the USA and EU.
- Examples of particular governments, past and present, to illustrate arguments.
- Examples of major political events and decisions in which governments have been called upon to act or react.
- The limits on government powers such as constitutions, laws, the weight of tradition, parliamentary majorities, forces for incrementalism, inertia, interest groups, policy communities and networks, popular opinion, institutional inertia and bureaucratic resistance.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis is on the way governments exercise their power: whether they lead or follow.

In the main body of the answer, candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as those indicated above. Candidates will need to recognise that some governments follow trends and bow to forces such as public opinion, the media and political opposition, while others pursue a sense of mission or vision. The issue of pragmatism in the exercise of power in modern politics may be introduced. One would expect a good range of examples of governments, political leaders and significant political events to illustrate the arguments.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. At all times use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section that derives from the preceding discussion. This must come back clearly to the proposition that, in the exercise of power, some governments lead public opinion, others merely follow it. They may support the proposition, refute it, or argue an intermediate position that a government might adopt both styles at varying times, depending upon circumstances.

---

**A2****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘In practice, a leader’s power is primarily determined by the presence of political rivals.’ Discuss.  
(40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Definitions of key relevant terms including leadership, leadership position, personality, image, authority.
- Concept of political rivalry and other related concepts such as patronage, ambition, disloyalty and treachery.
- Weber’s theory of charisma as an attribute of political leaders.
- Ways in which political figures seek power and position.
- Clashes and tensions within governments and related concepts such as collective responsibility, cabinet revolts, cabinet leaks, cabals and resignations.
- The electoral impact of a leader’s personality.
- Personalisation in modern electioneering styles.
- The opportunities available to government colleagues to undermine or threaten a leader’s power.
- Examples of political figures of past and present who have suffered from the behaviour of ambitious rivals.
- Examples of events where political leaders have been constrained by or undermined rivals (eg war, policy debates, elections, leadership challenges).
- Such examples may come from all points within the political system, including Westminster politics, Scottish, Welsh or Northern Ireland politics, local government, the EU, the USA and the world of interest-group politics.
- Comparative material, particularly US presidents.
- Value of rivals in politics as a check against totalitarian styles of government.
- Modern trends in politics, including an emphasis on presentation, public relations, news management and ‘spin doctoring’.
- The increasing role of figures such as the prime minister’s press secretary, or director of communications, in enhancing the power of the office.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the tensions that exist between leaders over the acquisition and exercise of power. The extract offers a clear steer on the discussion.

In the main body of the answer, candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as those indicated above. Candidates will need to recognise the fact that much opposition and rivalry in the exercise of power comes not from opposition parties but from within a leader's own party. Candidates may note the contrast between the positions of the British prime ministers (whose colleagues could be contenders for the top position) and the US president (where this is not the case). There is scope for a large range of examples from past and present to illustrate this dimension of power politics. Candidates should note that the extract offers a focused stimulus to this consideration. Although many candidates may concentrate on the position of the British prime minister, this should not be a mere list of powers. The stress should be on relations with, and tensions between, colleagues. In addition, the synoptic range may draw in other political leaders such as ministers, leaders of provincial assemblies and local authorities, and US figures.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. At all times use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that clearly derives from the preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that a leader's power is determined by the presence of political rivals. Alternatively, the conclusion may argue that it is a contingent relationship, which depends on prevailing circumstances.

---

## Section B: Participation and Representation

**B1****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘In theory, democracy implies the participation of *all* of the people *all* of the time but, in practice, it usually amounts to participation by *some* of the people *some* of the time.’ Discuss. (40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key terms such as democracy, participation, representative democracy.
- The nature of modern democracy.
- Forms of representative democracy.
- Theories of representation such as the Burkean view, microcosmic representation, representatives as delegates, representatives as advocates and theory of the mandate.
- The nature of participation.
- Forms of participation such as voting, referendums, campaigning, party membership, lobbying, demonstrating, pressure-group membership, direct action, party funding, meetings with bureaucrats.
- Measures of participation such as electoral turnout and membership of political organisations.
- The ideological dimension, particularly socialism, liberalism, liberal democracy and conservatism.
- Problems with representative government such as non-inclusion, party domination and elitism.
- Composition of existing representative assemblies and other forums (eg proportions of ethnic minorities, working class, women, young people, old people, etc).
- Relevant examples from throughout the specification to illustrate arguments.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

**Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the question of participation in democracy and the extent to which levels of participation may vary between different sections of society.

In the main body of the answer candidates should introduce and define relevant key terms such as those indicated above. Analysis should explain and examine the nature of participation and the forms it may take. This may be illustrated with a large range of examples drawn from throughout the specification. In connection with participation through voting, theories of representation, as mentioned above, may be drawn into the analysis. There may be some analysis of ideology, particularly socialism (equal participation of all), liberalism (freedom to participate), liberal democracy (participation through the market), and conservatism (participation confined to an elite class 'born to rule').

Analysis will be expected to identify the areas in which democracy can, in practice, be said to fall short of the ideal of full and equal participation, raising issues such as the preponderance in assemblies and governments of white, middle-class males. The analysis may make comparative reference, particularly to the USA and the EU. The analysis may argue that, despite the participatory shortcomings of representative government, it offers a viable level of participation.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. At all times use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent, and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

A conclusion should arise from the foregoing discussion and contain a clear acceptance or refutation of the proposition that democracy means the participation of all the people all the time, but in practice it usually amounts to participation by some of the people some of the time.

---

**B2****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘In modern democracies the role of elected representatives is being hijacked by others.’ Discuss.  
(40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key terms relevant to the question such as modern democracy, elected representative, representative government.
- The roles of elected representatives such as representatives, scrutinisers, publicisers, debaters and legislators.
- Theories of representation such as the Burkean view, microcosmic representation, representatives as delegates, representatives as advocates and theory of the mandate.
- Representative forums (eg Westminster, Scottish, Welsh and Irish assemblies, US Congress, local councils, TUC, CBI, NHS trusts, regional councils, etc).
- Strengths and/or weaknesses in representative institutions’ procedures such as question time, select committees, debate opportunities, congressional committees and local government scrutiny committees.
- Party domination in assemblies.
- Agencies that can usurp the role of elected representatives such as quangos, commissions, campaigning groups, unions, newspapers, radio and TV.
- Referendums as instruments that can usurp the role of elected representatives.
- Competence, qualifications and skills of members of assemblies.
- The ideological dimension, particularly the liberal view on representative government.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

**Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the extent to which the role of elected representatives is being usurped in modern democracies by other agencies. The extract offers a clear steer on the discussion.

In the main body of the answer key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined. A discussion on the roles of elected representatives would be particularly helpful. Candidates should identify the various institutions where elected representatives operate. They should examine the strengths and weaknesses of these with respect to the various instruments available for use, such as those detailed above. They will also need to consider the range of other agencies (detailed above) that may be said to be competing for their roles. These may be drawn from the entire specification. Examples may be offered showing how and why the roles of elected representatives may be hijacked. On the other hand, contrary examples may be given to argue that this is not taking place.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent, and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that the role of elected representatives in modern democracies is being hijacked by others.

---

**Section C: Political Culture**
**C1****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘Political culture is much more than a collection of attitudes and beliefs.’ Discuss. *(40 marks)*

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- The central concepts of political system and political culture.
- Various types of political culture such as traditional, secular, participant, subject, parochial and civic.
- Social factors relating to political culture such as sexism, racism, xenophobia and geographical divide.
- Concepts such as ideology, citizenship, deference, homogeneity and consensus.
- Institutions that both define and shape political culture such as constitutions, judiciaries, assemblies, electoral systems, public bureaucracies and levels of devolution.
- Related factors such as patterns of political recruitment to institutions and political structures.
- Social components of political culture such as class, gender, elitism and egalitarianism.
- Key attitudes such as those towards class and social stratification, gender and race.
- Key attitudes to political culture such as the willingness of people to accept the actions and policies of their governments.
- Knowledge of the range of factors constituting political culture such as political institutions, major historical landmarks, patterns of immigration, salient political issues, notable political figures, the presence of ancient institutions (monarchy, aristocracy), climate, geography (eg insularity), imperial experience and the media.
- Relevant current issues, events and debates.
- Methods of ascertaining popular beliefs and attitudes such as social surveys, opinion polls and focus groups, and the problems and limitations associated with these.
- Knowledge of factors that shape popular attitudes and beliefs such as TV, radio, the press, religion, the family, the peer group, the school, and the government itself.
- Relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the identification and examination of the wide range of elements that constitute a political culture.

In the main body of the answer candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as those indicated above. They should critically appraise that aspect of political culture consisting of attitudes that may be ascertained through opinion surveys. They may also question the reliability of people's responses to opinion surveys. Importantly, they should consider and identify other broader aspects of a political culture, drawing material from throughout the specification as indicated above.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that political culture is more than beliefs and attitudes.

---

**C2****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘Political apathy amongst the young suggests a democracy in decline.’ Discuss. (40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Definition of key terms such as political apathy, political disengagement, democracy in decline, cynicism, anti-democratic activity.
- Definition and examination of the term ‘the young’.
- Membership of political parties.
- Membership of associations.
- Falling turnouts, particularly amongst the young, at various levels of government: Westminster, European Parliament, US Congress, local government, and the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Ireland assemblies.
- Turnout as an indicator of the state of health of a democracy.
- Suggested reasons for political disenchantment amongst the young such as peer pressure, norms of ‘youth culture’, neo-liberal values, self-interest, career demands, hedonism, feelings of disempowerment, alienation and dislike of existing politicians.
- Alternative forms of political engagement such as canvassing, joining a party, forming a party, voting, standing at election for national assembly or local council, serving on NHS trusts, as school governors, or on regional councils.
- Informal means of political engagement such as publicity-seeking, lobbying, demonstrating, joining various types of pressure group, trade union membership and leadership, direct action, donating funds to a party, private meetings with civil servants.
- Relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

**Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should centre on the allegation of apathy amongst the young and the extent to which this suggests that political culture will see an increasingly alienated community as today's young become the older generation of later years. The extract offers a clear steer on the discussion.

In the main body of the answer, key relevant terms, such as those indicated above, should be introduced and defined. Candidates should identify and critically examine evidence of political apathy and disengagement amongst the young. Candidates may argue variously around the key proposition. Some may agree that the young are apathetic, but others may argue that they show their political awareness in different ways, say, in forms of direct action. On the issue of the future, candidates may argue that, while the young may be apathetic now, they will grow out of this as they mature. Some may cite the changes in the so-called sixties generation as they moved through life to become today's 'establishment'. They may argue that many forms of political engagement (detailed above) are not likely to be appealing or appropriate to the young, but will become more so as they grow to maturity. Some may argue that the existing political culture itself inhibits youthful participation. They may argue that the older generation do not welcome such involvement. Some may even note that the ancient Greeks valued the wisdom of age in politics (hence the senate).

They may also question whether a politically apathetic political culture is necessarily a sign of democracy in decline. Some may argue that a democracy in which only an enlightened minority participate is actually more rational – a protection against the rule of the mob or a 'tyranny of the majority'.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times, use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Arguments should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that political apathy amongst the young suggests a democracy in decline.

---

**Section D: Continuity and Change****D1****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘Political systems must move with the times if they are to remain effective.’ Discuss.

*(40 marks)*

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- The basic concepts of change and continuity.
- Understanding of the phrase ‘move with the times’.
- The ideological dimension, particularly ideologies of conservatism and of change.
- Pressures for change from society.
- Pressures for change within institutions.
- Pressures for change in the informal patterns of politics such as pressure-group activity, patterns of consultation, relations between politicians and officials, ways of informing the public, conventions within the constitution.
- Forces for continuity such as tradition, bureaucratic resistance, political timidity and fear of the new.
- The ideological dimension such as the conservative critique of revolution and argument for stability.
- Real change contrasted with apparent change (ie window-dressing).
- The range of institutions and political structures where change has taken place (or been resisted) such as constitutions, national, provincial and regional assemblies, electoral systems, bureaucracies at various levels, local government systems, executives and judiciaries.
- Examples of change (say the reform of local government) and resistance to change (say preservation of monarchy against republicanism or preservation of FPTP against reformists) in UK politics and in other systems, particularly the USA and the EU.
- Examples of political turbulence where systems have not changed to move with the times, as in revolutions and civil war.
- Reasons why changes have been implemented or resisted.
- Significant reforms which may have been necessary to preserve the political system, such as the extension of the franchise, the constitutionalisation of the monarchy, the gradual erosion of the authority of the House of Lords or devolution.
- Relevant examples from throughout specification to illustrate arguments.

- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.
- Comparative examples from other systems such as the USA and EU.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on reasons for change (and by implication resistance to change) in political systems.

In the main body of the answer key relevant terms such as those indicated above should be introduced and defined. Candidates may explain that much political debate centres on demands for change and resistance to these demands. They may also examine the extent to which self-interest often lies behind these respective positions; those benefiting from the *status quo* will argue for its continuance. Alternatively, they may elaborate on the ideological debate, with conservatives arguing that change can be dangerous and respecting the ‘wisdom of the ages’. They may show conservatism as arguing for slow organic change, lagging behind social development, and socialism as arguing for radical change leading social development.

Candidates should also consider the extent to which change is necessary for a political system to survive. Hence, they may look at significant reforms (as suggested above) that may have been necessary to preserve the political system. They may also look at failed reforms such as regional devolution.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times, use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that political systems must move with the times to remain effective. It is also possible to adopt a valid intermediate position.

**D2****Total for this question: 40 marks**

‘In democracies it is easier to change governments than constitutions.’ Discuss. (40 marks)

**Knowledge and Understanding**

In this synoptic question there are no narrowly defined limits to the areas of knowledge that a candidate may feel able to bring to the discussion. Hence, any specification of knowledge requirements can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material indicated below. On the other hand, they may successfully include material not indicated here.

Candidates should demonstrate accurate knowledge and understanding of factors such as the following:

- Key concepts relevant to this theme such as political change, continuity, evolutionary change and revolutionary change.
- Definition of constitutions as rule books for governance or, more broadly, the process of government as observed.
- Constitutions as written or unwritten, and the implications for change in the distinction.
- Constitutions as unchanging, and sometimes entrenched, guarantors of freedom, civil rights and the rule of law.
- Governments and change; may include both change *of* government, change *within* governments and change in the *direction* of a government.
- Democratic value of political systems that allow for governmental change.
- Democratic value of stability (ie resistance to change) of, and within, governments.
- A range of political institutions where change (evolutionary or revolutionary) and continuity may be observed, such as constitutions, assemblies (national, provincial and regional), electoral systems, bureaucracies at various levels, local government systems, executives and judiciaries.
- Pressures for change within government institutions, such as modernisation pledges, manifesto commitments, reformist politicians and bureaucrats, public demands, public dissatisfaction, ideological movements, etc.
- Pressures for change from the informal patterns of politics, such as pressure-group activity, patterns of consultation, relations between politicians and officials, ways of informing the public, conventions within the constitution.
- The ideological dimension of the question, making particular reference to conservatism and those ideologies favouring change or even revolution.
- Evidence and up-to-date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.
- Developments in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, and comparative examples from other systems, such as the USA and EU.

### **Skill/Analysis**

The synoptic nature of the essays leaves open a wide range of approaches to analysis and the following skills specification is indicative rather than definitive.

As in many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Answers should open with an introductory discussion in which candidates demonstrate a recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on change and continuity with respect to governments and constitutions. The extract offers a clear steer on the discussion.

In the main body of the answer, key relevant terms, such as those indicated above, should be introduced and defined. Candidates should be able to illustrate a clear difference between a constitution and a government with respect to change and continuity. They may distinguish between change of a government, change within a government and change in the direction of a government. They may argue that a government in a democracy is not there *in perpetuity*, and that where this is the case, one has a feature of dictatorship or totalitarianism. They may illustrate this with examples showing how governments can be changed *en bloc*, as in the case of many British general elections and US presidential elections, and note that this is less likely under a system of PR where coalitions can re-form and preserve some degree of continuity. On the other hand, they may argue that some degree of continuity is necessary if a government is to enact a programme and avoid the charge of short-termism. Once again, examples may be given.

They may note relevant constitutional provisions, such as the fact that a British prime minister can choose the date of the election and can stand repeatedly, whereas the US president serves a fixed term and is limited to only two terms. The position with respect to government may be contrasted with the constitution, where stability and entrenchment are seen as important. They may offer examples of constitutional restraint such as judicial review. Candidates may also note problems with entrenchment. This may lead to a consideration of the process of amendment. In the case of Britain, they may argue that there is no process of amendment because the constitution, being unwritten and entailing many important conventions, can actually be seen to defy the point made in the question.

Throughout the discussion there should be recognition of parallels and other links between systems and subsystems studied throughout the range of the specification. There should also be a selection of well-chosen examples from within the specification and from current events and issues to illustrate arguments. At all times, use of comparative analysis will be an asset. Argument should be cogent and coherent and analysis should display awareness of differing viewpoints.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the preceding discussion. This may support or refute the proposition that in democracies it is easier to change governments than constitutions.