



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

# Government and Politics

## Unit GOV1

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## CRITERIA FOR MARKING

### Introduction

The 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, the weightings are different. 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 principals 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.

One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is what precise mark should be given within a 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 that such an award would be 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.

**ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations, and provide accurate evidence and up to date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts and theories, using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations.</p> <p>Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p>	<p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationships between them producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrating sound contextual awareness. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories, using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct clear arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display an awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of issues. There is a clear recognition of parallels and connections together with some comparisons. There is good evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p>	<p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of political institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them producing answers with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples to illustrate points.	Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider political information and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
<b>Level 1</b>	Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete knowledge of political institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationships between them, with very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the content of the question with little interpretation and few examples often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.	Discussions are supported by few if any concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations will be sparse and incomplete. Analyses will show little awareness of differing view points and very few parallels and connections will be used to establish comparisons. Evaluations of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations will be superficial and naive.	Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent, conclusions will frequently not be adequately related to the preceding discussion.

**Unit GOV 1 – Electoral Systems and Voting Behaviour**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 1(a)</b> <b>4 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates display thorough knowledge and understanding of the concept of volatility. In appropriate detail, candidates show they appreciate the connections between volatility, low turnout and other related phenomena such as dealignment and churn. Awareness of current political developments.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a range or a wide range of well developed concepts using political vocabulary to explain volatility. In an appropriate manner candidates analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations of volatility based on relevant factors. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated or sound awareness of concepts relating to issues such as the influence of factors which might result in volatility. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is clear and full or good evaluation of principal issues, evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from or is linked to the discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates display a slight or outline knowledge and understanding of the concept of volatility. There may be a limited awareness of current developments and connections within a limited, or very limited, attempt at addressing the requirements of the set question. Limited interpretation or explanation offered with examples which may be inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to examine the term volatility with limited or very limited arguments and explanations. Candidates offer a very limited analysis or assessment which shows some awareness of factors or other connections with volatility. There may be a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations related to the term. Any evaluations of explanations may be superficial and naïve.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and knowledge of the 2001 general election in terms of ethnic minority voting behaviour and related matters. Discussions of pro-Labour bias compared with whole electorate as well as, possibly, low turnout and recent trends, possibly with reference to other elections or electoral systems, and assess technical and attitudinal reasons which might explain the contemporary situation, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. Answers include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations of the voting statistics, noting and discussing significant variations with up to date examples or references to the stimulus material to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide or range of developed or well developed concepts to explain voting behaviour in 2001 using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations based on factors such as ethnic composition of candidates, influence of campaign issues such as asylum seekers, wider aspects of the political culture, such as, attitudes of distrust, cynicism, alienation, other plausible reasons. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of relevant concepts relating to the contemporary situation, with sound examples. Parallels and connections are identified possibly together with well developed comparisons of voting behaviour elsewhere. There is clear and full, or good, evaluation of the reasons and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of the possible reasons for ethnic minority voting in the 2001 general election, producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness regarding the issues under discussion. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates use a sound range of concepts to consider the possible reasons for ethnic minority voting patterns in the 2001 general election. Basic information is utilised when they begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer adequate analysis which shows some awareness of reasons as well as historical trends. There is a recognition of basic contrasts (possibly with the past, or with differing groups within the electorate, or regional) but little emphasis on parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a logical and clear attempt to make an assessment of the statistics and distinctions reported. Evaluations of explanations for differences may be superficial in one or two respects.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate outline knowledge of the reasons for ethnic minority voting behaviour in the 2001 general election but with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples concerning factors such as candidates, relevant campaign issues etc.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider the question regarding the reasons for ethnic minority voting patterns in the 2001 general election, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of factors. There is a limited recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There may be a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one reason as opposed to at least one other.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of the reasons for ethnic minority voting behaviour in the 2001 general election, and answers show a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only a superficial awareness of the context of the question with little interpretation or explanation and few examples, often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates use a very limited range of concepts to consider the reasons for ethnic minority voting behaviour in the 2001 general election, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some very limited awareness of factors. There is a minimal recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a very simple attempt to analyse the impact/cause/other aspect of voting patterns with very basic arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one factor.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions frequently are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 2(a)</b> <b>4 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates display thorough knowledge and understanding of the political concept core voters and apply, or apply with confidence, an appropriate range of developed concepts and theories enabling a definition of core voters using political vocabulary to analyse political information and provide clear and cogent explanations.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a range, or a wide range, of well developed concepts using political vocabulary to explain core voters. In an appropriate manner candidates analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations based on relevant factors. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated or sound awareness of concepts relating to issues such as the (de)alignment trends concerning class and partisan attachment, the rise of affluent voters etc. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. Some may refer, for example, to the decline in trade unionism or to wider deference in the political culture. There is a clear and full or good evaluation of principal issues, evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from or is linked to the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(a) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates display a slight or outline knowledge and understanding of the concept of core voters voting with a limited awareness of distinctions with other related aspects such as (de)alignment and partisan attachment. Limited interpretation or explanation offered with examples which may be inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider the term, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis or assessment which shows some awareness of meaning. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations surrounding or connected with the term but any evaluations or explanations may be superficial and naïve.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 2(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and knowledge of factors which influence recent voting behaviour. Candidates may draw upon devolution, local or European Parliamentary elections as well as the general election material contained in the stimulus. Candidates may refer to the influence of class, possibly with comments or discussion of dealignment. They may select and analyse other factors such as the influence of other social factors - age, sex, ethnicity, etc - and consider the impact of issues in both near term and the official campaign, personalities, media, image, tactical considerations etc. They provide examples, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations of the significant factors and their impact, with up to date examples or references to the stimulus material to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of developed, or well developed, concepts explaining the influence of factors on recent voting behaviour, using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations based on the relevant factors. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of relevant concepts, such as class dealignment, gender gaps, sectoral cleavage, issue-voting. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full, or good, evaluation of issues and social factors evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of factors which have influenced recent voting behaviour, producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound understanding of the issues under discussion. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider factors which have influenced recent voting behaviour. Basic information is utilised when they begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer adequate analysis which shows some awareness of concepts, possible differences or similarities. There may be a recognition of basic voting trends which is subject to a basic analysis in some form. There is a simple attempt to evaluate the differences and distinctions in impact reported, concerning political issues, social factors and other related points. Evaluations of explanations for differences supported with examples.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>                      Candidates demonstrate a basic knowledge of factors which have influenced recent voting behaviour, and coverage might be unbalanced in terms of either depth or breadth. This imbalance may amount to being a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples about factors and their relative influence.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b>                      Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider the influence of factor(s) on recent voting behaviour, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of factors. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one factor as opposed to at least one other.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b>                      Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>                      Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of factor(s) which have influenced recent voting behaviour, and answers show a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness of the context of the question with little interpretation or explanation and few examples, often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b>                      Candidates use a very limited range of concepts to consider the impact of factors on recent voting behaviour, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of factors. There is minimal recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a very simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one factor as opposed to at least one other. Conclusions may be superficial or naïve.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b>                      Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 3(a)</b> <b>4 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates display thorough knowledge and understanding of the political concept of tactical voting. In appropriate detail, candidates illustrate their knowledge of the concept, possibly with examples, using political vocabulary to analyse political information and provide clear and cogent explanations.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a range, or a wide range, of well developed concepts using political vocabulary to explain the term tactical voting. In an appropriate manner candidates analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations based on relevant factors. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated or sound awareness of concepts relating to issues such as the relationship between votes cast and least preferred candidates, influence of polls or local information on voters' behaviour. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full or good evaluation of principles, evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from, or is linked to, the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(a) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b>                      Candidates display a slight or outline knowledge and understanding of the political concept tactical voting. There may be a limited awareness of the concept and a limited, or very limited, attempt at addressing the requirements of the set question.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b>                      Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider the term tactical voting, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis or assessment regarding the term and there is a recognition of basic, or very basic, parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments. Evaluations or explanations for differences may be superficial and naïve.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b>                      Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the proceeding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate comprehensive understanding and knowledge of the case against reforming the electoral system for general elections, particularly its alleged advantage of producing strong government. This will include the case for, but consideration may not be as thorough. There should be excellent understanding of the traditional arguments concerning strong government, simplicity, denial of access to extremists etc, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include references to other electoral systems, coalition formation or to technical aspects of representation - credit should be given but such information is not a necessity. Candidates may consider the politics of electoral reform with up to date examples or references to the stimulus material to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of developed, or well developed, concepts regarding an evaluation of FPTP in terms of fairness and its outcome regarding strong government using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information regarding the proposition and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations based on relevant factors. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of relevant concepts relating to the proposition, with sound examples. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full, or good, evaluation of issues, evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>                      Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of reforming the electoral system for general elections, in terms of fairness and strong government, which may involve consideration of counter-arguments, producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness regarding the issues under discussion. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b>                      Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider reforming the electoral system for general elections. Basic information is utilised when they begin to construct arguments and explanations regarding the case for and against in the context of the set question. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of the worthiness of the case being argued or examined. There is a recognition of basic contrasts but little on parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations for the differences and distinctions reported. Evaluations or explanations for differences will be explicit.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b>                      Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of the case for or against reforming the electoral system for general elections in the context of the set question, but with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples about the case for or against and may present the arguments in a simplified form.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider reforming the electoral system for general elections, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis and assessment which shows some awareness of factors. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one factor in the case argued against as opposed to at least one other factor.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
<b>Question 3(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of reforming the electoral system for general elections in the context of the set question, and answers show a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only a superficial awareness of the context of the question with little interpretation or explanation and few examples, often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates use a very limited range of concepts to consider the case for or against reforming the electoral system for general elections, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis or assessment which shows some awareness of factors concerning a case. There is a minimal recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a very simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one factor in the case for or against reform.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 4(a)</b> <b>4 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates display thorough knowledge and understanding of the political concept of party-based rather than candidate-based electoral systems. In appropriate detail, candidates show they appreciate the differences between the two, with example(s). There may be an example drawn from beyond the stimulus, but this is not a necessity. Full awareness of current political developments may be displayed.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a range, or a wide range, of well developed concepts using political vocabulary to explain party and candidate based systems. In an appropriate manner candidates analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations based on relevant factors. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated or sound awareness of concepts relating to relevant issues. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full or good evaluation of principal issues, evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Levels 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from or is linked to the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(a) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates display a slight or outline knowledge and understanding of the political terms. There may be a limited awareness of current developments and controversies within a limited, or very limited, attempt at addressing the requirements of the set question. Limited explanation or interpretation offered with examples which may be inaccurately or inappropriately used. There may be better knowledge of one term.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to explain the terms and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis or assessment which shows some awareness of relevant issues. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations for the terms. Evaluations or explanations may be superficial and naïve as well as unbalanced in coverage.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the proceeding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 4(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and knowledge of the case for (and against) the use of list systems. They may refer to the improved female or ethnic minority representation, or the ‘dumping’ of second rate or unpopular candidates as well as the tendency towards coalitions etc, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations of the significant arguments, with up to date examples or references to the stimulus material to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of developed or well developed concepts explaining the case against/for the use of list systems in terms of a comparison with PR arguments using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of the comparison with sound examples. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons and assessments. There is a clear and full, or good, evaluation of issues, evaluating consequent processes, and related arguments and explanations.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity, and produce answers with a clear sense of direction, culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of list systems and PR principles, producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness of the issues under discussion. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations or examples and provide clear evidence to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates use a sound range of concepts to consider the proposition contained in the set question. Detailed information is utilised when they begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer analysis which shows awareness of disadvantages and advantages in their assessments. There is recognition of parallels and connections together with clear comparisons. There is a good attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations for the case(s) reported.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(b) (contd)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of list systems and PR, and make vague or otherwise unbalanced reference to the counter-argument(s) within a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples regarding the proposition and may present the relevant workings/examples regarding list systems or PR in a simplified form.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates use a limited range of concepts to consider the proposition, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of factors. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and make an assessment concerning the relative advantages or disadvantages.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of the proposition, and answers show a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness of the context of the question with little interpretation or explanation and few examples, often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates use a very limited range of concepts to consider proposition contained in the set question, and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of factors. There is a minimal recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparison or assessment. There is a very simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations concerning the relative influence of one advantage or disadvantage regarding list systems specifically or PR generally.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>