

GCE 2005
January Series



Mark Scheme

Government and Politics (GOV2)

AS Unit 2 – Parties and Pressure Groups

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.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website:
www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2005 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell Director General

CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

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, 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.

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (GOV1, GOV2, GOV3)**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 8 marks)**

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (3 – 4 marks) The candidate successfully demonstrates accurate or generally accurate knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p> <p>Where appropriate, the candidate is able to illustrate his/her answer with relevant evidence/example(s).</p>	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (2 marks) The candidate provides an appropriate analysis of political data, concept(s) or term(s) showing an awareness of differing viewpoints where appropriate.</p>	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary.</p>
	<p>Levels 1 – 2 (1 – 2 marks) The candidate demonstrates slight or basic knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p> <p>The candidate may illustrate his/her answer with evidence/example(s) of limited relevance.</p>	<p>Levels 1 – 2 (1 mark) The candidate provides a superficial or partial analysis of political data, concept(s) or term(s).</p>	<p>Levels 1 – 2 (1 mark) The candidate communicates with limited clarity and effectiveness using a limited political vocabulary.</p>

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS (GOV1, GOV2, GOV3)**GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 22 marks)**

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (10 – 11 marks) The candidate successfully demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing an answer that deploys relevant knowledge and understanding to address the requirements of the question and that demonstrates significant contextual awareness.</p> <p>The candidate's answer includes relevant evidence and/or examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7 marks) The candidate evaluates political institutions, processes and behaviour, applying appropriate concepts and theories.</p> <p>The candidate provides analysis which displays sound awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with valid and precise comparisons. The answer includes relevant and convincing interpretations or explanations.</p>	<p>Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate communicates clear arguments and explanations using accurate political vocabulary. The candidate produces answers with a clear sense of direction leading towards a coherent conclusion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (7 – 9 marks) The candidate demonstrates generally accurate knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing an answer that addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates adequate contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer provides evidence backed up by clear examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5 – 6 marks) The candidate evaluates political institutions, processes and behaviour, applying some concepts or theories.</p> <p>The candidate provides clear arguments and explanations and demonstrates awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified, together with some sound comparison.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and explanations using some political vocabulary. A conclusion is linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions - continued

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (4 – 6 marks) The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationship between them. He/she makes a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The candidate may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question, and may produce limited evidence and/or few examples.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3 – 4 marks) The candidate offers a simplistic evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour and begins to construct arguments which contain basic explanation.</p> <p>The candidate shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is recognition of basic parallels or simplistic comparisons.</p>	<p>Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate attempts to develop an argument using basic political vocabulary. Where a conclusion is offered, its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1 – 3 marks) The candidate demonstrates slight and/or incomplete knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationship between them.</p> <p>The candidate makes a very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the context of the question is evident and the few examples cited are often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 – 2 marks) The candidate makes a partial attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes and behaviour. Arguments offered are superficial. There is very limited awareness of parallels or comparisons.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The answer relies upon narrative which is not fully coherent and which is expressed without using political vocabulary. A conclusion is either not offered or it is not related to the preceding material.</p>

1**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Explain what is meant by the term *factions* used in the extract. (8 marks)

Factions associated in the stimulus with divisions within political parties, with some examples cited. A faction might be defined as a fairly stable group within a party, sometimes with a constitution, formal organisation and membership; possibly a so-called “party within a party.” This may be contrasted with a tendency in the best responses, which might be described as a loose, more informal group within a party which shares a particular ideological perspective, attitude or policy stance.

(b) To what extent is a united party also likely to be a successful party? (22 marks)

Knowledge and understanding of the composition and structure of parties in terms of unity/division. The stimulus reminds candidates that all parties are coalitions comprising competing factions and tendencies, and the set question invites them to contextualise this in terms of parties’ recent reputations as successful (or unsuccessful) organisations. References may be made to more successful/less successful periods within the span of Thatcher’s years; to the divisions over Europe, Major’s “back to basics” campaign or Blair’s policies on education, health and foreign policy including the war in Iraq. There will also be references to periods of apparent unity – such as Labour’s extended political honeymoon following election to office in 1997. There will also be reference to the experience of parties in terms of their success during identified periods of unity (and division).

Analysis and assessment regarding links between party unity and success. Analysis of factors which measure party success – electoral success, leading position in opinion polls, policy success, success with party/leader image/popularity and effectiveness of spin on perceptions, sympathy of media, loyalty of party to leaders, and other plausible factors. Divisions within the party can make the party unpopular, even farcical (such as with the impact of the whipless rebels on Major and his government) or, occasionally, strengthen the leader if an unpopular faction is defeated (Blair replacing the old Clause 4). Hague and IDS’s credibility undermined by disunity, with subsequent impact on the political fortunes of the party (“if they can’t run the Tories, how can then run the country?” line of argument). Some candidates may develop the concept of spin regarding the creation of a successful party, with new Labour in position as an example (compared with Hague’s Conservatives in opposition). Here there may also be references to media sympathies where success seems to breed success and failure begets further disaster. Arguably, the divided and unpopular Conservatives attack on asylum seekers under Hague added to their electoral problems, whilst popular Blunkett’s tough measures against asylum seekers had strengthened his and his party’s reputation. Also, the divisions apparent in one party might be diminished when contrasted with the divisions in another – Labour’s EU splits seem inconsequential against Conservative EU splits.

2

Total for this question: 30 marks

- (a) Explain what is meant by *state funding of political parties* used in the extract. (8 marks)

References to parties' activities being funded out of taxation rather than from private sources. Candidates might pick up on the 'greater' in the stimulus and add that the state already funds some party activity, especially during elections. References might also be made to the need or otherwise, to place limits on party spending. Comparisons may be made with the position in other countries; references may be made to various reports, such as Neill, and to reforms recently introduced, as well as to scandals such as the Ecclestone affair.

- (b) "A modern political party does not need a large number of members." Discuss. (22 marks)

Knowledge and understanding of the organisation and membership of modern political parties. The stimulus alerts candidates to the trend of declining membership in the political parties. There may be references to measures taken by the parties in attempts to reverse this trend by making membership more attractive. There may also be references to the composition of party memberships which do not reflect that of the wider electorate – particularly middle class and, in the case of the Conservatives, unrepresentatively aged. Activities of grassroots members, both locally and nationally.

Analysis and evaluation of the statement regarding the need for mass memberships. Without explicit reference to sources, the arguments might follow along the lines of, for example, Michels. Some may make reference to the transformation process from mass bureaucratic parties to electoral professional parties. Strong ties between party members and leaders, which may be founded on alignment and/or ideology, replaced by a new stress on the leader, other senior party figures, and a catch-all appeal. The previous importances of mass members given way to new importance of professionals such as press secretaries and advisers. Some answers may tie in stimulus material regarding finance, with mass members financing 'their' party contrasted with individuals and groups financing electoral parties. Other answers might focus on the more practical advantages, or otherwise, of having large memberships. For example, some have argued that canvassing activities involving many members pounding the streets or cold calling on the phone are crucial to winning seats, whilst others argue that the effects of canvassing are at best neutral (citing Livingstone's 'canvasser-less' victory over conventional machines). It might be argued that the current climate of disengagement from conventional politics, reflected in low turnouts, is not conducive to the development of large mass memberships, and that parties have little choice but to soldier on with declining grassroots activists. Some answers might dissect the nature of party memberships, from mere passive dues-payers to activists. This may give an opportunity for parties with small but active memberships to wield undue influence, such as the Greens and BNP. A very few answers may still cite the success of the allegedly media-created SDP as an example of a modern party.

3**Total for this question: 30 marks**

(a) Explain what is meant by *lobbying at the European level* used in the extract (8 marks)

The context touches on the development of the increasingly large stage occupied by pressure groups – from local to national, supranational and international. Guided by the stimulus, candidates are likely to refer to the importance of the European Union to certain lobbies (such as agriculture) specifically mentioning the Commission, Council of Ministers, European Parliament and other fora, as well as Defra. The reference to Europe need to be confined to the EU institutions, and candidates may refer to the ‘mass lobbying/demonstrations’ of anti-capitalists etc which has taken place in Europe.

(b) Consider the most influential access points within the political system for pressure groups. (22 marks)

Knowledge and understanding likely to be guided by various pressure group typologies, such as insider/outsider mentioned in the following question. Such distinctions may lead to the identification of access points in Whitehall with civil servants, in Parliament, the EU as mentioned in the stimulus, or the more diffuse targets of media attention and public opinion which concern NSMs and other direct action organisations. Additional specific access points may be identified, such as local government or access points resulting from devolution. In contrast, there may be references to the new politics of, for example, the Countryside Alliance or the Anti War Coalition and the importance of media/public opinion.

Analysis and assessment regarding the most influential access points. Influence may be discussed in terms of persuading politicians and civil servants, over policy-formation, over the shaping of public opinion, etc. The use of Grant’s typology in either original or modified forms, or the distinctions mentioned in the following question, are likely to form the basis for analysis and assessment. Influence in Whitehall, for example, may be contrasted with the price of being a prisoner group. Brussels may be identified as the most influential access point for specific groups. Outsider influence may be deemed weak in terms of conventional access points, but subsequent discussion should relate outsider strategy to outsider goals. The conclusion may offer either a clear-cut or complex assessment. It might be that persuasive arguments identify one or two more influential access points, or that certain access points are only available to specific groups with other groups devising strategies that are more, or less, influential over a different time period.

4

Total for this question: 30 marks

(a) Explain what is meant by *cause groups* used in the extract.

(8 marks)

The stimulus suggests that cause groups are synonymous with, or a sub-set of, promotional groups. The stimulus also points to some ambiguities whereby groups may be cause/promotional as well as interest. Candidates may engage with this in the explanations by providing more clear-cut examples, or indeed, by challenging the thrust of the stimulus. Answers may discuss this particular classification in terms of being limited, outdated, in refer to alternative classifications, such as Grant's.

(b) Discuss how useful the “insider/outsider” distinction is in understanding pressure group politics.

(22 marks)

Knowledge and understanding of Grant's typology. Candidates will have already considered an alternative classification in part (a) and are now asked to evaluate the usefulness of the insider/outsider distinction. Candidates are likely to argue that some classification is necessary in order to make sense of the diversity found within the world of pressure groups. They may cite examples in support, such as CBI, TUC, BMA contrasted with, possibly, the Countryside Alliance or NSM. It might be argued that insider/outsider distinctions are based on the strategy or tactics of particular groups in terms of the need to access decision or policy-makers. Insider groups want to be consulted by government in order to shape or defend policy which is in their interests or the interests of their clients. Outsider groups may seek recognition by government and consequent insider status, or they may shun association with government since policy-influencing is not a priority. Candidates may refer to various elaborations of Grant's original typology in their responses – including groups which have both insider and outsider characteristics. They may note that some groups change status; under Labour the trade unions enjoyed insider status with beer and sandwiches at Number 10, whereas under the Thatcher regime they suffered something more akin to outsider status.

Analysis and evaluation of the usefulness of insider/outsider distinctions. Candidates may argue that this task is complex given the dual status of some groups (e.g. Liberty) or the increasing militancy of previously ‘respectable’ groups (such as NFU members in Farmers for Action). Also insider status need not confer tangible benefits – for example, local campaigns find it easy to win insider status but very hard to influence policy. Some commentators argue much the same is true of new Labour – its members willingly listen but fail to hear, such as in the GM debate. The ‘new’ politics of NSMs and ‘lifestyle’ politics of environmentalists and feminists may be seen as largely irrelevant to the ‘old’ politics of insider/outsider status. The goals of groups are relevant – are groups pursuing policy change or attempting to change societal attitudes? The former may have greater relevance to insider status, whereas neither insider nor outsider status appears pressing for the latter. For some, the motives of pressure group campaigners remain important since they wish to distinguish the altruistic from the pursuit of self-interest (promotional/cause).