



National
Qualifications
2016

2016 Politics

Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2016

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Assessment team.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Assessment team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.



General Marking Principles for Higher Politics

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidate responses.

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these General Marking Principles and the Detailed Marking Instructions for this assessment.
- (b) Marking should always be positive, ie marks should be awarded for what is correct and not deducted for errors or omissions.
- (c) If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader.
- (c) Where the candidate violates the rubric of the paper and answers more than one optional question, both responses should be marked and the better mark recorded.
- (d) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.
- (e) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (f) The detailed Marking Instructions are not an exhaustive list. Other relevant points should be credited.
- (g) For credit to be given, points must relate to the question asked. Where candidates give points of knowledge without specifying the context, these should be rewarded unless it is clear that they do not refer to the context of the question.
- (h) For knowledge/understanding marks to be awarded, points must be:
 - i. relevant to the issue in the question
 - ii. developed (by providing additional detail, exemplification, reasons or evidence)
 - iii. used to respond to the demands of the question (ie evaluate, analyse, etc)

Marking principles for each question type

For each of the question types the following provides an overview of marking principles.

The types of questions used in this paper are:

- Statement or given view. Discuss . . . [20-mark extended response]
- To what extent . . . [20-mark extended response]
- Analyse . . . [12-mark extended response]
- Evaluate . . . [12-mark extended response]
- Compare . . . [12-mark extended response]
- To what extent . . . [information-handling question – 8 marks]
- Compare . . . [information-handling question – 8 marks]

Extended response questions (12 or 20 marks)

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

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

Analyse questions

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

Compare questions

- Candidates will identify differences and/or similarities.

Evaluate questions

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

Discuss type questions

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

To what extent type questions

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

Source-based questions that assess information-handling skills (8 marks)

- Questions will have at least two sources at an appropriate SCQF level.
- Credit candidates who synthesise information both within and between sources.
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.

General marking guidelines for extended response (20 marks)

	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	4 marks	5 marks	6 marks
Knowledge and understanding scope Award up to 5 marks	One aspect with some description	Two aspects, each with some description OR One aspect with detailed description	Three aspects, each with some description OR Two aspects with detailed description	Four relevant aspects covered, each with some description OR Three aspects with detailed descriptions	Four aspects with detailed descriptions	
Knowledge and understanding development Award up to 5 marks A total of 8 marks overall awarded for knowledge and understanding	One aspect is developed with some explanations and/or exemplification	Two aspects are developed, each with some explanation and/or exemplification OR One aspect is developed with detailed explanation and/or exemplification	Three aspects are developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification OR Two aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification	Three or more aspects are developed, with extended explanation and relevant exemplification	Three or more aspects are developed, with extended and accurate explanations and development of points (showing where relevant a high level of theoretical/conceptual understanding) with relevant exemplification	
Analysis* Award up to 6 marks	1 mark will be awarded for each analytical statement which analyses the aspects in terms of the question. Award up to a maximum of 2 marks for an analytical statement with supporting justification or evidence. A maximum of 4 marks can be awarded for comments which address different aspects of an individual aspect.					
Structure Award up to 2 marks	Clear structure that addresses the issue identified in the question	Structure that clarifies the issue, presents evidence and develops a clear and consistent line of argument				

	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	4 marks	5 marks	6 marks
Conclusions* Award up to 4 marks	A straightforward conclusion that deals with the central issue in the question	A straightforward conclusion that deals with and evaluates the central issue in the question	A developed conclusion that directly addresses and provides an evaluation of the key issue in the question	A developed and well-argued conclusion with justifications that directly addresses and evaluates the key issue in the question		

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

General marking guidelines for extended response (12 marks)

	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks	4 marks
<p>Knowledge and understanding scope</p> <p>4 marks</p>	One relevant aspect, with some description	Two relevant aspects, each with some description OR One relevant aspect, with detailed description	Three relevant aspects, each with some description OR Two relevant aspects, one with detailed description	Two relevant aspects, each with detailed description - these should include the key points OR Three relevant aspects, one with detailed description
<p>Knowledge and understanding development</p> <p>4 marks</p> <p>A total of 8 marks overall awarded for knowledge and understanding</p>	One aspect is developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification	Two aspects are developed, each with some explanation and/or exemplification OR One aspect is developed with detailed explanation and/or exemplification	Three aspects are developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification OR Two relevant aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification	Two aspects are developed, with extended explanation and relevant exemplification OR Three relevant aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification
<p>Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Comments that identify relationships/implications/ make judgements</p> <p>4 marks</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this</p>	One relevant and accurate analytical or evaluative comment	Two different relevant and accurate analytical/ evaluative comments OR One extended and/or justified/exemplified analytical or evaluative comments	Three different relevant and analytical/evaluative comments OR Two different relevant and analytical/evaluative comments, at least one of which is extended and/or justified/exemplified	Three relevant and accurate analytical/ evaluative comments , at least one of which is justified or exemplified OR An extended, accurate and justified analytical or evaluative comment of an insightful nature which covers all three aspects of the question

General marking guidelines for source-based questions (compare) - 8 marks

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

General marking guidelines for source-based question (interpretation of electoral data) - 8 marks

	1 mark	2 marks	3 marks
<p>Interpretation of data linked to first part of statement</p> <p>Award up to 3 marks</p>	One aspect of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the first part of the statement	Two or more aspects of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the first part of the statement	Two or more aspects of data (from within one source or between sources) is synthesised and linked correctly to the first part of the statement with commentary
<p>Interpretation of data linked to second part of statement</p> <p>Award up to 3 marks</p>	One aspect of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the second part of the statement	Two or more aspects of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the second part of the statement	Two or more aspects of data (from within a single source or between sources) is synthesised and linked correctly to the second part of the statement with commentary
<p>Evaluation of extent of validity of the viewpoint</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks</p>	Evaluative comment on validity of one part of the statement	<p>Evaluative comments on validity of both parts of the statement</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Single evaluative comment incorporating overall conclusion about both parts of the statement</p>	

Marking Instructions for each question

Section 1 - Political Theory

Question		General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
1.	(a)	<p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of political concepts as appropriate to the question, and any links between them.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to the works of appropriate theorists to gain full marks; otherwise no more than 13 marks should be allocated.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. 	20	<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key features of direct democracy (eg citizens participate fully in the political process, creates a better informed citizenry, don't have to rely on self-serving politicians, heightens the control of citizens). • Key features of representative democracy (eg voters choose representatives to make decisions on their behalf, more practical than direct democracy, allows government to be in the hands of those with expert knowledge, ordinary citizens don't have to be directly involved). • Ideas of relevant theorists associated with each approach (eg Plato's critique of direct democracy, Schumpeter's evaluation of representative democracy). <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p><i>Direct democracy means that people are expected to directly take part in political decision-making, such as law-making. It means that they don't have to rely on professional politicians who may only be in it for themselves. Representative democracy is different. This is when there is a vote to choose the people that should make the laws and run the country. Ordinary people can then get on with their own lives and not have to bother about getting politically involved.</i></p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Analysis</p> <p>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where the candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc.) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Links between different components • Links between component(s) and the whole • Links between component(s) and related concepts • Similarities and contradictions • Consistency and inconsistency • Different views/interpretations • Possible consequences/implications • The relative importance of components • Understanding of underlying order of structure. <p>Conclusion(s)</p> <p>Candidates must reach a conclusion(s); make a judgement(s) about the issue in the question.</p>		<p>This contains one aspect of the difference between direct and indirect democracy, but with limited description (1 mark) and no development (0 marks).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p><i>Direct democracy means that people are expected to directly take part in political decision-making, such as law-making. It means that they don't have to rely on professional politicians who may only be in it for themselves. As a result there is less risk that politicians are faced with conflicts of interests such as the influence of lobbyists. Representative democracy is different. This is when there is a vote to choose the people that should make the laws and run the country. Ordinary people can then get on with their own lives and not have to bother about getting politically involved. This is an indirect form of democracy where popular participation in government is infrequent and brief. The link between the government and the governed is then described as an 'electoral mandate.' Those with greater expert knowledge and experience may then govern.</i></p> <p>This contains one aspect of the difference between direct and indirect democracy, but with limited description (1 mark) and limited development with some exemplification or explanations (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 4 marks:</p> <p><i>Direct democracy means that individuals make the decisions and are expected to participate fully in the political process. Sometimes called 'pure' democracy, it negates the need for legitimacy as citizens legislate for themselves. It heightens the control held by citizens and creates a better informed and more politically knowledgeable citizenry. People are then able to express views and interests without the need of self-serving politicians. The rule that ensues is considered legitimate; decisions will be accepted since the people made them. Ever since its inception in Ancient Greece, some theorists such as Plato have argued</i></p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Evaluation involves making judgements and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which a view is supported by the evidence • The relative importance of factors • Counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations • The overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together. <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> <p>Structure</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to a maximum of 12 marks for analysis/evaluation/structure.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of</p>		<p><i>against its use, often on the grounds that the 'masses' don't know what's best for them. Others argue that the expansion of the use of referenda and of e-voting may enhance the standing of direct democracy. For example in a number of US states voters have the right to initiate referenda on specific issues.</i></p> <p><i>Representative democracy is considered a limited and indirect form of democracy where popular participation in government is infrequent and brief. Citizens do not exercise power themselves, but instead, elect those who will legislate and govern on their behalf. The link between the government and the governed is thus described as an 'electoral mandate, for example the current Scottish Government has a mandate to legislate as a result of the 2011 Scottish Parliamentary elections.'</i> A division of labour is created wherein ordinary citizens need not become directly involved in the decision making process. It may also allow those with greater expert knowledge, experience and education to occupy the offices of state. Electoral accountability is an important feature of this type of system. Some however, would argue that the results of such a system don't necessarily proportionately reflect the wishes and aspirations of the various groups within society.</p> <p>This contains one aspect of the difference between direct and indirect democracy, with detailed descriptions (2 marks) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations (2 marks).</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Award up to 6 marks for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary (identifying the component parts and their relationships)</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p>		<p><i>In a system of direct democracy everyone is directly involved in making decisions but in large-scale societies this is impractical. Representative democracy allows everyone's views to be taken into account in a way that is more practical in modern society.</i></p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical statement. This is worth 1 mark.</p> <p><i>In a system of direct democracy everyone is directly involved in making decisions but in large-scale societies this is impractical. Representative democracy allows everyone's views to be taken into account in a way that is more practical in modern society.</i></p> <p><i>Schumpeter considered representative democracy a credible solution to the problem of most people simply not having sufficient time or expertise to be able to continuously engage in complex political debate. This system enabled individuals to select from a variety of politicians/parties, each offering different policy options. In this way political elites present themselves to the electorate on a regular basis and remain accountable to the electorate for the decisions they make.</i></p> <p>This is worth 2 marks due to additional justification and supporting evidence.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>The ideas of many different theorists could be used to answer this question. Candidates for example may use Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, Paine, Schumpeter, De Tocqueville, Dahl.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p><i>In conclusion, direct democracy lets people participate directly in decision-making but representative democracy means that professional politicians are elected instead.</i></p> <p>This provides a straightforward if limited conclusion which does attempt to deal with the central issue as identified by the question (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p><i>In conclusion, direct democracy is superior to representative democracy. Direct democracy lets people participate directly in decision-making but representative democracy means that professional politicians are elected instead. Direct democracy allows individuals to participate directly in the decision-making process, and in so doing express their own opinions and desires without any need to elect what may become self-serving politicians.</i></p> <p>This provides a straightforward conclusion which does deal with the central issue but also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question (2 marks).</p> <p><i>In conclusion, representative democracy is superior to direct democracy. Direct democracy may let people participate directly in decision-making</i></p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p><i>but representative democracy means that professional politicians are elected instead, which is much more practical. Schumpeter argued that most people simply didn't have the time or proficiency to engage in such activity. In addition, this then allows those with superior knowledge, experience and education to take-up the offices of state. To allow all citizens the right to participate directly in the political decision-making process was not something that all theorists were happy to condone; Plato, for example, disapproved of the 'masses' being considered capable of making such important decisions. Such people were, according to him, likely to be too easily influenced by the great orators. For example, it has been alleged that the Mormon Church influenced the outcome of the Proposition 8 vote in California on gay marriage by spending large amounts of money to influence voters. One of the arguments advocated by supporters of direct forms of democracy is that it heightens the awareness of the citizenry, however given social media and the 24 hour news cycle voters are now much more politically aware than they may have been in the past.</i></p> <p>This provides a very detailed conclusion which directly addresses and evaluates the key issues in the question and provides a high level of sophistication as it develops a line of thought with supporting justification (4 marks).</p> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly as long as these evaluate the issue identified in the question.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>Structure</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>For example, candidates should be credited highly for answers which define the central issue in their introduction, and provide a clear structure so that their essay develops a line of argument. Candidates should receive little or no credit for answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question (eg by failing to discuss differences between direct and indirect democracy with reference to the ideas of relevant theorists), or provide poorly structured answers which jump between different parts of the question and hence fail to develop a coherent line of argument.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
(b)	<p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of political ideologies as appropriate to the question, and any links between them.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to the works of appropriate theorists to gain full marks; otherwise no more than 13 marks should be allocated.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. <p>Analysis</p> <p>Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p>	20	<p>Knowledge and understanding If for example a candidate chose socialism and nationalism:</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background: the development of the two ideologies - ie for socialism, the Marxist critique of the impact of the Industrial Revolution and development of ideas of wealth equality, the replacement of the capitalist system by one of common ownership and the end of the class structure. • Attitudes towards the human nature (international fraternity for socialism, national self-interest for nationalism). • The key features associated with socialist ideology (community, comradeship, class, social equality and common ownership) and nationalist ideology (national identity, defence of the state and the sovereignty of the people). • The ideas of socialist theorist Karl Marx as outlined in <i>Capital</i> and nationalist theorist Johan Gottfried Herder as outlined in <i>Reflections on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind</i>. <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>Marx thought that the capitalist system was unfair and exploitative because a small elite group were able to exploit the profit earned from other people's labour. He influenced socialists to strive for an alternative system where wealth was fairly owned and shared. Herder opposed the Enlightenment, emphasising instead the distinctive 'spirit' central to each nation.</p> <p>This contains one aspect of the difference between socialism and nationalism, but with limited description (1 mark).</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between different components • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure. <p>Conclusion(s)</p> <p>Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence 		<p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>Marx thought that the capitalist system was unfair and exploitative because a small elite group were able to take the profit earned from other people's labour. He influenced socialists to strive for an alternative system where the means of production were in common ownership and society's wealth was fairly shared. This change could come about gradually, or as a result of revolution. Herder opposed Enlightenment rationalism, preferring instead to emphasise the distinctive 'spirit' central to each nation. He considered nations to be distinguished by attributes specific to them such as language, culture and land.</p> <p>This contains one aspect of the difference between socialism and nationalism, but with limited description (1 mark) and limited development with some exemplification or explanations (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 4 marks:</p> <p>Marx provided a critique of the impact of the Industrial Revolution and the subsequent emergence of the capitalist system. He thought that this system was unfair and exploitative because it allowed a small elite group (the bourgeoisie) to buy labour, and take the profit earned, from a much larger group (the proletariat). This, he argued, was possible because the existing social circumstances conspired to dull people's understanding of their situation. They lived in a state of what Marx called 'false consciousness.' He influenced socialists to strive to create a better alternative, one where the means of production (known as 'capital') were held in common ownership and administered by means of a command economy. In this way the state would be able to distribute society's wealth equally and fairly. Socialists differ in their views regarding how this could be achieved; some (gradualists) believe that change should come about step by step, others (revolutionaries) argue for fast and radical change.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the relative importance of factors • counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations • the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> <p>Structure</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>Award up to maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 12 marks for analysis/evaluation/structure.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p>		<p>Herder is considered to have been a founding figure of cultural nationalism. He led the intellectual challenge against Enlightenment rationalism. Instead, he argued for the importance of the nation. This, he characterised as being a collective organic entity made distinct by a number of crucial, and often quite unique, factors such as culture, language and land. These, and other factors, then helped to provide a nation with what he described as being its own, and very specific, 'spirit.' His was therefore, a philosophical perspective which placed most emphasis on the intrinsic worth of national culture. Nationalists tend therefore, to stress the importance of an individual's place within his nation state, and also the need for him to defend his nation's sovereignty from the threat posed by other nations. But whilst such a threat may become real, some argue that nationalism is essentially a 'psycho-political' ideology, in that it has as much to do with emotion and personal-identity as it has with objective character.</p> <p>This contains detailed description of Marx's socialist and Herder's nationalist ideologies (2 marks) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations (2 marks).</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Award up to 6 marks for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary (identifying the component parts and their relationships)</p> <p><i>In one very important sense, Marx's socialism and Herder's nationalism are similar: both are collectivist models, each of which places social solidarity before any liberal, or other individualistic, model.</i></p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical statement. This is worth 1 mark.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p><i>In one very important sense, Marx's socialism and Herder's nationalism are similar: both are collectivist models, each of which places social solidarity before any liberal, or other individualistic, model.</i></p> <p><i>Socialists provide an economic argument that capitalism is based on the exploitation of the working class and collective action is required to create a fairer more equitable society. The nationalist argument however, is based on emotional factors concerning personal-identity in relation to one's nation.</i></p> <p>This is worth 2 marks due to additional justification and supporting evidence.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p><i>In conclusion, socialism is wary of the state's support for the capitalist system, whereas nationalism tends to see the state as a vital component in the defence of the nation.</i></p> <p>This provides a straightforward if limited conclusion which does attempt to deal with the central issue as identified by the question (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p><i>In conclusion, whilst both ideologies represent collectivist models they differ in a very important way. Socialism is wary of the state's support for the capitalist system, whereas nationalism tends to see the state as a vital component in the defence of the nation. Socialism concentrates on the similarities that exist between the peoples of different societies under</i></p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p><i>capitalism. Nationalism emphasises the racial, linguistic and traditional traits specific to that nation. It therefore, focuses on the differences that exist between nations.</i></p> <p>This provides a straightforward conclusion which does deal with the central issue but also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question (2 marks).</p> <p><i>In conclusion, whilst both ideologies represent collectivist models they differ in a very important way. Socialism is wary of the state's support for the capitalist system, whereas nationalism tends to see the state as a vital component in the defence of the nation. Socialism concentrates on the similarities that exist between the peoples of different societies under capitalism. Nationalism emphasises the racial, linguistic and traditional traits specific to that nation. It therefore, focuses on the differences that exist between nations.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the socialist argument is an economic one which states that if the working classes ceased to be exploited, then society would become fair and equitable. The nationalist argument, on the other hand, is largely a psycho-political one, and derived from a variety of emotional factors to do with personal-identity in relation to one's nation. This then means that whereas a socialist perspective concentrates on the collective economic position of all, despite the state - a nationalist perspective instead focuses primarily on an individual's loyalty to his nation, and thus to the state which protects it. Furthermore, whereas Marx thought that the existing social order conspired to dull people's perception of reality and thus trick them into functioning in a state of 'false consciousness', Herder celebrated the existence, within each nation, of a national 'spirit.'</i></p> <p><i>Finally, the difference between these two ideologies could best be summarised by saying that socialists seek to achieve equality for the people whilst nationalists seek to defend the sovereignty of a nation's people.</i></p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>This provides a very detailed conclusion which directly addresses and evaluates the key issues in the question and provides a high level of sophistication as it develops a line of thought with supporting justification (4 marks).</p> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly as long as these evaluate the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Structure Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>For example, candidates should be credited highly for answers which define the central issue in their introduction, and provide a clear structure so that their essay develops a line of argument. Candidates should receive little or no credit for answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question (eg by failing to discuss differences between socialist and nationalist ideology with reference to the ideas of two relevant theorists), or provide poorly structured answers which jump between different parts of the question and hence fail to develop a coherent line of argument.</p>

Section 2 - Political Systems

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
2.	<p>Candidates must demonstrate they can make accurate comparisons and draw valid conclusions.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must refer to all sources and also say to what extent the evidence supports the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Analysis/evaluation</p> <p>Comparisons will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying areas of differences • identifying areas of similarity • making evaluative comments on the extent of these differences/ similarities • commenting on the consequences of these differences/similarities. <p>For full marks, candidates must use both sources and make three points of comparison.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for each accurate point of comparison and analytical comment.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 6 marks for accurate comparisons with associated analysis.</p>	8	<p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the UK Parliament is Sovereign. The Supreme Court cannot overturn any primary legislation made by Parliament but it can review the actions of Government and review secondary legislation. • The UK Supreme Court is the highest court in the United Kingdom, but not for criminal matters in Scotland. In addition, citizens can take cases to the European Court of Human Rights which can overturn decisions made in the UK. • Appointments to the UK Supreme Court are generally non-controversial and are not seen as party political decisions. They generate very little public interest or political debate. Appointments are made independently of political influence. <p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Supreme Court has the power of Judicial Review. It can invalidate laws passed by congress ie citizens united decision, as well as reviewing the actions of the executive branch. • The US Supreme Court is also the final court of appeal and its decisions cannot be overturned. It hears cases and settles disputes that have progressed through both the Federal courts system and the State Court system. • Appointments to the US Supreme Court are major political decisions. In fact, the appointments made by a President are seen by many as the most significant decisions they will make in office due to the impact Supreme Court Judges can have long after a President has left office. A Supreme Court justice is increasingly seen as a highly political post. <p>Credit any other relevant comparisons.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	Award up to 2 marks for an overall conclusion.		<p>Analysis</p> <p>In the US the Supreme Court has the power of Judicial Review and can overturn laws passed by Congress as well as reviewing the actions of the executive branch.</p> <p>In the UK the Supreme Court cannot overturn primary legislation passed by Parliament but can review secondary legislation and the actions of Government.</p> <p>One point of comparison is identified from two sources (1 mark).</p> <p>In the US the Supreme Court has the power of Judicial Review and can overturn laws passed by Congress as well as reviewing the actions of the executive branch. In the UK the Supreme Court cannot overturn primary legislation passed by Parliament but can review secondary legislation and the actions of Government.</p> <p>The US Supreme court therefore is in a much more powerful position as it can override laws passed by Congress and has made some of the most significant decisions affecting the US. In the UK Parliament is sovereign and its primary legislation cannot be blocked by the UK Supreme Court.</p> <p>One point of comparison is identified from two sources (1 mark) and a relevant analytical comment is made (1 mark).</p> <p>Conclusions</p> <p>Overall, the US Supreme Court has a much higher status than in the UK.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>A straightforward overall conclusion (1 mark)</p> <p>Overall, the US Supreme Court has a much higher status than in the UK. Unlike the UK Supreme Court it is undoubtedly the single highest court and its decisions are effectively final. It can invalidate laws passed by the legislature unlike in the UK and the appointment process is also much more important decision as reflected by the role of the executive and legislative branches in appointing justices.</p> <p>A detailed conclusion is made (2 marks).</p> <p>Candidates may make individual evaluative comments as they address each part of the question or they may produce a summative evaluation of each part of the question at the conclusion to their answer – both approaches should be credited.</p>

Question		General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
3.	(a)	<p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of two political systems, adopting a comparative approach as appropriate to the question.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question to gain up to full marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. 	12	<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>If for example the UK and US political systems were chosen:</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question (candidates must address at least two aspects to achieve full marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bill of Rights entrenched in the US constitution and guaranteed. The incorporation of the European Convention on Human Rights into law in the UK as a result of legislation - the Human Rights Act 1998. • Constitutional rights in the US can be very inflexible as a result of the complicated amendment process but the UK is very flexible as only legislation is required to be passed by parliament. • The role of the judiciary in both systems and the power of courts in the US to overturn legislation if it infringes constitutionally protected rights <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>Individuals in the UK have their rights protected by legislation ie the Human Rights Act (1998) and individuals in the USA have their rights protected by various amendments to the American Constitution. These amendments are known as The Bill of Rights.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Analysis/evaluation</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Comparisons will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying areas of differences • identifying areas of similarity • making evaluative comments on the extent of these • differences/similarities • commenting on the consequences of these differences/similarities. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p>		<p>This contains one relevant aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>Individuals in the UK have their rights protected by legislation ie the Human Rights Act (1998). For example, the Act completely abolished the death penalty in the UK. The death penalty still exists in some states in the USA but individuals have their rights protected by the first ten amendments to the American Constitution which is known as The Bill of Rights. For example, the first amendment guarantees the right to free speech.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect more detailed description (2 marks).</p> <p>The following would be awarded up to 4 marks:</p> <p>Individuals in the UK have their rights protected by legislation ie the Human Rights Act (1998). The Act incorporates the individual rights contained within the European Convention on Human Rights. UK citizens now have all the rights contained within the European Convention. One example was the case of Venables and Thompson, the child murderers of Jamie Bulger. Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights protected their privacy and newspapers are still not allowed to reveal their new identities.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p>		<p>Several amendments to the American Constitution provide individuals with powerful rights. The first ten amendments to the US constitution are known as the Bill of Rights. A good example is the 5th amendment which protects individuals against providing evidence to the police and the courts which might incriminate themselves. The concept of “Miranda rights” was enshrined in U.S. law following the 1966 Miranda v. Arizona Supreme Court decision, which found that the Fifth and Sixth Amendment rights of Ernesto Arturo Miranda had been violated by the Phoenix Arizona police department.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect detailed description (2 marks) and detailed development with exemplification and explanations (2 marks).</p> <p>Analysis/Evaluation</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for analytical comments that compare the similarities and differences between the two political systems. To gain 4 marks candidates must make analytical comparative comments on each of the aspects covered in their answer; otherwise a maximum of up to 3 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Therefore individual rights in the USA are stronger than in the UK. Rights are enshrined in the Constitution. However, in the UK the Human Rights Act is very recent and could potentially be changed by a future parliament.</p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical and comparative comment and is worth 1 mark.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>Therefore individual rights in the USA are stronger than in the UK. Rights are enshrined in the Constitution. Therefore legislation cannot be passed by Congress which infringes these rights. It is the job of all branches of US Government to uphold the Constitution whereas in the UK, Parliament is sovereign and can use legislation to alter individual rights. The Conservative Party's immigration bill has tried to make sure that illegal migrants and others cannot abuse article 8 of the European Convention- "the right to a family life" - to prevent their deportation from Britain. The current Conservative government is committed to replacing the Human Rights Act which many opponents have argued will adversely affect individual rights in the UK.</p> <p>This is a detailed analytical and comparative comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant point.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
(b)	<p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of two political systems, adopting a comparative approach as appropriate to the question.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question to gain up to full marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. 	12	<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>If for example the UK and Scottish political systems were chosen:</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question (candidates must address at least two aspects to achieve full marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parliamentary procedures such as Question Time, Prime Minister’s Question Time and First Minister Question Time in Scotland. • The role of Parliamentary Committees in scrutinising the actions of government in the UK and Scotland. • Debates such as Adjournment debates in the UK, ten minute rule bills and parliamentary consideration of opposition motions. • The role of the House of Lords in the UK <p>Credit any other relevant points</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>In the UK Houses of Commons and Lords there are select committees which scrutinise the work of government departments by carrying out investigations and producing reports. The Scottish parliament also has a number of mandatory committees which can hold hearings, carry out investigations and produce reports.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Analysis/evaluation</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Comparisons will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying areas of differences • identifying areas of similarity • making evaluative comments on the extent of these • differences/similarities • commenting on the consequences of these differences/similarities. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p>		<p>This contains one relevant aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>In the UK Houses of Commons and Lords there are select committees which scrutinise the work of government departments by carrying out investigations and producing reports. The composition of select committees is representative of the composition of MPs in the House of Commons. This means that if the government has a majority in parliament it will have a majority of its MPs on these committees. However, the chair of these committees is chosen by backbench MPs and can be from opposition parties.</p> <p>The Scottish parliament has a number of mandatory and subject committees which can hold hearings, carry out investigations and produce reports. Scottish Parliament committees reflect party strength but their convenors are decided by the members of these committees and are often from a range of parties.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect more detailed description (2 marks).</p> <p>The following would be awarded up to 4 marks:</p> <p>In the UK Houses of Commons and Lords there are select committees which scrutinise the work of government departments by carrying out investigations and producing reports. The composition of select committees is representative of the composition of MPs in the House of Commons. This means that if the government has a majority in parliament it will have a majority of its MPs on these committees. However, the chair of these committees is chosen by backbench MPs and can be from opposition parties. The Foreign Affairs Select Committee, despite having a majority of Labour MPs, carried out an investigation into the reasons for Britain's participation and invasion of Iraq. Tony Blair was called to give evidence and the committee produced a report which criticised a number of actions taken by the government.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p>		<p>The Scottish parliament has a number of mandatory and subject committees which can hold hearings, carry out investigations and produce reports. Mandatory committees tend to shadow government departments while subject committees scrutinise legislation relating to a particular area. Scottish Parliament committees reflect party strength but their convenors are decided by the members of these committees and are often from a range of parties. A few years ago a Scottish parliament committee questioned the First Minister over claims of his links with Donald Trump.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect detailed description (2 marks) and detailed development with exemplification and explanations (2 marks). Analysis/Evaluation.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for analytical comments that compare the similarities and differences between the two political systems. To gain 4 marks candidates must make analytical comparative comments on each of the aspects covered in their answer; otherwise a maximum of up to 3 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>In the UK parliament, select committees are seen as one of the most effective ways to scrutinise the government by questioning in detail and carrying out investigations. This is also the case in the Scottish parliament where committees allow MSPs the chance to question Ministers and Civil Servants in detail.</p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical and comparative comment and is worth 1 mark.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>In the UK parliament, select committees are seen as one of the most effective ways to scrutinise the government by questioning in detail and carrying out investigations. For example, the Culture and Media Select Committee questioned Jeremy Hunt about his decision to initially endorse the bid from News International to take over Sky News. This is also the case in the Scottish parliament where committees allow MSPs the chance to question Ministers and Civil Servants in detail.</p> <p>This is a detailed analytical and comparative comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant point.</p>

Section 3 - Political Parties and Elections

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
4.	<p>Candidates must demonstrate that they can interpret and evaluate electoral data.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must refer to all sources and also say to what extent the data supports the statement made.</p> <p>Analysis/evaluation</p> <p>Award up to 3 marks for answers that correctly interpret electoral data and link this to a specific part of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an evaluation of the validity of each part of the viewpoint.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must address both parts of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 6 marks for interpretation of data linked to each part of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 2 marks for evaluation of the validity of the viewpoint.</p>	8	<p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2009 Michael Bloomberg only achieved 51% of the vote and there was only 5% of a difference between the 2 candidates across the city as a whole. • Michael Bloomberg won significant victories in Staten Island, Manhattan and Queens. In Staten Island he achieved twice as many votes as his opponent. • Thompson easily beat Bloomberg in the Bronx and also beat him in Brooklyn. <p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The winning candidate Bill de Blasio won with nearly 75% of the vote citywide. • Bill de Blasio secured massive victories in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens. • Joe Lhota defeated De Blasio in Staten Island. <p>Source C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill de Blasio was successful with all racial groups, polling a higher % of the vote than his opponent. • Bill de Blasio easily defeated his opponent amongst all ethnic minority groups for example among blacks 96% voted for de Blasio and only 3% for his opponent. The results were closer between white voters (54% for de Blasio and 43% for Lhota) However, he still beat him by 11 points. • In 2013, de Blasio easily defeated his opponent in all income groups, for example he achieved almost two thirds of the vote in the \$100,000 income category. It was significantly higher in the other two income groups (with 86% in the less than \$50,000 category and 75% in the \$50,000-\$99,999 group. • De Blasio defeated Lhota in every single age group by significant margins.

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>Credit any other relevant information.</p> <p>Analysis: interpretation</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p><i>The view states that across the city as a whole and in each of the five boroughs, both Michael Bloomberg in 2009 and Bill De Blasio in 2013, overwhelmingly defeated their opponents in the elections for New York Mayor. Source A shows that Bloomberg, the winner in 2009 won with only 51 % of the vote whereas in Source B De Blasio the winning candidate in 2013 won with nearly 75% of the vote.</i></p> <p>One aspect of evidence is interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the first part of the statement (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p><i>The view states across the city as a whole and in each of the five boroughs, both Michael Bloomberg in 2009 and Bill De Blasio in 2013, overwhelmingly defeated their opponents in the elections for New York Mayor. Source A shows that Bloomberg, the winner in 2009 won with only 51 % of the vote whereas in Source B De Blasio the winning candidate in 2013 won with nearly 75% of the vote.</i></p> <p><i>In 2009 Bloomberg won by over 10% of the vote in 3 of the 5 boroughs but Bill Thompson beat him in 2 (the Bronx and Queens) and although De Blasio won big victories in 4 of the 5 boroughs his opponent won in Staten Island.</i></p> <p>Two or more aspects of evidence are interpreted correctly and linked to the first part of the statement (2 marks).</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>The following would be awarded 3 marks:</p> <p><i>The view states that across the city as a whole and in each of the five boroughs, both Michael Bloomberg in 2009 and Bill De Blasio in 2013, overwhelmingly defeated their opponents in the elections for New York Mayor. Source A shows that Bloomberg, the winner in 2009 won with only 51 % of the vote whereas in Source B De Blasio the winning candidate in 2013 won with nearly 75% of the vote.</i></p> <p><i>In 2009 Bloomberg won by over 10% of the vote in 3 of the 5 boroughs but Bill Thompson beat him in 2 (the Bronx and Queens) and although De Blasio won big victories in 4 of the 5 boroughs his opponent won in Staten Island.</i></p> <p><i>De Blasio did overwhelmingly defeat his opponent (73%-24%) whereas Bloomberg only narrowly won (51%-46%) and neither candidate won in each of the 5 boroughs.</i></p> <p>Two or more aspects of evidence are synthesised and linked correctly to the first part of the statement with commentary (3 marks).</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p><i>Overall the evidence does not really support the view that both victors won overwhelmingly across the city and in each of the 5 boroughs. De Blasio did win easily across the city but not in every area and Bloomberg only very narrowly beat his opponent citywide and also did not win in each of the five boroughs.</i></p> <p>An evaluative comment is made on one part of the statement (1 mark).</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
			<p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p><i>Overall the evidence does not really support the view that both victors won overwhelmingly across the city and in each of the 5 boroughs. De Blasio did win easily across the city but not in every area and Bloomberg only very narrowly beat his opponent citywide and also did not win in each of the five boroughs.</i></p> <p><i>However the evidence does appear to support the view that De Blasio comprehensively defeated his opponent in each section of society as he won every single age, race and income group. His smallest margin of victory was among whites but he still comprehensively beat his opponent by over 10% of the votes in this group.</i></p> <p>Evaluative comments on the validity of both parts of the statement have been made.</p> <p>Candidates may make individual evaluative comments as they address each part of the viewpoint or they may produce a summative evaluation of each part of the viewpoint at the conclusion to their answer – both approaches should be credited.</p>

Question		General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
5.	(a)	<p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of factors that affect the electoral performance of political parties as appropriate to the question.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question to gain up to full marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. 	12	<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of social class in influencing voting behaviour. • Factors leading to class dealignment. • Other socio-economic factors such as age, gender, region. <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>For example, the following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>The Sociological Model is based on the idea that voters would favour a party based on their social groupings, for example this could be their Social Class, with middle class people more likely to vote for the Conservatives and the working classes more likely to vote Labour.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Analysis/evaluation</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Comparisons will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying areas of differences • identifying areas of similarity • making evaluative comments on the extent of these • differences/similarities • commenting on the consequences of these differences/similarities. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p>		<p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>The Sociological Model is based on the idea that voters would favour a party based on their social groupings, for example this could be their Social Class, with middle class people more likely to vote for the Conservatives and the working classes more likely to vote Labour.</p> <p>There was evidence of a link between a person’s social class as measured by their occupation and their party preference. A, B and C1 voters (professional and managerial occupations) traditionally supported the Conservatives and voters in occupational classes C2, D and E (manual occupations) were much more likely to support Labour.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with more detailed description (2 marks).</p> <p>The following would be awarded up to 4 marks:</p> <p>The Sociological Model is based on the idea that voters would favour a party based on their social groupings, for example this could be their Social Class, with middle class people more likely to vote for the Conservatives and the working classes more likely to vote Labour.</p> <p>There was evidence of a link between a person’s social class as measured by their occupation and their party preference. A, B and C1 voters (professional and managerial occupations) traditionally supported the Conservatives and voters in occupational classes C2, D and E (manual occupations) were much more likely to support Labour.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p>		<p>For example, in the period from the Second World War up to the 1970's this appeared to be the case. In the 1950's and 1960's, most voters could be categorised as middle class Conservatives or working class Labour supporters with high levels of absolute class voting. In these years, Labour and the Conservatives between them often accounted for over 95% of total votes cast. The significance of class led Pulzer to state that social class was the basis of party politics, everything else was just "embellishment and detail".</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (2 marks) and detailed development with exemplification and explanation (2 marks).</p> <p>Analysis/Evaluation</p> <p>It is clear to see that the Sociological Model no longer holds the relevance that it did in previous years. The support for the two main parties has declined from over 95% in the 1950's to around 65% in 2010.</p> <p>This is a straightforward evaluative comment and is worth 1 mark.</p> <p>It is clear to see that the Sociological Model no longer holds the relevance that it did in previous years. The support for the two main parties has declined from over 95% in the 1950's to around 65% in 2010. There has been an increase in support for smaller parties who attract voters across all classes.</p> <p>During this period the number of A, B and C1 voters supporting the Conservatives has fallen below 50% and in 1997 Labour actually achieved a higher level of support in the C1 category than the Conservatives did. The number of C2, D and E voters supporting Labour has also declined.</p> <p>This is a more detailed evaluative comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
(b)	<p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of factors that affect the electoral performance of political parties as appropriate to the question.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question to gain up to full marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. 	12	<p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>If for example Compassionate Conservatism from the Conservative campaign in 2010 was chosen as the dominant idea:</p> <p>Credit reference to some of the following aspects of the question (candidates must address at least two aspects to achieve full marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deficit reduction. • The Big Society. • Limiting welfare. • Capping immigration. • NHS policy. <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be worth 1 mark:</p> <p>In 2010 the Conservative campaign was based around the ideas of Compassionate Conservatism. The Conservatives promised to ring-fence spending on the NHS. This was to persuade voters that they could be trusted with public services.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with limited description and would be worth 1 mark.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>Analysis/evaluation</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Comparisons will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying areas of differences • identifying areas of similarity • making evaluative comments on the extent of these • differences/similarities • commenting on the consequences of these differences/similarities. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p>		<p>The following would be worth 2 marks:</p> <p>In 2010 the Conservative campaign was based around the ideas of Compassionate Conservatism. The Conservatives promised to ring-fence spending on the NHS. David Cameron campaigned on a pledge that he would cut the deficit but not the NHS. This was to persuade voters that they could be trusted with public services which had been an issue where the Conservatives had trailed behind Labour in previous elections.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with detailed description and would be worth 2 marks.</p> <p>The following would be worth 4 marks:</p> <p>In 2010 the Conservative campaign was based around the ideas of Compassionate Conservatism. The Conservatives promised to ring-fence spending on the NHS. David Cameron campaigned on a pledge that he would cut the deficit but not the NHS. David Cameron also participated in a number of high-profile campaigns against hospital closures. The Conservatives also promised in their manifesto that there would be no top down reorganisation of the NHS. This was to persuade voters that they could be trusted with public services which had been an issue where the Conservatives had trailed behind Labour in previous elections. In previous elections the Conservatives suffered from a perception that they would cut public services and had been labelled as the “nasty party”. Another example was the Conservative commitment to maintain the levels of international aid budget. This campaign was designed to attract disillusioned Labour and floating voters.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with detailed descriptions (2 marks) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations.</p>

Question	General Marking Instructions for this type of question	Max Mark	Specific Marking Instructions for this question
	<p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p>		<p>Analysis/Evaluation</p> <p>The Conservative focus on the NHS proved to be relatively successful as there was an improvement in how voters thought the Conservatives would deal with public services.</p> <p>This is a straightforward evaluative comment and is worth 1 mark.</p> <p>The Conservative focus on the NHS proved to be relatively successful as there was an improvement in how voters thought the Conservatives would deal with public services. Evidence from opinion polls taken during the campaign showed a significant improvement in voters trust in the Conservatives on the issue of handling public services. This helped the Conservatives to overtake Labour as the party that could be trusted to look after the NHS. This had been an issue in previous elections where Labour consistently had a significant lead over the Conservatives.</p> <p>This is a more detailed evaluative comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p>

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]