



A-level
POLITICS
7152/1

Paper 1 Government and Politics of the UK

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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 from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

For confidentiality purposes acknowledgements of third-party material are published in a separate booklet which is available for free download from www.aqa.org.uk after the live examination series.

Copyright © 2019 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Levels of response mark scheme for 9-mark questions

0 1 Explain and analyse three ways in which the cabinet can limit the power of the Prime Minister. **[9 marks]**

0 2 Explain and analyse three ways in which minor parties can have an impact upon the political agenda in the UK. **[9 marks]**

0 3 Explain and analyse three factors that can lead to some UK pressure groups being more successful than others. **[9 marks]**

Target AO1: 6 marks, AO2: 3 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed knowledge of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes is demonstrated and appropriate political vocabulary is used. (AO1). Thorough explanations and appropriate selection of accurate supporting examples demonstrate detailed understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes (AO1). Analysis of three clear points is structured, clearly focused on the question and confidently developed in to a coherent answer (AO2).
2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally sound knowledge of political concepts, institutions and processes is demonstrated and generally appropriate political vocabulary is used (AO1). Some development of explanations and generally appropriate selection of supporting examples demonstrate generally accurate understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, though further detail may be required in places and some inaccuracies may be present (AO1). Analysis is developed in most places, though some points may be descriptive or in need of further development. Answers, for the most part, are clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material (AO2). <p>Students who only make two relevant points will be limited to this level.</p>
1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited knowledge of political concepts, institutions and processes is demonstrated and little or no appropriate political vocabulary is used (AO1). Limited development of explanations and selection of supporting examples demonstrate limited understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with further detail required and inaccuracies present throughout (AO1). Analysis takes the form of description for the most part. Coherence and structure are limited (AO2). <p>Students who only make one relevant point will be limited to this level.</p>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing worthy of credit.

0	1
---	---

Explain and analyse three ways in which the cabinet can limit the power of the Prime Minister.

[9 marks]

Indicative content

In their explanations and analysis, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- explanation and analysis of the theory of cabinet government, such as the PM as primus inter pares, with limited resources to control government departments that provide cabinet ministers with expertise and support.
- explanation and analysis of the impact and significance of high-profile resignations from the cabinet and the problems that can arise if senior ministers feel ignored, for example, Geoffrey Howe and Thatcher, Johnson and Davies over the Chequers plan.
- explanation and analysis of the impact and significance of divisions and opposition from within the cabinet, such as how factions can form and espouse different policy agendas for example the Brown/Blair relationship, the Quad's influence upon decision making under Cameron.
- explanation and analysis of the PM's constitutional powers of patronage being limited by factors such as the need for an effective cabinet to balance factions of the party, inclusion of potential rivals, ministers who refuse to be reshuffled, coalition government
- explanation and analysis of the impact of leaks and how collective responsibility has been under strain with some ministers remaining in the cabinet despite criticising policy, for example Boris Johnson.

Students are required to consider only three limitations. If a student exceeds this number reward only the best three. However, some may include relevant points not listed above and these should be credited. If a student gives only one or two examples they will receive a maximum of three and six marks respectively.

0	2
---	---

Explain and analyse three ways in which minor parties can have an impact upon the political agenda in the UK.

[9 marks]

Indicative content

In their explanations and analysis, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- explanation and analysis of how minor parties can represent the interest of those left unrepresented and provide a 'protest vote' for example analysis of the significance of UKIP/SNP/Green parties affecting the support for the major parties
- explanation and analysis of the impact upon the electoral landscape within a region and/or particular election, for example, analysis of the significance of the SNP 2015 general election/UKIP 2014 European elections
- explanation and analysis of the impact and significance of minor parties in the devolved assemblies
- explanation and analysis of the impact upon government policy in Westminster, for example, analysis of the significance of DUP's support to the Conservatives
- explanation and analysis of 'agenda setting', for example, the significance of UKIP's policies upon the referendum vote to leave the EU 2016, impact of UKIP/SNP/Green Party/ PC in the leadership debates.

Students are required to consider only three ways in which minor parties can have an impact. If a student exceeds this number reward only the best three. However, some may include relevant points not listed above and these should be credited. If a student gives only one or two examples they will receive a maximum of three and six marks respectively.

0	3
---	---

Explain and analyse three factors that can lead to some UK pressure groups being more successful than others.

[9 marks]

Indicative content

In their explanations and analysis, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- explanation and analysis of pressure group status, such as insider and outsider and their methods used
- explanation and analysis of the aims and philosophy of a group, for example, if the government is sympathetic towards the aims, if the aims of the group is popular with voters
- explanation and analysis of wealth and financial resources, for example, the ability to ‘buy influence’ with political parties and decision makers
- explanation and analysis of size, such as how groups with large memberships are hard to ignore
- explanation and analysis of the strength of opposition, for example, anti-smoking group ASH has been far more successful than its pro-smoking counterpart group Forest
- explanation and analysis of the impact of celebrity endorsement for example, Joanna Lumley and the Gurkha Justice Campaign.

Students are required to consider only three factors that lead to some UK pressure groups being more successful than others. If a student exceeds this number reward only the best three. However, some may include relevant points not listed above and these should be credited. If a student gives only one or two examples they will receive a maximum of three and six marks respectively.

Levels of response mark scheme for 25-mark extract-based essay

0	4
----------	----------

 Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments reported in the above extract regarding the issue of electoral reform.
[25 marks]**Target AO1: 5 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 10 marks**

Level	Marks	Descriptors
5	21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1). • Analysis of the extract is balanced and confidently developed. • Comparisons are well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2). • Evaluation of the above leads to well substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives and/or the status of the extract are successfully evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3). • The answer is well organised, coherent and has a sustained analytical focus on the question (AO2).
4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion, though further detail may be required in places (AO1). • Analysis of the extract is balanced and developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further. • Comparisons are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2). • Evaluation leads to conclusions that show some substantiation and consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives and/or the status of the extract are evaluated in constructing arguments, although in some places there could be further development (AO3). • The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set.
3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1). • Analytical points relating to the extract are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. • Comparisons are made and may be supported by examples (AO2). • Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion, but that lack substantiation (AO3). • Relevant perspectives and/or the status of the extract are commented on in constructing arguments, though evaluation is lacking depth (AO3). • The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set.
2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though these contain inaccuracies and irrelevant material (AO1).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of the extract takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are unsupported assertions (AO2). • Comparisons tend to be limited and unsupported by examples (AO2). • Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives are identified and some awareness of the status of the extract is shown in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation will be superficial (AO3). • The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).
1	1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1). • Analysis of the extract takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2). • Comparisons tend to be superficial and undeveloped (AO2). • Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3). • Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives and the status of the extract is present (AO3). • The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing worthy of credit.

0 4 Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments reported in the above extract regarding the issue of electoral reform.

[25 marks]

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation of the debate regarding the issue of electoral reform, as made in the article, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis of the extent to which FPTP “hands power” to the two main parties in Parliament
- evaluation and comparison of public attitudes towards reforming FPTP or maintaining the “status quo”
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which “under a more proportional system”, seats would be allocated more fairly in relation to votes cast
- analysis and evaluation of why Caroline Lucas and minor parties have a “vested interest” in the issue of electoral reform
- analysis and evaluation of how electoral reform would strengthen democracy
- analysis and evaluation of Steve Double’s argument that “FPTP consistently produces majority governments that can govern”
- analysis and evaluation of Steve Double’s argument that “FPTP is easy to understand”
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which FPTP “allows a direct link between an MP and their constituents”
- evaluation of Chris Skidmore’s argument of “why the government had no plans to change the voting system”
- evaluation and analysis of the Electoral Reform Society’s argument that the “2011 referendum should not be seen as a rejection of proportional representation.”

The analysis and evaluation of any political information is affected by:

- who the author is - their position or role
- the type of publication - newspaper, academic journal, electronic media
- the overt or implicit purpose of the author - to inform, persuade or influence
- the relevance of the extract to a political issue or concern, and how representative the extract is of a particular viewpoint.

Students will be expected to address some of these factors in their analysis and evaluation of the extract.

- In relation to the extract for this question, reference should be made to the fact that it was published on the BBC website. Some responses may refer to the BBC's Editorial Guidelines that set out the principles and practices that cover the BBC's commitment to due impartiality. The extract is informative and does not try to persuade the reader towards a particular side of the debate upon electoral reform.
- Evaluation of relevant perspectives within the extract, such as Caroline Lucas, Steve Double, Chris Skidmore and the Electoral Reform Society.

Students are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments presented in the article. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views may be awarded marks for analysis (AO2). To gain marks for evaluation (AO3) students must assess the relative strengths of the differing arguments. The analysis and evaluation must clearly focus on the arguments presented in the article.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples. Students who fail to focus their discussion on the arguments in the article, however complete their answer may otherwise be, cannot achieve above level 2.

Levels of response mark scheme for 25-mark essays

0 5 'There have been few significant changes to the British constitution since 1997.' Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

0 6 'Parliament is not an effective check on the executive.' Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

Target AO1: 5 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 10 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
5	21-25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1). Analysis is balanced and confidently developed (AO2). Synoptic links are well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2). Evaluation leads to well substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3). Relevant perspectives are successfully evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3). The answer is well organised, coherent with a sustained analytical focus on the question (AO2).
4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion, though further detail may be required in places (AO1). Analysis is balanced developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further (AO2). Synoptic links are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2). Evaluation leads to conclusions that show some substantiation and consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3). Relevant perspectives are evaluated in the process of constructing arguments, although in some places there could be further development of the evaluation (AO3). The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set.
3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1). Analytical points are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical. Synoptic links will be made, though explanation will lack depth (AO2). Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion, but that lack substantiation (AO3). Relevant perspectives are commented on in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation lacks depth (AO3). The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set.
2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions

		<p>and processes are used to support points made, though these contain inaccuracies and irrelevant material (AO1).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are unsupported assertions (AO2). • Synoptic links tend to be limited and undeveloped (AO2). • Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and there is no clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3). • Relevant perspectives are identified, though evaluation is superficial (AO3). • The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).
1	1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1). • Analysis takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2). • Few if any synoptic links are offered (AO2). • Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3). • Synoptic points tend to be superficial and undeveloped (AO2). • Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives is present (AO3). • The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing worthy of credit.

0	5
---	---

'There have been few significant changes to the British constitution since 1997.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

[25 marks]

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation of the statement students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of the significance of devolution upon parliamentary sovereignty and the impact of legislation such as the Scotland Act 1998/Scotland Act 2016 upon devolved powers
- analysis and evaluation of the significance of changes to rights, such as the impact of the Human Rights Act 1998
- analysis and evaluation of the significance and extent of decentralisation, such as elected mayors
- analysis and evaluation of the significance of parliamentary reforms such as the Fixed Term Parliaments Act 2011, Recall of MPs Act 2015.
- analysis and evaluation of the significance of the process of reform to the House of Lords, for example, analysis of the phases of reform since the House of Lords Act 1999
- analysis and evaluation of the significance of electoral reform, such as an increase in the use of proportional electoral systems in devolved and European elections in comparison to the lack of reform for Westminster elections
- analysis and evaluation of changes to the judiciary, such as an evaluation of the impact and significance of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005
- analysis and evaluation of the extent and significance of constitutional reform under New Labour, 1997-2010, in comparison to under the Conservatives 2010 onwards
- analysis and evaluation of changes to conventions.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as comparisons with the 'tortuous' formal amendment process of the USA's codified constitution, devolution, federalism, Parliament, electoral systems, the European Union, referendums. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above level 4.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples.

0	6
---	---

'Parliament is not an effective check on the executive.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

[25 marks]

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation of the statement, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of the theories of elective dictatorship and the fusion of powers, exacerbated by factors such as party discipline and size of majority
- analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of parliamentary questions such as PMQs, for example, effective parliamentary scrutiny or 'Punch and Judy' politics
- analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of parliamentary committees, such as select committees, for example, the impact of the Wright reforms, party composition, the impact of reports. Examples of particular committees could be used to illustrate the points made, such as Home Affairs and Windrush
- analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the Opposition and how this can vary according to circumstances, for example, size of the government majority, the party leaders, party unity
- analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the House of Lords, such as how the Lords can and does 'flex its muscles'. However, the Lords is a revising chamber and is restricted by the Parliament Acts of 1911 and 1949
- analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of back bench MPs for example, the impact of backbench rebellions, the backbench business committee.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as the political context linked to the electoral system and size of majority produced, the mandate, political parties, the powers and resources of committees in the UK in comparison to their USA counterparts, the executive, bicameralism in the UK compared to the USA, the fusion of powers in comparison to the separation of powers in the USA. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above level 4.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples.