

A-level  
**POLITICS**  
**7152/1**

Paper 1 Government and politics of the UK

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2023

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

**Copyright information**

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

Copyright © 2023 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.

## Section A

### Levels of response mark scheme for 9-mark questions

- 0 | 1** Explain and analyse three ways in which the results of elections have an impact on the types of government formed in the UK. **[9 marks]**
- 0 | 2** Explain and analyse three ways in which rights are protected in the UK. **[9 marks]**
- 0 | 3** Explain and analyse three methods used by UK pressure groups to achieve their aims. **[9 marks]**

### Target AO1: 6 marks, AO2: 3 marks

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

0	1
---	---

Explain and analyse three ways in which the results of elections have an impact on the types of government formed in the UK.

**[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 impact of a landslide general election upon government (eg 1997, 1983, 2019) when the government is in a commanding position to push its legislative agenda through Parliament
- explanation and analysis of the outcome of winning with a small majority (eg 2015). Prime ministers may struggle to get legislative proposals through Parliament (eg EU referendum bill 2015). The government may have to rely on the support of smaller parties. Defeats may be more likely in the House of Lords
- explanation and analysis of the impact upon the type of government caused by a hung Parliament, such as 2010 or 2017. A minority government may be formed (eg February 1974 or 2017 when Theresa May agreed a confidence and supply deal with the DUP). A coalition government was formed with the Liberal Democrats in 2010
- explanation and analysis of other elections such as to devolved administrations and the impact upon the types of government produced due to the more proportional electoral systems used (eg Welsh Parliament (Senedd), with Labour in power either alone or in coalition; SNP led minority government in Scotland).

Students are required to consider only three ways. 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 rights are protected 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 rights are protected by Parliament and the passing of statute law, such as the Human Rights Act 1998, the Freedom of Information Act 2000, the Equality Act 2010 or the Marriage Act 2013
- explanation and analysis of how rights are protected by the judiciary who exercise the rule of law, such as via the ongoing development of common law rights (eg R(Unison) v Lord Chancellor 2017) or the Supreme Court's use of its power of judicial review to issue a declaration of incompatibility where a parliamentary statute violates the rights guaranteed under the Human Rights Act 1998
- explanation and analysis of how individual and collective rights are protected by the many pressure groups within the UK that raise awareness of threats to civil rights and pressurise the government (eg The Fawcett Society, Liberty, Stonewall)
- explanation and analysis of how rights are protected by international agreements and organisations, such as the many UN human rights treaties or rulings made by the European Court of Human Rights
- explanation and analysis of how rights are protected within the institutional framework by committees such as the Equalities and Human Right Commission or the Joint Committee on Human Rights in Parliament or principles such as rule of law.

Students are required to consider only three ways. 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 methods used by UK pressure groups to achieve their aims.

**[9 marks]****Indicative content**

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

- explanation and analysis of lobbying at Westminster and Whitehall that are methods often used by insider groups, such as meeting regularly with decision makers (eg the Fawcett Society and its monthly All Party Parliamentary Group meetings with MPs; specialist evidence provided to select committees, such as the BMA and the sugar tax). Insider groups often employ lobbyists and reference may be made to the revolving door syndrome
- explanation and analysis of direct action, such as organising public demonstrations that are often used by outsider groups (eg Black Lives Matter marches 2020, the climate crisis protests organised by Extinction Rebellion) and strikes (eg NEU 2023)
- explanation and analysis of bringing test cases to court, such as ClientEarth who successfully used the high court to challenge government policy on air pollution 2018
- explanation and analysis of lobbying beyond Westminster and Whitehall, such as the devolved administrations (eg ASH and its lobbying of the Scottish Parliament to introduce a ban on smoking in public places in Scotland in 2006; UKfeminista and its campaign for safer travel for women on the London underground; Surfers Against Sewage whose cause is supranational and campaigns involve lobbying the EU)
- explanation and analysis of civil disobedience as a method often used by outsider groups, such as the blockades organised by Frack Off or the HS2 tunnel protests 2021 organised by environmental activists and Just Stop Oil in 2023.

Students are required to consider only three ways. 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.

## Section B

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

**0 4** Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments in the above extracts regarding the roles and influence of parliamentary select committees.

**[25 marks]**

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

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

2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>Analysis of the extract takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are unsupported assertions (AO2).</li> <li>Comparisons tend to be limited and unsupported by examples (AO2).</li> <li>Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
1	1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis of the extract takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2).</li> <li>Comparisons tend to be superficial and undeveloped (AO2).</li> <li>Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives and the status of the extract is present (AO3).</li> <li>The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing worthy of credit.</li> </ul>

**0 4**

Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments in the above extracts regarding the roles and influence of parliamentary select committees.

**[25 marks]**

**Indicative content**

In the analysis and evaluation of the debate regarding the roles and influence of parliamentary select committees, as made in the extracts, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of the effective roles of parliamentary select committees and how they can often “show a more positive side of Parliament,” as argued in Extract 1. Reference may be made to the various types of parliamentary select committees. Comparisons may be made with Extract 2 and the perspective that appearances before the Commons Liaison Committee take time away from the prime minister being able to focus on more important roles and matters, such as “delivering Brexit”
- analysis and evaluation of how the roles of select committees are beneficial as “party politics is largely left to one side”. However, comparisons may be made with the views in Extract 2 regarding tensions that test cross-party cohesion and create resentment. Steve Baker argues that it is a “profound injustice” that some MPs remain on committees, despite not remaining a member of the party that they were elected to serve under (eg Sarah Wollaston)
- analysis and evaluation of the important roles played by select committees in holding “the government and others to account” as argued in Extract 1. Comparisons may be made with arguments in Extract 2, which suggest that parliamentary committees are weak as they lack the

power to prevent government ministers from refusing to attend committee hearings (eg Boris Johnson; Priti Patel turning down four invitations to appear before the Home Affairs Committee in 2020)

- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which select committees “have had a major impact upon government policy”, as argued in Extract 1 (eg the Culture, Media and Sports Select Committee inquiry 2009–2010, which led to the Leveson Inquiry). However, in comparison, analysis and evaluation of the arguments made by Conservative MP Patrick McLoughlin in Extract 2 may suggest that select committee hearings are less important than other opportunities for scrutiny provided by the “chamber and all members of Parliament” (eg debates; PMQs)
- analysis and evaluation of the positive role and influence of the “Liaison Committee” as argued in Extract 1. Reference may be made to the composition of the Liaison Committee and the positive impact of the Wright Committee reforms. In comparison, analysis and evaluation of Extract 2 may highlight the weaknesses of the Liaison Committee (eg the prime minister only having to appear by convention). Such weaknesses have led to some committee chairs, raising “the issue in the Commons” regarding the prime minister being able to “avoid accountability”
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which members of the Liaison Committee are critical of the actions of the prime minister. Extract 2 highlights how Conservative MPs, such as Patrick McLoughlin, supported the actions of the prime minister, whereas Labour MP Yvette Cooper joined Sarah Wollaston in criticising the actions of the prime minister. This may lead to some responses questioning the extent to which “party politics is largely left to one side”, as argued in Extract 1
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which committees are influential with “powerful industry leaders...called to account,” as argued in Extract 1 (eg Rupert Murdoch regarding the phone-hacking scandal or Mike Ashley regarding poor working practices at Sports Direct). In comparison, analysis and evaluation of Extract 2 may argue that parliamentary committees are lacking in power, with “powerful industry leaders” refusing to appear (eg Mark Zuckerberg, 2018).

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 extracts:

- Extract 1 is written by Sarah Wollaston, who was Chair of the Health Select Committee and Liaison Committee in January 2019. The purpose of the article is to persuade the reader towards the more positive roles played by parliamentary committees. The positive stance towards committees taken by Sarah Wollaston could be due to her decision to pursue a parliamentary career via the committee system and based upon her experiences of her committee work and roles as Chair. She is also a GP, which may reflect her approach towards why committees play important roles in proposing policy solutions given her role as Chair of the Health Select Committee.
- Extract 2 is taken from an article on the BBC website from October 2019. 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 was written before the 2019 general election. Some responses may refer to this when analysing the perspective of the MPs mentioned and their reactions to Boris Johnson’s decision not to appear before the Liaison Committee. Sarah Wollaston defected to Change UK and then became a Liberal Democrat MP. Conservative Steve Baker is a member of the ERG.

- Both extracts were written in 2019, before the general election when the government had no overall majority. This could also be used in some responses to further explain the different perspectives noted within Extract 2.
- Students are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments presented in the articles. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views towards the roles and influence of parliamentary committees may be awarded marks for analysis (AO2). To gain marks for evaluation (AO3) students must assess the relative strengths of the differing arguments and whether the arguments in Extract 1 regarding the positive roles and influence of parliamentary committees are more convincing than those in Extract 2 highlighting the relative weaknesses in the roles and influence of parliamentary committees. The analysis and evaluation must clearly focus on the arguments presented in the articles.

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 articles, however complete their answer may otherwise be, cannot achieve above level 2.

## Section C

### Levels of response mark scheme for 25-mark essays

**0 | 5** 'Cabinet ministers still matter as heads of department, but the whole cabinet is no longer at the centre of important government decision making.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

**[25 marks]**

**0 | 6** 'The UK is experiencing a crisis in political participation.' 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"> <li>Detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis is balanced and confidently developed (AO2).</li> <li>Synoptic links are well explained, are focussed on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation leads to well substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives are successfully evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is well organised, coherent with a sustained analytical focus on the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
4	16-20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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).</li> <li>Analysis is balanced developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further (AO2).</li> <li>Synoptic links are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation leads to conclusions that show some substantiation and consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives are evaluated in the process of constructing arguments, although in some places there could be further development of the evaluation (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set (AO2).</li> </ul>

3	11-15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1).</li> <li>• Analytical points are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical (AO2).</li> <li>• Synoptic links will be made, though explanation will lack depth (AO2).</li> <li>• Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion, but that lack substantiation (AO3).</li> <li>• Relevant perspectives are commented on in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation lacks depth (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set (AO2).</li> </ul>
2	6-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• Analysis takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are unsupported assertions (AO2).</li> <li>• Synoptic links tend to be limited and undeveloped (AO2).</li> <li>• Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and there is no clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>• Relevant perspectives are identified, though evaluation is superficial (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
1	1-5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Analysis takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2).</li> <li>• Few if any synoptic links are offered (AO2).</li> <li>• Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>• Synoptic points tend to be superficial and undeveloped (AO2).</li> <li>• Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives is present (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing worthy of credit</li> </ul>

**0 | 5**

'Cabinet ministers still matter as heads of department, but the whole cabinet is no longer at the centre of important government decision making.' 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 cabinet as the key decision-making body within the plural executive with the prime minister being 'primus inter pares'. Students may analyse how such a system of cabinet government operates (eg conventions of individual ministerial responsibility and collective responsibility)
- analysis and evaluation of the PM as the dominant actor in the executive ('first'), supporting analysis with examples of such prime ministerial styles (Blair, Thatcher). Students may analyse factors such as changes to the frequency of cabinet meetings, inner cabinet meetings (eg 'the Quad') and style of cabinet meetings (eg bilaterals). However, the PM's style of leadership and use of the cabinet 'waxes and wanes' dependent upon circumstances (eg size of majority, party support, public support) and 'a PM is only as strong as his colleagues let him be' (eg Thatcher, May)
- analysis and evaluation of cabinet committees and their impact upon the use of the full cabinet (eg COBRA). However, decisions made outside of full cabinet can cause resentment and resignations (eg Michael Heseltine and Westland)
- analysis and evaluation of the convention of collective responsibility, supporting analysis with examples of resignations (eg Robin Cook, 2003; Geoffrey Howe, 1990; Iain Duncan Smith, 2016; Boris Johnson, 2018). However, collective responsibility is not always adhered to (eg coalition government) and at times suspended (eg EU referendum, free votes)
- analysis and evaluation of the considerable power that some cabinet ministers have within their own departments, supporting analysis with examples (Michael Gove and education reforms, Rishi Sunak as Chancellor, Gordon Brown as Chancellor). However, this is dependent upon a range of factors, such as ability to do the job (eg Karen Bradley, Northern Ireland; Estelle Morris, Education) or popularity with the public and/or the party (eg Johnson, Foreign Office)
- analysis and evaluation of the impact of the increased powers and responsibilities of special advisers. Cabinet ministers may appoint their own teams of powerful special advisers, with analysis supported by examples (Ed Balls and Ed Miliband under Gordon Brown as Chancellor; Dominic Cummings as special adviser to Michael Gove as Secretary of State for Education).

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as Parliament, the constitution, political parties, 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**

'The UK is experiencing a crisis in political participation.' 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 different methods of participation, such as traditional or formal methods (eg voting, joining a party, going on strike) and modern developments or informal methods (eg e-petitions, social media campaigns). Responses may evaluate that whilst formal methods of participation have declined, informal methods have increased, thereby challenging the concept of a participation crisis
- analysis and evaluation of how popular engagement with the formal processes and institutions of democracy have been in long-term decline since the 1960s (eg party membership). Comparisons may be made with growing pressure group membership (eg National Trust, RSPB) or the increase in membership for some parties (eg Green Party, Labour Party). Students may support their analyses with statistics
- analysis and evaluation of the decline in traditional forms of participation, such as voting in general elections (eg 59%, 2001). Turnout at other UK elections is lower still (eg EU elections, local elections, AV referendum). However, comparisons may be made with the increase in turnout for general elections since 2001, alongside other elections, such as referendums (eg Scottish Independence, 2014; EU, 2016). Students may support their analyses with statistics
- analysis and evaluation of the reasons for the decline in formal methods of participation (eg mistrust of politicians and political institutions; scandals, such as expenses; the electoral system). However, differential turnout occurs and there is not a participation crisis amongst all categories of voters (eg over 65s compared to 18–25 year olds). Students may support their analyses with statistics
- analysis and evaluation of new forms of collective political participation that challenge the concept of a participation crisis (eg signing petitions, boycotting products, demonstrations, social campaigns). However, responses may challenge the levels of engagement in collective participation (eg age of those more likely to engage, 'clicktivism')
- analysis and evaluation of contact participation as citizens continue to contact their elected representatives to redress their grievances (eg Marcus Rashford's open letter to all MPs regarding free school meals). MPs meet regularly with constituents (eg via social media accounts and web sites, Friday surgeries). However, some constituents choose not to engage with their MP due to a range of factors (eg impact of FPTP, mistrust of politicians)
- analysis and evaluation of engagement in political action via social media, with analysis supported by examples (engaging in online debates, political campaigns, organising demonstrations, donating to political causes). However, responses may argue that levels of engagement are superficial for some, with concerns regarding 'slacktivism' (minimal effort required in forwarding a tweet or clicking 'like'; Twitterbots).

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as pressure groups, Parliament, political parties, voting behaviour, elections and 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.