

**A-level
POLITICS
7152/1**

Paper 1 Government and politics of the UK

Mark scheme

June 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from 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 © 2024 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 Labour Party ideology has changed under its different leaders. **[9 marks]**

0 | 2 Explain and analyse three ways in which backbench MPs can influence policy within the legislative process. **[9 marks]**

0 | 3 Explain and analyse three ways in which pressure groups promote democracy in the UK. **[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 into 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 Labour Party ideology has changed under its different leaders.

[9 marks]

Indicative content

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

- explanation and analysis of Labour as a socialist party, an ideology based upon equality, common ownership and redistribution of wealth. Responses should address the aims of social democracy and how this has changed under the different strands of socialism advocated by the leadership
- explanation and analysis of 'Old Labour' ideology under the leadership of Michael Foot, with power pushed down to the grassroots and policies becoming more left-wing (eg 'tax and spend', increase in nationalisation of finance and industry, nuclear disarmament). Responses may focus upon how and why the party struggled electorally (eg 1983 manifesto, 'longest suicide note in history'; splits in the party, 'gang of four'; Thatcherism)
- explanation and analysis of Blair's New Labour project ('third way'), repositioning the party on the political spectrum by moving the party to the centre ground (eg 'triangulation', rewriting Clause IV, dropping 'tax and spend', commitment to social values). Responses may focus upon how and why this led to electoral success (eg 1997, 2001 landslides; three consecutive terms) with 'catch all policies' (eg devolution, minimum wage, 'education, education, education'). Some may also analyse the impact of Gordon Brown as Chancellor and Prime Minister
- explanation and analysis of the movement of the party slightly towards the left under Ed Miliband and the more dramatic break with New Labour under the leadership of Jeremy Corbyn and a return to a left-wing programme (Old Labour) of policies, such as economic socialism (renationalisation of energy firms, abolition of tuition fees) and trade unionism. Analysis may focus upon the electoral fortunes of the party under Corbyn (increased share of the vote, 2017; collapse of 'red wall', 2019; increased party membership)
- explanation and analysis of the movement of the party back towards the centre under the leadership of Keir Starmer (eg The Road Ahead document, 2021, which stated that the role of government is to be a partner to private enterprise, not stifle it).

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 backbench MPs can influence policy within the legislative process.

[9 marks]

Indicative content

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

- explanation and analysis of the legislative process from first to final readings, recognising the nature of each stage, voting procedures and the degree of backbench participation. Some stages are mere formalities (first reading). Analysis of the process may be demonstrated in terms of the opportunities afforded to backbenchers
- explanation and analysis of parliamentary debates and voting (eg second reading, third reading). Backbenchers can mobilise the threat of rebellions to defeat legislation or extract key concessions, with examples provided for analysis (Blair and 90-day detention, 2005). Size of government majority has a bearing upon the effectiveness of rebellions (coalition, supply and confidence, large majority, party balance in composition of public bill committees). Defeats at second reading are rare, but may occur (Thatcher and Sunday Trading 1986)
- explanation and analysis of stages where amendments can be tabled by backbench MPs, such as in public bill committees and the report stage. Analysis may focus upon the impact of the governing party having a majority (composition of committees, power to guillotine, influence of the party whips, debates) but that tabled amendments may be incorporated in to bills (eg Yvette Cooper's successful amendment to the Finance Bill 2019)
- explanation and analysis of the private members' bills procedure (eg Stalking Protection Act 2019). Analysis may focus upon time constraints and why many fail to become law. Candidates may explain a range of ways in which legislation can be introduced by MPs such as ballot bills, presentation bills and 10 minute rule bills each method is creditworthy.

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 ways in which pressure groups promote democracy 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 pluralism (Dahl) and the positive roles performed by pressure groups in dispersing power, with social media enabling more groups and social movements (eg Black Lives Matter, Extinction Rebellion) to communicate their message. Some responses may analyse how the 'holacratic' structure of some groups further enhances democracy or how groups use a wide range of democratic institutions as access points (eg devolved legislatures and assemblies, elected mayors)
- explanation and analysis of how pressure groups check power, with the expertise of some ensuring effective scrutiny of government (eg BMA and the sugar tax). Some responses may develop the concept of insider and outsider status for analysis of the types of groups that have closer access to the 'corridors of power'
- explanation and analysis of how pressure groups enhance representation of marginalised groups, acting as a safety valve, increasing accountability and forcing unpopular or non-party issues on to the political agenda (eg Howard League for Penal Reform, Liberty). Some responses may argue that this helps to prevent tyranny of the majority but may lead to too many groups being focused upon their own set of interests and issues ('hyperpluralism')
- explanation and analysis of how pressure groups encourage alternative methods of political participation in an era of declining party membership and differential turnout at elections, with a number of groups having large memberships (eg RSPB, National Trust). Some responses may argue that not all members are politically active
- explanation and analysis of how groups promote political education and debate, enabling citizens and policy-makers to become better-informed (eg 2016 Act for the Act campaign; Marcus Rashford and FareShare; NSPCC).

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 impact of referendums upon democracy in the UK.

[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 (AO2). Comparisons are well explained, are focused 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 (AO2). Comparisons are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2). Evaluation leads to conclusions that show some substantiation and are 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 (AO2).
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 (AO2). 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 (AO2).

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). • 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 in the above extracts regarding the impact of referendums upon democracy in the UK.

[25 marks]**Indicative content**

In the analysis and evaluation of the debate regarding the impact of referendums upon democracy in the UK, as made in the extracts, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of “representative democracy” and how it is “indirect democracy” as stated in Extract 1. Extract 1 clearly takes the view that referendums have a harmful impact upon representative democracy. Comparisons may be made to how this relates to “parliamentary democracy”, which is the focus of the 2018 House of Lords Briefing in Extract 2. Extract 2 contains perspectives regarding both the positive and negative impact of referendums upon parliamentary democracy
- analysis and evaluation of the argument in Extract 1 of the extent to which “ignorance, self-interest and emotion” are “filtered out by the institutions and procedures of representative democracy”. Some responses may refer to the Burkean model of representation for analysis, making reference to the concept of “mature intelligence” and why referendums may pose a threat to this. Comparisons may be made to how and why referendums can “legitimise policy decisions”, as stated in Extract 2 (eg gain a mandate for constitutional change), with relevant examples developed for analysis
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which referendums may have a negative impact upon representative democracy by “posing a simplified question” to voters who have not “given the matter much thought”, as argued in Extract 1. Analysis may develop examples of referendums that focus upon complex issues, which are not always settled once and for all by a single referendum. Comparisons may be made to the view in Extract 2 that suggests referendums have a positive impact upon democracy by providing the “public an opportunity to think deeply about an issue”, with examples developed for analysis and evaluation focusing upon which perspective is most convincing and why. Extract 2 is more balanced but some responses may focus analysis and evaluation upon what the “contrasting views” would be regarding “whether referendums can settle a policy issue”
- analysis and evaluation of how, why and the extent to which referendums harm representative democracy by allowing politicians to “abandon responsibility”, as argued in Extract 1. Comparisons may be made to how there is some agreement in Extract 2 regarding concerns for democracy, such as how “referendums tend to be dominated by elite groups rather than being about the views of the public” (eg misleading promises during campaigns). Some responses may evaluate that this is an increasingly valid argument as subsequent referendums have been held in the UK since the 2010 House of Lords report was written, with more recent examples developed for analysis, thereby possibly strengthening the arguments in Extract 1
- analysis and evaluation of why Extract 1 expresses concerns regarding the use of referendums that do not have “full franchises and threshold requirements”. Responses may develop examples for analysis and evaluation (eg comparison of Scotland 2014, which extended the franchise to 16-year-olds and EU 2016 which did not). Comparison may be made to views within Extract 2, which also express concerns for democracy but with a focus upon “public apathy” and “low turnout”. Responses may focus upon evaluating the extent of the significance of such arguments by analysing referendums with lower and higher turnouts (eg 42% AV 2011 compared to 85% Scotland 2014), with some developing concepts such as tyranny of the majority.

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:

- in relation to the extracts for this question, reference should be made to the fact that Extract 1 was adapted from an article written for the politically independent magazine, *Prospect*, by a leading academic, AC Grayling. It is clearly written to persuade the reader against the use of referendums for decision-making in the UK. AC Grayling supports such decision-making lying within the institutions and procedures of representative democracy. The article was written in February 2017, after the EU referendum, of which the author is clearly critical. Extract 2 is informative and educational as it is adapted from a 2018 House of Lords Library Briefing, based upon a report written by the House of Lords Constitution Committee in 2010. Witnesses who gave evidence to the 2010 Constitution Committee provided perspectives relevant to both sides of the debate. However, the report was written before a number of key referendums were held (eg AV 2011, Scotland 2014, EU 2016). The purpose of the 2018 Library Briefing was to prepare all members of the House of Lords for a debate on the impact of referendums upon parliamentary democracy, therefore it is more balanced than Extract 1 but reflective of the need for a debate on the issue.

Students are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments presented in the extracts. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views regarding the impact of referendums upon democracy in the UK 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 regarding the positive impact of referendums upon democracy are more or less convincing than those regarding the negative impact of referendums upon democracy in the UK. The analysis and evaluation must clearly focus on the arguments presented in the extracts.

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 'UK political parties should be funded by the state.' Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

0 | 6 'Social class is still the main influence on voting behaviour in the UK.' 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 focused 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 and 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 are 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 (AO2).

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 (AO2). • 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 (AO2).
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). • 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). • 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

'UK political parties should be funded by the state.' 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 changing basis of party funding supported by examples such as the impact of the decline of party membership and/or efforts to reduce the influence of trade unions within the Labour Party (Kinnock, Blair). Comparisons may be made with the increase in membership for some parties (eg SNP, Labour under Corbyn). Responses may argue that a decline in membership has led to an increased reliance upon other sources of funding in recent years (eg individual donations). Students may support their analyses with statistics
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which state funding exists for all parties (Cranborne money, Short money and Policy Development Grants), whether there should be more state funding available and how it would be allocated. Some responses may refer to existing proposals (eg 2007 Phillips Report)
- analysis and evaluation of controversies and scandals associated with the rise of large individual donations to parties and the extent to which increased state funding would address this. Analysis may be supported by relevant examples (Bernie Ecclestone affair, cash for honours, Pandora Papers)
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which recent regulations have made party funding more transparent and the overall effectiveness of such regulations (eg PPERA 2000, PPEA 2009, Trade Union Act 2016)
- analysis and evaluation of whether it should be the role of the state to divert financial resources away from other areas to fund political parties and the possible implications of doing so (freedom of choice for the taxpayer, less independence for parties, allocation to extremist parties, counter the influence of 'big money', cost effectiveness)
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which increased state funding would promote pluralism by allowing smaller parties to compete on an equal footing. Comparisons may be made with other difficulties faced by smaller parties (eg FPTP, two-party dominance). Responses may evaluate that increased state funding could further entrench the established parties or that minor parties have made an impact despite limited availability of state funding (SNP, Brexit Party EU elections 2019, DUP).

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as Parliament, Prime Minister and cabinet, devolution, electoral systems, pressure groups, rights, political parties USA, pressure groups USA, political ideas. 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

'Social class is still the main influence on voting behaviour in the UK.' 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 established link between class and voting, with responses being likely to focus upon the changing influence of class in recent elections in comparison to pre-1979 when voting patterns were more predictable (class alignment, partisan alignment). Some responses may refer to Pulzer's quote ('class is the basis of British party politics; all else is embellishment and detail') to establish the debate and consider why the link between class and voting has been undermined (eg changes in the class system, the labour market, party ideology, issue voting). Overall, evaluation may argue that there is still a link between class and voting but that it is no longer the main determinant. Responses should refer to three key elections since 1945, including 1997
- analysis and evaluation of the influence of a range of long-term (primacy) factors (age, gender, ethnicity, region) using statistical evidence for analysis and developing arguments with use of relevant political vocabulary (eg 'age-gap', 'gender-gap'). Some responses may evaluate whether factors such as age have become the new class or that class is linked to other factors, such as education
- analysis and evaluation of short-term (recency) factors (eg the '4 P's' – policies and manifesto pledges, personality of the party leader or candidate, past performance, party unity). Some responses may refer to the importance of the rational choice model and the arguments of psephologists such as Ivor Crewe. Students may use a range of relevant terminology for analysis (eg 'wallet voters', embourgeoisement, the red wall, prospective voting, retrospective voting, the magic million). Evaluation may place class into its proper context alongside such variables in an era of dealignment
- analysis and evaluation of the influence of the media and campaigns (dominant ideology model). Some responses may argue that campaigns have become more Americanised (eg 'cult of Maggie') with party leaders being deemed as an electoral asset (eg Tony Blair 1997, Boris Johnson 2019) or liability (eg Michael Foot 1983, Jeremy Corbyn 2019). Analysis may focus upon the role of the media during election campaigns (eg impact of debates, interviews, direct influence, agenda setting)
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which the nature of the electoral system and constituency (eg safe seat, marginal seat) may have an influence upon voting behaviour (tactical voting, differential turnout, wasted votes). Some responses may evaluate voting behaviour at general elections in comparison to other types (eg by-elections) or elections where systems other than FPTP are used (eg Scottish and Welsh Parliaments, AMS; Northern Ireland Assembly, STV).

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as political parties, devolution, the Prime Minister and cabinet, democracy and participation, factors in voting behaviour USA, rational choice theory, political ideas. 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.