

A-level
POLITICS
7152/1

Paper 1 Government and politics of the UK

Mark scheme

June 2020

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

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 © 2020 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, i.e. 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 judicial independence is upheld in the UK. **[9 marks]**

0 2 Explain and analyse three influences upon individual MPs when voting in the House of Commons. **[9 marks]**

0 3 Explain and analyse three circumstances under which referendums have been held 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 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 judicial independence is upheld 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 the Constitutional Reform Act 2005 and the significance of the Independent Judicial Appointments Commission
- explanation and analysis of the separation of powers, such as the creation of the UK Supreme Court and the removal of the role of the Lord Chancellor's significant roles in all three branches of government
- explanation and analysis of the concept of security of tenure, such as how judges are appointed for an open-ended term, limited only age. Judges can only be removed by a vote in both Houses of Parliament
- explanation and analysis of guaranteed salaries that are paid from the Consolidated Fund. Salaries cannot be manipulated by politicians as they are classified as standing services
- explanation and analysis of the training and experience of senior judges, such as how applicants to the Supreme Court must have held high judicial office for at least two years. Deferring to public opinion or politicians may be seen to compromise judicial integrity and independence
- explanation and analysis of the offence of contempt of court, such as under sub judice rules, the media and politicians are prevented from speaking publicly during legal proceedings.

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 influences upon individual MPs when voting in the House of Commons.

[9 marks]

Indicative content

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

- explanation and analysis of party representation and the mandate theory, for example, MPs are elected on the basis of party manifesto pledges rather than their own personalities
- explanation and analysis of the nature of representative democracy in the UK and the significance of the Burkean or trustee model, for example, MPs are responsible for acting on behalf of the best interests of constituents and may use their own judgement when doing so, particularly when using their own conscience on issues such as same sex marriage or abortion
- explanation and analysis of the delegate model and how MPs may choose to follow clear instructions given by constituents over certain issues, for example, a fifth of Labour MPs defied the three-line whip and voted against the Brexit Bill at Second Reading Feb 2017, with many citing constituents as a reason for doing so
- explanation and analysis of how backbench MPs are not bound by collective responsibility and may choose to rebel more frequently, whereas frontbench MPs are expected to vote in line with the party whip
- explanation and analysis of how some MPs are able to vote more freely if they are independent, for example, MPs such as Anna Soubry and Chuka Umunna who resigned from their parties in 2019 to initially sit as an independent grouping
- explanation and analysis of how individual MPs may choose to vote alongside other colleagues who are of the same faction within a party, rather than as the party whips instruct, for example, members of the ERG.
- explanation and analysis of how MPs may be bound by career advancement

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 circumstances under which referendums have been held 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 referendums that have been held to gain a mandate for constitutional change, for example, the Scottish and Welsh devolution referendums 1998 and others on the same issue that have followed
- explanation and analysis of referendums that have been held as part of a coalition agreement such as the AV referendum 2011 and also the commitment to further Welsh devolution and the referendum in 2011
- explanation and analysis of referendums that have been held due to party management in an attempt to settle divisions, for example, the 1975 European Communities referendum and/or the UK European Union membership referendum 2016
- explanation and analysis of how referendums have been called due to political pressure, for example, the SNP's success in the 2011 Scottish Parliament elections gave momentum for the 2014 Scottish independence referendum. UKIP's success in the 2014 EU elections added to the pressure upon David Cameron to call the UK European Union membership referendum 2016
- explanation and analysis of how referendums have been used more frequently at a local level since the 1990s to gain a mandate for structural changes to local government, for example, referendums held on establishing directly elected mayors
- explanation and analysis of how referendums have been used more frequently at a local level since the 1990s to authorise or reject local policies, such as the referendums on congestion charges in Edinburgh 2005 and Manchester 2008.

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.

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

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

Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments in the above extract regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the roles played by interest groups within pluralist 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. • 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). • 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 extract regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the roles played by interest groups within pluralist democracy in the UK.

[25 marks]

Indicative content

In the analysis and evaluation of the debate regarding the roles and activities of interest groups within pluralist democracy, as made in the extract, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of “pluralism” and the advantages to pluralist democracy played by interest groups. Comparisons may be made to concerns in the extract regarding elitism, with analysis and evaluation of how not all groups “can compete equally for power”
- analysis and evaluation of how “elections only give policy-makers a limited idea of public opinion” and the beneficial roles played by interest groups in relation to this, with relevant examples to support the arguments
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which “joining a pressure group demonstrates commitment to a cause” and give examples of groups who have “memberships in the millions.” Some responses may also evaluate that large membership doesn’t always guarantee members that are fully committed to a cause, with possible references to issues such as chequebook membership and slacktivism
- analysis and evaluation of how and the extent to which “interest groups allow citizens to influence policy makers between elections.” Comparisons may be made as to how “commitment to a cause” doesn’t guarantee power and influence, with evaluation and analysis of how and why

“there are clear inequalities in the ability of different groups to have an influence upon the decision-making process.” Some responses may, for example, analyse and evaluate how some petitions and/or demonstrations organised by interest groups have gathered the support of millions but have had little overall influence upon the decision-making process in comparison to more powerful groups such as the CBI or UK Finance

- analysis and evaluation of the “parliamentary processes” which “provide opportunities for interest group activities”. However, analysis, evaluation and comparison may be made to the points raised within the extract of how and why not all groups “have the ear of policy makers” and that there is not equal access to such parliamentary processes. Reference may be made to insider/outsider status
- analysis and evaluation of the “lobbying industry” and how lobbying has led to a “succession of scandals” with relevant supporting examples. Comparison may be made to how and why there have been attempts at restricting lobbying and the relative impact of such attempts
- analysis and evaluation of the point put forward by Democratic Audit in the first half of the extract that groups should “express their views responsibly and legally” if they are to remain influential. Comparisons may be made with how later in the extract, concerns are highlighted regarding scandals and potential buying of access due to money being taken “from well-funded interests.” Some responses may question the extent to which such activities are “responsible” and the extent to which they are “legally” acceptable
- analysis and evaluation of the concerns of the journalist Robert Peston and American academic Charles Lindblom regarding elitism and how the “voices of the super-wealthy are regularly listened to by politicians” and the extent to which those groups who employ “professional lobbyists” are able to gain access in comparison to those groups who don’t. Some responses may make reference to the revolving door syndrome, with relevant supporting examples. However, comparisons may be made to supportive points advanced by Democratic Audit at the beginning of the extract regarding how pluralist democracy should see “different groups competing equally for power” and the positive roles played by pressure groups
- analysis and evaluation of the overall extent to which groups can “compete equally for power and influence” within the UK and whether the arguments regarding the advantages of the roles played by interest groups within pluralist democracy are more or less convincing than those relating to the disadvantages. Some may argue that pluralist democracy is challenged within the UK and that elitism is a key feature within democracy. Reference may be made by some students to the views of Dahl and Mill as a basis for the debate.

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.

Candidates 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 adapted from a report published in the 2018 Audit of UK Democracy. Some responses may refer to the fact that Democratic Audit is an independent research unit. The extract is informative and does not try to persuade the reader towards a particular side of the debate upon the activities of interest groups within a pluralist democracy, but extensive academic research has been undertaken in order to publish the findings, as the research unit is based in the LSE’s Government Department

- the report is an annual report and that there are relevant and recent supporting examples of interest group activity that relate to the points within the extract. There have been a succession of 'scandals' before 2018 and attempts to restrict lobbying, which some students may identify as being relevant to the perspectives taken within the extract
- evaluation of relevant perspectives within the extract, such as political journalist Robert Peston and American academic Charles Lindblom. Peston is the political editor for ITV and a political and economics journalist who is criticising and expressing concerns regarding elitism and the roles played by wealthy groups, based upon the experience of his work. Some students may note that Charles Lindblom is an American academic and make synoptic references to similar concerns regarding the 'privileged position of business' in both the UK and the USA and how the 'revolving door syndrome' is a feature within both democracies. Comparisons may be made to other perspectives within the report that highlight the positive roles played by interest groups that outweigh such concerns, given the extensive research carried out by Democratic Audit in order to publish the report.

Students are required to analyse and evaluate the arguments presented in the article. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views regarding the advantages and disadvantages of the roles played by interest groups within a pluralist democracy 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 advantages of the roles played by interest groups within pluralist democracy are more or less convincing than those regarding the disadvantages. 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 'The United Kingdom now has a multi-party system.' Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

0 6 'Party leaders are of decisive importance in the winning or losing of general elections.' 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.

<p>2</p>	<p>6–10</p>	<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).
<p>1</p>	<p>1–5</p>	<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).
<p>0</p>	<p>0</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • nothing worthy of credit.

0 5

'The United Kingdom now has a multi-party system.' 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 what a multi-party system is in comparison to other party systems, such as a dominant-party system and/or a two-party system
- analysis and evaluation of how coalitions and hung parliaments are becoming a more regular feature in Westminster, such as in 2010 or the 2017 supply and confidence deal
- analysis and evaluation of the range of parties winning seats in the devolved assemblies where more proportional electoral systems are used. There are power-sharing governments and 'rainbow parliaments'
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which UK parties are becoming more factionalised internally, such as the lack of party unity over Brexit and differences between the ERG and one-nation Conservatives
- analysis and evaluation of the increasing range of parties sitting in Westminster, such as the SNP and Change UK following the defection of MPs from Labour and Conservatives, for example, Sarah Woolaston
- analysis and evaluation of how certain elections have seen an increase in the share of the vote going to parties other than Labour and Conservatives, such as in 2015 when 33% went to other parties. However, this was less significant in 2017 when under 18% of the share of the vote went to other parties
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which minor parties have been successful in second-order elections, such as UKIP and the 2014 EU elections and the emergence of others such as the Brexit Party and their success in the 2019 EU elections where they received 32% of the vote and 29 MEPs. Smaller parties also gained many seats in the 2019 local elections in England
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which minor parties attract support for issues and play a key role in referendum campaigns, such as UKIP 2016 and the influence of its then leader Nigel Farage or SNP in the 2014 referendum
- analysis and evaluation of how Labour and the Conservatives still dominate Parliament and form the government and official opposition, for example, they are always the dominant partner in coalition, minority government and supply and confidence deals
- analysis and evaluation of how there is still a lack of electoral success for smaller parties in Westminster and how the share of the vote is still largely allocated to Labour and the Conservatives, such as 83% in 2017 general election.
- analysis and evaluation of the impact of the electoral system used for Westminster elections and the impact upon the party system

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as the nature of the party system in the USA and the duopoly that exists, devolution, electoral systems, the European Union, voting behaviour, influence of the mass media, parliament, 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

'Party leaders are of decisive importance in the winning or losing of general elections.'
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 extent to which party leaders are important, with reference made to elections such as 1983 with Thatcher and Foot, 1997 and the impact of Blair, 2017 with May ('Maybot') and Corbyn
- analysis and evaluation of how some party leaders as prime ministers have been innovators and have widened the electoral appeal of the party, for example, Thatcher's economic policies, Blair and New Labour, Cameron's compassionate conservatism
- analysis and evaluation of the importance of party leaders as the mouthpiece of the party and the role played in selling the image of the party during the campaign
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which election campaigns have become more Americanised, such as 1983 and the 'the cult of Maggie' or the leadership debates since 2010 and the significance of May's refusal to debate in 2017
- analysis and evaluation of how leaders can be sometimes seen as either an electoral asset, such as Blair in 1997 and 2001, or an electoral liability
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which other recent factors are important in comparison to party leaders, such as policies and issue voting. Prospective voting is important, with voters behaving as consumers
- analysis and evaluation of retrospective voting, such as the importance of governing competence and the impact of economic mismanagement, such as the Winter of Discontent, Black Wednesday, 2008 financial crash
- analysis and evaluation of the overall influence of recency factors (rational choice model) upon voters in an 'era of dealignment' in comparison to 'primacy factors' such as class, age, gender, ethnicity.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as elections and patterns of participation, ideology, Prime Ministers, political parties, pressure group behaviour, referendums, the influence of the mass media. 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.