

**A-level  
POLITICS  
7152/1**

**Paper 1 Government and politics of the UK**

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2022

---

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 © 2022 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 media can have an influence upon the outcome of elections. **[9 marks]**
- 0 2** Explain and analyse three ways in which the Official Opposition can challenge the government in the House of Commons. **[9 marks]**
- 0 3** Explain and analyse three ways in which UK political parties select their leaders. **[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 media can have an influence upon the outcome of elections.

[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 direct influence theory, that the media does impact voting behaviour and can influence the outcome of elections (and not just during campaigns). The media helps shape voters' opinions of the leaders and parties, which is one reason as to why spin doctors and advertising agencies are employed (eg Saatchi & Saatchi, Alastair Campbell, Lee Cain). The media may have an influence upon undecided voters and may be particularly influential upon the 'magic million' (eg the 'Sun Wot Won It' 1992, 'Don't Chuck Britain in the Cor-Bin' 2019)
- explanation and analysis of the 'reinforcement theory,' that the media does little to influence voting but merely reinforces existing preferences. Voters favour papers/programmes that support rather than challenge their own views. Selective perception and selective retention may occur. Voters may recognise how sections of the media are openly biased, but choose to ignore it (eg 2017 17% of Daily Mail readers voted Labour despite the clear support of the paper for the Conservatives)
- explanation and analysis of the agenda setting theory, that the media has an influence regarding what the nation thinks about in terms of headlines and policies and also has an educational role. Interviewers (eg Paxman, Neil) scrutinise party leaders and cabinet/shadow cabinet members. Political correspondents inform viewers of key issues and events, particularly during the campaign itself
- explanation and analysis of the influence of the role played by TV debates since 2010 (eg 'Cleggmania' 2010, May's refusal to debate 2017, Johnson-Corbyn 2019)
- explanation and analysis of the influence of opinion polls, such as the 'bandwagon' and 'boomerang' effects (eg Portillo 1997)
- explanation and analysis of the influence of 'new media', such as social media platforms, that provide direct contact between those seeking election and voters themselves. In 2017, younger supporters used blogs and social media accounts to communicate pro-Corbyn coverage. The influence of social media forums is difficult to measure
- explanation and analysis of the role played by party political broadcasts, which may have an influence over viewers' perceptions of political brands (eg '12 questions to Boris' 2019, 'Labour's Tax Bombshell' 1992).

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 the Official Opposition can challenge the government 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 the Official Opposition in the House of Commons and circumstances that may affect their ability to challenge the government (eg size of majority)
- explanation and analysis of opportunities via oral and written questions, such as PMQs, Ministerial Question Time and urgent questions.
- explanation and analysis of opportunities via Opposition Days. Opposition Day debates can lead to a change in policy (eg Ghurkas 2009)
- explanation and analysis of opportunities via select committees, which can challenge the government by scrutinising policy, holding hearings and suggesting improvements to existing policy. A number are also chaired by members of the Official Opposition (eg Yvette Cooper as Chair of the Home Affairs Committee)
- explanation and analysis of challenge to the government via a vote of no confidence (eg 2019). Government defeats are rare but do occur (eg 1979).

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 UK political parties select their 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 how the Labour Party selects its leader (role of the PLP, local parties and trade union affiliate members). The process reflects internal party democracy as party members and registered supporters vote (OMOV and AV used). Rule changes under Ed Miliband allowed any member of the public who supported Labour to join the party as a 'registered supporter' for £3 and qualify to participate in the leadership election (eg this led to the election of Corbyn 2015)
- explanation and analysis of how the Conservative Party selects its leader. The Conservative Party had no formal mechanism for electing its leader until 1965. Between 1965 and 1997, the leadership election was restricted to the party's MPs alone. In 1997 The Fresh Future outlined the election rules that are applied today. The system of electing the leader consists of two stages. Conservative Members of Parliament vote until two candidates remain. Party members then vote on a one member one vote basis, such as in 2019 when Boris Johnson was elected as leader. The process has become more democratic internally with the greater involvement of party members
- explanation and analysis of how the Liberal Democrats select their leader. The Liberal Democrats have relied on postal ballots of members since 1975. AV is the electoral system that is used. Candidates for leadership must be MPs, with the support of at least 10% of Liberal Democrat MPs, at least 20 local parties and at least 200 members
- explanation and analysis of how there may only be one candidate on the ballot for leadership, either from the start of the process or by the final stage of voting (eg Theresa May 2016 was declared Leader without a vote from the party membership; Gordon Brown 2007; Vince Cable 2017)
- explanation and analysis of how minor parties select their leaders, such as the Green Party, who automatically hold leadership elections every two years and is considered to be more internally democratic in its involvement of party membership.

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**

<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
----------	----------

Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments in the above extracts regarding the need for a codified constitution in the UK.

**[25 marks]****Target AO1: 5 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 10 marks**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>Descriptors</b>
<b>5</b>	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</li> <li>• comparisons are well explained, are focused 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>
<b>4</b>	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</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 are 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.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	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</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.</li> </ul>



<b>2</b>	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>
<b>1</b>	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>
<b>0</b>	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 need for a codified constitution in the UK.

**[25 marks]**

**Indicative content**

In the analysis and evaluation of the debate regarding whether the UK should adopt a codified constitution, as made in the extracts, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of how and why the UK is “unusual” in not having a codified constitution and why it is “one of only a few democracies in the world” not to have one. Reference may be made to the evolutionary nature of the UK constitution and its several sources. Comparisons may be made with Extract 2, which argues that there is “no need of a written constitution” and that existing constitutional arrangements are sufficient
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which the current “arrangement is no longer adequate” due to its “lack of clarity”, as argued in Extract 1. Analysis and evaluation may focus upon the extent to which a codified constitution would provide greater clarity on what is and isn’t constitutional. Comparisons may be made with the arguments in Extract 2 regarding how the current constitution is sufficient in adapting to the “changing needs of the nation”. Codification would remove the flexibility and adaptability that the author argues is a strength of existing arrangements
- analysis and evaluation of how Extract 1 argues for the need of a codified constitution due to the failure of the current arrangement, even though “Britain does have a Human Rights Act” to “properly protect fundamental rights”. Comparisons may be made to arguments in Extract 2 that

argues against the need for a codified constitution as “rights are protected in multiple ways” (eg statute law)

- analysis and evaluation of how Extract 1 argues for the need of a codified constitution due to the “inadequacy of the current devolution settlement”. Reference may be made to tensions between the devolved administrations regarding Brexit and the “minimal role” played by them. Some responses may reference more recent policy divergences for analysis (eg response to Covid). In comparison, Extract 2 argues that Brexit “is a question mainly for Westminster” due to international relations being a reserved power
- analysis and evaluation of how a codified constitution would provide greater institutional checks and balances by separating power, including “properly setting out the power of the devolved administrations”. Comparisons may be made to arguments in Extract 2 that raise concerns regarding how “codified constitutions dramatically increase the role of the courts”. Reference may be made to how this would give greater political power to unelected and unaccountable judges who would be called upon to determine whether laws and political processes are constitutional. Extract 2 clearly argues that the existing constitutional arrangements “balance and share power” effectively enough without the need for a codified constitution. This is different to the perspective of Extract 1
- analysis and evaluation of how a lack of a codified constitution has “exacerbated recent political crises in recent years” due to a “lack of clarity,” as argued in Extract 1. Analysis should be supported with examples, such as the questionable legal status of referendums and their impact upon parliamentary sovereignty. In comparison, Extract 2 does recognise how Brexit has revealed “unresolved tensions” in the UK constitution but does not believe that a “written constitution would resolve them.”

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 is taken from an article published by the Constitution Unit, based at UCL. It is educational and is the product of independent academic research. Extract 2 is taken from Prospect Magazine which specialises in current affairs, but the articles that it publishes may be more persuasive towards a particular political viewpoint.
- Extract 1 is written by Sionaidh Douglas-Scott, an academic Law Professor at Queen Mary University of London. She is arguing in favour of a codified constitution for the UK, based upon academic research and expertise in Law rather than political affiliation.
- Extract 2 is written by Adam Tomkins, a former Conservative MSP and also a Professor of Public Law. His political affiliations may be identified as a reason as to why he is against the UK adopting a codified constitution. His role as an MSP may be used to support his view that devolution illustrates how the British constitution can adapt sufficiently to the changing needs of the nation. However, as a Conservative MSP his political allegiances do not support a complete overhaul of existing arrangements by adopting a codified constitution and further clarifying the powers of the devolved administrations.
- Extract 1 was written in January 2020, after the December 2019 general election when the Conservative government gained a large overall majority of over 80 seats. This may be used to reference concerns within Extract 1 regarding the UK's uncoded constitution. Extract 2 was written in April 2019, before the 2019 general election, when there was a confidence and supply government and sufficient checks upon power, illustrated by ‘all three branches of government’

being brought in to play by the Brexit process. This may lead some students to agree with the arguments in Extract 1 and the need for a codified constitution due to the tensions across the UK regarding Brexit and also the situation that arises when a party with a large majority forms the government and the impact that this can have upon statute laws passed. However, some may agree with Extract 2, that the case for retaining the current status quo is sufficient and support the viewpoint that a codified constitution leads to concentrations of power in unelected branches of government, such as the Supreme Court, rather than being able to adapt and protect rights via statute law and common law. Some may cite Brexit as enhancing parliamentary sovereignty.

- 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 need for a codified constitution 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 need for a codified constitution are more convincing than those in Extract 2 that are against a codified constitution. 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** 'The UK judiciary has had an increasingly significant impact upon the working of the executive and Parliament since 1997.' Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

**0 | 6** 'Representative democracy is in crisis 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"> <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 focused 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 and 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 are 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.</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</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> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	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>
<b>1</b>	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>
<b>0</b>	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>nothing worthy of credit.</li> </ul>

0	5
---	---

'The UK judiciary has had an increasingly significant impact upon the working of the executive and Parliament since 1997.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

[25 marks]

### Indicative content

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

- analysis and evaluation of the increasing significance of judicial review in the UK and the impact that it has had upon the working of the executive and Parliament since 1997, with analysis supported by examples such as R (Miller) v Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, 2017
- analysis and evaluation of the impact of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005, with analysis supported by examples such as changes to the role of the Lord Chancellor
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which judicial independence and the separation of powers have been enhanced by measures such as the Judicial Appointments Commission and the location of the court in a separate building
- analysis and evaluation of the impact of the Human Rights Act 1998, which has allowed senior judges to directly question statute laws, executive actions and government policy within UK courts. Analysis will be supported by examples
- analysis and evaluation of the impact of EU law and the precedent set under Factortame. However, many public policy areas remained within the remit of Parliament and Brexit removed the precedent of EU law over UK law
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which the executive branch and Parliament consider potential conflicts in the courts when drafting legislation (eg the role of Parliament's Joint Committee on Human Rights)
- analysis and evaluation of allegations and criticisms of growing judicial activism in recent years. However, judges do not have the power to enact legislation or policy, unlike Parliament and the executive branches of government.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as the executive, Parliament, US Supreme Court, rights, US Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the EU. 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

'Representative democracy is in crisis 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 nature and features of representative democracy, with analysis supported by examples (representation, accountability, legitimacy, participation, power dispersal)
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which referendums (eg EU, AV) have challenged representative democracy and the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty. Reference may be made to Burke's trustee model of representation
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which party discipline has challenged representative democracy and how MPs may be conflicted between balancing the interests of the party and party members who selected them with the interests of wider constituents. Reference may be made to the mandate model of representation. However, MPs are still accountable to their constituents and follow the delegate model (eg Zac Goldsmith 2016)
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which the under-representation in Parliament of a wide range of social groups (eg women, ethnic minorities) has had an impact upon representative democracy. Reference may be made to the 'male, pale and stale' image of many MPs and the theory regarding the need for Parliament to be a microcosm of society
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which unelected institutions, such as the House of Lords or the monarchy, undermine representative democracy with analysis supported by examples (92 hereditary peers, cash for honours)
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which representative democracy is in crisis due to the electoral system of FPTP that is used for general elections (eg 2019, the Conservatives won 365 seats on just under 44% of the popular vote). Safe seats lead to a lack of real choice in many constituencies. Comparisons may be made to the use of more proportional electoral systems (eg AMS in elections to the Scottish and Welsh Parliaments) and their impact upon representation and the party system
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which pressure groups enhance representative democracy, with analysis supported by examples (Howard League for Penal Reform, Liberty). However, elitism occurs with powerful groups dominating due to factors such as status and financial resources. Reference may be made to the theories of Dahl and Mills.
- analysis and evaluation of extent to which the franchise has been extended across the UK, with analysis supported by examples such as sixteen-year olds voting in the Scottish Independence referendum, 2014 and local elections. However, there are still many who feel disenfranchised (eg advocates of extending the franchise to 16- and 17-year olds for general elections, votes for prisoners.) Some responses may discuss participation and differential turnout for analysis.
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which representative democracy has been enhanced by devolution across the UK due to the dispersal of power.

Synoptic links may be found in areas such as pressure groups, electoral systems, referendums, political parties, Parliament, voting behaviour, democracy and political participation and devolution. 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.