



National
Qualifications
2015

2015 Politics

New Higher

Finalised Marking Instructions

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2015

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from SQA's NQ Assessment team.

Where the publication includes materials from sources other than SQA (secondary copyright), this material should only be reproduced for the purposes of examination or assessment. If it needs to be reproduced for any other purpose it is the centre's responsibility to obtain the necessary copyright clearance. SQA's NQ Assessment team may be able to direct you to the secondary sources.

These Marking Instructions have been prepared by Examination Teams for use by SQA Appointed Markers when marking External Course Assessments. This publication must not be reproduced for commercial or trade purposes.



General Marking Principles for Higher Politics

This information is provided to help you understand the general principles you must apply when marking candidate responses to questions in this paper. These principles must be read in conjunction with the detailed marking instructions, which identify the key features required in candidate responses.

- (a) Marks for each candidate response must always be assigned in line with these General Marking Principles and the Detailed Marking Instructions for this assessment.
- (b) Marking should always be positive. This means that, for each candidate response, marks are accumulated for the demonstration of relevant skills, knowledge and understanding: they are not deducted from a maximum on the basis of errors or omissions.
- (c) If a specific candidate response does not seem to be covered by either the principles or detailed Marking Instructions, and you are uncertain how to assess it, you must seek guidance from your Team Leader.
- (d) Where the candidate violates the rubric of the paper and answers more than one optional question, both responses should be marked and the better mark recorded.
- (e) Marking must be consistent. Never make a hasty judgement on a response based on length, quality of handwriting or a confused start.
- (f) Use the full range of marks available for each question.
- (g) The detailed Marking Instructions are not an exhaustive list. Other relevant points should be credited.
- (h) For credit to be given, points must relate to the question asked. Where candidates give points of knowledge without specifying the context, these should be rewarded unless it is clear that they do not refer to the context of the question.
- (i) For knowledge/understanding marks to be awarded, points must be:
 - i. relevant to the issue in the question
 - ii. developed (by providing additional detail, exemplification, reasons or evidence)
 - iii. used to respond to the demands of the question (ie evaluate, analyse, etc)

Marking principles for each question type

For each of the question types the following provides an overview of marking principles.

The types of questions used in this paper are:

- Statement or given view. Discuss . . . [20-mark extended response]
- To what extent . . . [20-mark extended response]
- Analyse . . . [12-mark extended response]
- Evaluate . . . [12-mark extended response]
- Compare . . . [12-mark extended response]
- To what extent . . . [information-handling question – 8 marks]
- Compare . . . [information-handling question – 8 marks]

Extended response questions (12 or 20 marks)

For 12-mark responses: up to a maximum of 8 marks will be awarded for knowledge and understanding (description, explanation and exemplification); the remaining marks will be awarded for the demonstration of higher-order skills of analysis or evaluation. Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

For 20-mark responses: up to 8 marks will be awarded for knowledge and understanding (description, explanation and exemplification); the remaining marks will be awarded for the demonstration of higher-order skills of analysis and evaluation and structured argument. Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

Analyse questions

- Candidates will identify parts of an issue, the relationship between these parts and their relationships with the whole; draw out and relate implications.

Compare questions

- Candidates will identify differences and/or similarities.

Evaluate questions

- Candidates will make a judgement based on criteria; determine the value of something.

Discuss type questions

- Candidates will communicate ideas and information on the issue in the statement; candidates will be credited for analysing and evaluating different views of the statement/viewpoint.

To what extent type questions

- Candidates will analyse the issue in the question and come to a conclusion or conclusions which involve an evaluative judgement which is likely to be quantitative in nature.

Source-based questions that assess information-handling skills (8 marks)

- Questions will have at least two sources at an appropriate SCQF level.
- Credit candidates who synthesise information both within and between sources.
- For full marks candidates must refer to all sources in their answer.

General marking guidelines for extended response (20 marks)

| | 1 mark | 2 marks | 3 marks | 4 marks | 5 marks | 6 marks |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|----------------|
| Knowledge and understanding scope Award up to 5 marks | One aspect with some description | Two aspects, each with some description OR One aspect with detailed description | Three aspects, each with some description OR Two aspects with detailed description | Four relevant aspects covered, each with some description OR Three aspects with detailed descriptions | Four aspects with detailed descriptions | |
| Knowledge and understanding development Award up to 5 marks A total of 8 marks overall awarded for knowledge and understanding | One aspect is developed with some explanations and/or exemplification | Two aspects are developed, each with some explanation and/or exemplification OR One aspect is developed with detailed explanation and/or exemplification | Three aspects are developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification OR Two aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification | Three or more aspects are developed, with extended explanation and relevant exemplification | Three or more aspects are developed, with extended and accurate explanations and development of points (showing where relevant a high level of theoretical/ conceptual understanding) with relevant exemplification | |
| Analysis* Award up to 6 marks | 1 mark will be awarded for each analytical statement which analyses the aspects in terms of the question. Award up to a maximum of 2 marks for an analytical statement with supporting justification or evidence. A maximum of 4 marks can be awarded for comments which address different aspects of an individual aspect. | | | | | |
| Structure Award up to 2 marks | Clear structure that addresses the issue identified in the question | Structure that clarifies the issue, presents evidence and develops a clear and consistent line of argument | | | | |
| Conclusions* Award up to 4 marks | A straightforward conclusion that deals with the central issue in the question | A straightforward conclusion that deals with and evaluates the central issue in the question | A developed conclusion that directly addresses and provides an evaluation of the key issue in the question | A developed and well-argued conclusion with justifications that directly address and evaluate the key issue in the question | | |

Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.

General marking guidelines for extended response (12 marks)

| | 1 mark | 2 marks | 3 marks | 4 marks |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Knowledge and understanding scope</p> <p>4 marks</p> | <p>One relevant aspect, with some description</p> | <p>Two relevant aspects, each with some description OR One relevant aspect, with detailed description</p> | <p>Three relevant aspects, each with some description OR Two relevant aspects, one with detailed description</p> | <p>Two relevant aspects, each with detailed description - these should include the key points OR Three relevant aspects, one with detailed description</p> |
| <p>Knowledge and understanding development</p> <p>4 marks</p> <p>A total of 8 marks overall awarded for knowledge and understanding</p> | <p>One aspect is developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification</p> | <p>Two aspects are developed, each with some explanation and/or exemplification OR One aspect is developed with detailed explanation and/or exemplification</p> | <p>Three aspects are developed, with some explanation and/or exemplification OR Two relevant aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification</p> | <p>Two aspects are developed, with extended explanation and relevant exemplification OR Three relevant aspects developed, one with detailed explanation and/or exemplification</p> |
| <p>Analysis and evaluation</p> <p>Comments that identify relationships/implications/ make judgements</p> <p>4 marks</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this</p> | <p>One relevant and accurate analytical or evaluative comment</p> | <p>Two different relevant and accurate analytical/ evaluative comments OR One extended and /or justified/ exemplified analytical or evaluative comment</p> | <p>Three different relevant and accurate analytical/ evaluative comments OR Two different relevant and analytical/evaluative comments, at least one of which is extended and/or justified/exemplified</p> | <p>Three relevant and accurate analytical/ evaluative comments , at least one of which is justified or exemplified OR An extended, accurate and justified analytical or evaluative comment of an insightful nature which covers all three aspects of the question</p> |

General marking guidelines for source-based questions (compare) - 8 marks

| | 1 mark | 2 marks | 3 marks |
|--|---|--|--|
| Analysis Identification of relevant points of comparison Award up to 3 marks | One accurate point of comparison identified from two sources | Two accurate points of comparison identified from two sources | Three accurate points of comparison identified from two sources |
| Analysis/evaluation Comments that identify relationships/implications/make judgements Award up to 3 marks | One relevant analytical/evaluative comment based on one point of comparison | Two relevant analytical/evaluative comments based on two points of comparison | Three relevant analytical/ evaluative comments based on three points of comparison |
| Overall conclusion Award up to 2 marks | Straightforward overall conclusion about the comparison based upon analysis of evidence | Detailed overall conclusion about the comparison based on analysis of evidence | |

General marking guidelines for source-based question (interpretation of electoral data) - 8 marks

| | 1 mark | 2 marks | 3 marks |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>Interpretation of data linked to first part of statement</p> <p>Award up to 3 marks</p> | <p>One aspect of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the first part of the statement</p> | <p>Two or more aspects of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the first part of the statement</p> | <p>Two or more aspects of data (from within one source or between sources) is synthesised and linked correctly to the first part of the statement with commentary</p> |
| <p>Interpretation of data linked to second part of statement</p> <p>Award up to 3 marks</p> | <p>One aspect of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the second part of the statement</p> | <p>Two or more aspects of data interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the second part of the statement</p> | <p>Two or more aspects of data (from within a single source or between sources) is synthesised and linked correctly to the second part of the statement with commentary</p> |
| <p>Evaluation of extent of validity of the viewpoint</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks</p> | <p>Evaluative comment on validity of one part of the statement</p> | <p>Evaluative comments on validity of both parts of the statement OR Single evaluative comment incorporating overall conclusion about both parts of the statement</p> | |

Detailed Marking Instructions for each question

Section 1 - Political Theory

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 1. | <p>Candidates must demonstrate they can make accurate comparisons and draw valid conclusions.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must refer to all sources and also say to what extent the evidence supports the viewpoint.</p> <p>Analysis/evaluation Comparisons will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifying areas of difference • Identifying areas of similarity • Making evaluative comments on the extent of these differences/similarities • Commenting on the consequences of these differences/similarities. <p>For full marks, candidates must use both sources and make three points of comparison.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for each accurate point of comparison and analytical comment.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 6 marks for accurate comparisons with associated analysis.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for an overall conclusion.</p> | 8 | <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Socialists consider it the role of the state to change, and then replace, the existing capitalist economic order • Socialists believe private property leads to inequality and exploitation and the state should remove this cause of inequality. Socialists oppose private property and support the common ownership of the means of production. • Socialists tend to hold a positive view of human nature and believe that it is the state's responsibility to create conditions that will foster co-operation between people and remove sources of resentment such as competition. <p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservatives believe that the state's role is to provide continuity by maintaining the status quo and promoting tradition and only allowing gradual change. • The Conservative view is that the state should protect people's private property as this provides a number of socially useful benefits • Conservatives hold a negative view of human nature, preferring instead that the state achieves social order by means of deterrents such as harsh punishment. <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Socialists believe in common ownership and a command economy, a Socialist state would be expected to achieve a fairer distribution of society's wealth. However, the Conservative view is that the state should protect people's private property, but not provide support for the less fortunate</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | <p>One point of comparison is identified from two sources (1 mark).</p> <p>Socialists believe the role of the state is to promote common ownership and a command economy, as this would be expected to achieve a fairer distribution of society's wealth. However, the Conservative view is that the state should protect people's private property, but not provide support for the less fortunate. Therefore the two ideologies have radically different views on the role of the state and private property.</p> <p>This is worth 2 marks. One point of comparison is identified from two sources (1 mark) and a relevant analytical comment is made (1 mark).</p> <p>Overall, socialism and conservatism see two drastically different roles for the state. Socialism view the state as leading change to promote a better society but conservatism sees the role of the state to maintain the existing structure to society and promote order and security</p> <p>A detailed conclusion is made (2 marks).</p> <p>Candidates may make individual evaluative comments as they address each part of the viewpoint (mini conclusions throughout) or they may produce a summative evaluation of each part of the viewpoint at the conclusion to their answer (overall conclusion) - both approaches should be credited.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| 2. (a) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of political concepts, adopting a comparative approach if appropriate to the question.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question to gain up to full marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The breadth of knowledge covered • The level of detail and description of these points • The accuracy of descriptions and explanations • How these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided. <p>Analysis/evaluation Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> | 12 | <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power as the ability to get someone to do something, which they would not have done otherwise through the use of threats, sanctions, manipulation or rewards. • Lukes’ first face of power: the open face of power, where the decision-making process is considered to be relatively transparent. • Lukes’ second face of power: the secretive face of power, in which the political agenda is set behind closed doors. • Lukes’ third face of power: evident where power is the ability to manipulate the opinions of others in order to persuade them that what is being proposed is desirable. <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>The third face of power is defined by Lukes as the ability to shape desires.</p> <p>This form of power is the ability to alter what someone thinks they want or need that may actually go against their best interests.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>The third face of power is defined by Lukes as the ability to shape desires. This form of power is the ability to alter what someone thinks they want or need that may actually go against their best interests. Lukes identified this as the most insidious face of power, with those in power being able to manipulate the rest of society into believing they are acting in their best interests.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| | <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between different components • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> | | <p>This contains one relevant aspect with more detailed description (2 marks).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 3 marks:</p> <p>The third face of power is defined by Lukes as the ability to shape desires. This form of power is the ability to alter what someone thinks they want or need that may actually go against their best interests. Lukes identified this as the most insidious face of power, with those in power being able to manipulate the rest of society into believing they are acting in their best interests. For example, Tony Blair claimed that there was strong evidence that Iraq under Saddam Hussein had Weapons of Mass Destruction. This was used to justify the invasion of Iraq but once the invasion had taken place it was revealed that this was not the case and lead to claims that that the evidence had been manipulated by the Prime Minister in order to manipulate public opinion.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (2 marks) and development with exemplification (1 mark).</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for an analytical comment. To gain 4 marks candidates must make analytical comments on at least two of the aspects covered in their answer; otherwise a maximum of up to 3 marks for analysis can be awarded.</p> <p>Lukes categorised the first face of power as the open face as the exercise of power was transparent and we could see who was using it and when it was being exercised. He identified the other two faces as the closed faces of power as it was not apparent who was wielding this power or when it was being used.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| | <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>This is a straightforward analytical and comparative comment and is worth 1 mark.</p> <p>Lukes categorised the first face of power as the open face as the exercise of power was transparent and we could see who was using it and when it was being exercised. For example when legislation was passed in parliament it was possible to identify how MPs voted and the impact of pressure groups etc. He identified the other two faces as the closed faces of power as it was not apparent who was wielding this power or when it was being used. Lukes argued that power was being exercised behind closed doors or when others did not recognise when it was being used.</p> <p>This is a more detailed and analytical comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| 2. (b) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of political concepts, adopting a comparative approach if appropriate to the question.</p> <p>Candidates must refer to at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question to gain up to full marks.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The breadth of knowledge covered • The level of detail and description of these points • The accuracy of descriptions and explanations • How these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanation provided. <p>Analysis/evaluation Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> | 12 | <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question (candidates must address at least two aspects to achieve full marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People make decisions and are expected to participate fully in the political process • Heightens the control of citizens • It creates a better informed and more politically knowledgeable citizenry • Do not have to rely on self-serving politicians • Credit any other relevant points. <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>Direct democracy means that people are expected to take part in political decision-making, such as law-making, themselves. It means that they don't have to rely on professional politicians who may only be in it for their own self-interest.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>Direct democracy means that people are expected to take part in political decision-making, such as law-making, themselves. This may be achieved through referenda where the voters directly make decisions on the issue. It means that they don't have to rely on professional politicians as in a system of representative democracy and would be the participants in the decision making process and may only be in it for their own self-interest or are constrained in parliament by party discipline.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with more detailed description (2 marks).</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| | <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between different components • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> | | <p>Direct democracy means that people are expected to take part in political decision-making, such as law-making, themselves. This may be achieved through referenda where the voters directly make decisions on the issue. It means that they don't have to rely on professional politicians as in a system of representative democracy and would be the participants in the decision making process and may only be in it for their own self-interest or are constrained in parliament by party discipline. The rule that ensues is considered legitimate; decisions will be accepted since the people made them. Ever since its inception in Ancient Greece, some such as Plato, have argued against its use, often on the grounds that the 'masses' don't know what's best for them. In modern times some consider it to be impractical, given the size of modern populations and the complexity of the decisions to be made. Others argue that the expansion of the use of referenda and of e-voting may enhance the standing of direct democracy. For example, Swiss cantons frequently provide opportunities for citizens to make political decisions directly.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (2 marks) and detailed development with explanation and exemplification (2 marks).</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for analytical comments on the key features of direct democracy. To gain 4 marks candidates must make analytical comments on at least two of the aspects covered in their answer; otherwise a maximum of up to 3 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>One of the key strengths of direct democracy is that it places decision making directly in this hands of the people. This means that all decisions are legitimate as they are made directly by the people. However, if the population in general lack understanding of issues then it means that poor decision making could result.</p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical comment and is worth 1 mark.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| | <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>One of the key strengths of direct democracy is that it places decision making directly in the hands of the people. This means that all decisions are legitimate as they are made directly by the people. However, if the population in general lack understanding of issues then it means that poor decision making could result. For example in some states where direct forms of decision making are offered, such as California, the voters have decided to have lower taxes but increased spending and this caused the state to have huge budget problems.</p> <p>This is a more detailed analytical comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> |

Section 2 - Political Systems

| Question | | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|-----|---|----------|---|
| 3. | (a) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of the constitutions of two different political systems and any links between them.</p> <p>Candidates must compare any two of the constitutions of the UK, USA, Scotland or the EU.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided <p>Analysis Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> | 20 | <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>If for example the UK and USA are chosen:</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of the constitution (ie for UK - Statue law, common law, conventions, works of authority, EU treaties etc) • Key constitutional principles (ie Federalism, separation of powers, Parliamentary supremacy, unitary state etc) • Codified and uncodified constitutions • Flexibility and process of amendment • Role and influence of the judiciary in interpreting the constitution <p>Credit any other relevant points</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>The USA has a codified constitution contained within one written document. The UK constitution is uncodified and does not have a single document called the constitution, the UK's constitution is derived from a number of sources.</p> <p>This contains one aspect but with limited description (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>The USA has a codified constitution contained within one written document. The US constitution was written by the Founding Fathers after America gained independence and sets out the federal system of government and the rights US citizens have. The UK constitution is uncodified and does not have a single document called the constitution, the UK's constitution is derived from a number of sources. The UK constitution has evolved over hundreds of years and is based on sources such as common law, statute law, EU treaties etc.</p> |

Page sixteen

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between different components • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure <p>Conclusion(s) Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence • the relative importance of factors • counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations • the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> | | <p>This contains one aspect with limited description (1 mark) and limited development with some exemplification or explanations (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 4 marks:</p> <p>The USA has a codified constitution contained within one written document. The US constitution was written by the Founding Fathers after America gained independence and sets out the federal system of government and the rights US citizens have. Article Four of the US constitution outlines the relation between the states and the federal government. It gives each of the 50 states particular powers eg in education which cannot be taken away by the federal Government.</p> <p>The UK constitution is uncodified and does not have a single document called the constitution, the UK's constitution is derived from a number of sources. The UK constitution has evolved over hundreds of years and is based on sources such as common law, statute law, EU treaties etc. For example, the Scotland Act 1997 changed the constitutional arrangements in the UK by creating the Scottish Parliament. As a result, statute law changed the constitutional arrangements of the UK and powers were devolved to the Scottish Parliament.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with detailed descriptions (2 marks) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations (2 marks).</p> <p>Analysis</p> <p>Award up to 6 marks for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary (identifying the component parts and their relationships).</p> <p>One way in which the two constitutions are different is in the importance of the constitution to political life. In the US, the constitution is supreme and is the highest form of law. On the other hand, in the UK, parliament is supreme.</p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical statement that identifies one difference between the UK and US constitutions. This is worth 1 mark.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|--|
| | <p>Structure Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>Award up to maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to a maximum of 12 marks for analysis/evaluation/structure.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>One way in which the two constitutions are different is in the separation of powers. A key feature of the US constitution is the strict separation of the powers; between the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. This is to ensure that no one person or institution could hold too much power. By contrast, the UK constitution has no separation of powers. Indeed, until 2005 one person, the Lord Chancellor, could be a member of all three arms of government; the Cabinet (the executive), a member of the House of Lords (the legislature) and the head of the legal system (the judiciary).</p> <p>This is a more detailed analytical statement that identifies one difference between the UK and US constitutions with additional justification and supporting evidence.(2 marks)</p> <p>Structure</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response. For example, candidates should be credited highly for answers which define the central issue in their introduction, and provide a clear structure so that their essay develops a line of argument. Candidates should receive little or no credit for answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question (eg by failing to identify differences/similarities between constitutions in different political systems), or provide poorly structured answers which jump between different parts of the question and hence fail to develop a coherent line of argument.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>In conclusion, there are big differences between the status of the constitutions of the US and the UK. In the US the constitution is supreme whereas in the UK parliament is supreme.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| | | | <p>This provides a straightforward if limited conclusion which does attempt to deal with the central issue as identified by the question (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>In conclusion, there are big differences between the status of the constitutions of the US and the UK. In the US the constitution is supreme whereas in the UK parliament is supreme. In the USA the Supreme Court can override legislation passed by congress by declaring it unconstitutional. However, the judiciary in the UK cannot invalidate an Act of Parliament. Therefore, the US constitution has a much higher status than the UK's constitution.</p> <p>This provides a straightforward conclusion which does deal with the central issue but also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question (2 marks).</p> <p>In conclusion, there are big differences between the nature and the status of the constitutions of the US and the UK. In the US the constitution is supreme. In the USA the Supreme Court can override legislation passed by congress by declaring it unconstitutional. The Supreme Court, through its power to interpret the constitution, has frequently intervened to block the will of the President and Congress. For example in 2010, the Supreme Court declared in its Citizens United decision that campaign finance limits were unconstitutional. The ability of the judiciary to interpret the constitution is one of the few ways that the constitution can be altered other than through the difficult formal amendment process. Overall, the US constitution is relatively inflexible.</p> <p>However, the judiciary in the UK cannot invalidate an Act of Parliament. In the UK the judiciary does not have power of judicial review. In the UK, one of the key principles of the constitution is that Parliament is supreme and this is one area where there is a clear difference between the UK and the US where the constitution is supreme. The ability of parliament to pass legislation such as the Scotland Act which alters the constitutional arrangements shows that in the UK the constitution is more flexible and can be more easily altered. Therefore, the US constitution has a different nature and much higher status than the UK's constitution.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | <p>This provides a very detailed conclusion which directly addresses and evaluates the key issue in the question and provides a high level of sophistication as it develops a line of thought with supporting justifications (4 marks).</p> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 3. (b) | <p>Candidates must demonstrate knowledge and understanding of key features of the political executive of two different political systems and any links between them and the other branches of Government.</p> <p>Candidates must compare the political executives of any two of the following - Scotland, UK, EU or USA.</p> <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided <p>Analysis Analysis involves identifying parts, the relationship between them, and their relationships with the whole. It can also involve drawing out and relating implications.</p> <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> | 20 | <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>If for example the UK and USA were chosen:</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constitutional limits on power of Executive • Checks by the Legislature • Position in relation to Cabinet • Limits on role as commander-in-chief • Term limits • Removal of Executive by Vote of No Confidence or Impeachment <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>In the UK the Prime Minister leads the largest party and the whip system usually ensures that the Government can pass its legislative programme. In the US however, Congress is elected separately from the President and is often controlled by a different political party than that of the President and in this circumstance the President may be unable to have his preferred legislation passed.</p> <p>This contains one aspect but with limited description (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>In the UK the Prime Minister leads the largest party and the whip system usually ensures that the Government can pass its legislative programme. In the US however, Congress is elected separately from the President and is often controlled by a different political party than that of the President and in this circumstance the President may be unable to have his preferred legislation passed. For example, Congress blocked President Obama's request for immigration reform.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between different components • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure <p>Conclusion(s) Candidates must reach a conclusion(s), make a judgment(s) or evaluative comment(s) about the issue in the question.</p> <p>Evaluation involves making judgments and/or drawing conclusions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the extent to which a view is supported by the evidence • the relative importance of factors • counter-arguments, including possible alternative interpretations • the overall impact/significance of the factors when taken together | | <p>This contains one aspect with limited description (1 mark) and limited development with some exemplification (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 4 marks:</p> <p>In the UK the Prime Minister leads the largest party and the whip system usually ensures that the Government can pass its legislative programme. For example, Tony Blair as Prime Minister had majorities in three different parliaments. Like all prime ministers, he used both the parliamentary whips and the loyalty of backbench MPs to have his key policies passed in parliament. In his first two terms Tony Blair suffered no parliamentary defeats, but in his third term he was defeated in parliament on a number of issues after rebellions by backbench Labour MPs.</p> <p>In the US however, Congress is elected separately from the President and is often controlled by a different political party than that of the President and in this circumstance the President may be unable to have his preferred legislation passed. Party loyalty is not as strong in the US than it is in the UK. For example, Congress blocked President Obama's request for immigration reform and he also found it very difficult to have his health care bill passed by Congress.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with detailed descriptions (2 marks) with a high degree of development based on highly relevant exemplification and detailed explanations (2 marks).</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Analysis Award up to 6 marks for answers that provide a high degree of analytical commentary (identifying the component parts and their relationships).</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| | <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> <p>Structure Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response.</p> <p>Award up to maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding. Award up to a maximum of 12 marks for analysis/evaluation/structure.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>UK prime ministers have fewer restrictions on their powers than American presidents and will usually be able to pass their legislative programmes as long as they have a majority in parliament.</p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical statement that identifies one difference between the limits on the UK prime minister and the US president. This is worth 1 mark.</p> <p>UK prime ministers have fewer restrictions on their powers than American presidents and will usually be able to pass their legislative programmes as long as they have a majority in parliament. The UK has a very strong whip system, indeed MPs are sometimes referred to as 'lobby fodder'. Party discipline is traditionally a strong feature of politics in the UK.</p> <p>By contrast, the US President relies on persuasion to have his proposals passed. There are a wide range of checks and balances across the US political system. Since 2010 president Obama, a Democrat, faced a very partisan Republican majority in the House of Representatives and this has made him one of the weaker Presidents in recent years.</p> <p>This is a more detailed analytical statement that identifies one difference between the UK prime minister and the US president with additional justification and supporting evidence. This is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Structure</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for the structure of the essay as well as the development of a line of argument throughout the candidate's response. For example, candidates should be credited highly for answers which define the central issue in their introduction, and provide a clear structure so that their essay develops a line of argument. Candidates should receive little or no credit for answers which do not explicitly identify or address the key issue in the question (eg by failing to identify differences/similarities between constitutions in different political systems), or provide poorly structured answers which jump between different parts of the question and hence fail to develop a coherent line of argument.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for a conclusion(s) based on the candidate's attempts to address the issue framed in the question. Candidates must also provide an evaluation/judgement of the issue addressed in the question.</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>In conclusion, UK prime ministers appear to have fewer limits on their powers than that of American presidents.</p> <p>This provides a straightforward if limited conclusion which does attempt to deal with the central issue as identified by the question (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>In conclusion, UK prime ministers appear to have fewer limits on their powers than that of American presidents. The US Constitution ensures that all US Presidents have a range of checks and balances in Congress and the Supreme Court to ensure that no one branch of government has absolute power. In the UK the prime minister does not have the same constitutional restrictions on their power.</p> <p>This provides a straightforward conclusion which does deal with the central issue but also attempts to evaluate the statement in the question (2 marks).</p> <p>In conclusion, the UK prime minister does appear to have very few limits on his power. This has led to claims that we have moved from a Cabinet system of government to a prime ministerial form of government. This was a charge that was levelled at Tony Blair. The American president on the other hand has many limits on their power. The US Constitution ensures that all US Presidents have a range of checks and balances to ensure that no one branch of government has absolute power. In the UK the prime minister does not have the same restrictions on their power.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | <p>The UK prime minister is, in most circumstances, able to dominate parliament and pass their legislative programme and is highly unlikely to be removed through a vote of no confidence. There are also no term limits. On the other hand, the US president will, more often than not, face a Congress with at least one chamber controlled by the opposing party and in recent years partisan opposition has severely restricted the ability of the president to implement his programme.</p> <p>This provides a very detailed conclusion which directly addresses and evaluates the key issue in the question and provides a high level of sophistication as it develops a line of thought with supporting justifications (4 marks).</p> <p>Although some candidates may offer a summative conclusion, many candidates will develop detailed conclusions throughout their answers and these should also be credited accordingly.</p> |

Section 3 - Political Parties and Elections

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| 4. | <p>Candidates must demonstrate that they can interpret and evaluate electoral data.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must refer to all sources and also say to what extent the data supports the statement made.</p> <p>Analysis/evaluation Award up to 3 marks for answers that correctly interpret electoral data and link this to a specific part of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an evaluation of the validity of each part of the viewpoint.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must address both parts of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 6 marks for interpretation of data linked to each part of the viewpoint.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 2 marks for evaluation of the validity of the viewpoint.</p> | 8 | <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <p>Source A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour won both elections and retained the seat. • Labour increased its majority from 1,247 to 5,488. • However, Labour’s total votes decreased from 11,926 to 11,192. • Both the SNP and the Liberal Democrats saw a significant decline in the number of votes received. • The Conservatives increased their votes from 1,792 to 1,893. • Others increased their votes from 276 to 848. <p>Source B</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Labour increased their share of the vote from 46.5% to 55.8% • The SNP share of the vote dropped by over 13% and the Liberal Democrats fell from 3.9% to 3%. • The Conservative Party saw a slight increase in their share of the vote, going from 7% to 9.4%. • Others share of the vote rose from 1.1% to 3.2%. <p>Source C</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total number of votes cast fell from 25,750 to 20,083. • Fewer spoilt ballots in 2014 (21) as opposed to 2011 (80). • There was a decrease in voter turnout by over 12%. • Increase in the number of candidates standing for election. <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | <p>Analysis: interpretation</p> <p>The following aspect would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>The view states that the Cowdenbeath election of 2014 was a great success for the Labour party and that no other party could be pleased with the outcome. Source A shows that Labour retained the seat and increased their majority by over 4,000 votes. However there was a slight fall in the number of votes they received compared to 2011.</p> <p>One aspect of data (eg number of votes) is interpreted accurately and linked correctly to the first part of the statement (1 mark).</p> <p>The following aspects would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>The view states that the Cowdenbeath election of 2014 great success for the Labour party and that no other party could be pleased with the outcome. Source A shows that Labour retained the seat with an increased majority of over 4,000 votes. However there was a slight fall in the number of votes they received compared to 2011.</p> <p>Source B shows that the Labour share of the vote increased significantly (nearly 10%) but although the SNP and Lib Dems share of the vote fell there was an increase in the share of the vote for the Conservatives and the Others.</p> <p>Two or more aspects of data (eg number of votes and share of the vote) are interpreted correctly and linked to the first part of the statement (2 marks).</p> <p>The following aspects would be awarded 3 marks:</p> <p>The view states that the Cowdenbeath election of 2014 great success for the Labour party and that no other party could be pleased with the outcome. Source A shows that Labour retained the seat with an increased majority of over 4,000 votes. However there was a slight fall in the number of votes they received compared to 2011.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | | | <p>Source B shows that the Labour share of the vote increased significantly (nearly 10%) but although the SNP and Lib Dems share of the vote fell there was an increase in the share of the vote for the Conservatives and the Others.</p> <p>Overall the information from both sources shows that the 2014 election was a great success for Labour but that the Conservatives and the Others could claim to be pleased with the outcome as they had increased their share of the vote.</p> <p>Two or more aspects of data (between two sources) are synthesised and linked correctly to the first part of the statement. (3 marks).</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>Overall, the evidence only partially supports the first part of the statement as the 2014 election was a great success for Labour but it is not the case that no other party could be pleased with their performance as the Others and the Conservatives did better in 2014 than in 2011.</p> <p>An evaluative comment is made on one part of the statement (1 mark).</p> <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>Overall, the evidence only partially supports the first part of the statement as the 2014 election was a great success for Labour but it is not the case that no other party could be pleased with their performance as the Others and the Conservatives did better in 2014 than in 2011.</p> <p>In addition it is wrong to claim there was significantly greater participation as there was a slight increase in some areas but the total number of votes actually fell by over 5,000.</p> <p>Evaluative comments on the validity of both parts of the statement have been made.</p> |

| Question | | | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|--|--|----------|--|
| | | | | | Candidates may make individual evaluative comments as they address each part of the viewpoint or they may produce a summative evaluation of each part of the viewpoint at the conclusion to their answer – both approaches should be credited. |
| | | | | | |

| Question | | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|-----|--|----------|--|
| 5. | (a) | <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Analysis/evaluation Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> | 12 | <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of social media eg Twitter and Facebook • Phone banks • Blogging • Internet eg websites, YouTube • Use of mobile technology eg mobile apps • Voter targeting software <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>The following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>In an attempt to engage with voters in the run up to the 2011 Scottish Parliament election, the SNP used new software to enable their campaign to be at the forefront of developments and keep ahead of their competitors. This software helped the SNP to target potential voters.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <p>links between different components</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>The following would be awarded 2 marks:</p> <p>In an attempt to engage with voters in the run up to the 2011 Scottish Parliament election, the SNP used new software to enable their campaign to be at the forefront of developments and keep ahead of their competitors. This software helped the SNP to target potential voters.</p> <p>They made use of a smartphone app that was linked to their bespoke database, Activate. This meant that voters and particular groups could be targeted and approached by the campaigners, saving time and directing resources where they could make a difference to the performance of the SNP in the election.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with more detailed description (2 marks).</p> <p>The following would be awarded up to 4 marks:</p> <p>In an attempt to engage with voters in the run up to the 2011 Scottish Parliament election, the SNP used new software to enable their campaign to be at the forefront of developments and keep ahead of their competitors. This software helped the SNP to target potential voters.</p> <p>They made use of a smartphone app that was linked to their bespoke database, Activate. This meant that voters and particular groups could be targeted and approached by the campaigners, saving time and directing resources where they could make a difference to the performance of the SNP in the election.</p> <p>A record of all 3.9 million voters, it also showed which people had voted previously, and how they fitted into 44 consumer types identified by postcode, family type, income and age. The fact that the database and app were steering the activists in terms of who they should approach meant that the SNP campaign could focus on particular demographics. This allowed them to canvass more members of the public in a week compared to conventional polls.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|---|
| | <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>This contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (2 marks) and detailed development with exemplification and explanation (2 marks).</p> <p>Analysis/Evaluation</p> <p>It has been claimed that the use of this database enabled the SNP canvassers to get more of their supporters to the polls, which contributed to their success in the 2011 election.</p> <p>This is a straightforward analytical comment and is worth 1 mark.</p> <p>The continued use of Activate proved to be beneficial to the SNP in the run up to the 2011 Scottish Parliament election. The newly introduced app for smartphones further enhanced the effectiveness of Activate as it enabled campaigners and activists to target particular groups in society. It could be argued that this was especially helpful to the campaign as they were less likely to approach voters who were not SNP supporters, based on the detailed information available.</p> <p>This is a more detailed evaluative comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> |

| Question | | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|-----|---|----------|--|
| 5. | (b) | <p>Knowledge and understanding Marks should be allocated for knowledge and understanding based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the breadth of knowledge covered • the level of detail and description of these points • the accuracy of descriptions and explanations • how these points are developed, taking into account the use of exemplification and the levels of explanations provided <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Analysis/evaluation Award up to 4 marks for answers that provide analytical/comparative comments.</p> | 12 | <p>Knowledge and understanding</p> <p>Credit reference to the following aspects of the question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-interest and consumer voting • Issue voting • Party leadership • Campaigns • Competence and reputation of political parties <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Possible responses may include:</p> <p>For example the following would be awarded 1 mark:</p> <p>The rational choice model of voting behaviour is concerned with the way in which people may vote based on their own rational self-interest. This can often be in relation to the economy, as there can be a link between the performance of a government and the strength of the economy at that particular time.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with limited description (1 mark).</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| | <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical/comparative comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>An analysis mark should be awarded where a candidate uses their knowledge and understanding/a source to identify relevant components (eg of an idea, theory, argument, etc) and clearly shows at least one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • links between different components • links between component(s) and the whole • links between component(s) and related concepts • similarities and contradictions • consistency and inconsistency • different views/interpretations • possible consequences/ implications • the relative importance of components • understanding of underlying order or structure. <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/ evaluation.</p> | | <p>The following would be worth 2 marks:</p> <p>The rational choice model of voting behaviour is concerned with the way in which people may vote based on their own rational self-interest. This can often be in relation to the economy, as there can be a link between the performance of a government and the strength of the economy at that particular time.</p> <p>Issues such as high unemployment, pay freezes and cuts in public spending “hurt” the voter, which can affect how they will cast their vote. Previous Prime Ministers have been accused of creating pre-election “booms” with regards to the economy, trying to curry favour with the electorate.</p> <p>This contains one aspect with detailed description. 2 marks.</p> <p>The following would be awarded 4 marks:</p> <p>The rational choice model of voting behaviour is concerned with the way in which people may vote based on their own rational self-interest. This can often be in relation to the economy, as there can be a link between the performance of a government and the strength of the economy at that particular time.</p> <p>Issues such as high unemployment, pay freezes and cuts in public spending “hurt” the voter, which can affect how they will cast their vote. Previous Prime Ministers have been accused of creating pre-election “booms” with regards to the economy, trying to curry favour with the electorate.</p> <p>Voters can be influenced by how the economy is performing and the subsequent impact (either of a positive or a negative nature) on their lives. House prices, interest rates and taxation are just some of the different policies that are covered by “the Economy”.</p> |

| Question | General Marking Instructions for this type of question | Max Mark | Specific Marking Instructions for this question |
|----------|---|----------|---|
| | <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> <p>For full marks, candidates must make analytical comments on at least two aspects of the issue identified in the question.</p> <p>Award up to a maximum of 8 marks for knowledge and understanding.</p> <p>Award up to 4 marks for analysis/evaluation.</p> <p>Where a candidate makes more analytical/evaluative points than are required to gain the maximum allocation of 4 marks, these can be credited as knowledge and understanding marks provided they meet the criteria for this.</p> | | <p>In 2010, the economy was identified as the single most important issue in the mind of voters. The Labour party was associated in the minds of many voters with the financial crisis. Opinion polls carried out before the 2010 election indicated that many voters blamed the Labour government. This was viewed as a major factor in Labour's defeat.</p> <p>This contains one relevant aspect with detailed description (2 marks) and detailed development with explanation and exemplification (2 marks).</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> <p>Analysis/Evaluation</p> <p>Increasingly, the handling of the economy is becoming more prominent in voters' minds. Surveys of voters' attitudes indicate it is always one of the main factors affecting how people vote.</p> <p>This is a straightforward evaluative comment and is worth 1 mark.</p> <p>Increasingly, the handling of the economy is becoming more prominent in voters' minds. Surveys of voters' attitudes indicate it is always one of the main factors affecting how people vote. For example in 2010, the economy was ranked the number one issue by voters above other factors such as immigration and the NHS.</p> <p>This is a more detailed evaluative comment with supporting evidence provided and is worth 2 marks.</p> <p>Credit any other relevant points.</p> |

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]