



---

# **GCE AS MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2022**

**AS  
GOVERNMENT & POLITICS – UNIT 2  
2160U20-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

## **GCE GOVERNMENT & POLITICS**

### **UNIT 2 - LIVING AND PARTICIPATING IN A DEMOCRACY**

#### **SUMMER 2022 MARK SCHEME**

#### **Marking guidance for examiners**

#### **Summary of assessment objectives for Unit 2**

The questions in Section A assess AO1. The questions in Section B assess both AO1 and AO2. The questions in Section C assess both AO1 and AO3. The assessment objectives focus on the ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories and issues (AO1); the ability to interpret and apply political information to identify and explain relevant similarities, differences, and connections (AO2), and the ability to analyse and evaluate the areas of government and politics studied to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions (AO3).

#### **The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for each question has two parts:

- Advice outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by the candidates.
- An assessment grid advising bands and associated marks that should be allocated to responses which demonstrate the characteristics needed in AO1, AO2 and AO3.

#### **Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

- The first stage for an examiner is to use both the indicative content and the assessment grid to decide the overall band.
- The second stage is to decide how firmly the characteristics expected for that band are displayed.
- Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

#### **Organisation and communication**

This issue should have bearing if the standard of organisation and communication is inconsistent with the descriptor for the band in which the answer falls. In this situation, examiners may decide not to award the highest mark in the band.

#### **Level Descriptors**

Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of level descriptors best describes the overall quality of the answer. The following grid should inform your decision as to which band the answer belongs. (N.B. The majority of questions follow a four-band structure. However, when the question has three bands 'Adequate' as a descriptor has been removed.)

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Thorough</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aware of a wide range of detailed and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates fully developed understanding that shows relevance to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are well chosen.</li> <li>• Precision in the use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is consistently applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a clear, developed and convincing interpretation of evidence that is fully accurate.</li> <li>• Is able to fully identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used in a consistently appropriate and effective way.</li> <li>• An effective and balanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Detailed and substantiated evaluation that offers secure judgements leading to rational conclusions.</li> </ul>
<b>Reasonable</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a range of detailed and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates well developed understanding that is relevant to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are appropriate.</li> <li>• Generally precise in the use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is mainly applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a clear and developed interpretation of evidence that is mostly accurate.</li> <li>• Is partially able to identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are mostly used in a suitable way and with a good level of competence and precision.</li> <li>• An accurate and balanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Detailed evaluation that offers generally secure judgements, with some link between rational conclusions and evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows some accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates partial understanding that is relevant to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is partially applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a sound interpretation of evidence that shows some accuracy.</li> <li>• Makes some attempt to identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used in a suitable way with a sound level of competence but may lack precision.</li> <li>• An imbalanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Sound evaluation that offers generalised judgements and conclusions, with limited use of evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>Limited</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge with some relevance to the topic or question.</li> <li>• Little or no development seen.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little or no use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is applied in a weak manner to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Can only form a simple interpretation of evidence, if at all, with very limited accuracy.</li> <li>• Makes weak attempt to identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used with limited competence.</li> <li>• Unsupported evaluation that offers simple or no conclusions.</li> </ul>

## Section A

### Question 1

Using examples, briefly describe **three** significant rights of citizens.

[6]

#### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In briefly describing **three** significant rights that citizens have candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of citizen rights and the part they play in the governance of the United Kingdom. In demonstrating this knowledge and understanding candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on describing rights that citizens have. The response might consider issues such as:

Could any three from the following:

- The right to freedom of expression, e.g. freedom of speech.
- The right to free association and demonstration, e.g. membership of a trade union.
- The right to privacy, e.g. access to sensitive information.
- The right to withdraw labour, e.g. strike action.
- The right to liberty and a fair trial, e.g. equality before the law.
- Any other relevant information.

Band	Marks	AO1
3	5-6	Thorough knowledge and understanding of three significant rights of citizens, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
2	3-4	Reasonable knowledge and understanding of three significant rights of citizens, with some use of evidence/examples.
1	1-2	Limited knowledge and understanding of three significant rights of citizens, with limited evidence/examples.
	0	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.

## Question 2

Using examples, briefly describe the main reasons for partisan dealignment in Wales and the UK. [6]

### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In describing the main reasons for partisan dealignment, candidates are expected to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the main reasons for partisan dealignment in Wales and the UK. In demonstrating this knowledge and understanding candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on describing the main reasons for partisan dealignment in Wales and the UK. The response might consider issues such as:

- The decline of class-based voting, e.g. traditional Labour voters voting Conservative or for Nationalist parties.
- It suggests that traditional Labour and Conservatives voters have moved away from voting based on class.
- Greater volatility in voter allegiance, election to election, based on dissatisfaction with the government.
- Consequence of greater political awareness and socialization.
- An aspect in the decline of deference within society.
- The predominance of short-term factors, e.g. issues.
- Any other relevant information.

Band	Marks	AO1
3	5-6	Thorough knowledge and understanding of partisan dealignment, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
2	3-4	Reasonable knowledge and understanding of partisan dealignment, with some use of evidence/examples.
1	1-2	Limited knowledge and understanding of partisan dealignment, with limited evidence/examples.
	0	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.

## Section B

### Question 3

Read Extract A below and answer the question that follows.

#### Extract A

##### What is STV?

There are a number of different alternatives to FPTP (First Past the Post), some of which are already being used in the UK. The best is called the Single Transferable Vote (STV). It uses 'preferential' voting in constituencies electing a number of members – instead of voting with an 'X', electors cast their ballot by numbering the candidates in order of preference – 1,2,3 and so on.

Candidates don't need a majority of the votes to be elected, just a known 'quota' or share of the votes, allowing minority viewpoints to be represented. Because voters are able to rank all the candidates in order of preference, few votes are wasted, unlike in FPTP elections where the majority of votes often do not contribute to the result.

[Extract adapted from [www.electoral-reform.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/What-is-STV.pdf](http://www.electoral-reform.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/What-is-STV.pdf), accessed July 2021]

Using Extract A as well as your own knowledge, compare and contrast the First Past the Post electoral system with the Single Transferable Vote electoral system. **[24]**

#### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In comparing the (FPTP) and (STV) electoral systems candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to interpret and apply political information of the First Past the Post electoral system with the Single Transferable Vote electoral system and explain the comparisons and contrasts between them. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on any relevant connections between them. The response might consider issues such as:

- FPTP gives the voter one candidate per party whereas STV gives the voter a choice of candidates in a multimember constituency (MMC). This usually includes a choice of candidates with the same party allegiance. STV is a preferential voting system so the voter ranks the candidates on the ballot paper in order of preference unlike FPTP. In both systems the voter cannot vote directly for a party.
- STV is a voting system designed to achieve a (more or less) proportional result whereas FPTP is not proportional. There are variations of STV. To achieve proportionality STV requires constituencies to be organised as Multimember constituencies (MMC) unlike FPTP which has single member constituencies.
- FPTP has clarity and is simple for the voter whereas in a 4 or 5 MMC with STV, with 5 or 6 parties competing, the total number of candidates on the ballot paper may be quite large. In practical terms it is relatively demanding to ask the voter to express a reasoned preference.

- In FPTP counting is relatively straightforward and the candidate with the most votes wins whereas in STV counting is complex. Each vote is initially allocated to the voter's preferred candidate. Depending on the number of electors and the number of candidates, each candidate needs a minimum number of votes to be elected. Counting is done in stages. A candidate is eliminated at each stage. When a candidate is eliminated, or has enough votes to be elected, surplus votes are transferred to the remaining candidates. There are different methods of doing this.
- Any other relevant information.



<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well-chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>13-16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Thorough interpretation of political information on FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Thorough explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections between FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>9-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Reasonable interpretation of political information on FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Reasonable explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections between FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>5-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Adequate interpretation of political information on FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Adequate explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections between FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Limited interpretation of political information on FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> <li>• Limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections FPTP and STV electoral systems.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Question 4

Read Extract B below and answer the question that follows.

### Extract B

#### Social movements and politics

The women's movement is a loosely organized variety of groups and individuals. Nevertheless, the women's movement has affected political change through legislative advances, such as equal pay. However, critics have suggested that the women's movement is a mainly middle-class movement and has failed to gain support from women who suffer the greatest social disadvantage.

The environmental movement does not fit into the framework of traditional parliamentary politics in that much of its activity is through pressure groups and protests. Britain's Green Party has not enjoyed the electoral success of green parties in Europe. Their failure to gain significant representation in parliament has led to division in the movement in terms of strategy and goals.

[Extract adapted from Coxall and Robins (1998) *Contemporary British Politics*, Macmillan Press Ltd. P484-491 ISBN 033373243-x]

Using Extract B as well as your own knowledge, compare and contrast the women's movement with the environmental movement.

[24]

### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In explaining the comparisons and contrasts between the women's movement and the environmental movement candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to interpret and apply political information about social movements. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on connections between the women's movement and the environmental movement.

The response might consider issues such as:

- Both movements have influenced political decision makers which has led to legislation, e.g. equality legislation, carrier bag charges.
- Both movements have raised awareness across all political parties about the core values and beliefs determining political, economic and social decision making.
- Both movements are not formally organised into a single political entity but have political parties associated with them, e.g. Women's Equality Party, Green Party.
- Whether the women's movement has achieved greater legislative change than the environmental movement.
- Environmental movement has used different tactics to that of the women's movement, e.g. disruptive protest.
- Any other relevant information.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of similarities and differences between the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well-chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>13-16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Thorough interpretation of political information about the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Thorough explanation of relevant similarities and differences and connections of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>9-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Reasonable interpretation of political information of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Reasonable explanation relevant of similarities and differences and connections of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of similarities and differences between the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>5-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Adequate interpretation of political information of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Adequate explanation relevant of similarities and differences and connections of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of similarities and differences between</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited application of political knowledge to the source.</li> <li>• Limited interpretation of political information of similarities and differences the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> <li>• Limited explanation relevant of similarities and differences and connections of the Women’s movement and the Environmental movement.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Section C

### Question 5

To what extent do you agree that turnout is more significant than other factors in determining the outcome of an election? [22]

#### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In discussing turnout at elections, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate relevant evidence in order to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and to draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on evidence from both sides of the argument. The response might consider issues such as:

Arguments that support turnout is more significant than other factors in determining the outcome of an election might include:

- Different demographic groups usually demonstrate different turnout levels and this can affect the outcome of an election.
- High turnout in certain age ranges can advantage the Conservative Party or Labour Party and this can affect the outcome of an election.
- The level of turnout of certain income groups can affect the outcome of an election.
- Low levels of turnout due to disillusion, apathy etc. can affect the outcome of an election.
- High turnout in marginal seats can affect the outcome of an election.
- Any other relevant material.

Arguments that challenge turnout is more significant than other factors in determining the outcome of an election might include:

- Gender, class and age-related issues may affect the outcome of an election.
- Regional strength by certain political parties may affect the outcome of an election.
- Ethnicity may affect the outcome of an election.
- Valence issues may affect the outcome of an election, e.g. views regarding government competency and economic management.
- The desirability and credibility of manifesto commitments may affect the outcome of an election.
- The role and bias of the media and opinion polls may affect the outcome of an election.
- Positional and tactical voting may affect the outcome of an election.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well-chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>10-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>7-9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>4-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is reasonable.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A superficial conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited analysis and evaluation of factors affecting elections.</li> <li>• Limited discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Question 6

Analyse who best protects human rights in the UK.

[22]

### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In discussing who best protects human rights in the UK, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate relevant evidence in order to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and to draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on evidence from both sides of the argument. The response might consider issues such as:

Arguments that analyse and reach a judgement on who best protects human rights in the UK may include:

- Human rights are best protected by legislation and applied by the legal system, e.g. The Human Rights Act.
- Human rights are best protected by the role of the Judiciary, e.g. the use of Judicial review and the Supreme Court.
- Human rights are best protected sufficiently by Common Law.
- Human rights are best protected by the UK being a member of international organisations, e.g. the EU, the UN.
- Human rights are best protected by the principle of equal rights being clearly established within the constitution, e.g. the rule of law, rights of minorities and positive discrimination.
- The pressure group Liberty is a well-known campaigner and think tank and best protects human rights as it influences government.
- The pressure group Justice is a lawyers' group that campaigns and lobbies for the protection of human rights in law enforcement and trials.
- Candidates may explore that human rights are not protected by any of the above.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well-chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>10-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>7-9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>4-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is adequate.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A superficial conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited analysis and evaluation of the protection of human rights.</li> <li>• Limited discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Question 7

'Coalition governments are the fairest outcome of any general election.' Discuss. [22]

### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In discussing the effectiveness of coalition governments candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate relevant evidence in order to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and to draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on evidence from both sides of the argument. The response might consider issues such as:

Arguments that support 'Coalition governments are the fairest outcome of a general election' may include:

- Coalition government is more democratic, and hence fairer, because it represents a much broader spectrum of public opinion than government by one party alone.
- Coalition government creates a more co-operative and dynamic political system, e.g. coalitions in Wales.
- Coalitions provide good government because their decisions are made in the interests of a majority of the people. Because a wide consensus of opinion is involved, any policy will be debated thoroughly within the government before it is implemented.
- By contrast single-party government is much more likely to impose badly thought-out policies upon parliament and people, perhaps for narrowly ideological reasons (for example, the poll tax in the UK).
- Any other relevant material.

Arguments that challenge 'Coalition governments are the fairest outcome of a general election' may include:

- Coalition government is less democratic as the balance of power is inevitably held by the small parties who can barter their support for concessions from the main groups within the coalition.
- Coalition government is less transparent because a party has no real chance of forming a government alone, the manifestos they present to the public become irrelevant and often wildly unrealistic.
- Coalitions provide ineffective government as they are unable to take a long-term view. Sometimes an ideological compass is necessary for governments to navigate in difficult political and economic waters, and coalitions lack such a unifying philosophy.
- Coalition governments are very unstable, often collapsing and reforming at frequent intervals.
- Landslide victories, e.g. 1945, 1979 or 1997, reflect a sea change in voting and validate one party governments.
- Any other relevant material.



<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>9-10</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of coalition government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well-chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>10-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of coalition government.</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of coalition government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>7-9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of coalition government.</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of coalition government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>4-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of the of coalition government.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is adequate.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A superficial conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of coalition government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited analysis and evaluation of coalition government.</li> <li>• Limited discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		