



**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)  
General Certificate of Education  
2022**

---

**Government and Politics**

**Assessment Unit AS 2**

*assessing*

**The British Political Process**

**[SGP21]**

**TUESDAY 24 MAY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **General Marking Instructions**

### ***Introduction***

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

### ***Assessment objectives***

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to demonstrate:

- AO1** Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and debates.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and theories; identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences between the political systems studied.
- AO3** Construct and communicate coherent arguments making use of a range of appropriate political vocabulary.

### ***Quality of candidates' responses***

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

### ***Flexibility in marking***

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce, in the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

### ***Positive marking***

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17 or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

### ***Awarding zero marks***

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

### ***Types of mark schemes***

Mark schemes for tasks or questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

### **Levels of response**

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

### **Quality of written communication**

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all tasks and questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These tasks and questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 5: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

**Level 1 (Inadequate):** The candidate makes only a very limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack any clarity and coherence. There is very little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is consistently unclear.

**Level 2 (Limited):** The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

**Level 3 (Satisfactory):** The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

**Level 4 (Good):** The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

**Level 5 (High standard):** The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

**COVID-19 Context**

Given the unprecedented circumstances presented by the COVID-19 public health crisis, senior examiners, under the instruction of CCEA awarding organisation, are required to train assistant examiners to apply the mark scheme in case of disrupted learning and lost teaching time. The interpretation and intended application of the mark scheme for this examination series will be communicated through the standardising meeting by the Chief or Principal Examiner and will be monitored through the supervision period. This paragraph will apply to examination series in 2021–2022 only.

**Section A: The UK Executive and Legislature**

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

**1** The Speaker determines which MP is allowed to speak, maintains order during debates, can punish MPs for breaking the rules of the House, is responsible for interpreting the rules of the House.

Any other relevant function.

**(AO1: 4 marks)**

[4]

4

**2 Background**

Select Committees are limited in their lack of power to compel papers to be made available or for individuals to appear before them. Specifically, they lack the power of subpoena. Members of Committees are often overworked and are unable to devote as much time to the work of the Committee as they should. It has been argued that members of Committees do not always act independently of party and that Whips seek to influence their proceedings. Committee reports do not have to be acted upon by the executive. Committees have no power to initiate legislation.

Any other relevant limitation.

**Level 1 ([1])**

The candidate identifies a valid limitation with little or no development.

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

The candidate offers a limited explanation of a valid limitation. There will be some supporting evidence.

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

The candidate provides a full explanation of a valid limitation. Relevant evidence will support the response.

If no example is given, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded

Apply criteria for other relevant limitation.

**(AO1: 2 × 5 marks)**

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

**(AO1: 10 marks)**

[10]

10

**3 (a) Background**

The argument that the executive dominated legislation and that Parliament's role was restricted to being a "rubber-stamp" was widely accepted twenty years ago. Most Bills were introduced by the executive and almost all passed with little or no amendment. Government defeats over legislation were rare. Public Bill Committees were often ridiculed for their ineffectiveness. Few Private Members Bills succeeded and those that did required the support of the executive. However, even during this period governments did have to compromise in the face of opposition from within their own ranks or from the Lords.

Recent years have witnessed a significant increase in Parliament's legislative activism. Executive Bills have been challenged more frequently and effectively. Defeats have become much more common and governments have been forced into retreats and compromises on a regular basis. This was the case even before Brexit. Parliament now appears to play a much more active and significant role in determining legislation.

For balance, candidates may refer to the fact that most Bills still emanate from the executive; that, if a government has a loyal majority, it will be able to push through its legislative programme; that the Lords' powers and democratic authority have not increased.

Weaker answers will be limited in terms of argument and especially evidence. Stronger answers will display understanding of the issues and be able to support this with evidence.

If no example/evidence is present, a maximum of level 3 can be awarded.

If an answer is unbalanced a maximum of level 4 can be awarded.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of Parliament's power to determine legislation and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

**Level 2 ([7]–[11])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of Parliament's power to determine legislation but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

**Level 3 ([12]–[16])**

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of Parliament's power to determine legislation but there are some gaps

in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

#### **Level 4 ([17]–[21])**

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of Parliament's power to determine legislation and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

#### **Level 5 ([22]–[26])**

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of Parliament's power to determine legislation and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached.

[26]

### **(b) Background**

The actual powers of the Prime Minister do not change a great deal. What does alter are the circumstances in which Prime Ministers seek to exercise these powers. This has been expressed in the phrase “events, dear boy, events” which may or may not have been said by Harold Macmillan. One huge circumstance that can increase or constrain a PM's power is the size of their Commons majority. Another is the level of opposition from their senior colleagues. The state of the economy and the actions of other states are two other circumstances that can have a profound effect upon the PM's ability to use the powers they have.

It is anticipated that candidates will identify a range of such factors.

For balance, candidates may argue that the PM's power is not simply determined by circumstances. For example, the personality of individual PMs can have an effect upon how they respond to events. Similarly, it could be argued that long-term social and political trends have a more profound effect.

If no example/evidence is present, a maximum of level 3 can be awarded. If an answer is unbalanced a maximum of level 4 can be awarded.

Weaker answers will be limited in terms of understanding and will lack evidence. Stronger answers will display understanding and be able to support this with a range of evidence.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Prime Ministerial power is determined by circumstances and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

**Level 2 ([7]–[11])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Prime Ministerial power is determined by circumstances but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

**Level 3 ([12]–[16])**

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Prime Ministerial power is determined by circumstances but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

**Level 4 ([17]–[21])**

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Prime Ministerial power is determined by circumstances and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples (AO1). There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached (AO3).

**Level 5 ([22]–[26])**

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Prime Ministerial power is determined by circumstances and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. [26]

**Section A**

AVAILABLE MARKS
26
40

## Section B: The UK Judiciary

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

### 4 Background

The judicial appointment process is no longer dominated by the executive as it was in the past. Judges are now appointed by the independent Judicial Appointments Commission while members of the Supreme Court are appointed by an independent Selection Commission. The criteria for applicants for the Supreme Court have been widened. Any other valid strength.

#### Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid strength with little or no development.

#### Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation of a strength.

#### Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of a valid strength.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

**(AO1: 5 marks)**

[5]

5

### 5 Background

The Supreme Court was established in 2009 as part of the reform of the judiciary. The intention was that the Court would have a greater degree of independence from the executive and legislature than had previously been the case. Since its creation, the Supreme Court has played an active role in holding the executive to account. Some of its decisions have been very high profile and have caused great controversy. The most significant have been the 2017 decision that MPs should decide on the triggering of Article 50 and the 2019 decision that the government had acted illegally in suspending Parliament. Both had a huge impact upon government actions. The Court has also taken a number of other decisions that have directly impacted upon executive policy and actions. The Human Rights Act entrenched the European Convention on Human Rights rules into UK law. This enhanced the power of the Supreme Court.

Weaker answers will be limited in range and evidence. Stronger answers will have a broader range of content and evidence.

An answer that contains no example/evidence can be awarded a maximum of level 3.

An answer that only has one point can be awarded a maximum of level 3.

#### Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the record of the Supreme Court in holding the executive to account and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

#### Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the record

of the Supreme Court in holding the executive to account but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the effect of the record of the Supreme Court in holding the executive to account but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

**Level 4 ([10]–[12])**

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the record of the Supreme Court in holding the executive to account and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

**Level 5 ([13]–[15])**

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the record of the Supreme Court in holding the executive to account and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. [15]

**Section B**

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

15

20

## Section C: Pressure Groups in the UK

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

### 6 Background

Many pressure groups seek to influence policy by persuading policy makers. Those that favour direct action reject this approach and instead seek to take action to directly bring about the outcome that they favour. For example, animal rights activists have blocked roads to prevent live animal exports and have broken into labs to release animals. Those opposed to Fracking have blocked roads and occupied land to physically prevent companies involved in the process. Extinction Rebellion is a current example of a direct action group although the intentions behind its actions are not always apparent. Direct action may or may not involve illegal activity. It is outsider groups that are most likely to resort to direct action.

#### Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a valid explanation with little or no development.

#### Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a limited explanation. There will be a relevant example.

#### Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation. A relevant example will support the response.

#### (AO1: 5 marks)

If no example is present, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

### 7 Background

An answer to this question should include a range of ways in which pressure groups can contribute to democracy in the UK. Pressure groups raise awareness of political issues and encourage participation in the political process. They provide a way in which groups that may feel underrepresented or neglected to express their views. They can hold the executive to account by highlighting failures in government policy. They can provide research and expert opinion that can inform policy debates.

An answer that contains no example/evidence can be awarded a maximum of level 3.

An answer that only has one point can be awarded a maximum of level 3.

Any other relevant arguments.

#### Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups have contributed to democracy in Britain and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence.

There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill informed and poorly constructed and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary.

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups have contributed to democracy in Britain but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary.

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups have contributed to democracy in Britain but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited.

**Level 4 ([10]–[12])**

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups have contributed to democracy in Britain and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached.

**Level 5 ([13]–[15])**

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of how pressure groups have contributed to democracy in Britain and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. [15]

**Section C**

**Total**

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

15

20

60