

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2008

GCE

GCE Government & Politics (8067/9067-9070)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UA020214

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

AS Principal Examiner Reports

1.	Unit 6491: People and Politics	4
2.	Unit 6492: Governing the UK	7
3.	Unit 6493: The Changing UK System	10

A2 Principal Examiner Reports

Route A:

1.	Unit 6494: UK Political Issues	12
2.	Unit 6495: The EU and European Issues	15
3.	Unit 6496: Policy-making in the UK	18

Route B:

1.	Unit 6497: Introducing Political Ideologies	20
2.	Unit 6498: Other Ideological Traditions	24
3.	Unit 6499: Ideological Development in the UK	27

Route C

1.	Unit 6500: Representation in the USA	30
2.	Unit 6501: Governing in the USA	38
3.	Unit 6502: Comparative UK and US Politics	45

Route D:

1.	Unit 6503: Introducing International Politics	47
2.	Unit 6504: Issues in International Politics	50
3.	Unit 6505: International Politics and the UK	53

	Statistics	55
--	-------------------	-----------

Unit 1: 6491 - People and Politics

General Comments

Perhaps, more than in previous series Assistant Examiners noted that this Summer's examination presented candidates at the extremes of ability. From one standpoint it was clear that candidates were prepared and furnished their responses with articulate and contemporary examples to show knowledge and understanding; however, the opposite extreme highlighted a lack of revision and preparation. Several examiners noted an increase in preparing set responses (perhaps used for previous homework topics) and then attempting to make them fit the questions raised. Thus many Assistant Examiners commented that candidates should take time to read fully the question before embarking on their response. A planned answer with the benefit of reflection invariably produced dividends, especially relevant for the more demanding (c) part of all the questions.

Question 1

(a) This was completed with ease and was clearly understood by most candidates. The better responses used examples effectively to highlight the distinction. It was common for weaker candidates to assert that 'outsider groups operate outside politics' and failed to articulate accurately the political processes, which insider and outsider groups operate through, which underlie their classification.

(b) The methods employed by pressure groups proved in the main to be well known. The differentiation came through fully applying candidate knowledge to the question. It was common for responses to centre on how pressure groups influence the government as opposed to public opinion; discussing the former often meant that answers remained in Level 2.

(c) Without doubt this was perhaps the most poorly completed question on the paper. It is true that the pressure group question is a 'magnet' for all levels of candidates but the inability for many to appreciate the question's remit was alarming. A catalogue of errors can be cited. Many simply were brief and provided little evidence of understanding the topic. Some veered off into describing only a geographical account of where pressure groups offices were situated. This quote from a confused student summarised some of the failures, which abounded: "By bombing cities in the UK the IRA distributed their power more widely as this affected a lot of people". It was noted that the concepts of pluralism and elitism were not well developed and appreciated. It is worth noting that although the specification is changing from September 2008 this topic and this area remains part of the new specification and centres need to note this in preparing candidates for future examinations.

Question 2

(a) No issues arose here and this question was handled well. Differentiation came from the level of clarification and detail. A small minority tended to repeat the same function and describing it in differing terms.

(b) The weaker candidates here tended to focus only on elections and perhaps remained at a 'macro' level. Many cited the blanket term of media use without connecting or demonstrating how political parties can be said to use the media as

a means of encouraging participation. Better prepared candidates cited both 'micro' and 'macro' levels by which political parties seek to engage and promote political participation in society. In the process they achieved a broader and more informed range of avenues of promoting political participation.

(c) Questions on political parties are now more popular and in reflection from this series, candidates are better prepared and informed. Perhaps one point to note is the need for balance to enter Level 3. It was not uncommon for candidates to simply denigrate political parties as defunct and unimportant. Many failed, all too often to understand their central importance in our political system. True, there may be faults, but to hit the top level of marks some of the positive aspects of political parties need to be taken into account and described: for instance our political system needs political parties to fill the offices of state. Dismissing them without credence is not an accurate depiction. This balance is crucial, it is not necessary to produce and even account to enter the top level but some acknowledgement of the counter-arguments are essential given the type and phrasing of this question. It is worth noting that many candidates asserted that political parties are declining in importance for their ideas are 'converging'. However, to state in isolation, that assimilation of ideas by the major parties is not a fully developed reason for declining importance, unless this point is further elaborated.

Question 3

(a) The concepts were better handled in the main than the examples, which were provided in support or clarification of them. It was common for 'hypothetical' examples of power and authority e.g. the terrorist versus the police officer to be less precise and detailed than real life examples from the world of politics.

(b) Weaker responses failed to move beyond elections by providing details of other areas by which legitimacy is advanced. Referendums were cited but often failing to outline how they advanced legitimacy. In the (c) response to this question a wide range of issues are developed in connection with the UK's democratic credentials: a similar wide platform is available here in (b) but was not articulated or developed to the same extent. For instance the wider constitutional framework, which embeds legitimacy, was under-developed.

(c) This question has appeared previously in similar formats and it was commented upon that it was perhaps the best handled of all the question (c) responses on the examination paper. In addition it was noted by many Assistant Examiners that it was the norm that candidates were more cynical of democracy and argued the case against democracy than voicing its praise.

Question 4

(a) Few candidates' encountered problems here and both political devices were described with accuracy and detail. In the main the tactic was to describe each and note their prominent features. Answers of the highest order precisely manoeuvred to show the distinguishing elements, which marked out the two devices.

(b) In past series similar questions have asked 'where' and 'why'. This was a more restricted question. It searched out a more interesting aspect of referendums and was a good lead in to the (c) part of the question. However many candidates still

wished to discuss 'where' as opposed to 'why' and in the process became marooned in Level 1 unable to fully appreciate the specific remit of the question.

(c) This was designed to be a simple and straightforward question: linking referendums and elections to the barometer of democracy and assessing the worth of each. The main failing for a huge number of candidates was the conversion of the question into a discussion of referendums exclusively and considering their negative and positive credentials. This serves to emphasise the point made earlier that a full reading and planning of a (c) response is vital to achieve a high mark. Elections were for a huge number ignored. Several Assistant Examiners did note the fact that political parties and governments can no longer set the exact wording of a referendum question, it having to have independent approval in law.

Unit 2: 6492 - Governing the UK

General comments

There were no special problems related to this examination. No questions were neglected and there was a good spread of responses across all questions.

There is still a sizeable minority of candidates who do not answer questions within the correct spaces in the examination papers and some who declare they are answering one question but then answer a different question.

Question 1

(a) Most responses identified the Prime Minister as leader of the *majority* party (responses referring to the PM as simply a party leader were not accurate). Thereafter there were various descriptions, many of which could receive credit. The strongest answers, though, described the PM as head of government, chief policy maker, cabinet leader and chief spokesperson for the government at home and abroad. The role of quasi head of state was also a valid description.

(b) Most responses concentrated on the use of patronage powers, referring to cabinet appointments, dismissals and reshuffles, but too many went no further. Stronger answers referred to control of the agenda, length and frequency of meetings, use of private advisers to marginalise cabinet and the use of kitchen cabinets, bilateral meetings with ministers or sofa politics. There was generally good understanding that cabinet discussions and conclusions could be manipulated by the Prime Minister. Many correctly identified collective responsibility as a device but failed to explain how it worked. There was generally good use of examples in this question. A common error was to suggest that the whips could keep the cabinet under control.

(c) A sizeable majority failed to find balance, simply describing how Prime Ministers have become more presidential without evaluating. Such responses could rarely score more than half marks. However, there was much good, effective use of the Foley thesis on spatial leadership and extensive knowledge of the characteristics of recent Prime Ministers. It was also encouraging to see how many distinguished between the constitutional role of a president compared to a Prime Minister, including different sources of authority and lines of accountability. The main failings proved to be among candidates who simply traced the growth of prime ministerial power uncritically.

Question 2

(a) Most answers were accurate and it was encouraging to see that less candidates confused independence with neutrality, a fault that used to be more common. Good knowledge of separation of powers. Nevertheless the confusion still appears too frequently. Some chose to describe how independence is maintained in this section, even though it was not asked for. Positive marking meant that no marks were lost, but such candidates simply lost some time.

(b) Too many answers here were rather superficial. References to the maintenance of the rule of law and citizens' rights were common and useful, though often not developed or exemplified. However too few candidates failed to point out how often the government are effectively defendants in judicial

reviews and so should not be allowed to influence the judiciary. Some impressive candidates correctly pointed out that judicial inquiries rely on independence of the judges. Examples were rather too scarce in general.

(c) There were many solid responses which accurately pointed out that there have been disputes concerning the jurisdiction of the EU (with still some candidates who believe the ECHR is administered by the EU), concerning *ultra vires* cases and human rights issues. Many quoted such cases as Belmarsh or the Afghan hijackers to illustrate these points effectively. However, references to law and order policy, prison sentencing etc. were scarce even though there has been much press coverage of such issues. Too few candidates were sensitive to the fact that judicial activism is increasing and that senior judges have been increasingly vociferous in their criticisms of government policy and actions, while ministers have also felt more able to criticise judges when they appear to be defying government policies, notably in anti terrorism measures. It was this question, above all, that demonstrated how important it is for candidates to follow and collect examples from current news stories for use in their responses.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates correctly identified the Lords as a scrutinising chamber and understood its role in examining legislation emerging from government and the Commons. However, that alone was not quite enough and top marks were awarded to those who went further, possibly referring to its judicial role or to its role in calling government to account, though it remains subordinate to the Commons in the latter respect. Those who briefly but effectively described it as a scrutinising, revising and delaying chamber mostly fared best.

(b) Most answers referred to the obvious distinction that the Commons is elected and the Lords appointed. However, too many went no further. Some tried to argue that the Commons was more representative than the Lords in terms of women and ethnic minorities, though this is not the case. The best extensions from the basic issue referred to the fact that virtually all MPs are attached to parties while a fair proportion of the Lords are crossbenchers or have loose attachments to parties. Some very good responses briefly discussed the idea that many members of the Lords are representatives of sectional groups while MPs represent parties first.

(c) It was encouraging to read so many answers which discussed the greater authority of the elected Commons which is converted into power. Most also correctly identified the legal limitations on the powers of the Lords (Parliament Acts and Salisbury convention). However the main failings were among those who were not sensitive to the fact that the authority of the Lords has grown since reform and that the Lords has become more active and more influential. In other words. Most responses were unbalanced, discussing powers but not influence, especially not growing influence. As with question 2 (c) there have been many recent news stories which demonstrate the growing importance and influence of the Lords. These should have been more in evidence. Often the lack of evidence made the difference between a Level 2 and a Level 3 mark.

Question 4

(a) There were many accurate answers referring to supreme power etc. However, not enough referred to the fact that there is more than one type of sovereignty - i.e. legal, political and external. Those who did know that there are different types received the highest marks.

(b) Virtually all candidates knew that legal sovereignty lies with parliament and most also knew that this is challenged by EU membership, though the UK retains ultimate sovereignty by having the ability to leave the EU. A common feature of answers was an ability to see devolution and executive power as challenges to parliamentary sovereignty without pointing out that these were challenges to the *political* sovereignty of parliament though not to its ultimate *legal* sovereignty. That said, some good responses did suggest that the Scottish parliament's primary legislative power was *effectively* legal sovereignty. Some suggested the monarch was still sovereign but failed to give convincing justification for this view. Similarly, those who assigned sovereignty to the Prime Minister were clearly confusing power with sovereignty.

(c) There were plenty of well prepared answers to this common question. There is, however, a common misconception that a codified constitution will *guarantee* that executive power would be reduced. Of course, this need not be the case. Such candidates were confusing the prospect of a clearer separation of powers with a redistribution of power which are not the same thing. Encouragingly many pointed out that a codified constitution would improve the knowledge of citizens of the system and of their rights which would be good for democracy and citizenship. Some extremely perceptive candidates pointed out that a codified constitution would probably expand the role of the judiciary. Arguments for retaining a flexible uncodified constitution seem to be well known and were generally competently described. But the most encouraging aspect of many responses was the prevalence of balanced, evaluative discussions. Comparisons with the USA were often well used.

Unit 3: 6493 - The Changing UK System

General Comments

Electoral reform and devolution were the two topics for the source material in this series. Devolution proved more popular by a considerable margin. Some general comments appertain to the handling of both questions. How candidates treat the first source based question is often a cause for concern, this worry emerges from the comments of many Assistant Examiners. It is noted that the candidate need not bring any additional knowledge (apart from the source) to the response to obtain full marks, but it may help to place in context the source and thus develop a fuller understanding by the candidate. Personal insight is neither forbidden nor necessary, but for some candidates if it is used constructively the source may be clarified. All too often candidates merely lifted verbatim the source and failed to put it in to their own words. This is not recommendable. Furthermore, it is worth noting for question (b) that it is considered 'own knowledge' if candidates can elaborate or provide further detail from the source material which is presented. This detail is considered additional to the source itself.

Question 1

(a) Building on from the general comments above, the candidate had to place in context the legitimacy or claim to govern by the Labour Party following the 2005 election. All too often the source was repeated, failing to show any appreciation or real understanding of its content. What was good to see was the candidate who developed the source to appreciate the claims it was making. For instance, the candidate who placed in perspective, the fact that less than 10 million votes gained by Labour accounts for less than one quarter of the total electorate. This demonstrated how to use the source effectively and thus gain full advantage.

(b) The word mandate recurs in the second source but was often underused and undeveloped by most candidates. Indeed candidates failed to develop accurately from the source the terms of 'adversarialism' and 'short-termism'. However where it may have been uncommon to develop both source and own knowledge to the same high degree, few candidates encountered problems with developing suggested benefits of electoral reform. A good number pursued the theme of electoral dictatorship as articulated by Lord Hailsham.

(c) Assistant Examiners note two main complains about performance here, superficial understanding and secondly inaccuracy. All too often it was noted that candidates briefly skipped through the positions of political parties displaying no depth or scope. This manifested itself most commonly that the two main parties (Labour and Conservative) are set against electoral reform whereas the Liberal Democrats are its most keen advocates. This is correct, but the response required an understanding of the reasons for these positions. A significant minority placed the Labour Party as against electoral reform anywhere; this is despite having introduced it throughout the UK. The Conservatives were incorrectly identified to be keen advocates of reform for Westminster, given that they have fared so well in the devolved regions and most recently for the London Mayor. Other main parties throughout the UK were noted and rewarded as appropriate, for instance the position of the SNP and Plaid Cymru in the devolved regions.

(d) Many candidates who could be said to have under-performed in the earlier part of the question made up ground here. There were few misinterpretations of the question, with candidates able to cite accurate and relevant disadvantages, which may be associated with reform. A minority perhaps failed to advance to the top level as they took a route to extolling first-past-the-post rather than the disadvantages of reform. What underpinned the top level response was clear evaluation of the drawbacks to change. Many Assistant Examiners noted how in some senses this question has become easier to answer given the implications of differing electoral systems to first-past-the-post in operation in the UK.

Question 2

(a) Brevity and a lack of precision caused most damage with this source question. It is true that since this source was written and the examination paper was set, devolution has returned successfully to Northern Ireland but this did not prevent or make the point raised in the source obsolete for reward. Once again the candidate who could place in context the source and work with its remit preformed well and accessed Level 3 marks with comparative ease.

(b) The source indicates success in both Scotland and Wales for devolution and it mentions briefly the areas of education, health and care for the elderly. Own knowledge was expected to enhance and develop this detail. The fact of differing arrangements for University fees in Scotland was often highlighted. It was good to see that the success of devolution in Northern Ireland was cited. Full articulation of the reason 'why' was more elusive and problematical for a number of candidates. Again a minority merely repeated the source and failed to develop their own knowledge as required.

(c) The two comments concerning a superficial understanding and material inaccuracies made concerning question 1 (c) are as equally as relevant here in 2 (c). Assistant Examiners noted that many candidates lacked depth and clarity when discussing the views of the main political parties. Inaccuracies emerged in the main here with respect to the Conservative Party. This arose from two inaccurate views, one, which was cited, was that the party were now strong proponents of further devolution or conversely to be totally against the process and keen to abolish it once they regain power. However, once again as with 1 (c) the views of regional parties were in evidence and relevantly discussed.

(d) Again as with 1(d) often a candidate peaked in their response in this final part of the question. It was uncommon for candidates not to be able to enter Level 2 and a good number reached Level 3 being able to accurately cite a range of advantages and disadvantages to the devolution process. Assistant Examiners noted that there was a well-founded understanding of the West Lothian Question and its ramifications. The move with the minority SNP administration in Edinburgh towards independence via a referendum was contemporary insight and relevant to the discussion.

Route A

Unit 4: 6494 - UK Political Issues

Question 1

Responses fell into three main categories. The first type listed some recent specific examples of taxation controversy, including examples such as the abolition of the 10p tax band, inheritance tax, fuel duty, Non-Dom tax and stealth taxes in general. The second type took a holistic view, referring to the size of the overall burden and its recent growth. In these first two cases credit was awarded, though each approach was considered rather too restricted for Level 3 marks. The third type tackled both the holistic and the specific issues concerning taxation. When accurate and exemplified, these often achieve Level 3 marks. The very strong examples, discussed ideology, referring to the neo-liberal approach, Labour's tax and spend reputation and the New Labour changing attitude.

Question 2

Rather too many responses contained little more than a list of anti crime measures adopted since 1979. Though these were often detailed and accurate they contained no evaluation and did not therefore address the full demands of the question and lost most or all of the assessment objective 2 marks. Some achieved better results by attempting evaluation, citing areas which had been successful and those where there had been less success. Statistics were acceptable if they were approximately accurate and demonstrated accurate trends. The strongest responses achieved three objectives. First, a good review of crime policy. Second, differentiation between the more and less successful aspects. Third, the strongest answers pointed out how statistics have been contested, that different sources of stats (e.g. British Crime Survey, Police, Home Office) showed a different picture, and that there were issues over *perceptions* of crime as well as the published statistics.

Question 3

This question was not done well on the whole. Rather too many candidates decided it was evaluative, answering a different question about how successful or otherwise multiculturalism has been. In fact the question was about how multiculturalism has attempted to address the issue of race relations, not how well. That said, there were many good discussions and explanations of what multiculturalism means and how it is operating. The strongest responses discussed issues such as education (multi-faith and single faith schools), the activities and policies of the CRE (now expanded and with a new name, though candidates were not expected to know the new title) plus a number of sporting and cultural initiatives. The very strong responses either referred to attempts to bring communities together and to avoid inter-cultural conflicts as have occurred in several Northern cities and towns, or engaged in a more 'ideological' discussion of how it is believed that multiculturalism can avoid tension and conflict. Unfortunately such responses were rare.

Question 4

As with question 2, a sizeable minority of responses did not engage with the question by failing to evaluate the various reforms. Instead they merely produced a list of the reforms uncritically. Also as with question 2 there were different types of evaluative response. Some successfully differentiated between success and failures. Others

demonstrated how the success, or otherwise, of the reforms was disputed, with some of the statistical information being questioned. Some very strong responses also pointed out that some reforms were long term so it was difficult to evaluate their effects. Where statistics were used (rather infrequently), credit was given as long as they were approximately accurate and showing accurate trends. A common fault was to discuss hospitals only and not addressing issues concerning, for example, primary care. That said, many discussed the problems in dentistry and were clearly speaking from personal experience (successfully as long as the information was not purely anecdotal or unbalanced).

Question 5

Unfortunately too many responses spent far too long explaining the background to the peace process, some even returning extensively to the seventeenth century. This was a contemporary question and, though some background to indicate how much sectarian conflict there had been in the past was useful, it should not have formed the majority of an answer. Thus the highest marks were awarded to those who were most able to focus on recent history and the contemporary scene. Of those who were thus focused there was good material on continuing conflict, noting continuing social problems, education issues and the maintenance of sectarian 'ghettoes' etc. There was also good knowledge shown of persistent, low levels of sectarian violence, splinter group activity and 'gangsterism' and so on. Stronger answers also evaluated the extent of conflict, as the question demanded. These balanced the many successes of the peace processes, not least the rapprochement between Paisley and McGuinness, especially after St Andrews against the continuing problems.

Question 6

It was encouraging to see so many candidates being clear about the principles of the welfare state, often stating them at the outset and giving a clear signpost as to where the answer was leading. There were many good or excellent responses. Weaker answers tended to concentrate on the *quality* of the welfare state rather than its principles. It was expected that Level 3 marks would be awarded to those who tackled at least three areas and, in the event, most candidates did go successfully beyond merely health and education. There is also now good awareness that private sector involvement does not constitute full scale privatisation. There were two types of structure. One type worked their way through various aspects of the welfare state - health, education, housing, pensions, social security etc. - and examined how far principles had been compromised in each case. The other type looked at the principles - universality, free at the point of delivery, equality etc. - and examined them thematically. The second type is more elegant and perhaps tended to attract higher marks, but the former approach was equally valid and was often done well. This was the strongest performing question and it is now becoming clearer to candidates how important principles of welfare are in political debate.

Question 7

Although the question was very prescriptive, a sizeable minority decided to ignore the demands made in the question and simply produced a review and assessment of economic policy over the period. These received credit because they were addressing the very generalised demands of the question. Higher marks were, however, reserved for those candidates who engaged with the three elements of the question. Those who did, were usually successful in finding enough evidence to consider the three verdicts. Certainly there was widespread knowledge of the favourable circumstances

which Chancellor Brown inherited in 1997, though too few added that the world economy was also improving in the mid 1990s. A few stronger responses also pointed to the idea that the economy had been strengthened, especially in terms of competitiveness and flexible labour markets, in the 1980s. There was widespread knowledge of the 'good judgment' evidence and this aspect was well covered on the whole. Stronger candidates could also engage with the 'exaggerated claims' aspect, though perhaps too many mentioned Northern Rock and the credit crunch without seeming to understand how they might be seen as evidence of such claims. An encouraging majority here pointed out the disputes regarding the measurement of public debt in view of the Golden Rule scenario. There were also many good assessments of the 'end to boom and bust' claim.

Unit 5: 6495 - The EU and European Issues

Question 1

Most candidates correctly identified the role of the Council, its various forms and its basic relationship with other institutions. A common error, however, was to describe it as the 'executive' arm of the EU, when it only shares this with the Commission. Too few, however, referred to its relatively limited role in the development of law and regulations in relation to the Commission, COREPER and other bodies such as the Committee of the Regions. That said, most understood its importance in ratifying EU law and policy. The clear discriminator in this was question was how much candidates had been able to evaluate its role, usually by comparing its theoretically all-powerful position with constraints, notably in relation to the European Parliament and to the Commission. It was often, though not always, pointed out that one of its most important functions is the playing out and compromises with, national interest.

Question 2

The role of the Court was well identified by most candidates though few understood its more recently acquired role in being able to deal with individuals and associations within the EU. In that sense its importance has grown. The implication of the question was that the Court has grown in importance and only stronger candidates engaged with such change. Most simply assessed its importance in a static way. However, there was some good knowledge in terms of its growing jurisdiction, especially over Social Chapter issues (where there were too few examples used) and because of the fact that an increasing number of matters have fallen under the EU jurisdiction.

Question 3

Few candidates attempted this question but, of those who did, there was an encouraging number of good responses. In the main such stronger answers engaged with the question and did look at factors such as enlargement, the building of the single market, the needs of the CAP, the need for economic development in some parts and attempts to create more economic equality within the EU and the politics of the Committee of the Regions. These responses were also often able to give useful illustrations from recent experience. Weaker responses tended not to engage with the question and were often confined to generalised comments about regional policy. These lower level answers also often failed to use any specific illustration at all.

Question 4

Some candidates went well beyond the confines of this question by producing a full evaluation of the single currency, balancing its strengths with its weaknesses. This was not required. A few very strong candidates chose to examine the *political* reasons why some might *choose* to describe it as failure. Of course these elements were conservative euro-sceptics or Europhobes. But this was a rarity. Most concentrated on the fact that some countries, notably the UK had chosen to stay out and it was therefore a failure if one of the strongest economies in the EU was outside the eurozone. A sizeable minority could go no further than this. The second element of most competent answers explained that growth in the EU had not been as strong as hoped for. A further feature of stronger answers was also that there was still too much inequality through the community. Although inflation was largely a feature of

the initial introduction of the currency, mention of it was given some credit as it had been hoped that the single currency would reduce prices. Finally it should be pointed out that candidates who referred to the currency as a failure because it was weak in international markets were out of date with their information, but they could be credited as long as they pointed out that it had been weak for most of its life and the current recovery might simply be a temporary phenomenon.

Question 5

This was a more predictable question and there were many well prepared responses. The main discriminator, therefore, tended to be the degree to which responses were up to date with their information and the success with which they had evaluated the deficit. There were two main approaches. The first was institutional, looking at the main EU bodies and assessing the degree to which they remain undemocratic. The increasing importance of the Parliament was usually deployed as evidence of democratisation, though few knew that the Commission is now more accountable than it used to be. Such institutional approaches were successful but remained limited. The second approach concerned the broader 'demos'. These referred to lack of representation in the EU and the fact that there is so much public disengagement with the Union. It was often correctly noted that the European Parliament suffered from low electoral turnouts and (along with the Commission and Council) lack of a democratic mandate. Unfortunately surprisingly few were able to show that pressure group activity and access have increased. The strongest answers were those which engaged with both the institutional approach and the broader demos issue. Strong evaluations, backed by evidence were required for Level 3 marks.

Question 6

This was a popular question and there were plenty of full, well prepared answers. The main discriminators were the extent to which controversy itself was described - not merely the issues - and the range of issues which were deployed. The strongest responses tended to address three of the five aspects to the question. The five were economic issues, political, cultural/religious, security and law and order and geopolitical. The very strong could discuss all five. Having said that, the main discriminator was whether responded could explain the causes of the controversies and some exceptional candidates understood that different countries viewed enlargement issues differently, explaining why in each case. However most responses tended to discuss the broad issues, usually economic and cultural, with special attention paid to Turkey. Only a minority understood that enlargement creates difficulties in political decision-making and even less were impressively able to link the controversy with the proposals in the Lisbon Treaty. Typical weaker responses referred only to the admission of poorer countries and the difficulties involved in allowing a large Muslim country into the EU with perhaps some mention of movements of populations within the Union.

Question 7

This was not a popular question with too many answers which went little further than explaining that countries could leave the EU and that, where there was unanimous voting in the Council, each country had a veto, possibly mentioning Gordon Brown's red lines. Stronger responses were able to differentiate clearly between areas of jurisdiction and non-jurisdiction and were able to point out that member governments had ample opportunities to negotiate political outcomes in various bodies in such a way as to preserve national interest. Typically weaker responses

concentrated on the retention of sovereignty rather than the broader issue of national interest. Strong candidates were able to describe examples of where member countries were able to form power blocs in order to preserve their joint interests. These stronger responses often were able to go beyond the UK experience and to discuss the situation of other members, notably the small countries who may form alliances with each other or with larger states.

Unit 6: 6496 - Policy Making in the UK

Question 1

A common weakness in responses was to see the role of the judiciary narrowly, arguing that its influence is largely confined to the way it dispenses justice. Thus, for example, influence was seen in terms of giving heavy sentences to pursue a 'prison works' agenda, or giving light and community sentences to promote a 'causes of crime' agenda. Though valid this approach was much too restricted. Fortunately there were also many responses which also understood that the judiciary has become increasingly active and vociferous in promoting various law and order agendas. There had been many examples in the news of judges becoming involved in policy and stronger candidates were aware of the interventions of such senior members of the judiciary as Lords Woolf, Bingham, Hoffman and Phillips. Most of these stronger responses knew that judges have tended to see prison as an unsatisfactory measure against much crime, notably young offenders. The other issue in which they are involved is anti terrorism and there was much written, accurately, about Belmarsh and the like. Only the very strong answers demonstrated that the judiciary has been operating as a kind of loose pressure group protecting human rights and more enlightened sentencing policies.

Question 2

Although reviews of the parties' attitude to the EU going back to the early 1980s were relevant - demonstrating contrasts with the current position - too many candidates spent too much time on such background to the detriment of analysis of the current position. It was not necessary for a high level mark to look further back than around 1992. Of those who did address the current position there were many responses which took a broad brush approach and simply described how the parties had become polarised up to 2005 and that there had been some reduction in more extreme attitudes, pointing out how the Liberal Democrats had remained consistently enthusiastic about Europe. Many stronger answers took a thematic approach rather than an historical one and looked at specific issues concerning the EU - typically integration, the single currency, enlargement, CAP, taxation, the constitution, foreign policy - and examined in each case the extent of inter-party consensus and conflict. These responses were usually successful. The historical approach could also attract a good mark provided the candidate demonstrated that they understood the changes in attitude of Labour, especially the contrast between Blair and Brown, together with Cameron's less hard edged approach to Europe, suggesting that there was less conflict, though those who suggested there was a 'new consensus' were perhaps carrying matters too far. A few very strong candidates pointed out that there are voices among the Lib Dems which have become less enthusiastic of European integration and were therefore hoping to place the party closer to the central position on the EU. The main discriminators were, thus, the extent of a candidates contemporary knowledge and the extent to which their conclusions were balanced and supported by evidence.

Question 3

The main weakness in responses was a tendency to look at the quality of the welfare state, rather than its principles. Thus, while there was a good deal of impressive knowledge of pressure group activity, this was too often directed at issues such as the level of pension provision (Help the Aged etc.) rather than a discussion of

whether the principle of the old age pension provision has been eroded. Similarly, health service unions have campaigned on such issues as pay and general expenditure, but the demands of the actual question, required campaigns on points of principle such as private sector involvement or post code lottery issues. Thus, a key discriminator was whether candidates had engaged successfully with this particular aspect of the question. A further discriminator was range, in terms of both the number of welfare services analysed and the number of pressure groups used as evidence. It was certainly expected that at least three welfare services (usually health, education plus at least one other) should be used for illustration. Most candidates who were competent or stronger could certainly refer to at least three services. A final, but equally important discriminator was whether a response had addressed the question 'with what success'. No great sophistication was required in this aspect, but a cogent conclusion, with some evidence, was required. Though the standard of responses varied greatly, it was encouraging to see how much candidates had clearly considered the influence of pressure groups when studying the welfare state.

Question 4

There was clearly some potential overlap between consideration of the 'constitution' in its narrow sense and the general working of the political system, which might be considered constitutional in nature. Examiners generally treated both as valid so good discussions of the effects of membership on political processes and the governance of the UK were credited. That said, consideration of the narrower sense of the 'constitution' was essential for good marks. Most candidates could successfully discuss the effects on parliamentary sovereignty and knew at least one example. Many also extended this to consideration of the changed position of the judiciary, notably the House of Lords as an appeal court. Beyond that, however, many candidates began to struggle for relevance and only the better prepared and more knowledgeable were able successfully to examine other factors. It would be a false assumption that the subsidiarity principle referred to at Maastricht led directly to devolution and it was encouraging that candidates who discussed devolution were aware of this. It was, however, valid to refer to the more general spirit of 'regionalism' which was emerging in Europe at that time. The very strong candidates discussed devolution in relation to European regional policy and regional funding. This was a very high level of awareness and analysis. Also seen in stronger responses was analysis of the changed relationship between ministers and parliament (thus accepting accountability as a constitutional issue) and the changed role of parliament generally. Unfortunately a distressingly large number of candidates still believe that the Human Rights Act emerged from the European Union and based a substantial part of their answer around this misconception. It was valid to suggest that there is some influence from the 'rights culture' in Europe and the introduction of the concept of 'positive' rights in the UK. It was also valid to suggest that the constitutional reform programme launched in 1997 was partly an attempt to modernise the British democracy in line with European practice.

Route B

General Comments

Performance in Units 4, 5 and 6 was generally in line with performance in previous years. High quality responses were characterised by the ability to focus consistently on the specific question set, develop balanced and coherent arguments, and demonstrate a confident grasp of relevant ideas and theories. The main distinction between medium and higher levels of performance was that the former tended to offer essentially descriptive accounts of the ideas, traditions and sub-traditions in question, while the latter are analytical and, where appropriate, evaluative. No question in these examinations was commonly misunderstood or misinterpreted. However, key terms used in questions were sometimes not soundly understood. As ever, it is wise to impress on students the need to avoid pre-selecting questions on the basis of their preferred topics, regardless of the particular wording and focus of the question itself.

Unit 4: 6497 - Introducing Political Ideologies

Question 1

Responses to this question were generally sound and often good. The most common liberal concern about democracy identified was the 'tyranny of the majority'. However, the quality candidates demonstrated in relation to this issue varied greatly, from those that simply mentioned the implicit dangers of democracy to minorities and dissenting individuals, to those who also, for example, took account of the tendency of majoritarianism to discourage debate and argument and reflected on concerns about the make-up of the majority. The key discriminators on this question were the accuracy and care with which liberal concerns were outlined and the range of liberal arguments considered. Many strong responses also started with a clear definition of democracy, in the process helping to sharpen the later discussion of liberal concerns about democracy. The most ineffective responses basically discussed liberal objections to power or government and therefore said relatively little about democracy noting that 'liberals fear government in all its forms, even democratic government', was of little relevance to the question.

Question 2

The quality of responses to this question was overall higher than in previous years. However, some candidates, and, I suspect, some centres, still make very basic mistakes about the meaning of these terms. The most damning mistake is to think that negative freedom means people being able to do whatever they want without any restrictions whatsoever, while positive freedom means people being able to do whatever they want within the constraints of law and government. The second weakness was to define the terms, not as forms of freedom, but by reference to their implications for the state. It was therefore suggested that negative freedom *means* rolling back the state, while positive freedom *means* extending state control. On the other hand, there were many very strong and insightful definitions of the two terms, effectively contrasted with one another. Nevertheless, effective definitions and distinctions were not always supported by the use of appropriate examples, as

required by the question. Where this was done, negative freedom was often associated with freedom of choice, privacy, and civil liberties, while positive freedom was commonly associated with welfare and social rights.

Question 3

This question proved to be an effective discriminator. Where candidates underperformed, it was usually for one of three reasons. First, their answer turned into an account of Marx's stages of history with little explanation of why these historical stages, and especially capitalism, were doomed to collapse. Second, candidates focused entirely on the first part of the question and therefore said little or nothing about how the collapse of capitalism would occur. Third, candidates sometimes focused largely on issues such as the dictatorship of the proletariat and the withering away of the state, events that were predicted to occur after capitalism had been overthrown by a proletarian revolution (or, at least, after that process had been initiated). The strongest responses to this question were able both to explain the inevitable collapse of capitalism in terms of internal contradictions and irreconcilable class conflict, and to show some insight into the developments that would bring the proletariat to revolutionary class consciousness, such as deepening crises of over-production.

Question 4

Some very weak responses to this question did little more than flag up general features of conservatism, presumably hoping that, in the process, objections to social equality would emerge. Fortunately, such an approach was not common. A more common reason for underperformance was, in effect, a tendency to mistake conservative objections to social equality for liberal ones. In this case, social equality was dismissed on meritocratic grounds, emphasising issues such as differences in individual ability or the willingness to work. This, of course, is not irrelevant to the conservative position on social equality, and stronger candidates were often able to discuss such objections in relation to the views of the liberal New Right. Stronger responses, however, also recognised that social equality is irreconcilable with conservative views about organicism and hierarchy. Nevertheless, although many candidates referred to the idea of an 'organic society', and recognised that this had some relevance to the question, only a minority were able to explain why organisms are naturally hierarchical, making the idea of social equality meaningless. Similarly, only stronger candidates recognised differences between hierarchy and meritocracy, the former being fixed rather than fluid, and not being a manifestation of unequal individual abilities, but of structural inequality.

Question 5

This question was generally well answered. Very few candidates failed to understand at least the basic features of communism and social democracy, with a very common assumption being, not unreasonably, that the differences between the two models of socialism are 'stark'. The principal discriminators, however, were the depth of understanding demonstrated, respectively, of communism and social democracy, and whether the differences between the models were effectively identified and

evaluated, as opposed to being simply implied. The very strong responses recognised that communism and social democracy differ both in their analysis of the nature of the capitalist system and in their models of the future socialist society, one based on common ownership or collectivisation, the other based on redistribution and social justice. The distinction that almost every response identified, albeit with varying degrees of sophistication, was between a communist model that sought to overthrow and replace capitalism and a social-democratic model that sought to humanise or reform capitalism. Whereas many responses did little more than draw attention to this point and support it with empirical evidence, stronger responses were able to explain why communists and social democrats have adopted different attitudes towards capitalism, as well as how this has shaped their understanding of socialism.

Question 6

This was a very popular question with very few weak responses. Strong responses often started by defining tradition; however, only a minority of candidates chose to do this, relying instead on implicit understanding demonstrated later in their answers. The main discriminator in relation to the first part of the question was how fully and accurately conservative arguments in favour of tradition and continuity were explained, and the range of such arguments that were addressed. The two most common arguments advanced related to the accumulated wisdom of the past and the tendency of tradition to generate stability and social cohesion. In the case of weaker responses, an account of traditional conservatism was offered, presumably in the hope that this would, at some point, cast light on the benefits of tradition itself. The 'extent' part of the question was an effective discriminator. Weak responses often said little about extent or addressed it instead by looking at recent trends in Cameron's Conservative Party. Stronger responses examined the relationship between conservative traditionalism and the New Right. Whereas many candidates recognised that the liberal New Right had broken with traditionalism by endorsing change in various areas of economic and social life, only the strongest candidates could explain this in terms of rationalism and a belief in principle and theory. Others seemed to think that the radicalism of the New Right was little more than a character defect in Margaret Thatcher. The strongest answers also recognised that whereas the liberal New Right had little sympathy for traditionalism, the conservative New Right placed greater emphasis upon it, particularly in relation to traditional values and a historically-rooted model of national identity.

Question 7

This question was successfully answered by a good number of candidates, some responses being thoughtful and incisive. Strong responses typically started by explaining and discussing the nature of toleration. When this was done by emphasising that liberals tolerate that of which they disapprove or dislike, this helped to set up the later discussion of acceptable and unacceptable levels of diversity. Voltaire's quote, unsurprisingly, often did good service here. Many candidates were also aware of wider benefits of diversity, not least the liberal belief that it is essential in order to promote debate, discussion and argument, without which truth will never emerge. The 'extent' part of the question proved to be an effective discriminator. Whereas some candidates struggled to focus on the issue of

extent at all, others wrote in a limited way about the need to prevent people encroaching on the freedom of others. A better way into this was demonstrated by those who reflected on Mill's distinction between self-regarding and other-regarding actions, an approach that was often used effectively. The strongest responses, however, noted that toleration implies its own limits, in that it is difficult for liberals to tolerate beliefs, practices or institutions that are themselves intolerant. This sometimes led to interesting discussions about liberal approaches to cultural diversity and religious or cultural practices that liberals find difficult to endorse because they clash with freedom and autonomy. Some very good responses also noted that liberals have used neutrality as a means of endorsing diversity, highlighting differences between 'negative' and 'positive' approaches to diversity.

Unit 5: 6498 - Other Ideological Traditions

Question 1

Responses to this question demonstrated a generally sound or better level of understanding. Most candidates recognised that the main distinction was that while anarchists reject the state in all its forms, Marxists stress the need for a temporary proletarian state in the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, the extent to which these differing positions were explained, particularly in relation to the underlying theories of the state, contrasted sharply. Stronger responses pointed out that, for anarchists, state oppression resides within human nature and the capacity for corruption, by contrast with the Marxist view that the state is essentially an instrument of class oppression. In some cases, the Marxist 'base/superstructure' thinking was mentioned, but not always with clearly understanding. Weak responses sometimes simply asserted that Marxists have a positive view towards the state, based on the totalitarian tendencies found in orthodox communist states. However, this ignored the fact that such statism was justified, initially at least, in terms of the dictatorship of the proletariat and that it contrasted markedly with Marx's predictions about the 'withering away' of the state.

Question 2

The strongest responses to this question provided a clear and full definition of the nation-state at the outset. Weaker ones simply provided general information about nationalism, sometimes discussing the nationalist view of the nation before moving on to the nationalist view of the state. Nevertheless, many responses were able to identify one or more grounds upon which nationalists have viewed the nation-state as a political ideal. The most successful answers often linked the nation-state to the principle of national self-determination, viewing such a state as a means through which the nation achieves control over its own destiny. The nation-state is therefore a guarantee of political freedom, making it, for nationalists and especially liberal nationalists, the only legitimate unit of political rule. Other responses focused instead, or in addition, on the stability and cohesion of the nation-state, sometimes seeing this as a virtue that conservative nationalists would be particularly keen to emphasise. A small number of candidates wrote only about the nature of the nation-state and the difficulty of defining the nation, probably in the hope that an alternative nationalism question was going to come up.

Question 3

Most candidates, in response to this question, showed at least an adequate understanding of anti-rationalism, usually associated with an emphasis on emotion and feeling over reason and intellect. The major discriminator, however, was the ability to demonstrate links between anti-rationalism and other aspects of fascism. Weaker candidates sometimes seemed to believe that they could provide a generalised account of fascism, remembering to refer back to anti-rationalism but often without explaining the nature of the linkage. Stronger responses understood fascism in the context of the rejection of the Enlightenment and its associated values, especially reason. In these cases, candidates discussed issues such as the idea

of the organic community, unquestioning obedience to a supreme leader, the nihilism of fascist doctrines reflected in notion such as 'creative destruction', and the tendency for fascist ideas to take the form of political myths. Many candidates also made good use of the idea of the 'politics of the will', often through reference Nietzsche (albeit spelt in an imaginative variety of ways).

Question 4

This was a popular question, well answered by the majority of candidates. Where responses were weak it was because of an unfamiliarity with the slogan or a tendency to write about feminism generally rather than the ideas of radical feminists. In these cases, responses sometimes looked at the different approaches of liberal feminists, socialist feminists and radical feminists to the idea of the public/private divide. Stronger responses recognised the significance of the divide as far as radical feminism is concerned. In the strongest examples, candidates were able to explain how and why radical feminists have believed that gender oppression originates in family, domestic or personal life, which then structures gender relations in the public sphere. This is why the personal is '*the* political'. In the strongest cases, such ideas were also linked to a redefinition of politics by radical feminist thinkers, distinguishing it from its conventional association with government, elections, political parties and public life generally. Some candidates mistakenly believed that radical feminists assert that the personal is the political because they favour political intrusions into the private domain through, for example, publicly funded childcare. Whether or not they hold such views, this is not what the slogan was coined to convey.

Question 5

The near universal answer adopted by candidates to this question was that anarchism is equally close to both individualism and collectivism, as reflected in the fact that there are rival individualist and collectivist schools of anarchism. This was a perfectly reasonable conclusion, although a small number of candidates argued persuasively for the merits of one over the other. Weaker responses often provided a sketchy definition of individualism and collectivism, before proceeding to describe the various ideas and manifestations of each school of anarchism. More effective responses not only provided a fuller and more insightful definition of the key terms, but also recognised their importance in shaping the contrasting schools of anarchism. They therefore were able to analyse and evaluate the linkages between, respectively, individualism and individualist anarchism and collectivism and collectivist anarchism. The latter candidates alone were able to access Level 3 marks, because only they were fully responding to the question set. Where answers emphasised the importance of individualism, this was usually done by highlighting the importance of individual freedom and personal autonomy. Where the importance of collectivism was stressed this was often linked to the capacity of free individuals to live harmoniously in the absence of political authority.

Question 6

Responses to feminism questions are often generally of high quality, and this question proved to be no exception. Very few candidates failed to identify feminism's compatibility with liberalism and socialism, although a major discriminator was between responses that seemed to assume that the compatibility was demonstrated by the simple fact of the existence of liberal feminism and socialist feminism, and ones that demonstrated how and why liberal and socialist ideas have been used to advance feminist arguments. Some candidates provided an account of radical feminism without fully recognising its relevance to the question set. Others, however, pointed out (helpfully) that radical feminists challenge the idea of compatibility with other doctrines, as neither liberalism nor socialism acknowledges the fundamental political importance of gender divisions. Candidates overwhelmingly accepted the incompatibility between feminism and conservatism but discussed this with varying degrees of insight. While strong candidates examined the arguably anti-feminist implications of the stress on tradition, organicism, hierarchy and so forth, others addressed this part of the question over-empirically by looking at the views and policies of Cameron and the modern Conservative Party. The latter approach seldom enabled significant theoretical and ideological tensions between feminism and conservatism to be identified, still less analysed.

Question 7

This was a popular question. Almost all responses were able to discuss linkages between fascism and nationalism, usually by looking at the kind of nationalism that fascists have embraced. In some cases this was done through a straightforward account of chauvinist or expansionist nationalism, but other candidates were able to examine more sophisticated ideas such as the notion of integral nationalism and the image of cyclical rebirth based on a past image of national greatness. Some weak responses failed to distinguish between nationalism and racialism, providing an account of Nazi race theories to back up the idea that fascism is an extreme form of nationalism. Stronger responses often distinguished helpfully between the extreme nationalism of Italian forms of fascism and the extreme racism of German Nazism. A significant discriminator was whether candidates focused on the issue of fascism 'merely' being an extreme form of nationalism. While weaker candidates sometimes ignored this aspect of the question, stronger ones were able to put fascist nationalism in a context of wider fascist ideas and doctrines. In the strongest cases, this was done in a thoroughly evaluative way, by making judgements about the importance of fascism's various core themes.

Unit 6: 6499 - Ideological Development in the UK

General Comments

As this is the synoptic paper, the quality of responses to each question asked can be judged broadly on the following three grounds. First, how effectively does the answer show an understanding of the relevant ideas and theories featured in Units 4 and 5? Second, how effectively does the response show an understanding of empirical developments in contemporary UK politics, addressed in Units 1, 2 and 3? Third, how successful is the response in identifying linkages between theory and practice, and, in particular, in evaluating the significance of ideological developments in the light of contemporary UK politics?

Question 1

This was, as ever, a very popular question. The notion of the 'third way' was a major discriminator. Some weaker responses did little more than paraphrase the question itself before going on to discuss, respectively, Labour's relationship with capitalism and with socialism. Such an approach enabled candidates to demonstrate some generalised knowledge and understanding relevant to the question, but often turned into a debate about the extent to which the Labour Party is any longer socialist. This may, indeed, have been the question that they were hoping would appear. The strongest responses, needless to say, showed a sophisticated understanding of the notion of the 'third way', with high level answers often showing an awareness of ideas such as liberal communitarianism and the work of theorists such as Anthony Giddens. In the strongest cases, this then led on to an analysis of Labour's policy positions since 1997, with sometimes insightful points being made about economic strategy, welfare reform, criminal justice policies and so forth. Weak responses sometimes spent far too long explaining how and why Labour had embarked on the modernisation process, in which case very little understanding was shown of the idea of the 'third way'. Another discriminator was the extent to which responses were genuinely up-to-date, in that they took account of developments under Gordon Brown as well as those under Tony Blair. Candidates were, of course, able to suggest that the idea of the 'third way' has little ideological and policy substance and has been used essentially for branding and marketing purposes. Many candidates also pointed out that references to the 'third way' have become less common in recent years, probably as a consequence of Labour's difficulties in translating the notion into a clear political vision.

Question 2

The main discriminator in this question turned out to be the reliability of candidates' understanding of the terms progressive and reactionary. Some candidates chose, unwisely, not to define the terms, but instead to provide a generalised account of the various forms of nationalism found in the UK, using the term intermittently and somewhat indiscriminately. Others associated progressive with something that is 'good' and reactionary with something that is 'bad', once again unhelpfully. A common misconception was to take reactionary to mean 'in reaction to something',

in which case, for example, Scottish nationalism is reactionary because it arose in reaction to the domination of England within the UK. Stronger candidates, fortunately, recognised that progressive forms of nationalism are orientated around 'forward looking' goals, usually associated with the acquisition of self-government and sovereign independence, while reactionary forms of nationalism are 'backward looking', in that they seek to return to an earlier, preferred time. Some insightful responses, for instance, distinguished between the broadly progressive character of political nationalism and the generally reactionary character of cultural nationalism, the latter being based, supposedly, on the idea of regenerating a marginalised national culture. Some good responses were also developed on the basis of the idea that progressive forms of nationalism are associated with a civic view of the nation, while reactionary ones are associated with an organic or ethnic view of the nation. A further discriminator was the breadth of contrasting nationalism addressed, with strong responses being able to make worthwhile judgements related to nationalism in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland, England and the UK. Quite reasonably, many high-level candidates argued that all forms of nationalism are complex, incorporating both progressive and reactionary elements.

Question 3

This was a popular question. The most common approach to it was to associate social inclusion with the One Nation tradition and link the free market to the ideas of Thatcherism, before going on to discuss the relative significance of One Nation and Thatcherite ideas in the modern Conservative Party. This was a reasonable approach, but it was done better by candidates who were able to explain both what social inclusion and the free market are, as well as how each of them is linked to different ideological traditions within the UK Conservative Party. A significant discriminator was the ability of candidates to focus on recent or contemporary developments within the party, especially during the period of Cameron's leadership. Some weaker candidates still continue to write at too great a length about other post-Thatcher leaders, leaving little time to discuss Cameron and to show an awareness of the significance of contemporary developments. Nevertheless, such weaknesses are, thankfully, becoming less common, as candidates are becoming more aware of the ideas and inclinations of Cameron, even though, frustratingly, too little policy substance has surfaced to date. In addressing David Cameron, weaker candidates sometimes did little more than provide a descriptive account of recent policy positions, making little comment about social inclusion or the free market. An alternative approach was to see him simply as a One Nation conservative who had entirely abandoned Thatcherism, a position that is difficult to sustain in the light of the general acceptance of the rolled-back state and continued (if invariably unstated) support for Euroscepticism. Strong responses, by contrast, offered a balanced and insightful analysis of Cameron's leadership and its ideological significance.

Question 4

The first discriminator in relation to this question was the ability to define and explain constitutional liberalism. Most candidates were able to do this in at least a rudimentary way, often by reference to the need for a constitution of some kind, but

preferably a codified constitution. Stronger explanations acknowledged that the basis of constitutional liberalism lay in a deep, and typically liberal, fear of power, and a determination that power be checked or constrained by devices such as guarantees for individual liberty, effective constitutional rules and institutional fragmentation leading to a system of checks and balances. Some very weak responses, however, ignored the term 'constitutional' and looked instead at the extent to which the major UK political parties have been converted to liberalism, not constitutional liberalism. This, needless to say, substantially reduced their ability to show relevant knowledge and understanding. Strong responses were able to examine the ideas and policies of the Labour, Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties to evaluate their relationship to constitutional liberalism, often noting that it is relevant to all parties, but to different degrees. This was often done insightfully with balanced judgements being drawn about the extent of Labour's and the Conservatives' 'conversions'. Weaker responses to this question sometimes treated the UK parties as a 'job lot', looking more at the extent to which the larger political system had been re-configured in line with the ideas of constitutional liberalism. These responses came close to being answers to a different question, one on whether the UK is a liberal democracy. Differences between and amongst the major parties were an important part of this question, as, clearly, they have been converted to the cause of constitutional liberalism to different degrees. Another weakness was the mistaken belief that the constitutional reforms introduced by the Blair government after 1997 demonstrated that Labour is wholeheartedly committed to constitutional liberalism. Stronger candidates, nevertheless, recognised that Labour's conversion has been, at best, a qualified one, and were able to support this with a critique of Labour's constitutional reforms under Blair as well as the actual and proposed reforms of Brown. Some candidates also made the mistake of asserting that the Conservatives remain completely opposed to constitutional liberalism, ignoring their stance on, for instance, devolution and Lords reform.

Route C

General Comments

This year's papers contained a mixture of questions, some traditional and some breaking new ground, designed to be accessible to all candidates while challenging the most able.

This Examiner's Report maintains the format for Units 4 & 5 that has been used for the past two years. It considers the requirements of each question, makes an overall assessment of how well each question was done and outlines common features of weak, stronger and strongest answers. In some cases, guidance on areas for improvement are added. Unit 6 does not cover the requirements of each question they are designed to encourage the inclusion of themes from across the syllabus.

Please take note of advice on a change of emphasis on Pressure Group essays in the future.

Unit 4: 6500 - Representation in the USA

General Comments

All of the issues addressed in this year's exam have been covered in previous exams. However, some have not appeared for a considerable time, such as National Party Conventions and the Electoral College which last featured in 2003 and 2005 respectively, and some asked candidates to examine unfamiliar aspects of a topic, such as the relationship between lobbyists and Congress and analysing alternative strategies offered critics of affirmative action. As a result, even though most candidates will have had to required knowledge to answer all of the questions, they needed to apply their understanding of the issues thoughtfully in order to achieve higher grades.

Question 1

This was a popular question and done well by a substantial proportion of the candidates. It required candidates to analyse the continuing importance of the formal and informal roles of National Party Conventions. The formal roles include:

- Selecting a presidential candidate.
- A forum for party factions to debate which issues should be included in the party's platform (manifesto).
- Announcing the vice-presidential candidate.
- Building cross-party links, as this is the only opportunity (occurring only once every four years) for activists across the country to come together.

The informal roles include:

- Unifying the party if there has been a bruising, divisive primary campaign.
- Taking full advantage of the opportunity, for one week in election year, to make the most of virtually all political attention being focussed on the party holding its convention.
- Conveying a positive impression of the candidate and the party.
- Establishing a "narrative" for the election campaign (eg the Republican convention of 2004 offered the alternative of a strong war-leader and a "flip-flopper").

- This may serve to provide a “bounce” in the polls going into the autumn campaign.

Clearly, the formal roles of the Conventions have declined in recent decades, not least because of the rising use and significance of primaries, but the informal roles remain important.

With widespread public debate in the period before this exam of the 2008 Democratic Party Convention possibly becoming a public battleground for the presidential nomination, candidates had a wealth of material to use for this question. In addition, because exam questions on elections have tracked the presidential election cycle in 2007/8, many centres had anticipated that there would be a question on this topic.

Despite these advantages, there were some weak responses, in which candidates recited the formal roles of the Conventions, with inaccuracies, with little recognition of how these have changed over time.

Stronger candidates had a more secure grasp of the formal roles of Conventions and their changing significance, although even among these responses certain errors were seen in many scripts - notably the belief that Vice Presidents continue to be announced at the Convention.

The strongest candidates were able to both assess the declining formal roles of Conventions and the continuing importance of the informal roles. The strongest answers were able to apply these points to Conventions since 1968, including those taking place in 2008, for example the choice of Denver for the Democratic Party Convention as part of the push for support in the Rocky Mountain states.

Question 2

This was the third most popular short answer question, done by substantially fewer candidates than the question on Conventions. It required candidates to explain strategies used by lobbyists, including:

- Benefiting from the “revolving door” syndrome, in which former legislators, bureaucrats, presidential advisors and assistants use their contacts to gain the kind of access to policy makers which ordinary citizens cannot and acting as the eyes and ears of their organisation on policy decisions being made and to convert policy-makers to their point of view.
- Providing a useful source of information and expertise. For policy-makers to make their mark, the advice of an experienced former policy-maker and the resources of use their organisation can be invaluable. Alternatively, lobbyists are often used to testify, as experts, before congressional committees.
- Mobilising grass roots support. Lobbyists for organisations with a mass membership may use the promise of mobilising their members in support of an elected official in return for support on issues of importance to them.
- Offering financial support. Lobbyists for wealthy organisations may use the promise of financial support during election campaigns in return for support on issues of importance to them.

It also required candidates to offer an assessment of the effectiveness of lobbyists, which is often measured in the growth of their numbers and increase in the fees they can command.

A significant proportion of the candidates who attempted this question were only able to offer broad generalisations about lobbyists and the overall standard of the responses was disappointing.

Weaker candidates tended to discuss lobbying in general, not specifically the work of professional lobbyists, or to concentrate exclusively on the “revolving door” syndrome.

Stronger candidates were able to provide a more complete description of the work of professional lobbyists. At this level, however, a tendency to drift away from the question was common. In particular, many candidates explained the role of lobbyists in drafting amicus briefs, which relates to influencing the judiciary, while others described the role of lobbyists in Iron Triangles, which relates to influencing the executive. The question asked specifically about how they seek to influence Congress. Candidates at this level also had a tendency to make only a cursory effort to evaluate the effectiveness of professional lobbyists.

Strongest candidates were able to effectively explain the work of professional lobbyists and assess factors that influence their success, such as a shared ideology with the majority party in Congress and a resistance to lobbying by some members of Congress (John Lewis was frequently mentioned).

Question 3

This was the least popular short-answer question. It required candidates to explain why some states are defined as “swing states” and to explain how they affect the campaigns of presidential candidates. This meant that candidates had to:

- Explain that swing states are a by-product of the electoral college.
- Recognise that in states that are solidly Democrat or solidly Republican voters can be largely taken for granted and absorb only a minor proportion of campaign effort and resources.
- Explain that it is the “Swing States” or “Battleground States”, therefore, that effectively determine the outcome of presidential elections and shape campaigns.

In the 2000 and 2004 elections, the most influential swing states were Florida and Ohio. Likely swing states in 2008 included Pennsylvania, Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico and Virginia.

While the majority of candidates attempting this question recognised that swing states are given disproportionate importance by the operation of the electoral college, only a small percentage explained the consequent impact on election strategies. The most effective responses made the point that, over time, demographic changes will lead to some “swing states” becoming safe for one party (e.g. Illinois) while others will become battlegrounds (e.g. Virginia).

Weakest candidates were often able to explain what is meant by a “swing state” and point to the events in Florida in the 2000 presidential election, but were unable to explain their impact on presidential elections generally.

Stronger candidates were able to relate “swing states” to the operation of the electoral college and usually used Florida and Ohio to illustrate their points.

Strongest candidates also related “swing states” to the operation of the electoral college, usually using a wider range of examples pertaining to the 2008 contest, but were also able to examine how this affected election campaigns with the strongest contrasting Barack Obama’s “blanket” approach with the traditional strategy of targeting “winnable” states.

Question 4

This was, by a wide margin, the most popular short-answer question. It required candidates to analyse (not just outline) a range of factors that explain the lack of electoral success of minor parties. Issues that could have been considered included:

- The first past the post electoral system, which has a tendency to produce two dominant parties wherever it is used.
- Many states have restrictive regulations which make it difficult for candidates to be included on the ballot unless they have already demonstrated (by raising signatures) that they have significant levels of support. This often causes expensive distractions from campaigning by the candidates who may have the fewest resources.
- Many states allow ‘straight ticket’ voting, which encourages voters to cast their votes for one of the main parties in all posts being contested.
- Federal funds are only available to parties which gained over 5% of the vote in the previous presidential election and full funding is only available to parties which gained over 25%.
- Campaigns are getting steadily more sophisticated and expensive and minor parties often have limited funds and expertise at their disposal.
- If a minor party produces a policy that attracts support, it is likely to be adopted by either or both major parties, thereby nullifying its electoral benefit.

Most candidates attempting this question offered a range of factors affecting minor party success in elections, including many in addition to those outlined above. The main discriminator, therefore, was the extent to which candidates analysed the significance and weight of each factor.

Weakest candidates tended to provide a “shopping list” of factors, without explanation or examples. Many candidates at this level also tended to cite the nature of the two main parties as an important factor but provide dated analysis that failed to recognise the growing ideological polarisation of the past decade.

Stronger candidates often provided a range of points, with some explanation but no weighting of their impact.

Strongest candidates not only explained the factors that inhibit minor party electoral success but were able to use past successes and failures (sometimes stretching back as far as the Bull Moose Party) to analyse the application of those factors in practice.

Question 5

This was the second most popular essay question. As a two-part essay, it required candidates to first analyse why affirmative action is criticised in the USA and, then, what alternatives those critics put forward to address the issues that affirmative action seeks to remedy.

Candidates should recognise that there are two contrasting viewpoints. One is that the legacy of slavery and segregation needs to be addressed but that affirmative action is not the best solution. The other is that the problems that plague the African American community arise from deficiencies in that community that may well be aggravated by the effects of affirmative action.

Criticisms offered by the first group include:

- The central American values are fairness and equality for everyone. Policies which appear to favour one group over others are out of step with American values.
- It uses one form of discrimination to compensate for another. All discrimination causes fear and anxiety.
- Affirmative Action is a form of compensation by whites for slavery and *Jim Crow*. But why should today's white Americans pay for the sins of their forefathers, especially as their forefathers may have nothing to do with slavery and *Jim Crow*?

Alternative solutions proposed by these critics to the continuing effects of legalised racial discrimination tend to concentrate on ways of making the remedies fairer to all, including:

- income-based programmes, to help all in poverty, to replace race-conscious programmes.
- community-based Affirmative Action in which the top 10% of students in each school is awarded a place in the University of their choice, thus ensuring that they do not have to directly compete with students from better-resourced schools or education districts (which tend to have white majorities).

Criticisms offered by the second group include:

- Affirmative Action encourages its beneficiaries to have unrealistic expectations of their prospects. Students who gain entry to elite colleges because of Affirmative Action despite weak grades, may be ill-equipped to cope with the academic demands.
- Affirmative Action encourages its beneficiaries to be lazy. Why work hard if Affirmative Action programs virtually guarantee progress?
- Because Affirmative Action programs have been in place for decades and have the appearance of becoming permanent, they send the message to its main beneficiaries, African Americans, that they cannot, and never will be able to, compete with other races on equal terms which is bad for their self-esteem and self-confidence.
- Equally damaging is the message they send to other races that African American success is not really due to ability, determination and hard-work but due to "preferential treatment".

Alternative solutions proposed by these critics tend to discount the continuing effects of legalised racial discrimination as explanations of problems in (particularly) African American communities and focus on suggestions to "adjust" the lifestyles of those communities. Their main proposals, therefore, are:

- Abolition of affirmative action as it fails to address the central problem, which is the deficiencies within minority communities.
- Cultural reform: struggling minority groups encouraged to examine the causes of their inability to effectively compete. They should then make the necessary adjustments to conform more closely with American "mainstream cultural norms" which are the basis of economic and social progress. At the

heart of this idea is the view that African Americans are lazier and less disciplined than other racial groups.

In everyday life, when a solution to a problem is challenged the critics will invariably be asked what alternative solutions they propose. The critics will either respond with alternatives or dispute the nature of the problem. This question asked candidates to explain the challenges to the solution (affirmative action) and the alternatives put forward by the challengers. Most candidates could do the former, but only a few could do the latter even though it is the logical extension of demonstrating an understanding to the criticisms of affirmative action. Thus, many responses covered half of this essay well but the other half poorly.

Weakest candidates tended to provide a generic or pre-prepared essay on affirmative action without addressing the question. A few, although not as many as in the past, provided an account of the history of race-relations in the USA.

Stronger candidates provided an affective analysis of the criticisms of affirmative action, able to distinguish between different types of critic, but were unable to address alternative proposed by those critics.

Strongest candidates were able to outline alternatives as well as criticisms but even at this level most responses were significantly weaker on the alternatives than the criticisms and there was room for improvement in even the strongest essays.

Question 6

This was the most popular of the essay questions, attracting more responses than the other two essays combined. It required candidates to analyse views of the roles played by pressure groups in the USA. Some observers argue that they are too powerful in the sense that they distort political priorities to the benefit of a small number of particularly influential sections of society at the expense of the 'common good' while a rival viewpoint argues that they provide a healthy "free market" of opinion that helps political leaders to make decisions that respect all interests in US society.

Those who argue that Pressure Groups are too powerful tend to anchor their argument in power elite theory which holds that they help maintain the social and economic dominance of a small circle who head Pressure Groups which have large memberships, effective lobbyists, effective lawyers and considerable wealth. The less wealthy and minorities, by contrast, tend to lack the organisation, political connections and lack the voting power to make themselves heard in the corridors of power.

Those who argue that Pressure Groups are not too powerful tend to anchor their argument in pluralist theory which holds that even if it appears that one section of society is dominant, US society is so open with multiple opportunities for everyone to be heard that all groups may make a contribution to shaping their society. Thus *Brown v. Board of Education* transformed the South, *Roe v. Wade* meant that vulnerable women no longer had to resort to back-street abortions; *Lawrence v. Texas* meant that laws which discriminated against gays were declared unconstitutional and, in 2004, gay marriage was permitted in Massachusetts.

Although candidates are repeatedly reminded by their teachers (in other subjects, as well as Politics) that any question that includes the command-word "Discuss"

requires them to consider both sides of the question, a substantial proportion of responses considered only the arguments that suggest that US pressure groups are too powerful. Consequently, although most candidates had clearly been well-prepared for this question, there was a very high proportion of moderate answers.

Weakest candidates tended to provide generic answers on Pressure Groups, not focussed on the question and lacking illustrations to support their points.

Stronger candidates tended to analyse of the role of Pressure Groups in US politics but in very general terms or, alternatively, only present the arguments that US pressure groups are too powerful without considering the counter-arguments.

Strongest candidates were able to provide detailed analysis of both views of the role of Pressure Groups in US politics, illustrated with recent examples.

Essays on US pressure groups, in the past, have almost always been about the impact of pressure groups on US democracy and the only truly unpredictable element has been whether an essay will appear or not. To inject greater variety, essay questions on the impact of pressure groups on US society will be more focussed - although still substantial enough for an essay question. Areas that may be considered are:

- Financial: do pressure groups help the already powerful and wealthy get a disproportionate share of federal funds and resources?
- Social: have pressure groups gone from being a unifying force (bringing people together in shared community-building activities) to being a divisive force (increasingly ideological, promoting "wedge" issues)?
- Electoral: are they responsible for shaping the terms of debate in elections ("wedge" issues again) and driving up the cost of elections by devising ways of evading the terms of campaign finance regulations? - An essay question on this theme was set in January 2007.

Question 7

This was the least popular essay question. It required candidates to explain the ideas and fortunes of the main strands of the Democratic Party and analyse the extent of their influence within the party.

The main factions of the party are:

- Blue Dog Democrats: this faction argues that Americans have become increasingly conservative and that Democrats have to respond to this trend by presenting an agenda which protects the interests of the vulnerable while respecting traditional Christian values and keeping taxes low. This agenda enables them to work with Republican moderates and they are the least likely to vote on party lines of any identifiable group in Congress. Criticised by other members of their own party as "Republican lite", the group had 44 members in the 110th Congress, following the 2006 mid-term election, an increase of seven compared to the previous election.
- Democratic Leadership Council: this faction, founded in 1985, also seeks to establish a political agenda for the Democratic Party which appeals to the conservative heartland of the USA. The group is often identified with Bill Clinton who became its leader in 1990 and, of course, went on to become President two years later. He argued that the Democrats had not been

trusted by middle-class voters to “defend our national interests abroad, to put their values into social policies at home, or to take their taxes and spend it with discipline”.

- The left: a loose coalition of party activists and internet-based organisations on the fringes of the party, such as MoveOn.org (that helped raise £40 million to promote a liberal agenda in the 2004 presidential election) they adopt a stance that there can be no compromise with conservatives and that the way for the Democratic Party to win power is by fighting every conservative policy which threatens hard-won rights such as abortion, civil rights for racial minorities, gay rights etc. The growing influence of this movement was demonstrated by the defeat of Senator Lieberman in the Democratic primary ahead of the 2006 midterm elections. Activists, using the internet to spread their message, generated a wave of support behind a little-known challenger, Ned Lamont, because of Lieberman’s support for President Bush’s foreign policy. Furthermore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and several chairmen of the most important committees (such as John Conyers, who chairs the House Judiciary committee) are to the left of the party.

Both the left and the Blue Dogs have had success in recent elections. Candidates were, therefore, rewarded for making legitimate arguments *either* that the party has moved to the left *or* that it is gravitating towards the centre, provided their conclusions are supported by recent evidence.

Not for the first time, on an essay question on political parties, there was a very high proportion of very strong and very weak answers.

Weakest candidates tended to provide dated responses, arguing that US political parties have no real ideological focus and therefore cannot be legitimately described as ‘liberal’.

Stronger candidates tended to focus on the main policies associated with the Democratic Party and discussed the extent to which these policies were ‘liberal’ without discussing the balance of power within the party.

Strongest candidates were able to discuss in detail the principal policy positions of at least two of the main factions within the party and weigh up how influential each group is within the party. The strongest candidates drew on recent developments, such as the success of each faction in the 2006 mid-term elections and the stances adopted by the presidential candidates during the 2008 presidential primaries in order to attract support.

Unit 5: 6501- Governing the USA

General comments

This year's exam had a number of unfamiliar questions. The role played by political parties in Congress has only been asked about once before and the ability of Presidents to influence the political balance of the Supreme Court was a new question. There was a question on the Federal Bureaucracy, which has also not appeared for several years (although the related issue of the President's relationship with the Cabinet has appeared frequently). However, candidates did not appear to find the unfamiliar questions off-putting: the question that has been set most frequently, on federalism, was the least popular while the new question on the Supreme Court was by far the most popular.

Question 1

This was the least popular question. It required candidates to demonstrate awareness that presidents have adopted a range of programmes since the late 1960's, collectively known as "New Federalism", designed to reverse the centralisation of power over the previous three decades, and to briefly evaluate the success of each.

The initiatives that candidates were expected to know about were:

- Nixon's policy of **General Revenue Sharing**, in which many categorical grants were replaced by block grants.
- Carter, who did not alter the system of General Revenue Sharing and, to reduce the Federal deficit he reduced financial aid to the states, forcing them to depend to a greater extent on their own resources.
- Reagan, who reduced Federal anti-poverty programmes and proposed "**swaps**" in which the states would take full responsibility for two of them (welfare and food stamps) and the Federal government would take full responsibility for the third (Medicaid - medical care for the very poor).
- Clinton, whose presidency saw the longest economic boom in modern times, which led to a dramatic increase in tax revenues for the states and less reliance on income from the Federal government.
- Post 9/11. With an economic downturn and the demands of homeland security the states are finding themselves increasingly dependent on Washington DC in the 21st Century. Despite a professed presidential commitment to New Federalism, central control in policy areas from education (*No Child Left Behind Act*) to disaster management (*Hurricane Katrina*) increased.

In the past, candidates answering questions on federalism have made the mistake of providing historical accounts of the development of federal/state relations, regardless of the question. This was far less common this year, with most candidates appropriately starting their responses with either President Johnson or President Nixon. However, evaluation of the programmes was often limited.

Weakest candidates continued to make the age-old error of providing a historical account of federalism or, in a few cases, thinking that the question referred to the operation of the federal government.

Stronger candidates recognised that the question was about new federalism and were able to provide an account (with varying degrees of accuracy) of presidential

initiatives. In many cases, however, the account stopped after Reagan and many responses at this level were not able to offer much evaluation of the programmes.

Strongest candidates evaluated the initiatives of all modern presidents, including George W Bush, including in their assessment the impact of events such as post 9/11 Homeland Security and Hurricane Katrina.

Question 2

This was not a very popular question, attempted by only a few more candidates than the question on federalism. It required candidates to demonstrate a recognition that since the Republicans captured control of Congress with the *Contract with America* in 1994, the party leadership has actively strengthened party discipline:

- The party platform has been a significant factor in the political success of Republicans in recent elections, especially 1994, 2002 & 2004.
- Party loyalty, as well as seniority, is used by the Republican leadership in determining Committee Chairmanships. (Arlen Specter was threatened with losing the Chairmanship of the Senate Judiciary Committee in November 2004 for a comment which suggested a lack of party solidarity.)
- Since 2004, House Speaker Hastert has applied a policy of only allowing bills to complete their passage if they have the support of a “majority of the majority”, meaning that he will not allow the Democrats to claim credit for measures even if they have bi-partisan support.
- As the Republicans in Congress have become more unified, Democrats have responded in kind leading to a growing proportion of votes on party lines.
- As a consequence of these factors, the Republican controlled Congress only not put President George W Bush in the position of having to veto a bill on one occasion in his first six years in office.

Following the Democratic capture control of Congress in 2006, again on a national platform of opposition to the war in Iraq and presidential incompetence over Hurricane Katrina, the Speaker, Nancy Pelosi, has adopted a similar approach, although a strong cohort of conservatives in the party (Blue Dogs) has meant that she has been somewhat less effective at imposing her will on the party than the Republicans were.

Generally, this was not a well-answered question. Too many candidates offered an assessment of the strengths of political parties in the USA without reference to the role of parties in the operation of Congress.

Weakest candidates, of whom there were many, presented the (now outdated) Broader thesis that political parties do not play a significant role in US politics and, therefore, do not play a significant role in Congress.

Stronger candidates explained that parties have become more cohesive and polarised in the past two decades and concluded that this must be reflected in the operation of Congress but failed to explain how or offer illustrations.

Strongest candidates were able to analyse both the increasingly ideological nature of Congressional elections, meaning that members of Congress increasingly owe their position to the party’s platform, and how the Republican leadership exerted control over the House of Representative, often explaining how majority leader Tom DeLay acquired the nickname “the hammer” .

Question 3

Although it has never been asked before, this was the most popular question. It required candidates to demonstrate an understanding that all presidents wish to appoint like-minded judges to the bench, but faces significant constraints when selecting candidates and getting them confirmed, and has no influence over them once confirmed.

At the selection stage, the constraints are:

- Opportunity: appointments can only be made if there is a vacancy, due to retirement, death or impeachment.
- The American Bar Association: since 1952, the Association's committee on the Federal Judiciary has been consulted concerning almost every Federal judicial appointment, rating each nominee as "exceptionally well qualified", "well qualified", "qualified" or "not qualified".
- Balance: throughout the history of the judiciary, most judges have been white Anglo-Saxon men. On the Supreme Court, the first Jewish Justice, Louis Brandeis, was appointed in 1916, the first African American, Thurgood Marshall, in 1967, the first woman, Sandra Day O'Connor, in 1981 and the first Italian American, Antonin Scalia, in 1986.
- Geography: since its earliest days, Presidents have done their best to ensure that all regions of the United States have been represented on the Court. In 1932, the principal objection to the strongest candidate, Justice Cardozo, arose from the fact that he was from New York and there were already two justices from that state on the bench. One of the other Justices from New York generously offered to resign so that Justice Cardozo could be appointed.

At the nomination phase, the constraints are:

- Pressure Groups, which take a special interest in the work of the Courts, keep files on all potential nominees. As soon as an announcement is made, they will issue press-releases and produce television adverts which support or oppose the nominee with a view to putting pressure on the Senators. Famously, Reagan's nominee, Robert Bork, was discredited by the process and he was not confirmed.
- Senators, who meet nominees to discuss any issues or concerns they may have, provide the nominees with exploring their approach to making judgements and indicating their views on the major issues of the day (President George W Bush's nominee, Harriet Miers, withdrew at this stage in 2005) and hold hearings.

Even if the President's preferred nominee negotiates these obstacles, he or she may not behave in the way expected. In general, Democrat Presidents tend to be more liberal and prefer to appoint this kind of "activist" judge. Alternatively, they can nominate judges who believe that it is the role of the legislature, not the courts, to pass laws which govern people's daily lives, according to the will of the electorate as expressed at the most recent election. In general, Republican Presidents tend to be more conservative and prefer to appoint this kind of "restrained" judge who is reluctant to use the powers available to the courts to shape US society. However, Conservatives, especially, have been dismayed that a significant proportion of Supreme Court Justices have proved to be far less conservative than the Presidents who nominated them expected. In the 1950's President Eisenhower described his appointment of Earl Warren to Chief Justice as "the biggest damn fool mistake I ever made". Of the justices currently on the Supreme Court two of the more liberal members, Justices Stevens and Souter, were appointed by Republican Presidents.

The overall standard of responses was very good.

Weakest candidates tended to concentrate exclusively on the constraints imposed by the Senate at the confirmation stage. Some, very weak responses, suggested that the President and the Senate are under a constitutional obligation to produce a balanced court.

Stronger candidates were able to effectively evaluate two of the three ways in which the President faces limitations, often citing the most famous illustrations to support their points: President Carter (no vacancies), Robert Bork (rejected by the Senate) and Chief Justice Earl Warren (“the biggest damn fool mistake I ever made”).

Strongest candidates were able to evaluate all the restrictions faced by presidents, supported by an impressive range of examples.

Question 4

This was a very popular question, attempted by only marginally fewer candidates than question 3. It required candidates to demonstrate an understanding that separation is a constitutional principle, first outlined by the French philosopher Montesquieu, that each branch of government should have defined roles and powers, without any overlap of personnel. Candidates were also expected to recognise that the concept of separation of powers is necessarily complemented by a system of checks and balances to ensure that none of the branches of government encroaches on the powers or roles of the others.

There are two main criticisms of how the principle works in practice. One criticism of the system is that it has not worked in the ways intended by the authors of the constitution, as illustrated by the following points:

- The Supreme Court, through judicial review, has acquired quasi-legislative powers.
- The Presidency has effectively nullified the foreign policy powers of Congress, deploying troops on a huge scale without declaring war and signing Executive Agreements instead of Treaties (that require two-thirds Senate approval).
- Where one party controls both the White House and both chambers of Congress, as in the period 2002-2006, high levels of co-operation may negate the effects of both Separation of Powers and Checks and Balances.

Another criticism is that it works in precisely the ways intended by the founding fathers, limiting the ability of Federal politicians to govern by causing gridlock as illustrated by the following points:

- Since the Democrats captured Congress in 2006, few bills have been passed.
- When the Republicans controlled Congress during the Presidency of Bill Clinton, gridlock was so severe that the government had to be shut down twice.
- Government departments are accountable to both the President and to Congress, making it difficult for the President to organise and run the bureaucracy in ways that s/he may wish.

Although there were some effective responses, a majority were general and often vague.

Weakest candidates misunderstood the term “separation of powers”, confusing it with state/federal relations.

Stronger candidates were able to provide an effective explanation of separation of powers, with a recognition that it is necessarily complemented checks and balances, but tended to provide only limited evaluation of how well the system works.

Strongest candidates were able to effectively explain the principle and evaluate different ways in which it has been criticised.

Question 5

This was, by a wide margin, the most popular essay question even though informal feedback suggests that some candidates were put off by the term “imperial judiciary”. It required candidates to demonstrate that they understand that the term ‘imperial judiciary’ relates to the idea that the Supreme Court has usurped the policy-making powers (i.e. that many of its decisions have been ‘political’) that the Founding Fathers reserved for the elected branches of government.

A range of approaches to the question were credited. Some candidates considered the factors which enable Supreme Court justices to take decisions which may reasonably be seen as ‘political’, balanced by factors which encourage them to avoid entering the ‘political thicket’. Other candidates interpreted the term “imperial judiciary” to mean “liberal” courts/decisions that have extended constitutional rights, particularly for minorities and used examples covering a range of issues from Civil Rights for African Americans, Gay Rights, the rights of suspects etc., balanced by arguments that the courts/decisions may be “conservative”.

Overall, this question was well-answered with some outstanding responses.

Weakest candidates tended to describe the Court’s work, with minimal or poor analysis as if the significance of cases was self-evident and needed no explanation.

Stronger candidates tended to produce one-sided answers, outlining the argument that the Supreme Court is “imperial” without any analysis of arguments that it may not be. Answers at this level tended to use a limited range of illustrations, usually relying exclusively on the stock *Brown v Board* and *Roe v Wade*.

Strongest candidates analysed effectively both sides of the issues and had a wealth of current examples at their finger-tips.

Question 6

This was the least popular essay question. It required candidates to demonstrate that they understand that Presidents face a number of challenges in managing the executive branch effectively and have tried a number of strategies. Federal Bureaucracy is responsive to their political priorities and accountable for their actions.

The principal challenges that presidents face are:

- limited freedom of choice in organising the 15 executive departments to reflect their priorities.
- other parts of the federal government have, by law, a significant measure of independence from the White House.

Strategies used by all presidents to exert control over this bureaucracy include:

- The “spoils” system: since George Washington, Presidents have appointed political sympathizers to senior jobs in the government.
- The Executive Office of the Presidency: this group of departments, inside the White House, monitors the implementation of presidential priorities and provided co-ordination and direction across the Executive branch.

Additionally, each President has introduced their own measures to hold the Federal Bureaucracy to account. President George W Bush introduced the *Management Agenda*, a package which included:

- Grading federal departments and agencies on the results they achieved, with the White House defining “success”.
- Increased White House oversight of regulations issued, to ensure that they were consistent with the President’s aims.
- The introduction of performance-related pay to make it easier to reward or fire employees according to the administration’s goals.
- “Competitive sourcing” which would force federal workers to compete against private contractors to run programmes.
- Creating a “sunset” process, which would require federal programmes to justify their existence every ten years.

Candidates attempting this question were generally well-prepared. Thus, the select group that answered this question tended to do well.

Weakest candidates, who clearly had not been taught this topic, thought they were answering a question on federalism.

Stronger candidates provided effective analysis of the difficulties faced by presidents in controlling the federal bureaucracy but were much less effective when considering the strategies used to overcome these difficulties.

Strongest candidates effectively analysed both the difficulties faced by presidents and the instruments available to overcome these difficulties, although even at this level there were few references to the specific measures adopted by presidents in recent years.

Question 7

This was the second most popular essay question. It required candidates to demonstrate an awareness that the Constitution was written to ensure that civil liberties would be protected at all times, especially when the security of the nation was threatened when civil liberties would be most at risk, but that not everyone in the USA agrees that the constitution strikes the right balance between, on one hand, entrenched rights and, on the other hand, flexibility, in such circumstances.

Broadly, there are three views on how effective the constitution has been at times of national insecurity:

- One view is that the right balance has been struck: even in times of crisis, governments have been able to respond effectively without infringing the liberties of the citizens. Or, on the rare occasions that the core principles of freedom and liberty have been breached, such as President Lincoln suspending Constitutional freedoms during the Civil War or Japanese-Americans being denied their Constitutional rights during World War II the

balance has been restored once the crisis passed. The developments since the camp for “enemy combatants” was established on Guantanamo Bay may be used to illustrate this point. Although hundreds have been detained for up to six years in the camp, without trial, the Supreme Court ruled, with increasing impatience, that the inmates are entitled to constitutional protections in the cases of *Rasul v Bush* (2004), *Hamdan v Rumsfeld* (2006) and *Boumediene v Bush* (2008).

- Another view, often associated with the political right, is that it is too flexible and complain that it has allowed the government, especially the Executive branch, to use periods of crisis to steadily undermine those mechanisms in the constitution which protect liberty, which should protect citizens from the accumulation of power by the national government. Thus, when it was revealed in 2005 that the Bush administration had authorized eavesdropping on overseas phone calls made for the USA, the President argued that as Commander in Chief he was constitutionally mandated to do anything within his power to protect the American people. The result is that the balance between effective government and personal freedom has tilted dangerously away from liberty, undermining the core principle of the Constitution.
- A third group, often associated with the political left, is that civil liberties are paramount and that government (especially the Supreme Court) should be quicker to intervene when liberties are undermined by measures such as the Patriot Act and the establishment of the prisoner camp at Guantanamo Bay. Groups such as the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), believe that the traditional deference shown by the guardians of the Constitution towards the elected branches of government mean that they take too long to restore rights if Congress and the President sacrifice liberty of fear of being accused of doing too little to promote security.

There were a wide range of responses to this question, from weak to very impressive.

Weak responses took a variety of forms. Some tried to turn the question into a judiciary question and limited their responses to ways in which the Supreme Court has interpreted and enforced the bill of rights, but with no reference to the context of the impact of concern about homeland security. Others focussed entirely on the aftermath of 9/11 and produced a critique of the foreign policy of George W Bush. Others tried to work the question around to civil rights and abortion, which clearly have little to do with security issues. Yet others simply produced generalised, superficial, answers that offered little by way of analysis.

Stronger candidates tended to weigh up examples of civil liberties being effectively defended and examples of erosions of civil liberties, but not different perspectives on the effectiveness of the constitution.

Strongest candidates analysed in detail recent developments, including the slow initial response of the Supreme Court, its recent decisions and the way in which public opinion has forced the administration to review its approach to due process.

Unit 6: 6502 - Comparative UK and US Politics

General Comments

This year, for the first time since 2003, there was a synoptic question on elections. Considering the infrequency of questions on this topic, it was surprising, but pleasing, that it was the most popular of all the questions.

Candidates could achieve good marks for answers which made effective narrow comparisons of the two political systems but top marks were reserved for candidates who produced genuinely synoptic responses drawing on a range of topics studied over the two years of the course.

Question 1

The popularity of this question was surpassed only by question 3.

It provided an opportunity for candidates to discuss the changing nature of the UK's unitary system and the USA's federal system.

Weaker candidates tended to describe constitutional changes relating to the centralisation or decentralisation of power in the UK and USA, leading to an historical narrative with little analysis.

Stronger candidates produced more analytical responses but tended to limit their material to narrow comparisons of federalism and devolution, with examples, but omitting relevant strands from other topics such as the flow of power to Brussels.

Strongest candidates considered a wide range of relevant issues, developing sophisticated arguments such as the debate on whether the UK is functionally a region of a "federal EU superstate", the centralising effect of target setting by the national governments in both countries and the ebb and flow of the Supreme Court's treatment of states' rights.

Question 2

This was, by a small margin, the least popular question.

It provided an opportunity for candidates to discuss the extent of ideological polarisation in the UK and the USA, comparing and contrasting trends.

Weakest candidates wrote as if they lived in the 1980's, not only arguing that there were sharp ideological divisions in the UK, with minimal party differences in the USA, but even using Margaret Thatcher to illustrate their points.

Stronger candidates demonstrated a stronger grasp of recent developments but were able to only apply party platforms to a limited range of issues, such as views on the EU and the war in Iraq.

Strongest candidates provided cogent and well-substantiated analysis throughout their answers with frequent reference to up to date developments of the main parties on both sides of the Atlantic, structured thematically with a reasonable balance between the two systems in each paragraph.

Question 3

This was the most popular question on this paper.

It provided an opportunity for candidates discuss the extent to which the two phases of the electoral process, selection of candidates and the election, make politicians responsive to the needs and wishes of voters.

There were a substantial proportion of weak responses to this question. Some attempted to use the concept of “responsiveness” to argue that pressure groups are better attuned to the public than politicians and thereby write an essay on pressure groups. Others attempted to argue that the party leadership in the legislature put pressure on backbenchers to comply with the needs of the party at the expense of the voters and thereby write an essay on legislatures. Yet others compared elections in the two countries but completely overlooked the nomination process (despite sitting the exam at the end of the primary season) and its significance.

Stronger candidates tended to provide effective analysis of one phase of the electoral process, selection *or* election, but a much less effective analysis of the other.

Strongest candidates provided wide ranging and comprehensive responses, referring to many key factors (e.g. pork barrelling, locality rules, party voting and whipping, local politics/constituencies, gerrymandering, candidate selection, fusion of powers and so on). Invariably there were excellent supporting examples, many of which were up to date. Some candidates had a commendable knowledge of the status of individual Senators and Congressman.

Question 4

This was one of the least popular questions and, overall, the least well-answered.

It provided candidates with an opportunity to discuss the ways in which other branches of government check the powers of the Heads of Government, and consider whether these mechanisms have been less effective since 2001.

Weakest candidates tended to produce a journalistic account of any developments since 2001 that served to erode civil liberties - effectively answering a question from the previous year, without any structured political analysis.

Stronger candidates tended to provide narrow comparisons of how effectively the legislatures of the UK and USA have constrained the two heads of government but omitting relevant strands from other topics, such as the judiciaries, the European Convention on Human Rights, the Bill of Rights, the EU etc.

Strongest candidates were well informed, giving a coherent assessment of the ebbs and flows of power since 2001, making intelligent use of the constraints of the two constitutions, judiciaries, public opinion and media as well as legislatures.

Route D

Unit 4: 6503 - Introducing International Politics

General Comments

This was a challenging paper and an effective discriminator. Two of the short essay questions were quite straightforward, but questions 1 and 4 were designed to make candidates evaluate their knowledge in response to unfamiliar questions. The long essay questions were particularly challenging. Thus the paper was a fair examination, and a true test.

Question 1

This was a popular question which was answered quite well. Many candidates overdid the cultural side of globalisation in which McDonalds and Coca Cola were regarded as missionaries on behalf of the USA. Many also gave attention to the recent revolution in media and communications but without considering how truly global is the reach of the internet and mobile phones. Less attention was paid to the "outsourcing" of manufacturing and very few candidates challenged the assumption that globalisation is indeed modern. Basic answers described globalisation and how it relates in the modern world, but failed to address whether globalisation is purely a modern phenomenon. Good answers had strong knowledge of globalisation, past and present, and were able to discuss the extent to which globalisation is a greater phenomenon in modern times, with reference given to the spread of Christianity and the British, Spanish and French empires, for example.

Question 2

This question was straightforward, quite popular and usually well answered. Most candidates described the origins and ideology of the WTO. They then assessed its role as an arbiter of free trade, noting the prominent US/EU disputes. Most were able to describe the role of the WTO and give some criticism or praise of its effectiveness. Stronger answers contained a more balanced analysis and good detailed examples, of the strengths and weaknesses of the WTO. Examples given included US steel tariffs, EU banana preferences, bra wars, agriculture and the Doha round of trade talks.

Question 3

This was also a less popular question though those candidates who answered it usually produced good answers. The deciding point was an adequate definition of intergovernmentalism as contrasted with supranationalism which were assessed in terms of their effects on states sovereignty. The latter was, of course, the motivation for the pursuit of intergovernmentalism. Basic answers contained awareness of intergovernmentalism and how it operates in the EU. Good answers had stronger awareness of intergovernmentalism and a balanced account of why it has been defended in the EU, but also awareness of how it has declined.

Question 4

This was the most popular question on the paper and was generally well answered. A few candidates misunderstood "emerging nations" to mean nations in the process of creation such as Kosovo. However, most wrote about China and India, their industrialisation, consumption of primary products and latent (mainly) political

power. Most dwelt on the implications for polarity and global warming. Basic answers understood the term 'emerging nations' but were either not fully aware that the growing power of some states will have an impact on international politics, or a grossly exaggerated impact was suggested. Good answers had an excellent awareness of the growth of China, India, Brazil etc, and their impact on international politics, including the impact on polarity and global security. The change from unipolarity to bipolarity or multipolarity and the implications for global security were well covered.

Question 5

This was the least popular question on the paper. Most candidates established that there was a basic incompatibility between the recognition of human rights and state sovereignty. However, most identified an apparent shift towards favouring human rights that was enunciated in Blair's Chicago speech but then went on to note that any intervention, thereby breaching sovereignty, had more to do with the relative power of the offending state or its value in terms of raw materials. Iraq seemed an attractive lesson in the punishment of breaches of human rights, Zimbabwe less so. Basic answers showed awareness of the meaning of state sovereignty, and awareness was also shown of humanitarian concerns, but there was limited understanding of how the two relate. Good answers included excellent awareness of the restrictions state sovereignty has placed on those who have supported humanitarian intervention, but also awareness of the UN pledge to prevent genocide. Analysis had to be given with a range of relevant examples, such as Bosnia, Kosovo and Darfur.

Question 6

Most candidates identified that debt, mainly incurred during the 1970s, was a great burden to many LDCs, but also identified the problems associated with its relief such as corruption, unfair advantage over other LDCs and spending on inappropriate projects. Free trade has considerable advantages in that it conforms to the ideology of the rich states and offers the prospect of mutual benefits in terms of trade. However, many pointed to the example of the Asian Tigers whose success was founded on export promotion behind initial protectionism to allow industries and agricultural initiatives to become established. Conversely the rich north protect their vulnerable industries, notably agriculture with tariffs and economic support hence closing any market to the LDCs. Basic answers showed simple understanding of the link between free trade or debt relief and development. However, they showed little ability to compare and contrast the effectiveness of both strategies. Good answers gave excellent analysis of the pros and cons of relying on free trade in reducing poverty, but also a good awareness of the role of debt relief.

Question 7

This was the most popular "long essay" question but many candidates had difficulty in establishing a valid approach. Most examined the UN as a target for world government describing the make up of the General Assembly and the Security Council. The judicial function was filled by the ICJ and ICC with the IMF, WTO and World Bank fulfilling the economic roles. The missing element was the military and so most concluded that world government was an impossibility. Another approach examined the EU as a sort of guide for a global institution based upon surrendered (or not) sovereignty. The difficulties experienced by an organisation attempting to govern 27 states made the UN ambition seem impossible. Basic answers showed awareness of a few international institutions, particularly the UN, but little ability to relate these bodies to that of a world government. Good answers showed strong

awareness of the roles and positions of a range of international institutions and of the limitations of these bodies.

Unit 5: 6504 - Issues in International Politics

General Comments

This was a good, testing paper which clearly discriminated between strong and other candidates. The general standard was high with most candidates using clear expression and demonstrating analytical skills. It was relatively straightforward to differentiate between candidates with relevant, up to date knowledge and those without. Strong candidates were able to provide good to excellent answers. Weaker candidates struggled to provide detailed knowledge, balance and analysis. Disappointingly, many students either are unable to give good definitions of key terms, or they do not begin their answers by defining such terms. Very few good definitions of genocide were provided, for example. All questions were good discriminators, the 60 mark essays in particular, but there were few excellent answers to question 6.

Question 1

Most students were able to describe tensions between the EU and USA, but weaker answers concentrated on one aspect, such as the Iraq war, and then examples were poorly explained. Good candidates had strong knowledge of the tensions between the USA and some EU states past and present. Such candidates were able to discuss the extent to which this is a temporary period of tension and will be resolved once Bush steps down, or whether the tension is deeply rooted. They also noted that some EU states still enjoy excellent relations with the USA.

Question 2

It appears that many centres have not taught anti-globalisation, yet a number of candidates tried to answer this question. Many candidates, therefore, were able to describe globalisation and give criticisms of it, but were very weak in analysing the anti-globalisation movement. Good answers illustrated that some candidates are aware of the movement. In such answers, balanced analysis was given. They also contained good detailed examples, of the umbrella nature of the anti-globalisation movement, and also mention was made by some of how the movement has been in decline.

Question 3

This was a straightforward question. Basic answers showed awareness of the role of the World Bank, but frustratingly only one sided analysis and limited examples was given. Good answers showed strong awareness of operations of the World Bank and a balanced account of why it has been criticised and also defended. The World Bank should not be simply condemned for its part in the Structural Adjustment Program, without also acknowledging its role in fighting poverty and promoting human development. Good answers discussed the Millennium Development goals, for example, and the desire to improve basic living standards.

Question 4

Many weaker answers showed implicit understanding of the term 'genocide' but no clear definition given. This is a poor strategy for answering such a question on international politics. Basic answers were too simplistic, and only offered one-sided analysis. Good answers showed excellent awareness of the role of the UN in

preventing genocide, and included a balanced assessment of its effectiveness. Awareness too was shown of the state-centric nature of the international system and of the dominance of the UNSC Permanent 5 members. Indeed, some concluded that the UN is only as powerful as the strongest states allow it to be.

Question 5

This was a very popular essay question. It was similar to a question asked before the War on Terror began, but the answers were, of course, quite different. Basic answers showed awareness that the Cold War was a conflict of political ideologies between communism and capitalism. They also showed some awareness of the growth of nationalist and ethnic conflict in the 1990s, such in Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. However, only simplistic analysis was offered and limited examples. Good answers contained excellent awareness of the nature of conflict from the end of the Cold War. They gave strong analysis of the extent to which the nationalist conflicts of the 1990s have been replaced by a clash of civilisations, and as such, a return to ideological struggle. Surprisingly, some argued that the clash of civilisations was a national and ethnic struggle, rather than one of ideology. Well argued and knowledgeable proponents of such an argument could gain credit for this unconventional view.

Question 6

Although diplomacy is clearly on the specification, few candidates appeared to have been taught the role of diplomacy. This was not a popular question, and few of those who did attempt the question provided a good definition of diplomacy. Basic answers showed a simple understanding of how diplomacy has resolved some disputes, but a poor, or no, definition was given and a weak understanding of the role, and limitations of, diplomacy was evident. Good answers showed excellent understanding of the role of diplomacy, and analysis of the effectiveness of diplomacy in resolving some conflicts but not others. They also made good use of examples. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict was a typical example of the failure of diplomacy. Typically candidates argued that diplomatic solutions such as the Oslo Accords were unsuccessful because a mutually beneficial solution could not be found which would be acceptable to hardliners on both sides of the dispute. Diplomacy is successful when such a compromise can be found, or at least, when the two sides agree to disagree and prefer to maintain reasonable diplomatic relations rather than allow the conflict to escalate.

Question 7

This was a popular question, as the environment is topical and has been a regular short essay question. Some candidates found the longer essay format more challenging and struggled to include enough detail or analysis. Basic answers showed an awareness of a few attempts to tackle climate change, such as the Kyoto treaty, but were simplistic and provided one-sided analysis of the environmental debate. Good answers showed a strong awareness of the difficulty in bringing about collective action to prevent climate change. Such candidates showed that states typically strive to further their national interest and are often unwilling to make sacrifices for the global good. As with the tragedy of the commons, short term selfish interests tend to overcome collective aims.

Unit 6: 6505 - International Politics and the UK

General Comments

This was a good, testing paper which clearly discriminated between strong and other candidates. The general standard was high with most candidates using clear expression and demonstrating analytical skills. It was relatively straightforward to differentiate between candidates with relevant, up to date knowledge and those without. Strong candidates were able to provide good to excellent answers. Weaker candidates struggled to provide detailed knowledge, balance and analysis. Question 4 was the most straightforward, and therefore there were many good answers. All questions provided the opportunity for strong candidates to show their knowledge and their ability to analyse relatively complex material.

Question 1

This was a relatively straightforward question which most candidates found was suitable for well structured and analytical answers. Most candidates were able to describe Euroscepticism, but more basic answers gave one-sided analysis. Good answers were written by candidates who had strong knowledge of the EU debate inside the UK. They explained the role of the media, and the different positions within and between political parties. They did not exaggerate the significance and support of UKIP, for example. But they did note that the major parties tried to avoid discussing the EU at the last election.

Question 2

The Iraq question provided a strong candidate with the opportunity to discuss a range of issues which arguably resulted from the Iraq war. More basic answers were able to describe the aftermath of the Iraq war, but were one-sided and often inaccurate or they gave an exaggerated assessment of the impact on UK politics. Good answers contained more balanced analysis and good detailed examples, of the impact of the Iraq war on the Blair government, PM powers, parliamentary powers, voter apathy etc.

Question 3

This question was often chosen by those who clearly had not prepared themselves properly for the examination. There was, perhaps inevitably, some overlap with Question 2, but much more analysis was required of threats to civil liberties. Basic answers contained awareness of some tightening of civil liberties, but were simplistic. Good answers showed strong awareness of the use of existing and new legislation to give the security forces more powers, but balance was also given. Brown's desire to extend detention without charge (not trial as some claimed) to 42 days was discussed by many candidates. Also discussed was threats to significant freedoms, such as of speech, association and movement.

Question 4

This was a very popular question and there were some excellent answers. Basic answers showed understanding of the impact of EU membership on sovereignty, but a simplistic assessment was given. Good answers showed excellent awareness of how membership of the EU has impacted upon UK sovereignty. They displayed good

knowledge of the pooling debate, and of the impact of ever closer union on UK institutions, the legal system etc.

Statistics

AS

Unit 1 (6491) People and Politics

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	53	48	43	38	33
Uniform Boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 2 (6492) Governing the UK

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	55	49	43	38	33
Uniform Boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

Unit 3 (6493) The Changing UK System

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	50	27	24	21	18	16
Uniform Boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40

A2

Route A

Unit 4 (6494) UK Political Issues

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	57	52	47	42	37
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 5 (6495) The EU and European Issues

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	59	54	49	44	40
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 6 (6496) Policy-making in the UK

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	58	51	44	38	32
Uniform Boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

Route B

Unit 4 (6497) Introducing Political Ideologies

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	57	50	43	37	31
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 5 (6498) Other Ideological Traditions

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	61	54	47	41	35
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 6 (6499) Ideological Development in UK

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	58	50	42	34	27
Uniform Boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

Route C

Unit 4 (6500) Representation in the USA

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	58	53	48	44	40
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 5 (6501) Governing the USA

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	57	50	43	36	29
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 6 (6502) Comparative UK and US Politics

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	54	48	42	36	30
Uniform Boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

Route D

Unit 4 (6503) Introducing International Politics

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	56	50	45	40	35
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 5 (6504) Issues in International Politics

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	55	51	47	44	41
Uniform Boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36

Unit 6 (6505) International Politics and the UK

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw Boundary mark	100	61	55	49	43	38
Uniform Boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467 Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA020214 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on
0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH