

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in  
Government & Politics (6GP02/01)

Paper 01: Governing the UK

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6GP02\_01\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

<b>No. 1 (a)</b>	
AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Key knowledge and understanding	
<p>The source identifies the following types of committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative committees of the House of Commons</li> <li>• Departmental Select Committees</li> <li>• Non-departmental/cross-departmental committees</li> <li>• Ongoing committees</li> <li>• Backbench Business Committee.</li> </ul>	
<p>Marks are allocated for each source that is correctly identified.</p> <p>1 mark is awarded if any one type is identified.</p> <p>2 marks are awarded if any one type is identified with some detail.</p> <p>A composite mark is then obtained.</p>	

<b>No. 1 (b)</b>	
<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding	
<p>The various Commons committees can be said to be effective, the source notes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They act as a close scrutineer on legislation</li> <li>• They act as a watchdog on various government departments</li> <li>• Committees bring publicity to issues and they publish their reports to which the government has 60 days to respond.</li> <li>• The reforms made to the committee systems have raised their profile and potential.</li> <li>• The committees are televised and attract public interest.</li> </ul> <p>Own knowledge of features of committees and their reporting process may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any enhancement or development of the source.</li> <li>• The Liaison Committee brings greater scrutiny to the Prime Minister.</li> <li>• MPs may develop their career by taking part in the committee system.</li> <li>• Witnesses are called to account, often from a high-profile background.</li> <li>• Some chairs of committees further their work and profile by raising issues in the media.</li> <li>• Criticisms of the committee system may be levied with regards to their impact and scope.</li> </ul> <p>There is a debate as to the impact of Commons committees. Some argue that they are important with a rising impact. Whereas others state that despite the reform their findings and their influence is alleged to be minimal.</p> <p>A Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: It will rely on purely own knowledge or exclusive reference to the source.</p> <p>A Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Accurate and relevant reference made from both the source and own knowledge.</p>	
<b>Level 3</b> <b>6–7 Marks</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of the reforms and the reporting mechanisms. Drawn from own knowledge and the source.
<b>Level 2</b> <b>3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of the reforms and the reporting mechanisms either drawn from the source and/or from the candidate's own knowledge

<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Weak to very limited knowledge and understanding of the reforms and the reporting mechanisms drawn either from the source or the candidate's own knowledge
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Intellectual skills relevant to this question</b>	
Ability to explain effectively the reforms and reporting process identified	
<b>Level 3 3 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to explain the reforms and reporting systems of select committees.
<b>Level 2 2 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to explain the reforms and reporting systems of select committees.
<b>Level 1 0-1 Mark</b>	Weak or poor ability to explain the reforms and reporting systems of select committees.

No. 1 (c)	
AO1	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding ( <i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )	
<p>Apart from committees there are numerous other ways by which Parliament controls the executive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is PM questions, where MPs can ask the PM questions directly on executive affairs, the Leader of the Official Opposition having a clear role in PM question time. <b>However</b>, critics point out that this is a sham and an opportunity for sound bites and show, it has no real impact on controlling the executive.</li> <li>• Ministerial questions. Members of the Lords and MPs have the chance to probe the executive. Some argue that this puts pressure on ministers and may determine their political career. <b>However</b>, others feel that it is cosmetic and has limited impact on the executive.</li> <li>• The House of Commons and various backbench revolts may act to control the executive, either by blocking legislation or by preventing the executive from introducing legislation. <b>However</b>, this is ultimately dependant on the government majority, party unity and the ability to command effective opposition.</li> <li>• Votes of Confidence. These can be held by Parliament on distinct issues or individuals in the executive to censure the government. Parliament has the ultimate sanction and if a vote of confidence in the whole government is tabled and lost, the executive by convention resigns. <b>However</b>, in reality the executive has invariably an in-built majority and these processes are rare.</li> <li>• Debates in both Houses of Parliament. Here the executive is questioned and seeks the approval of each House for certain actions. Debates are known to be well informed with suitable experts in the Lords able to probe in depth government actions and intentions. <b>However</b>, some argue that debates are essentially 'cosmetic' and a determined government may 'tokenistically' listen but still take its desired action.</li> <li>• The House of Lords exerts control and may block legislation. Recently the House of Lords has inflicted numerous defeats on the executive, resulting major changes to government policy. <b>However</b>, the Lords has little real power, the government can veto its delay and many point out it has little democratic credentials to challenge a democratically elected and representative government.</li> </ul> <p>A Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: There will be a limited awareness of how parliament is able to control the executive, the content will not be expansive and informed.</p>	

A Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: There will be clear awareness of how parliament controls the executive, the content will show detail and clarity.	
<b>Level 3 6-8 Marks</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of a range of ways by which Parliament controls the executive.
<b>Level 2 3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of ways by which Parliament controls the executive
<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Weak to very limited knowledge and understanding of the way by which Parliament controls the executive
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
Intellectual skills relevant to this question	
Ability to analyse, evaluate and assess the extent to which the executive is challenged and controlled by Parliament.	
<b>Level 3 7-9 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse evaluate and assess the means and impact of Parliament's control of the executive.
<b>Level 2 4-6 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse, evaluate and assess the means and impact of Parliament's control of the executive.
<b>Level 1 0-3 Marks</b>	Weak to poor ability to analyse, evaluate and assess the means and impact of Parliament's control of the executive.
<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 6-8 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. A well-structured response with balance and clear conclusions supported by evidence.
<b>Level 2 3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. A structured response with some balance and some coherent conclusions drawn.
<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate analysis, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. Poor or limited structure and weak or limited conclusions.

<b>No. 2 (a)</b>	
<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding	
<p>The source identifies several aspects of the Prime Minister's role in relation to ministers and their departments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The appointment of ministers to post</li> <li>• Chairs the cabinet and establishes the cabinet committee system</li> <li>• Allocating functional operations of ministers and their departments</li> <li>• The power to dismiss ministers from their departmental responsibility</li> <li>• In coalition government the source notes that appointment, reshuffle and sacking of ministers must be done in consultation with the Deputy Prime Minister.</li> <li>• Provides a sense of direction for ministers to take.</li> </ul>	
<p>Marks are allocated for</p> <p>1 mark is awarded if any one aspect is identified with some detail.</p> <p>2 marks are awarded if any one aspect is identified and fully described.</p> <p>A composite mark is then obtained.</p>	

<b>No. 2 (b)</b>	
<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding	
<p>The source highlights the following impact of the coalition on the office of the Prime Minister:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consults and agrees on appointments, reshuffle and sacking which has an impact on the PM.</li> <li>• In/out arrangements that means the balance is maintained thorough the coalition's term of office, limiting the scope of the PM.</li> <li>• The coalition prime minister was guided by a written agreement.</li> </ul> <p>Own knowledge on the impact of the coalition on the office of Prime Minister may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any enhancement or development of the source.</li> <li>• The coalition was said to empower the Prime Minister as he had a clear working majority in the House of Commons</li> <li>• It has restricted the Prime Minister in terms of policy options, having to consult</li> <li>• It has changed how the PM conducts Cabinet business</li> <li>• Arguably it did raise the profile of the role of the Deputy Prime Minister in relation to the Prime Minister.</li> <li>• The coalition introduced fixed term parliaments.</li> </ul> <p>A Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: It will rely on purely own knowledge or exclusive reference to the source.</p> <p>A Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Accurate and relevant reference made from both the source and own knowledge.</p>	
<b>Level 3 6-7 Marks</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of the reforms and the reporting mechanisms. Drawn from own knowledge and the source.
<b>Level 2 3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of the reforms and the reporting mechanisms either drawn from the source and/or from the candidate's own knowledge
<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Weak to very limited knowledge and understanding of the reforms and the reporting mechanisms drawn either from the source or the candidate's own knowledge
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
Intellectual skills relevant to this question	

Ability to analyse the limitations imposed on the PM by the coalition agreement.	
<b>Level 3 3 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to explain the scope and remit of the coalition limitations on the PM.
<b>Level 2 2 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to explain the scope and remit of the coalition limitations on the PM.
<b>Level 1 1 Mark</b>	Very poor or weak ability to explain the scope and remit of the coalition limitations on the PM.

<b>No. 2 (c)</b>	
<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding ( <i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )	
<p>Those who argue that the PM is free from effective political constraints cite the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The power of PM patronage is vast and powerful</li> <li>• The party only rarely removes an incumbent PM in office</li> <li>• The PM has a vast media influence and profile</li> <li>• Success in General Election brings a vast reward for a PM</li> <li>• Parliament rarely constrains a PM if the majority is large and the opposition is weak.</li> </ul> <p>Those who argue that the PM has effective constraints cite the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PM can be restrained on policy options if large sections of the cabinet do not agree</li> <li>• The PM is not totally free when choosing the cabinet and their choice is both limited and dictated by heavyweights in the party</li> <li>• Parliament in certain circumstances does limit the PM</li> <li>• A powerful media can mobilise public opinion and constrain the PM.</li> <li>• The EU and the devolved assemblies may act to constrain.</li> </ul> <p>A Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features: There will be a limited awareness of how the prime minister is free/not free from political constraints, the content will not be expansive and informed.</p> <p>A Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: There will be clear awareness of how the prime minister is free/not free from effective political constraints, the content will show detail and clarity.</p>	
<b>Level 3 6-8 Marks</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of how the relationship between the PM and effective constraints
<b>Level 2 3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of how the relationship between the PM and effective constraints
<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Weak to very poor knowledge and understanding how the relationship between the PM and effective constraints
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
Intellectual skills relevant to this question	
The ability to evaluate and assess the relationship and power balance between the PM and sources of constraint.	
<b>Level 3 7-9 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to evaluate and assess the relationship and power balance between the PM and sources of effective constraint.

<b>Level 2 4-6 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to evaluate and assess the relationship and power balance between the PM and the sources of effective constraint.
<b>Level 1 0-3 Marks</b>	Weak ability to evaluate and assess the effectiveness of the relationship and power balance between the PM sources of effective constraint
<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 6-8 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluations, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b>Level 2 3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluations, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluations, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

<b>No. 3</b>	
<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding ( <i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )	
<p>Constitutional change has been part of every Government's agenda since 1997. There are some who are convinced that constitutional reform should advance still further in new and in existing reformed areas. On the other hand there are those who feel that we have reached the limits of constitutional reform and this group are equally convinced that no further constitutional reform should take place.</p> <p>Those who are convinced that further constitutional reform should take place cite the following areas for reform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constitutional reform to the House of Lords is incomplete, it remains unelected and thus undemocratic</li> <li>• Further reform is required to the House of Commons to modernise its processes</li> <li>• Constitutional reform to the electoral system used for Westminster are required as MPs and government get 100% of the power on less than 50% of the vote</li> <li>• Further constitutional reform is required for devolution, it is uneven in different regions of the UK and it requires redress</li> <li>• Constitutional reform is required to redress the imbalance brought about by the so called 'West Lothian Question' where Scottish MP's have the ability to influence 'English only' legislation the so called EVEL issues (English Votes for English Laws)</li> <li>• Overall many cite that the UK requires a codified constitution to bring together all aspects of how the UK is governed</li> <li>• Many are calling for constitutional reform to abolish the Human Rights Act (based on the ECHR) and introduce a purely UK Bill of Rights with the Supreme Court as the highest authority on its interpretation</li> </ul> <p>Those who are convinced that no further constitutional reform should take place cite the following areas for reform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Constitutional reform to the House of Lords has now brought about all the desired for changes, we now have a more vibrant and expert second chamber, no change required</li> <li>• The House of Commons has been sufficiently reformed with changes such as the Wright Reforms, fixed term parliaments and recall elections</li> </ul>	

- Constitutional reform to the electoral system used for Westminster is not required, the current system gives us strong and stable government, furthermore change was rejected in the 2011 referendum
- Devolution has now reached its end point. Further devolution will lead to the break up of the UK which will be damaging
- Parliament has the potential already to restrict Scottish MPs from voting on certain bills without further constitutional reform
- There is no need for a codified constitution, the constitution we have works well and has served us for centuries
- Adherence to the Human Rights Act (based on the ECHR) acts as an international guardian of rights and civil liberties

Both sides of the debate will be addressed

A level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

It will not have a clear balance of points and will side with one aspect of the debate. The points raised may be incomplete and lack depth and clarity.

A level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

It will have a clear balance of points and will demonstrate a sound understanding of both aspect of the debate. The points raised will be complete and accurate.

<b>Level 3 14-20 Marks</b>	Full and developed knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against further constitutional change in the UK
<b>Level 2 7-13 Marks</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against further constitutional change in the UK
<b>Level 1 0-6 Marks</b>	Weak to poor knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against further constitutional change in the UK
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
Intellectual skills relevant to this question	
Ability to explain and evaluate the arguments and parties for and against further constitutional change in the UK.	
<b>Level 3 8-12 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate the nature of potential reforms.
<b>Level 2 4-7 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate the nature of potential reforms.
<b>Level 1 0-3 Marks</b>	Weak or very limited ability to analyse and evaluate the nature of potential reforms.
<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 6-8 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluations, making good use of

	appropriate vocabulary. A well-developed clear structure with coherent conclusions.
<b>Level 2</b> <b>3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluations, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. Some discernible structure with relevant conclusions.
<b>Level 1</b> <b>0-2 Marks</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluations, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. Lacking a clear structure and with weak or limited conclusions.

<b>No. 4</b>	
<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
Key knowledge and understanding ( <i>This is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i> )	
<p>The argument that judges are the best guardians base their premise on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Judges have the rule of law at their disposal – this implies the superiority of rules not of men. Armed with such things as the Human Rights Act, the principles of Natural Justice, Judicial Review and past precedent, judges have a readymade script to protect rights and civil liberties.</li> <li>• Judges are independent of the other two branches of the state, they can thus act without fear of censure or caution from the other two sectors</li> <li>• Judges are supposedly political neutral and also socially neutral and are devoid of partisan balance, they can thus act for the individual in the face of an overwhelming state actor</li> <li>• Other reasons, plus relevant case examples may be advanced to support this view.</li> </ul> <p>However, those who argue that Parliament and/or the executive are better protectors of rights and liberties cite the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some may argue that judges are weak at protecting rights and their attempts can be thwarted by both government and Parliament</li> <li>• Parliament, some say, is the ultimate guardian of rights for it is law sanctioned here that judges must follow and abide by. The HRA and the FOI came into effect with Parliament’s approval. Likewise, parliamentary law or statute is superior to judicial precedent and case law.</li> <li>• Judges are accused of being politically biased ‘tending to side with conservative values and pro-government’ they are also alleged to be socially biased, favouring middle and upper class values and against working class and organised trade unions.</li> <li>• Parliament and MPs can redress grievances if sufficient evidence is presented to them swifter than judges can</li> <li>• Others cite that a powerful executive with a majority in Parliament is the ultimate decision maker for the range and scope of rights and civil liberties that are set out for the general public.</li> <li>• It is argued by some that neither judges nor Parliament nor the executive act to protect rights and civil liberties and that the overall system is biased against the individual.</li> </ul>	

- Other reasons, plus relevant case examples may be advanced to support this view

A Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:  
There will be a limited appreciation of the contrasting ability between judges and parliament or the executive. There will be limited contemporary reference to case support.

A Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:  
There will be a clear appreciation of the contrasting ability between judges and parliament or the executive. There will be contemporary evidence to support the case for and against judges in contrast to parliament and the executive.

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 14-20 Marks</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of the nature of how rights and civil liberties are guarded and protected by the judiciary, Parliament and the executive
<b>Level 2 7-13 Marks</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of the nature of how rights and civil liberties are guarded and protected by the judiciary, Parliament and the executive
<b>Level 1 0-6 Marks</b>	Weak to very poor knowledge and understanding of the nature of how rights and civil liberties are guarded and protected by the judiciary, Parliament and the executive
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
Intellectual skills relevant to this question are indicated by an ability to evaluate, explain and analyse the position of the judiciary, Parliament and the executive as guardians of rights and civil liberties in the UK.	
<b>Level 3 8-12 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse, evaluate and explain the position of the judiciary, Parliament and the executive as guardians of rights and civil liberties in the UK.
<b>Level 2 4-7 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse, evaluate and explain the position of the judiciary, Parliament and the executive as guardians of rights and civil liberties in the UK.
<b>Level 1 0-3 Marks</b>	Weak to poor ability to analyse, evaluate and explain the position of the judiciary, Parliament and the executive as guardians of rights and civil liberties in the UK.
<b>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 6-8 Marks</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluation, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. A well-developed clear structure with coherent conclusions.
<b>Level 2 3-5 Marks</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluation, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. Some discernible structure with relevant conclusions.
<b>Level 1 0-2 Marks</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent analysis and evaluation, making little or no use of

	appropriate vocabulary. Lacking a clear structure and with weak or limited conclusions.
--	---

