



**2008 Politics**

**Higher – Paper 2**

**Finalised Marking Instructions**

© Scottish Qualifications Authority 2008

The information in this publication may be reproduced to support SQA qualifications only on a non-commercial basis. If it is to be used for any other purposes written permission must be obtained from the Assessment Materials Team, Dalkeith.

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

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

## 2008 Politics

### Higher

#### Paper 2

#### Section A – Political Theory

##### Question A1

“The defining feature of the state is sovereignty – its absolute and unrestricted power”

Discuss, using the work of Hobbes, Locke and Marx/Lenin to illustrate your answer. (20)

Candidates must refer to the quote/question and make their comments on it with appropriate examples from all three theorists in order to score above 14/20.

Award up to 3 marks for relevant descriptions of each of the key features of the state – depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 12 marks.

The remaining 8 marks can be gained by appropriate illustrations from the work of Marx, Lenin and Hobbes.

##### **Credit references to aspects of the following:**

- The state is the supreme/sovereign law making body in a geographical area with the power of coercion over the individual.
- The state gets its authority and legitimacy from the people. Candidates should clearly understand the role of the democratic process – free and regular elections, universal franchise, choice etc – in protecting the individual from the state and in conferring legitimacy, authority and in giving consent to governments – the state can be described as an instrument of domination.
- **Hobbes** claimed, Man is not naturally good, but naturally a selfish hedonist; As human motives were, in their natural state, guided by unenlightened self-interest, these could, if left unchecked, have highly destructive consequences; Left unrestrained, humans, propelled by their internal dynamics, would crash against each other. Hobbes tried to envision what society would be like in a “state of nature” – before any civil state or rule of law. His conclusion was dispiriting: life would be “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short”, a “war of every man against every man”.
- Nonetheless, as all people are equal, possessing a passionate love of survival (right of nature) and some degree of rationality (law of nature), Hobbes concluded that a viable, working society would arise as an equilibrium between these competing forces. The logic is simple. Any person’s right of nature justifies violence against everybody else. Consequently, in the interests of personal survival, people will come around to agreeing that they should renounce their right to use violence. However, this yields up a tense and unstable equilibrium. The moment one party deviates from their promise, all will deviate and war restarts;

- To keep society going with peace and confidence a Leviathan must be worked into the social contract. This Leviathan is the State – whether in the form of an absolute monarch or a democratic parliament, it does not matter. The important point is that the State will be given a monopoly on violence and absolute authority. In return, the State promises to exercise its absolute power to maintain a state of peace (by punishing deviants, etc.) Realizing that its power depends wholly on the willingness of the citizenry to surrender theirs, the State itself will have an incentive *not* to abuse it. Of course, there is no guarantee that it won't. But when it does, it must brace itself for the consequences.

**Marx** did not provide a coherent, detailed analysis of the state and therefore his writings have been interpreted widely by many, including **Lenin**:

- State power is about the economic base and an individual's relationship to the means of production – proletariat/bourgeoisie; worker/capitalist.
- The state regulates conflict and tries to maintain order and stability.
- State acts as an instrument of class rule – to protect and maintain the interests of the dominant economic/political class.
- The state is a set of political institutions which reflects the nature of class divisions in society.
- State is a product of historical class struggle – state is not neutral but plays a key role in representing and operating in the interests of the dominant class.
- Candidates could choose UK and illustrate the argument put forward by some that a single, cohesive ruling class exists – power is due to its ownership and control of capital – credit appropriate examples and explanations, particularly to materialism and the economic system as the basis of society. Superstructure and substructure and their relationship to policy and power.
- Candidates may use USSR or China or Cuba and show how Lenin extended Marx's ideas.
- Notion of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the fact that there will be no need for a state when the lower phase of socialism moves on to the higher phase of communism.
- Any other relevant points.

## Question A2

“Max Weber’s classification of types of legitimacy is still seen as relevant today but it also has its limitations”.

Discuss.

(20)

Candidates must refer to the quote/question and make their comments on it with appropriate examples from the theorist in order to score above 14/20. They must comment on the extent to which his types of authority/legitimacy are relevant today and what the limitations may be.

Award up to 4 marks for relevant descriptions of each of the key types of legitimacy in Weber’s classification - depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 12 marks;

The remaining 8 marks can be gained by appropriate illustrations from the work of Max Weber where relevant today and/or examples using Lukes’ work as being more up to date.

### Credit references to aspects of the following:

- The term legitimacy broadly means rightfulness and therefore it confers an authoritative or binding character which transforms power into authority.
- The claim to legitimacy is sometimes more important than the fact of obedience – a willingness to comply, a way of giving consent which obligates individuals to acknowledge the authority of government.
- Why do people obey the state? – this tends to reflect a shift from the philosophy of why should they obey the state to the sociology of Max Weber in which he identifies in each case the basis on which legitimacy was established.
- Candidates should refer in depth to Weber’s three ideal types of authority; traditional, charismatic and legal-rational.
- Importance of concept of consent in terms of it being the main distinction between power and authority – Weber’s typologies allow candidates to refer to both consent and obligation and explore how these operate within particular states or historically.
- Consent through voting and elections can be compared to traditional charismatic examples of Weber.
- Consent and obligation are both core to democracy.
- Different **types of authority** giving relevant examples to illustrate these eg **traditional authority** – rooted in history; charismatic **authority** which stems from personality and **legal-rational** authority which is grounded in a set of impersonal rules.
- Linking examples eg traditional – monarchy; charismatic – Ghandi or Hitler; legal-rational – bureaucracies.

- **Authority** is closely connected with power – additional factor that those over whom power is exercised must believe the power holder has the **moral right** to exercise power and to **employ sanctions** if they wish – ‘legitimate power’.
- The most common **legitimising** procedure is free elections – Gorbachev’s power and authority was seriously undermined by the fact that he had never submitted himself to popular election whereas Yeltsin made sure he had popular electoral support.
- It is possible to exercise power without authority but it is unstable; rulers without legitimacy are obliged to rely on coercion.
- Candidates may decide to point out that Steven Lukes’ work brings Weber’s notion of authority more up to date - they should be credited for points related to Lukes but only if they link their comments in to the question asked.
- Any other relevant points.

### Question A3

“The key elements of Liberalism and Conservatism are very similar”.

Discuss using the work of Locke and Burke.

(20)

Candidates must refer to the quote/question and make their comments on it with appropriate examples from the theorists in order to score above 14/20. They must comment on the extent to which the key elements of liberalism and conservatism are very similar or not, justifying their assertions.

Award up to 2 marks for relevant descriptions of each of the key elements of liberalism and conservatism depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 12 marks ;

The remaining 8 marks can be gained by appropriate illustrations/references from the work of Locke and Burke.

#### **Credit references to aspects of the following:**

##### **Conservatism**

**Edmund Burke** was in opposition to the radical new ideas of those leading the French revolution – and he developed his thoughts into a logical and full account of early conservative principles as follows:

- Man is not a rational creature but is driven by basic instincts and emotions – the imperfections of man had to be recognized.
- Since man is not capable of being made perfect through education etc he must have discipline imposed on him by some superior force.
- Man needs order and security – which are more desirable than individual freedom and tolerance. The purpose of political power is to create and maintain good order.
- This is best achieved through continuity and respect for traditional institutions – eg landed interests, the family, the church.
- Rapid and violent change is to be avoided – reforms only when necessary and with regard to tradition.
- Ownership of property brings responsibility – those who own should try to look after/protect those who don't.

## **Liberalism**

**John Locke's** view was that each man is born with certain rights which are natural and cannot be denied to him by other men – government needs to be based on consent:

- Individualism – core principle of liberalism – a belief in the supreme importance of the human individual as opposed to any social group.
- Freedom – individual freedom or liberty is a core value of liberalism; arises naturally from belief in individual.
- Reason – world has rational structure and humans have ability to reason – believe in progress and the capacity of individuals to resolve their differences through debate not war.
- Equality – ‘born equal’ - liberals have a commitment to equal rights especially before the law and in politics eg one person, one vote, favour equality of opportunity – meritocracy – rather than equality of outcome.
- Toleration – to think, act and speak (within some limits) can lead to social enrichment, believe pluralism is healthy; natural balance and harmony – no such thing as irreconcilable conflict.
- Consent – willing agreement – ‘consent of the governed’ - favour democracy and representation although need a ‘constitution’ as vital to guarantee order and stability in society – aware of dangers of tyranny – need bill of rights and written constitution.

## Section B – Political Structures

### Question B4

Compare and contrast the links between elected representatives and their constituents in the UK Parliament with those in **either** the Scottish Parliament **or** the US Congress. (20)

Award up to 2 marks for each developed point depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 20 marks ie 10 marks for the UK and 10 marks for the other country chosen. In order for a candidate to ensure a pass mark in this essay they **MUST** compare and contrast – simply describing one system followed by another (even brilliantly) should only score around half marks.

#### Credit references to aspects of the following:

##### The UK

- Candidates may contrast the elected lower chamber (House of Commons) with the unelected upper chamber (House of Lords); explanation of single MP constituencies is important when comparing with Scotland or the USA; reference to links between MPs and their constituents eg surgeries, local party meetings, events in the constituency, lobbying on their behalf, taking up cases against Ministerial departments, meetings at Westminster, access to the Commons Chamber public gallery (although curtailed due to recent breaches of security) etc.
- MPs take care to represent the interests of constituencies. Whips accept that this may transcend party loyalty on occasion. Members of Governing party have defied Government policy over such issues as Iraq, identity cards, nuclear waste dumping sites and the siting of motorways and railways.
- Candidates may mention the role each MP plays in representing particular interests – mention of MPs and sponsorship by outside groups including trade unions, business and cause groups; individual campaign spending is very limited by law so there is little need for financial support from such groups.
- Any other relevant points.

##### The USA

- The US Congress is one of the most pluralist bodies in western democracies; power is extremely diffused and access to key centres of power is very open through the lobby.
- Explanation of the types of representation in Congress eg differences between the Senate and House of Representatives in this due to terms of office ie six years as against 2 years; Senators therefore less open to pressure from constituents than Representatives who are sensitive to constituency opinion; differences in terms of local/state representation – number of Representatives versus only 2 senators.
- Senators take more of a national outlook while Representatives are more concerned with domestic issues.
- The committee system relies heavily upon information and opinion from interest groups.
- Fewer Senators so they're better known than Representatives who have less prestige; bills have more chance of success in the Senate.

- Party loyalty is important – members tend to toe the party line more and more these days but the party system is weaker than in the UK and allows for members to support external groups more openly.
- The voting and speaking record of members is well known; Representatives more than Senators have to look after their constituents' needs.
- Members rely heavily upon interest groups for finance of election campaigns and political support.
- Any other relevant points.

## **Scotland**

- The electoral system – using both the first-past-the-post and additional member system gives better representation – credit details appropriately in terms of who represents constituents (regional and list MSPs); still notion of surgeries etc in terms of direct and indirect contact between constituents and elected MSPs; ministers/shadow ministers/MSPs – candidates may argue they have a better chance of having their local MSP in a position of power than in the rest of the UK or USA and therefore the links are more important and helpful.
- The work of the Public Petitions Committee is very different from what happens in the UK and USA - The PPC is a special committee set up to allow the public direct **access** to the Parliament. Any individual or group can make a request (petition) for the Parliament to: take a view on a matter of public interest or concern; or change existing legislation or introduce new legislation. The PPC will consider each petition and make a decision on the course of action to be taken in each case. The PPC has several courses of action it may take. Basically, it decides whether the parliament as a whole should debate the issues, a specific committee should deal with it or whether it is more appropriate for another body to consider the petition. Provided the subject matter is within the Scottish Parliament's remit (ie refers to a devolved matter) the PPC must consider the petition.
- The Committee system in Scotland was designed to encourage significant public involvement in the Parliament's activities. For example, individuals as well as members of organisations and groups can appear before committees or write to them to give evidence;
- Scottish Parliament has “family friendly” business hours unlike Westminster.
- Any other relevant points.

## Question B5

Compare and contrast the role of the judiciary in the UK with that of **either** Scotland **or** the USA. (20)

Award up to 2 marks for each developed point depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 10 marks for the UK and 10 marks for the other country chosen. In order for a candidate to ensure a pass mark in this essay they **MUST** compare and contrast – simply describing the role of the judiciary in one country followed by another (even brilliantly) should only score around half marks.

### Credit references to aspects of the following:

#### The UK

- The principle that separates the judiciary from the legislative and executive in the UK is called the independence of the judiciary – in theory at least; no written constitution – place of judiciary in precedent, case law etc.
- The separation of powers is critical also in this answer before candidates describe examples of reality ie senior judges are appointed by the Lord Chancellor – a member of the Cabinet and therefore a politician, member of the Executive and Legislative body (Lords).
- The Law Lords – 12 of them – sit in the House of Lords and therefore belong to both the legislative and judicial bodies of government; they also sit as an appeal court.
- Judicial neutrality implies also that cases are heard without bias – the view has always been that judges are not normally neutral. They are frequently seen as a conservative (small “c”) body of people who tend to favour the status quo and the authority of the state against progressive ideas and the interests of individual citizens.
- Judges contribute to both the making and development of the laws – as part of the House of Lords as a revising chamber; through judicial interpretation of laws ie clarifying what the laws actually mean; through Case Law – showing how laws are applied; through common law ie tradition (judicial precedents).
- Some argue they are not elected and therefore not accountable (Philip Norton) while others believe they belong to an unrepresentative elite (Professor John Griffiths).
- Any other relevant points.

#### Scotland

- The major law appointments in Scotland are still made through the Queen on the advice of the PM/Lord Chancellor and are still run to a great extent from London.
- There has never been the right to appeal criminal matters in Scotland to the House of Lords but civil matters can and do go to the Lords.
- The Minister for Justice in Scotland who is an MSP in the Scottish Parliament is responsible for criminal justice, youth justice, social work, police, prisons and sentencing policy, courts and law reform as well as a number of other related matters.

- The Lord Advocate and the Solicitor-General for Scotland are the ultimate source of legal advice to the Government on all Scottish matters, and, along with the English Law Officers (Attorney-General and Solicitor-General), of advice on matters of constitutional and international law (such as the constitutional aspects of European Community obligations) and other legal matters affecting the United Kingdom as a whole. They are Ministers in their own right, independent of the Secretary of State.
- The Lord Advocate's Department in London, whose permanent head is the Legal Secretary to the Lord Advocate and First Parliamentary Counsel for Scotland. The members of the Department are the parliamentary counsel for Scotland – legal specialists who draft both Scottish Bills and the Scottish provisions in Bills applying also to other parts of the United Kingdom. They also give advice on matters of Scots Law to other Government departments.
- Any other relevant points

### **The USA**

- The importance of the constitution in the USA and how it lays out the roles and powers of the judiciary – the constitution is sovereign in the USA while Parliament is said to be sovereign in the UK.
- The independence of the judiciary and separation of powers both critical in the USA context – expect explanations and exemplification of both in some detail.
- The latter points should show much a clearer separation between the legislative and the judicial branches of government.
- The appointment process – the President's choices for judge need to be approved by a Senate (sometimes controlled by another party); appointed for life – have to be impeached to be removed, none ever has.
- Judicial impartiality is different from judicial independence. The first is to do with fairness in approach and judgements based on merits and not bias whereas the other means that judges should be free from outside interference or control.
- The judicial review process and famous examples like *Brown v. The Board of Education, Topeka, 1954* a ruling that all segregation caused inequality and was therefore unconstitutional.
- Any other relevant points.

### **General points – mainly UK/USA comparisons – credit appropriately**

- **Principle of an Independent Judiciary** – a chief characteristic of liberal-democratic systems is that judges are strictly independent and non-political. They should be 'above' politics to guarantee a separation between the law and politics. (This is often seen as misleading since judges play a lead role in both legal and political activities when they attempt to resolve conflict or maintain state authority.) Candidates could use the USA and UK to contrast the significance of the Judiciary.
- USA Constitution creating checks and balances to keep judges separate from the executive and legislature whereas UK's senior judges are members of the legislature (House of Lords), Judiciary and through the Lord Chancellor, the Executive.
- UK – Lord Chancellor is a political appointment by the Prime Minister and he is a member of the Court – he appoints judges to the lower courts and gives advice to the Monarch on High Court appointments. Prime Minister gives advice on Court of Appeal appointments.

- USA judges are nominated to Supreme Court by the President and ratified by the Senate Judiciary Committee. State elections and nominations procedures can be by a public commission.
- Judges in both are permanent – they have jobs for life more or less. Free from civil proceedings for anything they say or do in the course of judicial activity; they are allowed to vote but must not align themselves to party politics or enter political debate (by declaring public interpretations of laws they are seen as being involved in political debate – taking sides but they would argue against such a view).
- Judges may be subject to extreme and/or internal bias – the principle of judicial independence should stop external bias but judges do have prejudices and sympathies of their own. The UK Court of Appeal over General Pinochet saw one judge’s decision called into question over his membership of Amnesty International – his internal bias may have affected his judicial decision-making.
- Judges are increasingly drawn into political arena through judicial inquiries in the UK eg Lord Justice Scott, arms to Iraq in 1994; Lord Justice Taylor, Hillsborough disaster; Lord Nolan, ethics in public life.
- Because of parliamentary sovereignty UK judges cannot overrule executive decisions except when using **ultra vires** (see below); whereas USA Supreme Court can declare actions of Congress and President unconstitutional. In this way the USA Supreme Court can enter political decision-making and make policy without reference to elected politicians. The power of **Judicial Review** is crucial here with some examples being used as illustration eg in USA the famous Brown v Board of Education (1954) rejected segregation in schools as unconstitutional; Roe v Wade (1973) and the abortion issue.
- UK judges can deal more narrowly through the principle of **ultra vires** to declare actions of ministers unlawful eg declaring Greater London Councils subsidies to London Transport illegal. During 1992 and 1996 the UK Home Secretary was defeated by the courts no fewer than 10 times – this reflects the growth of a ‘human rights culture’ within the UK judiciary and a growing anxiety about the misuse of executive power, particularly in the UK where this is an absence of effective checks and balances.

## Question B6

Compare and contrast the checks and balances that exist to control the power of the UK Prime Minister with those of **either** Scotland's First Minister **or** the President of the USA. (20)

Award up to 2 marks for each developed point depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 10 marks for the UK and 10 marks for the other country chosen. In order for a candidate to ensure a pass mark in this essay they **MUST** compare and contrast – simply describing the role of the judiciary in one country followed by another (even brilliantly) should only score around half marks.

### Credit references to aspects of the following:

- Comparing the UK's Prime Ministerial executive with either Scotland's First Minister or the American President will lead to some similarities and differences and interpretations/conclusions about which is more or less "powerful" in one area or another – if Scotland is chosen it should be clear the First Minister lacks power in several critical areas when compared with the PM and/or the President.
- Candidates should detail what the powers of the respective chosen executives are and begin to compare and contrast the various checks and balances that exist.
- The UK and USA examples, if chosen, could point to a number of similarities eg extensive powers of patronage/appointment; chief policy-makers; heads of the governing party; foreign policy; role of Commander-in-Chief of armed forces – critical in US especially; policy making – checked by size of majority (if one exists at all), economic conditions; clear differences between UK and/or USA and that of Scotland in terms of powers (reserved areas, those topics UK only can deal with for Scotland etc).
- Variations in power tend to be more subtle – the President dominates his Cabinet and unlike the PM he cannot be outvoted by them; patronage is directly from the President for the whole of the administrative services – he does not share this with Cabinet members; the President cannot be removed from office for political reasons by the legislature whereas the PM depends on parliamentary support.
- The PM though is not limited by an entrenched constitution – a big plus for the PM over the President; PM's patronage does not need the approval of the legislature like the President's does; PM's party support much stronger than that which a President in the USA can count on where the party machine is much weaker; PM dominates Parliament whereas President may not dominate Congress; UK more unitary therefore less problems than President who has to deal with strong regional forces and he has limited jurisdiction among the states; PM chooses date of elections – dates fixed in USA.
- Other checks and balances eg Opposition parties, Cabinet ministers/members, question time, the media and access to the media, committee system, cabinet versus Prime Ministerial/Presidential government; constitutions.
- Candidates may wish try to reach a conclusion based on the evidence they present about which Executive is more or less powerful given the checks and balances in their chosen countries – credit appropriately for well thought through conclusions.
- Any other relevant points.

## Section C – Political Representation

### Question C7

Explain the main theories of representation, illustrating your answer with examples from the UK. (20)

Award up to 2 marks for each developed point depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification - up to a total of 4 marks for each of four theories/models of representation. In order to gain an overall mark of 14/20 and above the candidate must have used appropriate illustrations/examples from the UK.

#### Credit references to aspects of the following:

- The **Trustee and Delegate Models** were developed before the emergence of modern political parties and therefore they view representatives as individual actors.
- The **trustee theory** suggests that the role of a representative is to act in the interest of his or her constituents.
- This theory presents a solution to the problem of uninformed constituents that do not have the necessary knowledge on issues to take an educated position on issues. The representative is “entrusted” with the position to make decisions that will benefit the district he or she represents.
- This position also allows for the representative to take into consideration other benefactors such as the state or nation as a whole.
- This definition is put forward by Edmund Burke and is clearly based on a historical period where mass education did not take place and illiteracy was rife. It has been criticised as being anti-democratic.
- Expected to exercise “mature judgement” and “enlightened conscience” – to act in the interests of others; an elitist approach believing that the masses do not know their best interests; possibilities of pursuing self-interests if they’re allowed to exercise their own judgement.

The **delegate theory** of representation counters this ideal of representation.

- **Delegate** – a person who is chosen to act for another on the basis of clear guidance or instructions.
- Expected to convey the views of others with little capacity to exercise personal judgement or preferences eg TU official.
- Requires regular elections and constituency meetings to ensure dialogue between delegate and electors/party members.
- Possibility of recall to give more control.
- Closer to popular sovereignty and helps check self-interest (to some extent) but it is argued that it limits the scope for leadership and it may lead to narrow thinking (local issues) and conflict between local and national issues.

- **Mandate** – this theory/model was developed to reflect the growth of importance of the modern political party in getting individuals elected – there are few independent representatives any more.
- This is based on the “doctrine of the mandate” – on winning an election a party gains a popular mandate that authorises it to carry out the policies and programmes it campaigned on during the election. Since it is the party and not the individual that is the agency of representation in this theory/model party unity and party discipline become more important and justified. Reps are therefore more loyal to the party that helped them get elected.
- Candidates may mention some criticisms of the mandate – voters do not always act rationally in choosing a party/rep on the basis of policies; they may be swayed by one or two manifesto policies but not support many others.
- The **Resemblance Theory** refers to whether those elected are in fact a representative cross-section — the extent to which they typify or resemble the group they claim to represent. Many would argue this is too narrow or exclusive a view of representation to be useful.
- Any other relevant points.

## Question C8

Explain the main theories of voting behaviour, illustrating your answer with examples from the UK. (20)

Award up to 2 marks for each developed point depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification - up to a total of 4 marks for each of four theories/models of representation. In order to gain an overall mark of 14/20 and above the candidate must have used appropriate illustrations/examples from the UK.

NB\* It is critical that candidates make explicit reference to the theories by name rather than implicitly by referring to long-term reasons for voting behaviour (when they mean the sociological model) and short term reasons for voting behaviour (when they mean the rational-choice model).

### Credit references to aspects of the following:

- Psephology – the scientific study of voting behaviour – is still very important despite major problems with prediction of election results.
- The **party-identification model** – based on a sense of psychological attachment to a party.
- Early political socialisation with the family as the main influence reinforced later by group membership and experiences.
- Attitudes and perceptions are learned – particularly within the family, schools, peer groups, work.
- Candidates need to be aware of partisan de-alignment – a general fall in party identification and habitual voting patterns over recent years.
- The **sociological model** – voting behaviour is linked to the economic and social position of a particular group that the voter belongs to – social class, gender, ethnicity, religion and region are examples.
- The role of the individual and personal self-interest are ignored here.
- Empirical evidence is that the link between sociological factors and party support has weakened.
- The **rational-choice model** – the individual is at the heart of this making rational decisions based on personal self-interest.
- Issue-voting becomes important in this model.
- The **dominant-ideology model** – similar to sociological theories but the role of the mass media is much stronger – a process of social conditioning where individual choices are perhaps shaped by ideological manipulation and control.
- Any other relevant points.

### Question C9

Explain and illustrate the key advantages and disadvantages of using the Additional Member System top-up along with the First Past The Post electoral system in Scottish Parliamentary elections.

(20)

Award up to 2 marks for each developed point depending on quality, level of detail, relevance, accuracy and exemplification – up to a total of 8 marks for advantages and 8 marks for disadvantages. In order to gain an overall mark of 14/20 and above the candidate must have used appropriate illustrations/examples from the Scottish Parliamentary elections.

#### Credit references to aspects of the following:

- Candidates should explain the basic facts of the system of election in Scotland – the FPTP and AMS top-up using list MSPs.
- Scotland is divided into 73 constituencies and each constituency elects one MSP. These are known as **constituency MSPs** and are elected by ‘first past the post’ in exactly the same way as MPs are elected to Westminster. This is the elector’s ‘first vote’.
- The ‘second vote’ is used to elect 56 **additional members**. Scotland is divided into 8 parliamentary Regions and each region elects 7 regional MSPs. In the second vote the voter votes for a party rather than a candidate. The parties are then allocated a number of additional members to make the overall result more proportional. The regional MSPs are selected from lists compiled by the parties. These MSPs are also sometimes referred to as List MSPs.

#### Advantages:

- The whole assembly is proportionally representative and there is a better balance of electoral fairness and the need for constituency representation.
- It keeps alive the possibility of single-party government.
- It allows electors to choose a constituency rep from one party yet support another party to form a government.
- It takes account of the fact that holding Ministerial office and representing constituents are very different jobs with different talents and experience required.
- Examples to illustrate these advantages from past elections required.
- Any other relevant points.

**Weaknesses:**

- Retaining single-member constituencies prevents the achievement of high levels of proportionality.
- The system creates two classes of reps – one burdened by insecurity and constituency duties the other having higher status and the prospect of holding Ministerial office.
- Constituencies are much larger and therefore representation may suffer – others argue each constituent has more rather than less representation.
- Parties become more centralised and powerful due to decisions about who goes on the list and at what point.
- Examples to illustrate these weaknesses required.
- Any other relevant points.

[END OF MARKING INSTRUCTIONS]