



STUDY DOG POLITICS

2026 Predicted Paper

Paper 2

UK Government & Non-Core Political Ideas

Time: 2 hours

In the style of Edexcel

Name	
Mark	
Grade	

Instructions

- Use **black** ink or ball-point pen.
- **Fill in your name** at the top of this page.
- There are **two** sections you must answer **three** questions:
 - in Section A answer **either** 1(a) **or** 1(b) and then **either** 2(a) **or** 2(b)
 - in Section B answer **either** 3(a) **or** 3(b), 4(a) **or** 4(b), 5(a) **or** 5(b), 6(a) **or** 6(b), 7(a) **or** 7(b).
- Writing space is **not provided**. Answer on lined paper

Information

- The total mark for this paper is 84.
- The marks for **each** question are shown in brackets
 - *use this as a guide as to how long to spend on each question.*

Advice

- Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.

SECTION A: UK GOVERNMENT

Answer ONE question from EITHER Question 1(a) OR Question 1(b) and then answer ONE question from EITHER Question 2(a) OR Question 2(b).

EITHER

1 (a) *Source A is adapted from an academic and parliamentary commentary on ministerial accountability in the UK.*

The twin conventions of individual ministerial responsibility (IMR) and collective ministerial responsibility (CMR) are said to lie at the heart of the British constitution.

In practice, both conventions have shown considerable flexibility. High-profile departmental failures, from the Windrush scandal to the Post Office Horizon affair, rarely produce ministerial resignations of their own accord. The lines between personal culpability and departmental error have blurred in an era of large, complex government departments. Critics argue that the convention of IMR has become largely cosmetic: ministers resign when they become political liabilities, not when they are genuinely responsible for failures.

The doctrine of collective responsibility has similarly evolved. Cabinet government in the traditional sense (where senior ministers genuinely deliberate and reach collective decisions) has been largely replaced by bilateral meetings between the Prime Minister and individual ministers. The Blair government suspended CMR during the 1975 and 2016 EU referendums, allowing ministers to campaign on opposing sides. Boris Johnson's Cabinet was riven by public disagreements over Brexit strategy, yet CMR was rarely invoked. Most recently, Prime Ministers have increasingly governed through small inner circles of advisers, leaving Cabinet as a formal rubber stamp.

Yet both conventions retain real force. The threat of resignation remains a significant check on Prime Ministerial authority, as demonstrated when senior Cabinet ministers such as Geoffrey Howe and Robin Cook resigned in high-profile acts of conscience that weakened the governments they left. CMR continues to provide government coherence and a collective mandate for policy, even if the discipline it imposes is applied unevenly.

(Source: Study Dog's own material)

Using source A, evaluate the view that the conventions of individual and collective ministerial responsibility are no longer effective constraints on the executive

In your response you must:

- *compare and contrast the different opinions in the source*
- *examine and debate these views in a balanced way*
- *analyse and evaluate **only** the information presented in the source.*

(30)



OR

1 (b) *Source B is adapted from a website that outlines the royal prerogative and executive power in the UK.*

The royal prerogative remains one of the most contested features of the British constitution. It includes the power to declare war, conclude treaties, dissolve Parliament, appoint ministers, and grant honours. These are not trivial powers. The decision to commit British armed forces to Iraq in 2003 was taken under prerogative authority, without a legally binding Parliamentary vote. The triggering of Article 50 to begin the Brexit process was initially attempted under prerogative authority before the Supreme Court ruled otherwise.

Defenders of the prerogative argue that it provides the executive with necessary flexibility and speed. In matters of national security and foreign policy, the need to act decisively can outweigh the benefits of Parliamentary deliberation. The prerogative has also, over centuries, been progressively constrained: the Fixed-Term Parliaments Act 2011 removed the power to dissolve Parliament at will, and the courts have shown increasing willingness to review the exercise of prerogative powers, most dramatically in the Miller cases of 2017 and 2019.

Critics, however, argue that too much executive power still rests on unaccountable foundations. Parliament cannot easily scrutinise what it does not vote on. Treaties negotiated under the prerogative bind the UK legally without any Parliamentary debate. The Constitutional Reform and Governance Act 2010 introduced some ratification rights for Parliament over treaties, but its scope is limited. For many constitutional reformers, the prerogative represents the last significant bastion of unaccountable executive power, a relic of monarchical government that has no place in a modern democracy.

(Source: Study Dog's own material)

Using source B, evaluate the view that the royal prerogative gives the Prime Minister too much power.

In your response you must:

- *compare and contrast the different opinions in the source*
- *examine and debate these views in a balanced way*
- *analyse and evaluate **only** the information presented in the source.*

(30)

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)



AND EITHER

- 2 (a) Evaluate the view that the opposition and backbenchers are the most effective means by which Parliament holds the executive to account.

In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

OR

- 2 (b) Evaluate the view that sovereignty in the UK no longer lies with Parliament alone.

In your answer you should draw on relevant knowledge and understanding of the study of Component 1: UK Politics and Core Political Ideas. You must consider this view and the alternative to this view in a balanced way.

(30)

(Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 60 MARKS



SECTION B: NON-CORE POLITICAL IDEAS

Answer ONE question from EITHER (a) OR (b) from the political idea that you have studied.

Anarchism

EITHER

- 3 (a) To what extent do collectivist and individualist anarchists disagree over the nature of freedom?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

- 3 (b) To what extent is the anarchist vision of a stateless society a realistic and coherent goal?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 3 = 24 marks)

Ecologism

EITHER

- 4 (a) To what extent do ecologists agree that environmental ethics must replace the mechanistic world view?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

- 4 (b) To what extent do shallow and deep green ecologists agree?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 4 = 24 marks)



Feminism

EITHER

- 5 (a) To what extent does intersectionality challenge the core principles of feminist thought?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

- 5 (b) To what extent do feminists agree about the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 5 = 24 marks)

Multiculturalism

EITHER

- 6 (a) To what extent do multiculturalists agree on the politics of recognition?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

- 6 (b) To what extent are conservative criticisms of multiculturalism justified?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 6 = 24 marks)



Nationalism

EITHER

7 (a) To what extent is nationalism defined by culturalism rather than racialism?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

OR

7 (b) To what extent does nationalism support regression?

You must use appropriate thinkers you have studied to support your answer and consider both sides in a balanced way.

(24)

(Total for Question 7 = 24 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 24 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 84 MARKS

