

**GCE AS**

**Government  
and Politics**

**January 2008**

**Mark Schemes**

Issued: April 2008



MARK SCHEMES (2008)

Foreword

*Introduction*

Mark Schemes are published to assist teachers and students in their preparation for examinations. Through the mark schemes teachers and students will be able to see what examiners are looking for in response to questions and exactly where the marks have been awarded. The publishing of the mark schemes may help to show that examiners are not concerned about finding out what a student does not know but rather with rewarding students for what they do know.

*The Purpose of Mark Schemes*

Examination papers are set and revised by teams of examiners and revisers appointed by the Council. The teams of examiners and revisers include experienced teachers who are familiar with the level and standards expected of 16- and 18-year-old students in schools and colleges. The job of the examiners is to set the questions and the mark schemes; and the job of the revisers is to review the questions and mark schemes commenting on a large range of issues about which they must be satisfied before the question papers and mark schemes are finalised.

The questions and the mark schemes are developed in association with each other so that the issues of differentiation and positive achievement can be addressed right from the start. Mark schemes therefore are regarded as a part of an integral process which begins with the setting of questions and ends with the marking of the examination.

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to provide a uniform basis for the marking process so that all the markers are following exactly the same instructions and making the same judgements in so far as this is possible. Before marking begins a standardising meeting is held where all the markers are briefed using the mark scheme and samples of the students' work in the form of scripts. Consideration is also given at this stage to any comments on the operational papers received from teachers and their organisations. During this meeting, and up to and including the end of the marking, there is provision for amendments to be made to the mark scheme. What is published represents this final form of the mark scheme.

It is important to recognise that in some cases there may well be other correct responses which are equally acceptable to those published: the mark scheme can only cover those responses which emerged in the examination. There may also be instances where certain judgements may have to be left to the experience of the examiner, for example, where there is no absolute correct response – all teachers will be familiar with making such judgements.

The Council hopes that the mark schemes will be viewed and used in a constructive way as a further support to the teaching and learning processes.



## CONTENTS

Module 1: The Government and Politics of Northern Ireland

Module 2: The Inter-relationships of the United Kingdom Executive, Legislature and Judiciary 5

Module 3: Political Behaviour 13





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)  
General Certificate of Education  
2008**

---

## **Government and Politics**

### **Assessment Unit AS 1**

*assessing*

**Module 1: The Government and  
Politics of Northern Ireland**

**[ASQ11]**

**THURSDAY 10 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

# **MARK SCHEME**

## 1 Background

The Assembly created by the Good Friday Agreement had an impressive range of scrutiny powers. The Assembly Committees referred to in the Source had considerable ability to hold Ministers to account and, in the short periods during which the Assembly operated, had begun to exercise those powers. MLAs could also use Question Time and Debates to challenge members of the Executive. Candidates who make only reference to the source can score a maximum of Level 4. Candidates who make no reference to the source can score a maximum of Level 4. An answer that is unbalanced can score a maximum of Level 4. These ceilings also apply to question 2.

### Level 1 ([1]–[2])

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of how the Assembly could hold the Executive to account (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas (AO3).

### Level 2 ([3]–[4])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of how the Assembly could hold the Executive to account (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as are the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

### Level 3 ([5]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of how the Assembly could hold the Executive to account (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair, as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

### Level 4 ([7]–[8])

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of how the Assembly could hold the Executive to account (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates a clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair, as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

### Level 5 ([9]–[10])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of how the Assembly could hold the Executive to account (AO1). A cogent argument is constructed which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is effective, with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is good, as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

[10]

10



**2 Background**

In 1998 the DUP and Sinn Fein were poles apart on many issues including the Good Friday Agreement. The former was opposed to the Agreement and declared its intention to “wreck” it. The latter was in favour of the Agreement and insistent on the Republican movement’s right to be part of a power sharing government. The DUP, by contrast, was opposed to power sharing especially with what they regarded as terrorists. The two parties were also divided on issues such as the reform of policing, prisoner releases and demilitarisation.

**Level 1 ([1]–[2])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the differences between the DUP and Sinn Fein on the Belfast Agreement (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([3]–[5])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the differences between the DUP and Sinn Fein on the Belfast Agreement (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as are the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([6]–[8])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the differences between the DUP and Sinn Fein on the Belfast Agreement (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate’s level of communication and use of appropriate vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair, as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([9]–[11])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the differences between the DUP and Sinn Fein on the Belfast Agreement (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair, as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([12]–[14])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the differences between the DUP and Sinn Fein on the Belfast Agreement (AO1). A cogent argument is constructed which demonstrates reference for wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear and effective with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

[14]

14

**Total**

**24**





*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)  
General Certificate of Education  
2008**

---

## **Government and Politics**

### **Assessment Unit AS 2**

*assessing*

**Module 2: The Inter-relationships of the United  
Kingdom Executive, Legislature and Judiciary**

**[ASQ21]**

**THURSDAY 10 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

# **MARK SCHEME**

- 1 [1] for identification and up to [2] for accurate explanation of each of three criticisms of Commons' Select Committees (AO1). Criticisms could include the limited powers of the Committees; the lack of financial resources to support Committee investigations; Executive attempts to influence the work of the Committees; the Executive's freedom to ignore Committee findings and reports.

[9]

9

2 (a) **Background**

The judiciary has been criticised on many counts not least the unrepresentative nature of those who exercise judicial power. The main focus of these criticisms has been on the unrepresentative class, gender and ethnic composition of judiciary. Answers should identify these areas although candidates will not be expected to go into statistical evidence or give specific examples. Weaker responses will tend to argue that judges are all upper class, white males while stronger responses will offer a more accurate picture. The best answers may also point out that attempts to create a more representative judiciary have so far been unsuccessful.

Some reference should be made to how the unrepresentative character of the judiciary has resulted in the judiciary being labelled by some as "pro-Establishment" in the performance of its political role. Critics, including Griffiths, have argued that there is an in-built pro-government and establishment bias in the judiciary that affects its judgements in both judicial review cases and in judicial inquiries. The Widgery Report and, more recently, the Hutton Inquiry have been given as examples of this bias.

An answer that contains only one criticism can achieve a maximum of Level 3. An answer that contains no evidence can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

**Level 1 ([1]–[2])**

The candidate demonstrates very little knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the judiciary and the response indicates that the candidate has little or no understanding of the point of the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence and fails to address the question (AO1). The level of communication and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([3]–[4])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the judiciary and there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question and contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is little relevant evidence (AO1). The level of communication is basic, as are the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([5]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the judiciary but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the point of the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. Limited relevant evidence is presented (AO1). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([7]–[8])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the judiciary. The response demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question and the majority of material presented is relevant and addresses the question. The answer contains relevant evidence (AO1). Communication is clear with use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([9]–[10])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the judiciary. The response demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the point of the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented that consistently addresses the question (AO1). The candidate communicates effectively, and makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [10]

**(b) Background**

Answers should contain the idea that patronage has to do with the PM's power to appoint and to remove. Weaker candidates will have an unclear understanding of the meaning of patronage. This may reveal itself in either a confused use of the term or in a limited understanding of what patronage powers are. Weaker answers may restrict the discussion to the appointment of members of the government or even to just the Cabinet. Stronger answers will identify that patronage powers go much further than this.

For an answer to be limited it should identify the criticism that patronage powers amount to a dangerous centralisation of power in the hands of the PM. Stronger answers will refer to the erosion of the principle of collective Cabinet government and the creation of a presidential Prime Minister. Answers should contain evidence of the use of patronage powers by Prime Ministers to enhance their control over the executive, with reference to Blair and Thatcher being the most obvious. More historical evidence is equally acceptable. Another criticism is that the PM's powers of patronage result in a group of unelected and unaccountable Prime Ministerial advisers having far too much political influence.

An answer that contains only one criticism can achieve a maximum of Level 3. An answer that contains no evidence can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

**Level 1 ([1]–[2])**

The candidate demonstrates very little knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Prime Minister's powers of patronage and the response indicates that the candidate has little or no understanding of the point of the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence and fails to address the question (AO1). The level of communication and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([3]–[4])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Prime Minister's powers of patronage and there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question and contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. There is little relevant evidence (AO1). The level of communication is basic, as are the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([5]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Prime Minister's powers of patronage but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the point of the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. Limited relevant evidence is presented (AO1). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([7]–[8])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Prime Minister's powers of patronage. The response demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question and the majority of material presented is relevant and addresses the question. The answer contains relevant evidence (AO1). Communication is clear with use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([9]–[10])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Prime Minister's powers of patronage. The response demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the point of the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented that consistently addresses the question (AO1). The candidate communicates effectively, and makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

[10]

10

### 3 (a) Background

The extent to which the executive now dominates the British political system is one of the major debates in contemporary politics. In theory, Parliament is sovereign, but this has not been the reality for a long time. The question now is one of whether Parliament has any remaining power at all or is completely subservient to the executive.

Weaker answers will tend to have little or no understanding of the issue raised by the question and/or will be one-sided in their approach. Limited answers will have more grasp of what the issue is but will be restricted in knowledge and understanding and this will be reflected in a restricted discussion and/or limited evidence. The stronger answers will have more detailed knowledge and understanding of both arguments and evidence. They will also offer the most balanced approach to the question and may look back to a period when the legislature played a more independent role. Stronger answers will tend to have this longer term perspective while weaker answers will concentrate on the relationship between the current executive and legislature.

An answer that contains only one criticism can achieve a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that has no balance and is totally one-sided can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

#### **Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates very little knowledge and understanding of the debate about executive dominance over the Commons and the response indicates that the candidate has little or no understanding of the point of the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence and fails to address the question (AO1). An argument, if present, is irrelevant, poorly constructed and/or unbalanced (AO2). The level of communication and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas (AO3).

#### **Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about executive dominance over the Commons and there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question and contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. The answer contains little relevant evidence (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes reference to some relevant arguments and which does have a degree of balance (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as are the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

#### **Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about executive dominance over the Commons but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the point of the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. Limited relevant evidence

is presented (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes limited reference to relevant arguments, does address the question and has some balance (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

#### **Level 4 ([10]–[12])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the debate about executive dominance over the Commons. The response demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question and the majority of material presented is relevant and addresses the question. The answer contains relevant evidence (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes reference to relevant arguments, addresses the question and is balanced (AO2). Communication is clear with use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

#### **Level 5 ([13]–[16])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about executive dominance over the Commons. The response demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the point of the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented that consistently addresses the question (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant arguments in a focused and balanced response (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, and makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [16]

#### **(b) Background**

In spite of changes to the powers and composition of the House of Lords, the upper house remains a very important element of British parliamentary democracy. This is particularly so when a government has a large majority in the Commons and has little difficulty in getting its way in the lower house. At such times the Lords has appeared to relish the role of being a thorn in the side of governments. The alternative view is that the Lords are of little real relevance and simply a nuisance to the government. The strongest answers may pick up on the suggestion in the title that the significance of the Lords as scrutiniser of the executive has increased as the role of the Commons in this area has been undermined by party discipline and the careerism of MPs. Such answers may point out the distinction between the Lords and the Commons in areas such as party disciplines, whips, quality of debate, time available to scrutinise the executive and other issues.

Weaker answers to questions on the Lords often focus on recent reforms to the House but without relating that to the question. Better answers may discuss reforms but will discuss this in the context of whether this enhances or diminishes the Lords' capacity to scrutinise. Answers will also be differentiated by the evidence presented: weaker answers tend to have little or no evidence of the Lords challenging the executive.

An answer that contains only one criticism can achieve a maximum of Level 3.  
An answer that contains no evidence can achieve a maximum of Level 4.  
An answer that has no balance and is totally one-sided can achieve a maximum of Level 4.



**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates very little knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Lords' record as a scrutiniser of the executive and the response indicates that the candidate has little or no understanding of the point of the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence and fails to address the question (AO1). An argument, if present, is irrelevant, poorly constructed and/or unbalanced (AO2). The level of communication and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Lords' record as a scrutiniser of the executive and there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question and contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. The answer contains little relevant evidence (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes reference to some relevant arguments and which does have a degree of balance (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as are the standard of QWC and the structure and the presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Lords' record as a scrutiniser of the executive but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the point of the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. Limited relevant evidence is presented (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes limited reference to relevant arguments, does address the question and has some balance (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([10]–[12])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Lords' record as a scrutiniser of the executive. The response demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question and the majority of material presented is relevant and addresses the question. The answer contains relevant evidence (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes reference to relevant arguments, addresses the question and is balanced (AO2). Communication is clear with use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([13]–[16])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of the Lords’ record as a scrutiniser of the executive. The response demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the point of the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented that consistently addresses the question (AO1). An answer is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant arguments in a focused and balanced response (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, and makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

[16]

16

**Total**

**35**



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)  
General Certificate of Education  
2008**

---

## **Government and Politics**

Assessment Unit AS 3

*assessing*

Module 3: Political Behaviour

**[ASQ31]**

**MONDAY 28 JANUARY, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

In part **(b)** a totally one-sided response can score up to a maximum of top **Level 4**.

In part **(a)** an answer that has no supporting evidence or illustrations can score a maximum of **Level 3**.

In part **(b)** an answer that has no supporting evidence or illustrations can score a maximum of **Level 4**.

An answer that refers to only one political system can score a maximum of **Level 4**.

These ceilings apply to all 4 questions.

## **1 (a) Background**

Political culture refers to the values, beliefs, customs, traditions, symbols and aspirations of a population that relate to the political system.

### **Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of political culture but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

### **Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of political culture (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

### **Level 3 ([7]–[10])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political culture (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

### **Level 4 ([11]–[14])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of political culture (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([15]–[18])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political culture (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [18]

**(b) Background**

Control over education and of the curriculum by the state or other agencies is almost a universal phenomenon. This would suggest that education is an enormously important agent of political socialisation, especially as it comes so early in the individual's life. The opposing view is that education is only one agent, that the impact of schooling has been exaggerated and that other agents are as important if not more so.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the impact of education upon political socialisation (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the impact of education upon political socialisation (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the impact of education upon political socialisation (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([10]–[13])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the impact of education upon political socialisation (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([14]–[17])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the ways in which governments seek to control political socialisation (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [17]

35

**2 (a) Background**

The Simple Majority system of election has been attacked primarily on the grounds that it is an un-proportional and unfair method of election. It distorts the popular vote and seriously discriminates against parties other than the leading two. By giving one party an exaggerated margin of victory it can lead to elective dictatorship. It also fails to provide effective constituency representation.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Simple Majority system of election but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Simple Majority system of election (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[10])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Simple Majority system of election (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([11]–[14])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Simple Majority system of election (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([15]–[18])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of the Simple Majority system of election (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [18]

**(b) Background**

Referenda have been widely criticised for failing to benefit the democratic process. It is argued that low turnout can result in a situation of tyranny of the majority and policy being determined by a highly motivated minority. It is also alleged that referenda are open to a considerable degree of manipulation by the state seeking to legitimate policy by giving it the appearance of popular endorsement. Supporters of referenda would refute such allegations and maintain that there is no better way of democratising any system than by greater use of referenda.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against referenda but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against referenda (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against referenda (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([10]–[13])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against referenda (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([14]–[17])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against referenda (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [17]

**3 (a) Background**

There are many reasons why voters may not vote. First, the decision may be a conscious expression of alienation from the political system. It could be the case that non-voting could be a form of tactical voting. On the other hand it could be the case that apathy is the primary cause of non-voting. Non-voters could also be expressing their satisfaction with the existing political system.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the factors leading to non-voting but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the factors leading to non-voting (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[10])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the factors leading to non-voting (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([11]–[14])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the factors leading to non-voting (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).



**Level 5 ([15]–[18])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the factors leading to non-voting (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [18]

**(b) Background**

Those who adopt the Primacy Model of voting behaviour tend to dismiss the power of the Mass Media to influence voters. This is a view shared by many of those who work in the media itself. However, there are also many who believe that the Media's power to set the agenda and to influence voting are considerable and are now key to the outcome of elections.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the debate about the impact of the media upon voting but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about the impact of the media upon voting (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about the impact of the media upon voting (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([10]–[13])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the debate about the impact of the media upon voting (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([14]–[17])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about the impact of the media upon voting (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [17]

**4 (a) Background**

It is anticipated that most candidates will correctly express the view that cause groups tend to have a much shorter life span than interest groups. However, even interest groups can disappear with social and economic changes and some cause groups have proved remarkably durable because the cause they espouse has remained important.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the reasons why some pressure groups last longer than others but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the reasons why some pressure groups last longer than others (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[10])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons why some pressure groups last longer than others (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([11]–[14])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the reasons why some pressure groups last longer than others (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([15]–[18])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the reasons why some pressure groups last longer than others (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3). [18]

**(b) Background**

The view that pressure groups are a major threat is one shared by those on both the left and right of the political spectrum, although those on the left are less concerned with the issue of democracy. It is Pluralist theorists who tend to promote pressure groups as an essential ingredient of any democratic system primarily because they help to prevent the tyrannical concentration of political power.

**Level 1 ([1]–[3])**

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether pressure groups threaten democracy but there are obvious gaps in that knowledge (AO1). An argument, if present, is ill-informed, poorly constructed and largely irrelevant (AO2). The level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 2 ([4]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether pressure groups threaten democracy (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates partial understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The level of communication is basic, as is the standard of QWC and the structure and presentation of ideas. There is partial use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

**Level 3 ([7]–[9])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether pressure groups threaten democracy (AO1). An argument is constructed that makes limited reference to relevant evidence and which demonstrates limited understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate's level of communication and use of appropriate political vocabulary are both limited. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 4 ([10]–[13])**

The candidate demonstrates general knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether pressure groups threaten democracy (AO1). An argument is constructed which makes reference to a range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates clear understanding of the point of the question (AO2). Communication is clear with consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. The standard of QWC is fair as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

**Level 5 ([14]–[17])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether pressure groups threaten democracy (AO1). A cogent argument is advanced which makes reference to a wide range of relevant evidence and which demonstrates full understanding of the point of the question (AO2). The candidate communicates effectively, makes consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and reaches a clear and logical conclusion. The standard of QWC is good as is the structure and presentation of ideas (AO3).

[17]

35

**Total**

**35**