



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme

# June 2003

---

## GCE

# Government and Politics

## Unit GOV3

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## CRITERIA FOR MARKING

### Introduction

The AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, the weightings are different. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principals of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

Using a *levels of response* mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analyses, evaluation, arguments and explanations. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is what precise mark should be given within a level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:-

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?"

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

**ASSESSMENT MATRIX**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p>Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationship between them producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations and provide accurate evidence and up to date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts and theories, using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p>	<p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p>Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationships between them producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrating sound contextual awareness. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories, using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct clear arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display an awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is a clear recognition of parallels and connections together with some comparisons. There is good evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.</p>	<p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Level 2</b>	Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of political institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them producing answers with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples to illustrate points.	Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider political information and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
<b>Level 1</b>	Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete knowledge of political institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationships between them with very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the content of the question with little interpretation and few examples often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.	Discussions are supported by few if any concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations are sparse and incomplete. Analyses show little awareness of differing view points and very few parallels and connections are used to establish comparisons. Evaluations of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations are superficial and naive.	Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent, conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.

**Unit GOV3 – Features of a Representative Democracy**

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(a)</b> <b>8 marks</b>	<b>Level 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate good understanding of the term ‘The House of Commons is not socially representative of the nation’.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates apply an appropriate range of developed concepts enabling analysis of the relevant information using political vocabulary to analyse information and provide clear explanations.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from and is linked to the discussion.
	<b>Level 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the term ‘The House of Commons is not socially representative of the nation’.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts and theories. Explanations are simple.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and knowledge of whether the main role of MPs is to represent the views and interests of their constituents (e.g. elected, accountable, representative). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations (e.g. roles as party member, responsive to whips). They provide full and accurate evidence and up to date examples (from extract and own knowledge) to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (accountability, representative, etc.). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the underlying reasons why the main role of MPs is arguably to represent the <u>views and interests</u> of their constituents, and of differing viewpoints about their role and powers and identifies parallels and well developed comparisons (e.g. with local councillors, MSPs). There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether MPs should place loyalty above constituency interests and views.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of whether the main role of MPs is to represent the views and interests of their constituents (e.g. elected, accountable, representative). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations (e.g. party role). They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. accountability). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the underlying reasons why the main role of MPs is arguably to represent the <u>views and interests</u> of their constituents and of different viewpoints about its role and power and identifies parallels (e.g. with local councillors). There is good evaluation of issues such as whether MPs should place party loyalty above constituency interests and views.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the roles of MPs. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include partial but reasonably effective attempt at explanations of whether the main role of MPs is to represent their constituents. They provide not very detailed examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 1-2 (1-4 marks)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts. They offer limited analysis which shows limited awareness of the roles of MPs and identify basic parallels and comparisons. Attempts to evaluate arguments are simple.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete understanding of the roles of MPs. They produce answers which show a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrate only superficial contextual awareness covering part of the question with little explanation of whether MPs main role is to represent their constituents. They provide few examples often inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>See level above.</b></p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(a)</b> <b>8 marks</b>	<b>Level 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate good understanding of the term ‘European Parliament’.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates apply an appropriate range of developed concepts, enabling analysis of the relevant information and using political vocabulary to analyse information and provide clear explanations.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from or is linked to the discussion.
	<b>Level 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the term ‘European Parliament’.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts and theories. Explanations are simple.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.



	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 2(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the European Council of Ministers and why it arguably is the real decision-making of the EU (e.g. composed of national governments' ministers). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations (e.g. relative power of European Parliament and Commission). They provide full and accurate evidence and up to date examples (from extract and own knowledge) to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (accountability, legislative, executive, legitimacy, etc.). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the underlying reasons for the power of the Council of Ministers, and of differing viewpoints about its role and powers and identifies parallels and well developed comparisons (e.g. with the UK government and Parliament). There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether the Council of Ministers powers should be decreased.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of the Council Members and why it is arguably the real decision-making power of the EU. They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations (e.g. relative power of European Parliament). They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. accountability). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the underlying reasons for the power of the Council Ministers and of different viewpoints about its role and power and identifies parallels (e.g. with Westminster). There is good evaluation of issues such as whether the Council of Ministers powers should be decreased.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the Council of Ministers and its powers. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include partial but reasonably effective attempt at explanations of whether the Council of Ministers is the real decision-making body of the EU. They provide not very detailed examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 1-2 (1-4 mark)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts. They offer limited analysis which shows limited awareness of the underlying reasons the power of the Council of Ministers and identify basic parallels and comparisons. Attempts to evaluate arguments are simple.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b>                      Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete understanding of the powers of the Council of Ministers. They produce answers which show a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrate only superficial contextual awareness covering part of the question with little explanation of whether/why the Council of Ministers is the real decision-making body of the EU. They provide few examples often inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>See level above.</b></p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b>                      Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(a)</b> <b>8 marks</b>	<b>Level 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a good understanding of the term ‘Civil Service’.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates apply an appropriate range of developed concepts, enabling analysis of the relevant information and using political vocabulary to analyse information and provide clear explanations.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from or is linked to the discussion.
	<b>Level 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the term ‘Civil Service’.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts and theories. Explanations are simple.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the authority and influence of the Prime Minister (e.g. powers of appointment and dismissal, influence over Cabinet, Parliament and party). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations (e.g. relative power of other Cabinet Ministers, changes over time). They provide full and accurate evidence and up to date examples to substantiate points made.	<b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (e.g. legitimacy, executive dominance, Prime Ministerial/Cabinet government, authority, influence etc.). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the underlying reasons for the <u>authority and influence</u> of the Prime Minister, and; of differing viewpoints about his/her role and powers and identifies parallels and well developed comparisons (e.g. with presidential systems, between different Prime Ministers). There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether the Prime Minister's powers should be increased.	<b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.
	<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of the authority and influence of the Prime Minister (e.g. powers of appointment and dismissal). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations (e.g. relative powers of other Ministers). They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.	<b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. Prime Ministerial/Cabinet government, authority influence). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the underlying reasons for the <u>authority and influence</u> of the Prime Minister and of different viewpoints about his/her role and power and identifies parallels (e.g. between different Prime Ministers). There is good evaluation of issues such as whether the PM should have more power.	<b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of authority and influence of the Prime Minister. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include partial but reasonably effective attempt at explanations of whether the Prime Minister wields great authority and influence. They provide not very detailed examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 1-2 (1-4 marks)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts making little attempt to distinguish between power, authority or influence. They offer limited analysis which shows limited awareness of the factors underlying the Prime Minister's authority and influence and identify basic parallels and comparisons. Attempts to evaluate arguments are simple.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete understanding of the authority and influence of the PM. They produce answers which show a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrate only superficial contextual awareness covering part of the question with little explanation of whether the PM wields great authority and influence. They provide few examples often inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>See level above.</b></p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(a)</b> <b>8 marks</b>	<b>Level 3-4 (3-4 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate good understanding of the role of the Parliamentary Commission for Administration (Ombudsman).	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates apply an appropriate range of developed concepts enabling identification of the relevant information and using political vocabulary to analyse information and provide clear explanations.	<b>Level 3-4 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from and is linked to the discussion.
	<b>Level 1-2 (1-2 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the role of the Parliamentary Commission for Administration (Ombudsman).	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts and theories. Explanations are simple.	<b>Level 1-2 (1 mark)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<p><b>Question 4(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b></p>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the case for and against the use of quangos within the British system of government (e.g. reduces ministerial workload, allows specialisation, accountability concerns). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations (patronage implication). They provide full and accurate evidence and up to date examples (from extract and own knowledge) to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (accountability, patronage democratic, legitimacy, etc). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the case <u>for and against</u> quasi-government, and of differing viewpoints about its role and powers and identifies parallels and well developed comparisons (e.g. elected councils, government departments, Next Step Agencies). There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether the use of quangos should be increased/decreased.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>



	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of the case for and against the use of quangos with-in the British System of government (e.g. reduces ministerial workload, allows specialisation, or accountability concern). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations of explanations. They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. accountability). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the case <u>for and against</u> quasi-government and of different viewpoints about its role and power and identifies parallels (e.g. with government departments). There is good evaluation of issues such as whether the use of quangos should be increased/decreased.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the case for and against the use of quangos within the British system of government. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question (e.g. case <u>for or against</u>). They produce answers which include partial but reasonably effective attempt at explanations. They provide not very detailed examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 1-2 (1-4 marks)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts. They offer limited analysis which shows limited awareness of the case for and against quasi-government within the British system of government and identify basic parallels and comparisons. Attempts to evaluate arguments are simple.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(b) (contd.)</b>	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete understanding of the case for and against the use of quangos within the British system of government. They produce answers which show a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrate only superficial contextual awareness covering part of the question with little explanation. They provide few examples often inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p><b>See level above.</b></p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>