



**ADVANCED SUBSIDIARY (AS)
General Certificate of Education
2011**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit AS 1

**The Government and
Politics of Northern Ireland**

[AQ111]

MONDAY 13 JUNE, AFTERNOON

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

These mark schemes are intended to ensure that the AS/A2 examinations are marked consistently and fairly. The mark schemes provide examiners with an indication of the quality and range of candidate responses likely to be worthy of credit. They also set out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses. The mark schemes should be read in conjunction with these general marking instructions which apply to all papers.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners will be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of 17- and 18-year-olds, which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their AS/A2 examinations.

Flexibility in marking

The mark schemes which accompany the specimen examination papers are not intended to be totally prescriptive. For many questions, there may be a number of equally legitimate responses and different methods by which the candidates may achieve good marks. No mark scheme can cover all the answers which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner for the paper concerned.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for valid responses rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected for 17- and 18-year-old GCE candidates. Conversely, marks should only be awarded for valid responses and not given for an attempt which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication. These questions are indicated on the cover of the examination paper.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of response

Questions requiring extended written answers are marked in terms of levels of response. In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the "best fit" bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement. The following guidance is provided to assist examiners:

Threshold performance: Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.

Intermediate performance: Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.

High performance: Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are assessed on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication which is incorporated within the marks awarded for that level. Where the quality of candidates' subject knowledge and understanding is not matched by the quality of written communication, marks awarded will not exceed the maximum for Level 4.

1 Background

[1] will be awarded for identification and up to [3] for explanation of the function given in the Source. **(AO1: [4])** [1] will be awarded for identification and up to [3] for explanation of another relevant function. **(AO1: [4])** Other functions that candidates may refer to include the initiation of legislation; the scrutiny of Executive legislation; the carrying out of investigations; the publication of reports; advising on matters brought to the Committee by a Minister.

- if there is no reference to the function given in the Source, a maximum of [6] can be awarded
- if there is no reference to any evidence or examples, a maximum of [6] can be awarded
- if the function in the Source is divided into two functions – budgets and annual plans – a maximum of [6] can be awarded as long as both are fully explained
- scrutiny is a legitimate second function to that given in the Source
- calling for “persons or papers” or “ask organisations and people to provide information” are powers, not explicit functions. They can be part of an explanation: committees consult with outside bodies to assist them in their scrutiny or legislative roles.

[8]

8

2 Background

Many observers consider Statutory Committees to be one of the more successful features of the devolved institutions. Even under the 1998 Assembly, Committees attracted some positive comment for their scrutiny of the Executive, for their work on Executive legislation, the seriousness with which they approached their work, and the relative absence of partisanship found in the Committees. Since the restoration of devolution in 2007 the same positive judgements have been made of Committees. Candidates may refer to the criticisms of Committees but can receive no credit for this.

Weaker answers will tend to present general statements and rely heavily upon the Source. Stronger answers will be more detailed contain supporting evidence.

- if there is no reference to the Source, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- if there is no reference to evidence or examples, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- if only one “success” is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded if the explanation is very detailed
- the question imposes no time constraint so evidence from 1999 onwards is relevant
- comparisons with Direct Rule or with the UK (or other) system are valid
- candidates may present what Committees *can do* as “successes”: this is not so. Candidates must present evident of what they *have done*
- limitations of Committees are not required by the question and receive no credit but read the response fully to ensure that a limitation does not lead to or imply a success.

Level 1 ([1]–[4]) AO1: [2]; AO2: [1]; AO3: [1]

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the positive record of Statutory Committees. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or has no evidence. (AO1) There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed, and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary. (AO3)

Level 2 ([5]–[7]) AO1: [3]; AO2: [2]; AO3: [2]

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the positive record of Statutory Committees but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. (AO1) There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary. (AO3)

Level 3 ([8]–[10]) AO1: [4]; AO2: [3]; AO3: [3]

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the positive record of Statutory Committees but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. (AO1) There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited. (AO3)

Level 4 ([11]–[13]) AO1: [5]; AO2: [4]; AO3: [4]

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the positive record of Statutory Committees and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. (AO1) There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. (AO3)

Level 5 ([14]–[16]) AO1: [6]; AO2: [5]; AO3: [5]

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the positive record of Statutory Committees and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. (AO1) There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An

argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. (AO3) [16]

3 (a) Background

From 1999 onwards, support for the Ulster Unionist Party steadily declined as Unionist voters deserted to the Democratic Unionists. The task for the UUP leadership, since they were replaced as the dominant Unionist Party has been to halt this decline. The UUP leadership has attempted a number of initiatives, the most high profile of which has been its pact with the Tory Party although earlier attempts at collaboration with loyalists were widely regarded as having a negative effect upon support for the UUP. There is also evidence that the UUP has sought to shake up its leadership team in response to claims that it was too middle aged, middle class and too male. The UUP has also reviewed its policies in an attempt to establish its distance from the DUP. The Party's decision to vote against the devolution of policing and justice powers is evidence of a new approach. Candidates may also refer to the breaking of links with the Orange Order, reform of the Party's Youth wing, topping the poll in European elections and the impact of the TUV on support for the DUP.

Candidates may well argue that the UUP has been unsuccessful in mounting any challenge to the DUP.

Weaker answers will be unclear on the developments affecting the UUP and will lack evidence. Stronger answers will display understanding and will present a range of evidence.

- if no evidence or examples are referred to, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- if the answer is completely or significantly unbalanced in terms of the argument, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded
- as the question does impose a time constraint of, roughly 2003, material from before this period is background and does not directly answer the question. However, it may be applied to the question. For example, it could be argued that the UUP's failure to secure IRA decommissioning after 1999 means it continues to be seen by some as the weaker unionist party. Read all background or historical narrative material carefully
- it is anticipated that the most common, relevant approach will be one that evaluates the UUP's attempt to regain lost support from the DUP, with reference to the factors outlined in the Background Statement
- however, an approach that argues that DUP tactics continue to prevent a UUP revival is also valid
- statistical information – on election outcomes, for example, is relevant but does not amount to explanation or analysis.

Level 1 ([1]–[6]) AO1: [2]; AO2: [3]; AO3: [1]

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of UUP policy and performance, and makes little attempt to answer 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. (AO1) There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed, and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary. (AO3)

Level 2 ([7]–[11]) AO1: [4]; AO2: [5]; AO3: [2]

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the record of UUP policy and performance, but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. (AO1) There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary. (AO3)

Level 3 ([12]–[16]) AO1: [6]; AO2: [7]; AO3: [3]

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of UUP policy and performance, but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. (AO1) There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas, and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited. (AO3)

Level 4 ([17]–[21]) AO1: [7]; AO2: [9]; AO3: [5]

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of UUP policy and performance, and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. (AO1) There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. (AO3)

Level 5 ([22]–[26]) AO1: [8]; AO2: [11]; AO3: [7]

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of UUP policy and performance, and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. (AO1) There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation

of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. (AO3) [26]

(b) Background

MLAs have come under sustained attack for what many perceive to be their failure to carry out the functions assigned to them by the Good Friday and St Andrews Agreements. Many feel that they have not been effective in scrutinising the Executive, for a variety of reasons, not least because their party is represented in that Executive. Legislative scrutiny has also been limited and unsatisfactory. MLAs have the power to initiate legislation but have been inactive either individually or as members of committees. Only in acting as representatives have MLAs been in any way a success, and this is largely out of self-interest. The alternative view is that this is far too harsh a judgement of MLAs, many of whom have become increasingly active in scrutiny and in participating in the legislative process.

Weaker answers will tend to be limited in the range of functions identified and lack evidence. Stronger answers will offer a broader range of functions and present detailed evidence.

- if no evidence or examples are referred to, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- if the answer is completely or significantly unbalanced in terms of the argument, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded
- no time constraints imposed by the question: evidence can go back to 1998
- comparison with MPs under Direct Rule or comparison of the first and second periods of devolution can both be valid approaches
- the Representative, Legislative and Scrutiny functions of MLAs are all relevant
- all three are not necessary for an answer to achieve Level 5
- however, if only one function is discussed a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- some material from the response to Question 2 can also be relevant to this Question but must be evaluated
- an answer that focuses on “Assembly” rather than MLAs is still valid.

Level 1 ([1]–[6]) AO1: [2]; AO2: [3]; AO3: [1]

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of the functions and record of MLAs and makes little attempt to answer 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. (AO1) There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is poor. An argument, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed, and the level of communication and the use of political vocabulary are both rudimentary. (AO3)

Level 2 ([7]–[11]) AO1: [4]; AO2: [5]; AO3: [2]

The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of the record of the functions and record of MLAs but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding, and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. (AO1) There is some basic analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is limited. An argument is constructed although the level of communication and the structure and presentation of ideas are both basic. There is restricted use of appropriate political vocabulary. (AO3)

Level 3 ([12]–[16]) AO1: [6]; AO2: [7]; AO3: [3]

The candidate demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of the functions and record of MLAs, but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with more general material. (AO1) There is some limited analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument is constructed although the level of communication, the structure and presentation of ideas, and the use of appropriate political vocabulary are limited. (AO3)

Level 4 ([17]–[21]) AO1: [7]; AO2: [9]; AO3: [5]

The candidate demonstrates full and accurate knowledge and understanding of the functions and record of MLAs, and deploys this to answer the question. The answer contains relevant evidence and examples. (AO1) There is sound analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. An argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is appropriate use of political vocabulary and a conclusion is reached. (AO3)

Level 5 ([22]–[26]) AO1: [8]; AO2: [11]; AO3: [7]

The candidate demonstrates comprehensive, detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of the functions and record of MLAs, and deploys this consistently to answer the question. A range of relevant evidence is presented. (AO1) There is thorough analysis of political information, arguments and explanations. (AO2) Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. An argument is constructed which displays effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is consistent use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached. (AO3) [26]

26

Total

50