

General Certificate of Education

Government and Politics 1151/2151

GOVP2 Governing Modern Britain

Mark Scheme

2010 examination - January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Copyright © 2010 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

Dr Michael Cresswell, Director

CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Introduction

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 specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in Section 4.2 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 mark 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 principles of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

There are no limits to the areas of knowledge that candidates may feel able bring to the discussion. Therefore the specification of requirements outlined in the mark schemes can only be indicative. Candidates are not expected to include all the material presented in order to access the full range of available marks. At the same time they may successfully include material from their particular studies which is not indicated in the scheme.

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 analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. 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.

Examiners should initially make a decision about which Level any given response should be placed in. Having determined the appropriate Level the examiners must then choose the precise mark to be given within that 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 whether the middle mark is 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 'ls 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.

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (a) questions (Total: 5 marks)

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy

A01

Level 4 (5 marks)

The candidate successfully demonstrates excellent knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).

Where appropriate, the candidate is able to illustrate his/her answer with relevant evidence/example(s).

Level 3

(4 marks)

The candidate successfully demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).

Where appropriate, the candidate is able to illustrate his/her answer with relevant evidence/example(s).

Level 2

(2-3 marks)

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).

The candidate may illustrate his/her answer with evidence/example(s) of limited relevance.

Level 1 (1 mark)

The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s).

The candidate may illustrate his/her answer with evidence/example(s) of little relevance.

0 marks

No relevant response.

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (Total: 10 marks)

Knowledge and	Skills:	Communication	
Understanding:	Analysis &		
Recall, Select & Deploy	Evaluation		
AO1	AO2	AO3	
Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate demonstrates an excellent knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes. The candidate deploys relevant knowledge and understanding to fully address the requirements of the question and produces accurate and/or relevant examples to illustrate points made.	Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate applies an excellent range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.	Levels 3–4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively, in a structured and sustained manner, making excellent or good use of appropriate political vocabulary. There are few, if any, errors of	
Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes. The candidate addresses the requirements of the question and produces examples and/or evidence to illustrate points made.	Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate applies a good range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.	spelling, punctuation and grammar and the response should be legible. The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion	
Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes. The candidate makes a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question and produces few or inaccurate examples and/or limited evidence to illustrate points made.	Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate applies a limited range of concepts and makes limited use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.	Levels 1–2 (1 mark) The candidate communicates explanations or arguments with limited clarity and effectiveness, using limited political vocabulary. The answer may lack either a clear focus on the question or a sense of direction. There are frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar, and legibility may be a problem.	

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (b) questions (continued)

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 1 (1 mark) The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/ institutions and processes. The candidate makes little attempt to address the requirements of the question and produces few examples and/or little evidence to illustrate points made.	Level 1 (1 mark) The candidate applies few concepts and makes little use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.	Levels 1–2 (continued) (1 mark) A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.
0 marks No relevant response.	0 marks No relevant response.	0 marks No relevant response.

AS GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (c) questions (Total: 25 marks)

Knowledge and	Skills:	Communication	
Understanding:	Analysis & Evaluation		
Recall, Select & Deploy			
A01	AO2	AO3	
Level 4	Level 4	Level 4	
(10–11 marks)	(7–8 marks)	(5–6 marks) The candidate	
The candidate successfully	The candidate evaluates		
demonstrates accurate	political institutions,	communicates clear,	
knowledge and understanding of	processes and behaviour,	structured and sustained	
political concepts/theories/	applying appropriate	arguments and	
institutions and processes and	concepts and theories.	explanations, making	
the relationship between them,	The condidate provides	excellent use of	
producing an answer that	The candidate provides	appropriate political	
deploys relevant knowledge and	analysis which displays	vocabulary.	
understanding to address the	sound awareness of differing	The response should be	
requirements of the question and that demonstrates	viewpoints and a clear	The response should be	
	recognition of issues.	legible with few, if any,	
significant contextual	Parallels and connections	errors of spelling,	
awareness.	are identified, together with valid and precise	punctuation and grammar.	
The candidate's answer	comparisons. The answer	The candidate produces	
includes relevant evidence	includes relevant and	answers with a clear	
and/or examples to substantiate	convincing interpretations or	sense of direction leading	
and illustrate points made.	explanations.	towards a coherent	
and mustrate points made.	explanations.	conclusion.	
Level 3	Level 3	Level 3	
(7–9 marks)	(5–6 marks)	(3–4 marks)	
The candidate demonstrates	The candidate evaluates	The candidate	
generally accurate knowledge	political institutions,	communicates arguments	
and understanding of political	processes and behaviour,	and explanations, making	
concepts/theories/institutions	applying some concepts or	good use of appropriate	
and processes and the	theories.	political vocabulary.	
relationship between them,		,	
producing an answer that	The candidate provides clear	The response should be	
addresses the requirements of	arguments and explanations	legible but there may be	
the question and demonstrates	and demonstrates	occasional errors of	
adequate contextual awareness.	awareness of differing	spelling, punctuation and	
·	viewpoints and recognition of	grammar.	
The answer provides evidence	issues. Parallels and		
backed up by clear examples to	connections are identified,	A conclusion is linked to	
illustrate points made.	together with some sound	the preceding discussion.	
	comparison.		

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for part (c) questions (continued)

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 2 (4–6 marks) The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationship between them, making a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. The candidate may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question, and may produce limited evidence and/or few examples.	Level 2 (3–4 marks) The candidate offers a limited evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour and begins to construct arguments which contain basic explanation. The candidate shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is recognition of basic parallels or limited comparisons.	Cerel 2 (2 marks) The candidate attempts to develop an argument using basic political vocabulary. There are frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar, and legibility may be a problem. Where a conclusion is offered, its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
Level 1 (1–3 marks) The candidate demonstrates slight and/or incomplete knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationship between them. The candidate makes a very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the context of the question is evident and the few examples cited are often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.	Level 1 (1–2 marks) The candidate makes a partial attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes and behaviour. Arguments offered are superficial or simplistic. There is very limited awareness of parallels or comparisons.	Level 1 (1 mark) The answer relies upon narrative which is not fully coherent and which is expressed without using political vocabulary. Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive and the response may not be legible. A conclusion is either not offered or it is not related to the preceding material.
0 marks No relevant response.	0 marks No relevant response.	0 marks No relevant response.

NB: whilst there is no requirement for candidates to make reference to the extract or passage provided when answering part 'c' questions, the use of such material can be credited on AO1 and AO2, where it is relevant to the question posed. Candidates may also be given credit for using relevant material drawn from the extracts or passages which accompany other questions on the paper.

(a) Explain the term *the judiciary* used in the extract.

1

(5 marks)

The extract provides useful contextual material referring to separation of powers and identifying the judiciary, executive and legislature as relevant powers in this context. Weaker candidates may do little more than repeat this, accompanying it with references to 'judges' or similar. Better answers should provide information about the functions of the judiciary – eg interpret the law – and may explain how this role has increased in significance as a result of measures such as the Human Rights Act and would increase further still with the adoption of a fully codified British constitution. Reward other relevant information, eg recruitment patterns of judiciary, social composition, judicial independence etc, comparison/contrast with judiciary in other political systems (eg USA). While the emphasis is on political relevance/context, accept accurate 'legal' information (eg different 'types' of judge, difference from magistrates, distinction between roles at trial of judge and jury, etc) but full marks are possible without this.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why the British constitution allows the political system to adapt easily to changing circumstances. (10 marks)

The extract provides useful contextual material and asserts the statement inviting explanation in the question. Candidates are likely to explain that the term 'flexible' indicates that a constitution is easy to amend or similar. Lower level responses are likely to do little more than state this and perhaps offer contrasts with written/codified/entrenched/rigid constitutions.

Better candidates should provide information about the processes involved in amending the British constitution (eg statute, convention) and explain *why* this allows the British political system to adapt easily to changing circumstances. Answers are likely to explain that amending statute requires only 'ordinary' Act of Parliament with a simple majority, that 'parliamentary sovereignty' allows Parliament to legislate on any subject, that judges cannot set statute aside and that conventions can be changed through evolution or political consensus. Reward accurate examples of 'constitutional' changes that have been easily implemented (eg entry to EU, devolution, House of Lords reform, Human Rights Act). Relevant discussion about advantages/disadvantages of flexible constitutions should be rewarded, as should contrasts/comparisons with constitutions of other political systems (eg USA) but question only requires explanation so full marks are possible without these.

(c) 'The absence of a separation of powers in Britain gives the government too much power.'

Discuss. (25 marks)

For AO1, from own knowledge candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the term 'separation of powers' and the extent to which this characterises the British political system. Candidates are likely to identify the three 'powers' (executive, legislative, judicial) and to identify their location within the British political system. Most candidates will explain that the fusion of executive and legislative powers in Britain in normal circumstances gives the executive effective control over Parliament. Most candidates should also be able to show knowledge and understanding of procedures and mechanisms which normally lead to 'executive domination' (eg government majorities, whips) although better candidates might also demonstrate that some aspects of the British system – eg judicial independence and recent establishment of a Supreme Court – exhibit some of the features of a separation of powers. Better candidates might also show knowledge and understanding of other aspects of the British political system relevant to the power of government in Britain (eg accountability to Parliament, Human Rights Act). Reward answers that demonstrate knowledge and understanding of comparative material (eg separation of powers in USA) but full marks are possible without this.

With AO2, all candidates are likely to recognise that the absence of a separation of powers arguably gives elected politicians more power than if there was such a separation. Candidates are likely to develop this argument with reference to concepts such as 'executive domination' and the powers normally exercised by government in the UK. Better candidates might also explain that other aspects of the British constitution (eg parliamentary sovereignty, absence of a codified constitution) also increase the power of the executive in the UK. 'Too much' is a discriminator and in addressing this candidates should recognise that there are limits upon the power of the government (eg governments can be removed by Parliament, rights of Opposition and backbenchers, constraints such as House of Lords, Human Rights Act, judicial review/independence, the media).

Possible to argue both for (eg fusion of executive and legislature gives government too much power) and against (eg absence of separation of powers does not make government immune from Human Rights Act, judicial review) the contention in the question. Analysis which develops the advantages of allowing governments to have considerable power (eg swift response to changing circumstances) is relevant and should be rewarded. For highest level, however, the main focus of the answer should be 'absence of separation of powers' and the extent to which this does/does not give too much power to government. Reward at all levels relevant examples (eg proposed extension of powers of detention in 2007). Comparative analysis (eg with USA) is relevant and should be rewarded but there is no expectation that this should be detailed or extensive.

(a) Explain the term *backbenchers* used in the extract.

2

(5 marks)

The extract gives useful contextual information explaining that backbenchers usually obey their party's whip. Weaker answers are likely to restate this adding only that MPs sit on the backbenches of the House of Commons or similar. For 3 or more marks, however, there should be additional relevant information (eg contrast with frontbenchers – and, as is referred to in the extract, possibly also crossbenchers in the House of Lords; not minister/member of government or shadow cabinet/minister; main roles of backbenchers, usually younger MPs or ex frontbenchers). At all levels reward examples (eg of individual backbenchers; of Private Member's Bills promoted from backbenches). Analysis of influence (eg in maintaining party discipline, promotion of party manifesto, tendency towards increased rebelliousness) is relevant and should be rewarded but as question only requires explanation, full marks are possible without this.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why recent reforms can be said to have made the House of Lords more legitimate. (10 marks)

The extract asserts the statement requiring explanation and gives useful contextual information about recent House of Lords reforms and their effects. For AO1, weaker candidates may do little more than select information from the extract, whilst better candidates are likely to demonstrate from own knowledge specific information about recent reforms (eg reduction in hereditary peers). For AO2, weaker answers are likely to focus on reduction in hereditary element as main source of greater legitimacy. For middle levels and above, however, there should also be recognition of other factors (eg recent reforms after lengthy public and parliamentary debate, removal of traditional Conservative majority) that also arguably increase legitimacy. Reward also at AO1 relevant knowledge, and at AO2 discussion/analysis, relating to removal of 'Law Lords' to new Supreme Court stemming from Constitutional Reform Act 2005).

Discussion of aspects which continue to undermine legitimacy (eg Prime Minister still largely controls creation of peers) are relevant and should be rewarded, but as question requires only explanation of 'why more legitimate' full marks are possible without this.

(c) How successfully does Parliament perform its representative functions in modern Britain? (25 marks)

With AO1, most candidates should be able to explain the main functions of Parliament (representation, legislation and scrutiny). With representation, candidates should show knowledge and understanding of the composition of Parliament and the main features of this relevant to its representative function. Candidates are likely to focus on the main aspects of representation such as constituency and party representation. In this regard candidates are likely to demonstrate the nature of constituency representation in the House of Commons (eg each MP represents one constituency) with better candidates also explaining relevant factors which underlie this (eg FPTP electoral system). Similarly, most candidates will show knowledge and understanding of the nature of party representation (eg almost all MPs are elected as a party candidate) with better candidates showing knowledge and understanding of factors which increase the significance of this in terms of Parliament's representative function (eq dominance of two or three parties in House of Commons; normal arrangement of one party having a majority). Candidates illustrating their answers with relevant information about parliamentary procedures (eg question time, adjournment debates) should be rewarded at all levels. The question is about Parliament (ie not just the House of Commons) and better candidates should, therefore, also show knowledge and understanding of the representative function (or lack of it) of the House of Lords.

With AO2, weaker candidates are likely to focus very largely on the fact that Parliament allows MPs to represent constituents' views and, more widely, public opinion, but that most MPs tend to vote on party lines. The question, however, asks about the success with which Parliament performs 'its representative function' and so most candidates are likely to discuss (a) how successfully the constituency representative function is performed (eq MPs can raise constituency issues at question time, on adjournment, with Private Members Bills etc) with better candidates also discussing why in practice the effectiveness of this tends to be constrained (eg by lack of time and the inability of individual MPs to persuade the government/ majority to support them); (b) how far in practice MPs act primarily as party representatives (eg most votes are on party lines) with better candidates offering analysis of why (eg whips. patronage, discipline etc ensure that a party's MPs tend to support its front bench). 'How successfully' is a discriminator and should be addressed specifically for higher levels (eg while MPs mainly act as party representatives, MPs can sometimes successfully represent constituency concerns; while MPs usually act as party representatives this does not always follow eg threat of deselection might influence MPs to disobey whips). The guestion refers to Parliament and relevant discussion of the House of Lords (eg extent of ability to frustrate the will of the elected 'representative' House of Commons; no opportunity for constituency representation although other interests can be represented) should normally also be included for highest level marks.

This question could be answered in terms of the social background of MPs and Peers. However, this is not within the Unit 2 specification. Answers approaching the question in this way can be fully rewarded as appropriate where this is linked with discussion of Parliament's 'representative function' and 'how successfully'.

(a) Explain the term *bilateral* used in the extract.

3

(5 marks)

The extract gives useful contextual information and indicates that the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister were present at a bilateral. Weaker candidates may simply repeat this, although for 2 marks and above there should be some recognition at minimum that a bilateral consists of a meeting between the Prime Minister and departmental Minister or similar. For higher marks there should be knowledge and understanding of additional relevant material, eg aspect of 'sofa government', contrast with Cabinet committees and, for 5 marks, some explanation of significance eg arguably undermines Cabinet, strengthens influence of Prime Minister.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, consider the view that Cabinet ministers who disagree with government policy should resign. (10 marks)

The extract provides useful contextual information eg views of Alastair Campbell and John Prescott, resignation of Robin Cook. Weaker candidates are likely simply to repeat this, but for top level AO1 there should normally be additional relevant information from own knowledge eg Clare Short did eventually resign, PM has power to dismiss ministers who disagree with Cabinet decisions (or as in this case retain them to prevent their becoming a focus of backbench dissent). Reward other relevant examples of resignation (eg John Denham with Iraq; Heseltine over Westland), and of examples when governments have allowed open disagreement (eg Wilson and EU), although as these are relatively rare full marks will normally be possible without this.

Better candidates are likely to explain the question by identifying links with the convention of collective responsibility. Explanation is likely to focus on the fact that ministerial resignations in line with the convention are relatively rare and disagreement within the Cabinet is today often indicated instead by, for example, leaks to the media or 'coded' messages. Reward contrasts, etc with individual responsibility. Analysis of why collective responsibility remains significant (eg strengthens executive against Parliament) and also why dissenting ministers so rarely resign (fear of weakening standing of government/party, implications for political career) is relevant and should be rewarded, although as question requires only explanation, full marks will normally be possible without this.

(c) 'The main policy decisions within government are still made by the Cabinet.' Discuss.

(25 marks)

For AO1, candidates should demonstrate knowledge and understanding of Cabinet functions, including policy making and for full marks there will normally also be recognition of the wider Cabinet system relevant to policy making (eg Cabinet committees, Cabinet Office etc) and of other policy actors/fora (eg Prime Minister, bilaterals, departmental ministers/civil servants etc). External influences on policy making (eg media, pressure groups) are relevant but the main focus must be on policy making actors and fora within the core executive. Better candidates should also be able to illustrate their answers with examples of other policy decisions that have/have not been taken by the Cabinet and by the policy making styles associated with different prime ministers (eg Thatcher, Major, Blair, Brown).

For AO2, weaker answers may simply focus on the prime ministerial/Cabinet government debate. Better answers should focus on policy-making (as opposed to other aspects of prime ministerial/cabinet power eg patronage, dissolution power). 'Main' is a discriminator and should normally be addressed specifically for top level marks. In this regard most candidates are likely to suggest that only the 'main' policy decisions are now taken by the Cabinet, although there is scope to argue that 'main' decisions are often taken by the Prime Minister or by small groups in bilaterals, cabinet committees, a 'kitchen cabinet' etc. At all levels analysis informed by specific examples of policy making should be rewarded, although better answers are likely to recognise that the role of the Cabinet and other actors in most cases depends on the policy concerned and variables such as imminence of general election, political standing of government, party unity, size of majority etc. Better answers are also likely to develop analysis that shows varying policy making styles adopted under different premierships as well as variations over time (eg tendency for reduced policy making role for Cabinet over time).

(a) Explain the term *devolution* used in the extract.

(5 marks)

The extract gives useful contextual material and identifies Scotland and Wales. Weaker answers are likely to do little more than restate this, probably referring to the Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly as examples of devolved institutions. For three or more marks there should be additional, relevant information such as further detail about such institutions (eg powers). However, for 4/5 marks there should also be some attempt to explain the process involved with devolution (eg transferring power from a central to a regional or local level) and/or the relationship between devolved institutions and central government (eg parliamentary sovereignty retained at Westminster). Contrasts with independence and federalism are relevant and should be rewarded but full marks are possible without this. Answers referring to devolution in London and Northern Ireland should be accepted and rewarded on their merits, but full marks are possible without this.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain the statement that local government is responsible for delivering important public services. (10 marks)

The extract provides useful contextual material and asserts the statement inviting explanation in the question. Most candidates are likely to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of local government (eg elected local authorities and councils) and for middle range AO1 marks should also be able to identify specific services for which local government is responsible. (Answers relating to England only should be accepted as should answers relating to other parts of the United Kingdom where this is made clear by the candidate). Services most likely to be identified are education, housing, social services, planning, traffic management, etc. Knowledge and understanding about central/local government relationships should also be rewarded where this is relevant to the question.

With AO2, weaker answers are likely to do little more than distinguish between different services provided by local government. For higher marks, however, there should be some attempt to address 'important', which could lead candidates to consider whether some important services (eg health) are outside local authorities' competence, whether many local government services (eg bus shelters) are not especially important and/or whether central government is responsible for providing really important functions (eg defence). Reward relevant discussion about central/local relations eg central controls effectively remove local discretion even though services themselves are important. Reward also answers that explain that local government is not only a service provider but it is also elected and, therefore, an example of what is referred to in the extract as a 'democratic arena'. Discussion about why local government has responsibility for 'important' service provision (eg typical local services require local knowledge/contact, central government is too remote to provide efficiently, etc) should be rewarded but as the question only requires explanation, full marks are possible without this.

(c) To what extent does multi-level governance increase democracy and bring government closer to the people? (25 marks)

With AO1, weaker candidates are likely to do little more than identify some of the main institutions that exist at different levels (eg European Parliament, Welsh Assembly). For higher marks at AO1, however, candidates should be able to demonstrate knowledge of the main powers, functions, composition etc of the various institutions operating at these levels. As the question focuses on democracy and closeness to the people, highest level AO1 marks should normally only be awarded to candidates demonstrating knowledge and understanding of the democratic basis of institutions at the various levels (eg elected and non-elected bodies) and of the main services etc provided at the various levels. Reward at all levels examples of specific decisions/policies illustrating differing policy outcomes facilitated by multi-level governance (eg student tuition fees in Scotland). Reward also relevant knowledge and understanding of local government and Northern Ireland, but full marks are possible without this.

With AO2 the weakest answers will probably do little more than assert that the existence of different levels of elected government by definition increases democracy and brings government closer to the people. Better candidates, however, should offer reasoned discussion to support such contentions (eg increases democracy because more elected representatives/elections, brings government closer because some are smaller units of government). Better candidates should also be able to evaluate the validity of this contention to different levels of government (eg devolved government is arguably 'more democratic' than European because non-elected EU institutions arguably have more power than those that are elected; local and devolved government brings government closer to people but EU arguably makes government more remote). 'To what extent' is a discriminator and should be addressed specifically for higher marks. Such answers will normally develop arguments which challenge as well as support the statement (eg multi-level government can result in less democracy because of 'fuzzy accountability'; perceived remoteness or lack of power leads to low election turnout; formal multi-level structures do not necessarily make government closer to people as exemplified where local government is heavily constrained/controlled by central government). For highest level marks both 'increase democracy' and 'closer to the people' should normally be addressed.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID

AS Assessment Objective	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective Part (a) question	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective Part (b) Question	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective Part (c) question	Total Marks by Assessment Objective
AO1	5	4	11	20
AO2	0	4	8	12
AO3	0	2	6	8
Total	5	10	25	40