



**General Certificate of Education
January 2011**

Government and Politics GOV3C

Politics and Power

Unit 3C

Mark Scheme

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 © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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.

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.

At A2, generally speaking, there is no unambiguously 'right' or 'wrong' answer to the 30-mark questions. Answers will be judged on factors such as quality of the argument, depth of knowledge and understanding, a synoptic grasp of the subject, appropriateness of the examples and internal logic of the discussion. Where candidates are presented with a proposition to be discussed they may support it, reject it or adopt a balanced position.

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 '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.

A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS
GENERIC MARK SCHEME for questions with a total of 10 marks

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
AO1	AO2	AO3
<p>Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate fully addresses the requirements of the question and provides developed and effective to comprehensive interpretation. The answer also provides clear to accurate evidence and, where appropriate, good to excellent examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>Levels 3–4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively in a sustained and structured manner, using appropriate political vocabulary. There are few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and the response should be legible.</p>
<p>Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate demonstrates good knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate clearly addresses the requirements of the question and provides sound interpretation and contextual awareness. The answer includes good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
<p>Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate makes a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question and provides little to partial, but reasonably effective, interpretation. Answers offer limited evidence and few, or inaccurate, examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The candidate demonstrates little knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate makes little attempt to address the requirements of the question and provides little interpretation. Answers offer little evidence and few, or inaccurate, examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The candidate applies few concepts and makes little use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.</p>	<p>There are frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and legibility may be a problem. A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.</p>
<p>0 marks No relevant response.</p>	<p>0 marks No relevant response.</p>	<p>0 marks No relevant response.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for questions with a total of 30 marks

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
AO1	AO2	AO3
<p>Level 4 (10–12 marks) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. A synoptic approach is fully developed, drawing appropriately on knowledge, perspectives and examples from a wide range of studies in government and politics. The answer fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates excellent contextual awareness. The answer includes excellent examples to illustrate points made. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations, as well as accurate evidence and relevant examples, to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (10–12 marks) The candidate displays excellent awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is an excellent and sustained focus on the specific question asked. There is clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. Appropriate parallels and connections are clearly identified, together with well-developed comparisons. A wide range of concepts is used and developed.</p>	<p>Level 4 (6 marks) The candidate communicates structured and sustained arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity. Excellent use is made of political vocabulary to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. The response should be legible, with few, if any, errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. The answer has a clear sense of direction, culminating in a conclusion that flows from the preceding discussion.</p>
<p>Level 3 (7–9 marks) The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. A synoptic approach is well developed using a range of knowledge, perspectives and examples gained elsewhere in the study of government and politics. The answer clearly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates sound contextual awareness. The answer includes developed and effective interpretations or explanations and also clear evidence and good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (7–9 marks) The candidate displays sound awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is a clear focus on the question. There is a sound evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays good awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is good recognition of parallels and comparisons. Appropriate concepts are used and developed.</p>	<p>Level 3 (4–5 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions well. Good use is made of political vocabulary to construct clear arguments and explanations. The response should be legible but there may be occasional errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar. The candidate produces an answer with a conclusion linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for questions with a total of 30 marks (continued)

Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
AO1	AO2	AO3
<p>Level 2 (4–6 marks) The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them. The answer makes a limited attempt to address the question and demonstrates contextual awareness covering part of the question. An attempt to develop a synoptic approach is made, using a limited range of knowledge, perspectives and examples gained more broadly in the study of government and politics. The answer includes a partial and reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation, with some examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (4–6 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question, resulting in a restricted focus. There is a limited evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour, which displays a partial awareness of differing viewpoints and issues. There is some recognition of basic parallels and comparisons. Arguments and explanations are undeveloped, with a limited use of concepts.</p>	<p>Level 2 (2–3 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and conclusions adequately, with a limited use of political vocabulary. There are frequent errors of spelling, punctuation and grammar and legibility may be a problem. A conclusion is offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
<p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) The candidate demonstrates a slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and a limited awareness of the relationships between them. A very limited attempt at synopticity is made, sometimes using superficial or inaccurate knowledge, perspectives and examples cited from elsewhere in their study of government and politics. There is little attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness, if any, of the context of the question, with little interpretation and few, if any, examples, often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1–3 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question, and focus is lacking. Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial. Analysis shows little awareness of differing viewpoints and issues. There is little, if any, recognition of parallels and comparisons. Arguments, explanations and use of concepts are superficial and naïve.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The answer relies upon narrative that is not fully coherent. There is little or no use of political vocabulary. Errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar may be intrusive and the response may not be legible. A conclusion, if present, is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>
<p>0 marks No relevant response.</p>	<p>0 marks No relevant response.</p>	<p>0 marks No relevant response.</p>

Topic 1 Power in Modern Society**Total for this topic: 40 marks**

(01) Explain the essential features of a totalitarian government.	<i>(10 marks)</i>
---	-------------------

Expect variations in the answers given but, broadly speaking, candidates should be expected to argue that totalitarian government exists where the state has absolute power. All associations within society are under state domination. The church, trade unions, educational establishments and the media may be seen as under state control. This results in various consequences, such as restrictions on freedoms of association and speech. It can also relate to social life and dress codes. Such a state may have only one political party, which is able to outlaw potential political opponents. Some may draw parallels with autocracy, absolutism, fundamentalist theocracies or a police state. Some candidates may cite thinkers such as Hobbes or Rousseau as suggestive of forms of totalitarianism. Some candidates may seek to illustrate their discussion with examples of states they judge to be totalitarian, such as communist countries. Alternatively, they may argue that absolute totalitarianism is not possible in practice.

(02) 'Political power is inevitably concentrated in the hands of elites.' Discuss.	<i>(30 marks)</i>
--	-------------------

As with many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this open-ended question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

In the course of the answer, candidates should demonstrate an understanding that the focus of the analysis should be an assessment of the validity of this assertion from elite theorists that power will always fall into the hands of the few. Key relevant terms such as 'elite', 'the establishment', 'the political class' and 'the ruling class' should be introduced and defined. There may also be discussion on sources of elite power such as education, position, wealth, social connections.

In developing the analysis, candidates may be expected to explain the central tenets of elite theory, beginning with the classical elitists. It is likely, for example, that they will refer to Michels's 'Iron law of oligarchy'. They may mention other thinkers such as Plato and, say, Schumpeter, noting the elitist elements in their thought. They may also examine other countervailing theories of power, such as pluralism, Marxism and institutionalism. They may dispute the applicability of elite theory in either prescriptive or descriptive terms and perhaps pose a pluralist counter-argument.

In selecting examples to support their analysis, candidates may explore the argument that Britain has been a particularly elitist society, drawing evidence from institutions such as the House of Lords, public schools, Oxbridge, civil service recruitment, the military, the church, the City and the boardrooms of big business. They may examine patterns of contemporary development, perhaps suggesting new patterns of elite structure, arguing that Britain has moved some way from being an ascriptive society to an achievement one.

In developing a synoptic perspective, candidates may make comparison with countries of which they have knowledge, such as the USA, perhaps arguing that these are less, or more, open and egalitarian. They may also consider the EU and the question of a possible 'Euro-elite'. Some

may include the provincial systems of Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland and ask whether devolution gives rise to the formation of new political elites.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from previous discussion. This may argue either that elite domination is indeed an 'iron law' or that power in society is dispersed in some way or other.

Topic 2 Executive Power**Total for this topic: 40 marks**

(03) Argue the case for executive secrecy.

(10 marks)

It is more usual for examination candidates to be invited to argue against executive secrecy than for it. Hence the ability to consider the opposite case should be a good discriminator. Candidates should cite reasons for executive secrecy, such as the need for government advisers to be able to 'think the unthinkable' in policy formation. They may also argue that, under conditions of openness, civil servants would feel constrained from speaking freely in their discussions with ministers. They may also consider the case for protecting information in the national interest. This may entail reference to official secrets legislation. Commercial sensitivity is another factor that may feature in analysis. Candidates may consider the role of parliaments and assemblies in eliciting information from members of executives and whether this is always appropriate or beneficial. They may cite cases (such as that of Clive Ponting) where members of executives have felt constrained to blow the whistle, and may demonstrate knowledge of the rules laid down to guide those with a crisis of confidence. Candidates may also touch upon freedom-of-information legislation and its difficulties. It is likely that some candidates will spend some time considering the case against secrecy. This should not detract, providing they also consider the case for.

(04) 'Increasingly, modern executives are more concerned with image and presentation than with pursuing sound policy and government.' Discuss. *(30 marks)*

As with many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this open-ended question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

Candidates are invited to apply their knowledge of the role of the executive to a consideration of contemporary debate. They should recognise that an important function of the executive arm of government in a democracy is communicating with the people. They should also recognise that this is a responsibility that can be misused in the interests of electoral success. Candidates will need to offer some definitions or interpretations of the terms 'gesture politics' and 'spin'. They may also introduce related terms and concepts such as 'spin doctor', 'soundbite' and 'news management'. They should recognise that the terms relate to the executives' use of media specialists, press briefings and the now regular, formal appearances of UK prime ministers before press gatherings, in a manner that may be seen to betray influence from the USA. This may lead into discussions about the power of the press and the relationships of the executive with the 'media barons'. Various examples might be expected, such as the dominant presences of Bernard Ingham and Alastair Campbell as press officers or directors of communications, the growth of public relations sections within departments and significant events such as the notorious 9/11 email of Jo Moore.

Candidates may take the line that there is little new in this suggested development, citing figures from the past who were skilled in their public relations skills, such as Harold Macmillan and Harold Wilson. Some may even refer to Disraeli. They may also cite comparative examples, such as Kennedy and Clinton in the USA. Candidates may also consider executive figures who have been seen weak in this respect such as Major, Brown or Nixon.

Another line that candidates could take would be to look at the ways executives try to communicate directly with the people through 'people's panels', focus groups and the use of the internet through channels such as U-tube. This could be linked with executive attention to opinion polls in shaping their presentations.

It may be argued that the executive is not the only source of official communication with the people. Countervailing communications may come from legislatures through parliamentary debate, select committee reports, broadcast interviews and press articles. In addition, under conditions of a free press, journalists can also pose a countervailing force. Even members of judiciaries may be said to make public statements and enter public debate.

Candidates may cite examples of executive initiatives in, say, health, education, foreign policy or the economy, arguing that the presentation of a policy may have been at variance with the actuality, such as the double counting of expenditure increases in certain areas. Some candidates may seek to argue that news management is more a characteristic of oppressive (possibly) communist regimes, exerting totalitarian control over the broadcast and print media. Examples of various regimes may be expected.

In developing a synoptic perspective, candidates may make comparison with countries of which they have knowledge such as the USA, perhaps arguing that these are less, or more, open to gesture politics and spin. They may also consider the EU and its communications techniques. Some may include the provincial systems of Northern Ireland, Wales and Scotland and ask whether devolution gives rise to changes in the way their executives communicate with their populations.

There should be a concluding section to the answer that derives from the previous discussion. This may argue either that modern executives are really more concerned with image and presentation than in pursuing sound policy and government, or that this is an unjustified critique launched by oppositions and commentators. Alternatively, they may take an intermediate position.

Topic 3 Political Culture**Total for this topic: 40 marks****(05) Consider the case for multiculturalism.****(10 marks)**

Candidates will be expected to recognise that a number of factors, such as globalisation, ease of transportation, asylum-seeking, economic migration, the growth of ethnic minority communities and diversity movements, all place the idea of multicultural communities in the forefront of debate around political culture. In presenting the case, candidates may be expected to refer to factors such as the UK's long history of accommodating those from other countries and belonging to other religions, and the richness of cultural diversity. They may cite benefits to a community deriving from variety in terms of cuisine, dress, moral codes and ideology. Religion may feature as candidates stress the value and traditions of religious freedom. Some candidates may consider the case of the USA, its history and the idea of a cultural melting pot. Credit will be given for recognising various manifestations of multiculturalism and examples of the ways governments may seek to accommodate it.

(06) 'Political cultures are never static.' Discuss.**(30 marks)**

As with many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this open-ended question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

In the course of the answer, candidates should demonstrate an understanding that the focus of the analysis should be on the dynamic nature of a political culture. Candidates may argue variously around the key proposition. Some may agree that political culture is a dynamic feature of politics, but others may argue that it is largely static, preserving fundamental value and belief systems that define a particular political system. The word 'never' serves as a discriminator.

Candidates will be expected to show clear understanding of the concepts of political culture and change. They may also introduce related concepts such as citizenship, deference, homogeneity and consensus. It may be expected that candidates will identify and examine institutions that both define and shape political culture, such as constitutions, judiciaries, monarchy, aristocracy, assemblies, electoral systems, public bureaucracies, history, levels of devolution and geographical divide. Some may explore the ideological dimension of political culture, considering the idea of a dominant ideology, other competing ideologies, values and norms.

In considering whether or not political cultures are static, candidates may analyse patterns of change in popular attitudes and beliefs. These may include attitudes towards the political system itself, and the willingness of people to accept the actions and policies of their governments. This may lead into a consideration of other factors, such as the extent to which people feel they can influence their government, trust it, safely forgo civil liberties, obey the law and show respect for the forces of law and order. They may consider attitudes towards various figures of authority such as teachers, parents, police, the judiciary, MPs, local councillors, state officials, the medical profession, care workers and so on. Some candidates may address changes in attitudes of a social nature, such as sense of community, racism, sexism and xenophobia. Candidates may also examine forces shaping popular attitudes and beliefs, such

as TV, radio, the press, religion, the family, the peer group, the school, and the government itself.

Candidates may outline contrasting types of political culture (eg traditional, secular, participant, subject, parochial and civic) and ask whether there is a pattern of change from one type to another. Some candidates may focus on generational changes, identifying groups such as the post-war generation, the 1960s generation, 'Thatcher's children', and the New Labour era. Here they may consider the factors conditioning attitudes, such as the camaraderie during the war, the austerity of the early post-war years, the trauma of the Suez crisis, the 'No such thing as society' era, the damaged reputation of the monarchy, less deferential treatment of politicians by the media and the advent of Labour as a party of sustained government.

Some candidates may seek more underlying aspects of political culture and argue that apparent changes are of a superficial nature. They may, for example, argue that the classic pillars of continuity, consensus, homogeneity and deference remain at the heart of any stable political culture.

Candidates will be able to mine a rich vein of examples of ways in which political cultures could be said to be coming under pressure. They may, for example, consider changes in education, family relationships, more permissive attitudes, more aggressive mass media, acceptance of alternative lifestyles, a more prominent place for women in the workplace and in public life, a perceived terrorist threat, increased drug use, and a perceived influx of asylum-seekers. The creation of provincial assemblies in the UK should provide an important example concerning the factor of homogeneity.

There is much scope for a synoptic dimension and candidates may choose examples from any political culture with which they are familiar, particularly the USA. They may even argue that change in one political culture can be explained in terms of contagion from another. This could of course lead to a consideration of the thesis that British political culture is influenced by that of the USA.

There should be a concluding section that clearly derives from the preceding discussion. This must come back to the proposition that a political culture is never static. Candidates may support the proposition, challenge it, or adopt an intermediate position.

Topic 4 Britain in Europe**Total for this topic: (40 marks)****(07) Explain the concept of European citizenship.****(10 marks)**

Candidates should recognise the concept of European citizenship as being fundamental to the idea of the EU. They may cite the Maastricht treaty as a significant step in the development of European citizenship, providing for certain rights for nationals: to reside and move freely through the community and vote and stand in municipal and European parliament elections. Some may stress the symbolic nature of the concept, noting that it stresses the idea of integration and of an authority above the level of the nation-state. Candidates may take a normative position, arguing variously that the effect is to undermine national loyalty and patriotism, offers wider protection of the rights of individuals, or that it is little more than an empty gesture, with no real effect upon people's lives.

(08) 'EU membership impacts significantly on the UK's political institutions.' Discuss.**(30 marks)**

As with many political issues, there is no right or wrong answer to this open-ended question. Answers will be judged on factors such as the quality of the argument, the depth of knowledge and understanding, the degree of synopticity, the appropriateness of the examples and the internal logic of the discussion.

In the course of the answer, candidates should demonstrate an understanding that the focus of the analysis should be on the impact of EU membership upon the domestic governance of a nation-state. The word 'significantly' serves as a discriminator. From the outset, candidates should show a general understanding that, in the contemporary world, no government has complete autonomy. Membership of the EU should be seen as a particular example of this subjection to outside forces. Throughout the analysis, candidates should show understanding of centrally relevant concepts such as federalism, multilevel governance, supranationality, national sovereignty and subsidiarity. They should also clarify their understanding of the term 'political institution', and candidates may vary in their interpretations of this.

A consideration of governmental structures might include an assessment of the provisions for parliamentary scrutiny of EU legislation, the use of cabinet committees, the creation of special EU sections within government departments and the creation of ministers with EU responsibilities. Some candidates may include the process of secondment of domestic civil servants to the Brussels bureaucracies. They may also consider the ways in which EU membership influences the structure and working of the devolved institutions.

The judiciary may also be examined. Candidates may consider the forms of EU legislation and the differing degrees of compulsion they carry (Directives, Regulations, etc). They may also consider the status of European legislation vis-à-vis that from the domestic parliament. This may be illustrated with examples of clashes between domestic and European law. They may also examine the role of the European Commission in monitoring the implementation of EU legislation by domestic institutions and the role of the European Court in judging a state's compliance. Some candidates may give some attention to the secondment of domestic judges to the European Court.

Candidates may also consider the constraints placed upon the ability of the domestic parliament to legislate. This could lead into a consideration of the effects of membership on national sovereignty. Limitations on domestic legislation may be illustrated with reference to policy areas such as monetary union, employment regulation, diversity, social regulation, the environment, immigration, asylum-seeking and the free movement of workers. Candidates may note points of congruence or conflict.

Some candidates may consider political parties. Here they may focus on political cleavage. They may consider the impact of Euroscepticism as a factor in domestic politics. The debate and controversy over EU membership between and within political parties could be a key part of this analysis. This could lead to an assessment of the impact of UKIP in British politics. EU membership as a factor in electoral outcomes may also be analysed. They may ask whether the use of PR in Euro-elections could pose a challenge to the domestic electoral system.

There should be a concluding section that clearly derives from the preceding discussion. This must come back to the proposition that EU membership impacts significantly on UK political institutions. Candidates may support the proposition, challenge it, or adopt an intermediate position by, say, arguing that there is an impact but it is not significant.

ASSESSMENT OBJECTIVE GRID

A2 Assessment Objective	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 10-mark questions	Marks allocated by Assessment Objective 30-mark questions	Total Marks by Assessment Objective
AO1	4	12	16
AO2	4	12	16
AO3	2	6	8
Total	10	30	40