



ASSESSMENT and  
QUALIFICATIONS  
ALLIANCE

# Mark scheme January 2003

---

## GCE

### Government and Politics

### Unit GOV3

---

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

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334  
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ  
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

## Unit 3: Features of a Representative Democracy

### Criteria for marking

#### Introduction

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

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

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

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

#### Using a levels of response mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon 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.

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

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

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

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

## Assessment matrix

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

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

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

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 1(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the view that there is executive dominance of the House of Commons (e.g. party discipline, rarity of government defeats in commons, limited scrutiny opportunities). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations (e.g. examples of government domination/weakness depending on size of majority). They provide full and accurate evidence and up-to-date examples to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (executive dominance, mandate, elective dictatorship accountability, majoritarian government). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the underlying reasons for executive dominance and of differing reasons for this (e.g. significance of electoral systems) and make well developed comparisons (e.g. with House of Lords). There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether the powers of the executive over the House of Commons should/should not be reduced.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of the view that there is executive dominance of the House of Commons (e.g. party discipline, rarity of government defeats). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations (e.g. examples of government dominating House of Commons). They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. elected dictatorship). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the underlying reasons for executive dominance and of different viewpoints. There is good evaluation of issues.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and explanations well, and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

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

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

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 2(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of local government and why it is arguably ‘a vital ingredient of British democracy’. They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness, with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations. They provide full and accurate evidence and up-to-date examples to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (accountability, devolution representative, legitimacy, etc.). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of why local government might be regarded as a vital ingredient of British democracy and of differing viewpoints (e.g. low turnout, growth of non-elected local government undermines democratic value). They identify parallels and make well developed comparisons (e.g. with devolved assemblies and the Westminster Parliament). There is clear evaluation of issues (e.g. of recent democratic renewal initiatives).</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of local government and why it is arguably ‘a vital ingredient of British democracy’ (e.g. elected). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations. They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. accountability). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the underlying reasons why local government might be regarded as a vital ingredient of British democracy, and of differing viewpoints (e.g. low turnout, growth of non-elected local government undermines democratic value), and which identifies parallels (e.g. with Westminster). There is good evaluation of issues.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

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

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

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the role of the Cabinet and how far this is to rubber stamp decisions taken elsewhere (e.g. decisions often taken by Prime Minister, individual ministers/departments select committees, etc.). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations (e.g. increased prime ministerial dominance has eroded Cabinet's role). They provide full and accurate evidence and policy examples to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (accountability, prime ministerial/cabinet government, representative, etc.). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of why the Cabinet <u>usually</u> rubber stamps decisions made elsewhere and of differing viewpoints about its role and powers. They identify parallels and make well developed comparisons (e.g. with Cabinets in local government). There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether the Cabinet's powers should be increased.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of the role of the Cabinet and how far this is to rubber stamp decisions taken elsewhere (e.g. decisions often taken by Prime Minister, individual ministers/departments, select committees, etc.). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations. They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. accountability). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of why the Cabinet <u>usually</u> rubber stamps decisions made elsewhere and of different viewpoints about its role and power and identifies parallels. There is good evaluation of issues such as whether the Cabinet should have more power.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 3(b) (cont)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the Cabinet and its decision-making powers. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at explanations of whether the Cabinet rubber stamps decisions that have been made elsewhere. They provide not very detailed examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1-4 marks)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts. They offer limited analysis which shows limited awareness of why the Cabinet rubber stamps decisions made elsewhere and identify basic parallels and comparisons. Attempts to evaluate arguments are simple. There is little or no attempt to analyse ‘usually’.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete understanding of the Cabinet and its decision-making powers. They produce answers which show a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrate only superficial contextual awareness covering part of the question with little explanation of whether Cabinet rubber stamps decisions that have been made elsewhere. They provide few examples often inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	See level above.	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

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

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(b)</b> <b>22 marks</b>	<p><b>Level 4 (10-11 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the view that senior civil servants, rather than ministers, are ‘the real decision-makers’ in Whitehall (e.g. expertise, permanence). They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness with detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations. They provide full and accurate evidence and up to date examples to substantiate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (7 marks)</b> Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts (bureaucracy, responsibility, accountability). They offer analysis which demonstrates a sophisticated awareness of the underlying reasons why arguably <u>senior</u> civil servants rather than ministers are the real decision-makers, and of differing viewpoints (e.g. ministers who have resources, increased use of special advisers). They identify parallels and make well developed comparisons. There is clear evaluation of issues such as whether civil service power should be reduced.</p>	<p><b>Level 4 (4 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p><b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a sound understanding of the view that senior civil servants, rather than ministers, are ‘the real decision-makers’ in Whitehall (e.g. expertise, permanence). They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate sound contextual awareness with effective interpretations or explanations. They provide some clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</b> Candidates apply a range of developed concepts (e.g. accountability). They provide analysis which offers an awareness of the underlying reasons why arguably senior civil servants rather than ministers are the real decision-makers and of different viewpoints about their role and power. There is good evaluation of issues such as whether civil service power should be reduced.</p>	<p><b>Level 3 (3 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and explanations well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	<b>Knowledge and Understanding</b>	<b>Skills</b>	<b>Communication</b>
	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Question 4(b) (cont)</b>	<p><b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the view that civil servants, rather than ministers, are the real decision-makers in Whitehall. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include partial but reasonably effective attempt at explanations. They provide not very detailed examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p><b>Levels 1-2 (1-4 marks)</b> Candidates apply a limited range of concepts. They offer limited analysis which shows limited awareness of the underlying reasons why civil servants rather than ministers are the real decision-makers. There is no attempt to discuss <u>senior</u> or to develop alternative viewpoints. Attempts to evaluate arguments are simple.</p>	<p><b>Level 2 (2 marks)</b> Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p><b>Level 1 (1-3 marks)</b> Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete understanding of the view that civil servants rather than ministers are the real decision-makers in Whitehall. They produce answers which show a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrate only superficial contextual awareness covering part of the question with little explanation. They provide few examples often inaccurately or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>See level above.</p>	<p><b>Level 1 (1 mark)</b> Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>