



**General Certificate of Education
June 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
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.	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 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.
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.	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.	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, 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.	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.
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.	Level 1 (1 mark) The candidate applies few concepts and makes little use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.	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.
0 marks No relevant response.	0 marks No relevant response.	0 marks No relevant response.

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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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) Examine the factors that confer legitimacy upon a government.	(10 marks)
--	------------

Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the term 'legitimacy' in the context of government. They may offer some form of definition of legitimate government, such as one that enjoys popular acceptance. Factors conferring legitimacy may include trust in leaders, recognition of expertise or qualifications to rule (as in the case of elite educational establishments), tradition (noting the position of monarchs and other forms of inherited power), religion (noting historical and contemporary links between church and state), charisma in leaders, and democratic election. Candidates may argue that government can spend much time in generating legitimacy, sometimes by creating a dominant ideology. They may also note that governments can sacrifice legitimacy as a result of scandals, policy failures, abuses of power and so on. They may note that revolutions can occur because of a crisis in legitimacy. Candidates may give examples of governments both with and without legitimacy. Some may cite particular actions of a government as lacking legitimacy and/or cases where public opinion appears to have been flouted. Examples of legitimate and illegitimate acts and forms of government will be rewarded at all levels.

(02) 'It is better that politicians hold to their principles than modify them so as to gain power.' Discuss.	(30 marks)
--	------------

Candidates should recognise that their analysis must focus on the nature of power, its exercise and its acquisition. This question centres on the age-old problem of the extent to which a politician or party can hold true to their defining principles while seeking real power. Candidates may introduce and define key relevant concepts such as power, principle, authority, influence and political interest.

The question invites candidates to consider the gaining of power without a 'moral compass': that is, power for its own sake. It will be possible to argue here that in practice there have been, and still are, governments and political leaders who do indeed give the impression of being more interested in being in power than in what they actually do with it.

Individuals often compromise certain of their principles before the dictates of their party, and parties modify their principles before the electorate. Candidates will usually consider the important issue of the compromises necessary in politics. They may be expected to cite examples of governments and political figures who may be said to have acted without morally acceptable principles. It is possible that some may cite the scandal over British MPs' expenses as an example of power without principle. Others may cite government decisions that betray the basic principles in their ideologies. The rise of career politicians, putting advancement above principles may also be cited.

Developments within the British Labour Party may well be cited. Ideological purists may actually prefer to remain in opposition rather than betray their principles. In contrast, Wilson and Blair may be identified as leaders more concerned with gaining power than implementing socialism. The long-running debate over Clause 4 of the party's constitution could provide a potent example. On the other hand, candidates may note that the Conservative Party is often depicted as being more concerned with an entitlement to power than principle. This changed

with the arrival of Margaret Thatcher, who claimed to be a 'conviction politician'. Candidates may take David Cameron as an example of a Conservative leader, again making the acquisition of power the main priority exemplified by his 'rebranding' of the Conservative Party. They may illustrate this through his willingness to form a coalition with the Liberal Democrats in 2010. Similarly, they may argue that in joining the coalition the Liberal Democrats have also made compromises in the pursuit of power.

For some candidates, the discussion may lead to a consideration of the concept of pragmatism in the exercise of power, with policy being decided on the basis of 'what works' rather than whether it accords with the principles embedded in party ideology. The Conservative espousal of the post-war welfare state and New Labour's acceptance of Thatcher's privatisation policies could be provided as examples. In this discussion, candidates may regard such pragmatism as a necessary aspect of democratic politics or as weakness. Some candidates may also take a comparative perspective and consider the position of the politics of a country with which they are familiar, such as the USA.

The conclusion must clearly follow from the previous discussion and should centre on an evaluation of the proposition that power without principle is barren, but principle without power is futile.

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

(03) Present the case for a collegiate form of government.

(10 marks)

Candidates should explain the term 'collegiate government', which essentially means cabinet government. They may contrast this with a presidential executive (but they are not asked to elaborate on this). In presenting the arguments for collegiate government they should cite factors such as considered deliberation before arriving at decisions, a wide representation of interests and points of view, a wide range of expertise in decision-making, a basis for interdepartmental co-operation and 'joined-up government', opportunities for promoting public discussion, a range of access points for affected interests, and a defence against dictatorial tendencies within an executive.

(04) 'Modern executives are forever under a threat of domination by officials.' Discuss.

(30 marks)

Candidates should note that, under modern conditions, executives are increasingly expected to make decisions in areas where considerable technical knowledge and understanding are required. Such areas include scientific research funding, the economy, weaponry, medical technology, statistics, information technology, and so on. Candidates should recognise that the assertion in question argues that this development tends to lead to officials rather than politicians dominating executives. They should appreciate that this can be seen as posing a threat to democracy. They may make reference to quasi-constitutional doctrines such as 'Officials are on tap but not on top', or 'Officials propose, ministers dispose', and explain the rationale behind these.

Candidates may note the various types of officials involved within the executive. They may note the divisions between scientific and administrative officials. They may also refer to the hierarchical nature of government bureaucracy, noting that some officials work very closely with the political heads. Some candidates may argue that the impact of developments varies with different types of executive (prime ministerial or presidential) and different styles of bureaucratic appointments (permanent or non-permanent).

At a theoretical level, candidates may cite Weber's 'dictatorship of the official' thesis. Some may make use of Theakstone's models. At a higher level, some may refer to rational choice theory, which sees bureaucrats as self-interested actors likely to subvert the politicians' endeavours through strategies such as withholding information, empire-building and maximising salaries and job security. Some may note such strategies without reference to the theory.

Candidates may note the ways in which politicians can seek to reduce the power of officials through such strategies as influencing official appointments and promotions, appointing a 'counter-bureaucracy' in the form of special advisers and consultants, enlisting support from interest groups and seeking public approval. Candidates should address the democratic implications of official power within the executive. Examples may be drawn variously from current reported events, decision-making case studies, memoirs of officials and politicians, and so on.

'Forever' is a discriminator and candidates focusing on this specifically – for example, by pointing out that changing political circumstances may alter power relationships – should be rewarded at all levels.

The conclusion should centre on an evaluation of the proposition that modern executives are under a threat of domination by officials. Candidates may agree or disagree with the proposition but the position adopted must clearly follow from the previous discussion.

Topic 3 Political Culture**Total for this topic: 40 marks****(05) Explain the concept of deference.****(10 marks)**

Candidates will need to recognise deference as one of the characteristics that constitute a political culture. They may explain that in a deferential political culture people will generally trust the institutions of state to operate in the public interest. They may argue that deference is necessary for political stability and that, where there is a crisis of deference, civic unrest and even revolution can ensue. Some may argue that deference is a necessary condition of a capitalist state. On the other hand, some candidates may challenge the virtue of deference, seeing it as conducive to class rule and oppression. They may note that deference can be shown towards a range of institutions besides those of the government, including the courts, the police force, schools, the medical profession and the legal profession. Candidates may note that, in the UK, this characteristic was more prevalent in the mid-twentieth century than today. Some may draw a distinction between political cultures, perhaps by suggesting that those of the USA and France have been less deferential than that of the UK.

(06) Analyse the factors that shape a political culture.**(30 marks)**

Candidates should demonstrate their recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on identifying and examining a wide range of influences that shape a political culture.

In the main body of the answer, candidates should introduce and define key relevant terms such as:

- the central concepts of political attitudes, political beliefs, political socialisation and political culture
- types of political culture such as traditional, secular, participant, subject, parochial and civic
- relevant aspect of political culture such as ideology, citizenship, deference, patriotism, xenophobia, homogeneity and consensus.

Candidates should identify and critically appraise a range of determinants of political culture. These may include the presence and nature of institutional features such as constitutions, judiciaries, assemblies, electoral systems, public bureaucracies and levels of devolution. They may also examine dominant attitudes such as those towards class and social stratification, religion, gender and race. Important historical landmarks such as wars, revolutions and imperial experience may also be considered as determinants of political culture. Candidates may analyse patterns of immigration, salient political issues, the impact of notable political figures and the presence of ancient traditions and practices (monarchy, aristocracy, church). Climate, geography and natural catastrophes may also be included in the analysis. Relevant comparative material should be rewarded. Agents of political socialisation such as TV, radio, the press, religion, family, peer group, school, and the government itself, should also be considered.

There should be a concluding section that derives from the preceding discussion. However, as with many political issues, there is no unambiguously right or wrong answer to this question. Candidates may assign differing degrees of importance to the factors they identify and analyse. The important discriminator is the extent to which their choices are justified and supported with arguments and examples.

Topic 4 Britain in Europe**Total for this topic: (40 marks)**

- | | |
|---|------------|
| (07) Explain why the system of qualified majority voting (QMV) is used in the Council of Ministers. | (10 marks) |
|---|------------|

Candidates should recognise that the Council tends to be a forum where ministers fight their nationalistic corners and this can result in deadlock. To mitigate this, the treaties have made provision for a system of qualified majority voting (QMV) so that decisions do not require unanimity. (Some candidates may refer to the 1966 'Luxembourg compromise', permitting a state to veto any proposal judged to threaten its vital national interest.) Candidates should note that the treaties also lay down the categories of policy that are subject to QMV and may also note that successive treaties have gradually extended these. The treaties have also modified the methodology of the QMV system.

In explaining the system, candidates should note that each member's vote is weighted to reflect population size (but with some generosity to the smaller nations).

Under the system of QMV established under the Nice Treaty the following three conditions must be satisfied:

1. the proposal must be supported by 255 votes from the total of 345 (about 74 per cent)
2. the proposal must be backed by a majority of members
3. the states supporting the decision must represent at least 62 per cent of the total EU population.

Some candidates may note that a 'blocking minority' may be put together by states aiming to reject a proposal. However, to make it impossible for a very small number of the most populous member states to reject a decision, a blocking minority must comprise at least four member states; otherwise, the qualified majority will be deemed to have been reached even if the population criterion is not met.

It is possible that some candidates will refer to the system to come into operation in 2014, following the Lisbon Treaty. This will be acceptable. Where they do this, they must explain that the system is based on the principle of the double majority and will work as follows:

1. decisions will need the support of 55 per cent of member states (currently 15 out of 27 EU countries)
2. these states must represent a minimum of 65 per cent of the EU population.

(08) 'Not all institutions of the European Union (EU) operate in the interests of supranationalism.' Discuss.

(30 marks)

Candidates should demonstrate their recognition that the essential focus of the analysis should be on the different characters of the institutions of the EU. It is probable that candidates will focus on the Council of Ministers, the European Commission, the European Parliament and the European Council. Some may mention others, such as the Court of Justice and the Economic and Social Committee and Committee of the Regions. While relevant mention of these may gain credit, this is not a necessary condition to access top-level marks.

Candidates should explain relevant concepts such as EU institution, supranationalism and internationalism. They may also be expected to introduce terms such as 'federalism', 'national sovereignty' and 'national interest'. In examining the institutions, candidates should note both the intentions underlying their original creation and their subsequent development. In all cases there should be some consideration of the likely impact of the Lisbon Treaty, entering into force on 1 December 2009.

In the case of the Commission, candidates should recognise a clear orientation towards supranationalism as exemplified in the oath, or solemn undertaking, sworn by the commissioners upon taking up their positions. In this they agree to operate in the interest of the community as a whole and not seek or take instructions from their home states. However, some candidates may argue that events have seen some lessening of this character as a result of enlargement, and divergences between countries over issues such as the invasion of Iraq and the economic crisis. Candidates may attempt to assess the significance of the creation of the position of President of the Commission and the choice of Herman van Rompuy as the first incumbent. Candidates may also argue that the supranationalist character of the Commission is enhanced by the large battalions of Brussels-based civil servants who are sometimes accused of 'going native'.

Candidates should note that the Council of Ministers exhibits a rather different character, with members being elected ministers from member states and subject to political pressure at home from parliaments and public opinion. They may cite statements made over the years by UK ministers to the effect that they are 'batting for Britain'. The controversy over voting procedures may be seen as another indication of the attention given to national interests by Council members and the states they represent.

Candidates should see the European Parliament, in which MEPs sit in ideological rather than national groupings, as another example of an institution with a supranational character. However, some may argue that not all MEPs display a supranationalist spirit. Candidates may comment on the substantial representation in the EP of UKIP, with its avowedly anti-supranationalist agenda.

In terms of this question, the European Council should be seen by candidates as of particular importance. Consisting of heads of state or government, such an institution was never envisaged in the original Rome Treaty. The result of the desire of the national leaders, particular de Gaulle, to take centre-stage, it may be seen as undermining the supranationalist aims of the Treaty. Candidates may note how national leaders frequently form alliances in order to gain national advantage. They may point to John Major's 'game, set and match' claim upon securing UK policy opt-outs at the Maastricht summit.

There should be a selection of well-chosen examples to illustrate arguments. These may well include reference to significant figures, such as Jacques Delors or Roy Jenkins, who have influenced the development of the EU. Some candidates may argue that certain member states have more difficulty with the supranational perspective than others and may cite the UK as a prime example.

There should be a concluding section that derives from the preceding discussion. However, as with many political issues, there is no unambiguously right or wrong answer to this question. Candidates must come back to the proposition that not all institutions of the EU operate in the interests of supranationalism, which they may support or refute.

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

Converting Marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) marks by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion