



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2011

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

FRIDAY 21 JANUARY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

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

Quality of candidates' responses

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

Flexibility in marking

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

Positive marking

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

Types of mark schemes

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

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

Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

Quality of Written Communication

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates’ responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication which is incorporated within the marks awarded for AO3. Where the quality of candidates’ subject knowledge and understanding is not matched by the quality of written communication, marks awarded will not exceed the maximum for Level 4.

Option A: The United Kingdom and the United States of America**Section A****1 Background**

Those who drew up the US Constitution intended that federalism would provide a vital check upon the power of the central state and so help to prevent the tyranny that they feared so greatly. As with many features of the Constitution, federalism has evolved over the past two hundred years and this has been the subject of debate over whether it has been eroded rather than evolved. States' rights advocates believe that there has been an unacceptable erosion of the powers of individual states and that this threatens the very foundations of US democracy. The introduction of the New Deal was one of many examples of where central government shifted the balance of power in its favour. This has led to repeated attempts to reverse the centralisation process over the past fifty years. The alternative view is that federalism has evolved but continues to play a significant role in the US political system. The individual states are still a major focus of power in the US and no president can ignore this fact. Candidates need to support both arguments with relevant evidence.

Weaker answers will tend to rely upon the Source and provide little further evidence. Better answers will be balanced and will offer a range of evidence.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence or examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who fails to refer to the Source at all, even implicitly can achieve a maximum of Level 4
- A candidate who fails to evaluate/assess/provide any balance can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [3]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about federalism and states' rights and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or contains no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [6]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about federalism and states' rights but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). The quality of

spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [9]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about federalism and states' rights but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1 [7]; AO2 [12]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about federalism and states' rights and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

AO1 [8]; AO2 [15]; AO3 [7]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the debate about federalism and states' rights and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3). [30]

30

Section B**2 Background**

The Electoral College is a mechanism employed in the election of the US President. Those who wrote the Constitution wished to protect state interests and therefore the President is not elected by a headcount of US citizens but by a more complicated method. The candidate that wins a majority in each state wins the electoral college votes for that state. Each state's number of college votes is based upon its size. The candidate that wins an absolute majority of electoral college votes is duly elected.

Up to [2] for each relevant point, up to a total of [5]. (AO1 [5])

If no example is included a maximum of [4] can be awarded.

[5]

5

3 Background

In their determination to prevent tyranny, the authors of the US Constitution sought to impose severe constraints upon the executive. In practice, US Presidents have been able to circumvent these constraints to become the dominant part of the US political system. Presidents have exploited the gaps in the Constitution to extend their powers. They have used their control over the federal economy to gain their way in other areas. They have employed events such as economic crises, wars and terrorist attacks to enhance the powers of the presidency. They have also used veto powers, Executive Orders and Executive Agreements to overcome constitutional constraints.

- If a candidate refers to only one means by which the President can overcome restraints, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- If no examples/evidence are included, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1 [1]; AO2 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of how Presidents have overcome Constitutional restraints and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of how Presidents have overcome Constitutional restraints but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant general or irrelevant material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

AO1 [3]; AO2 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of how Presidents have overcome Constitutional restraints but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question. The response contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 4 ([7]–[8])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [4]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of how Presidents have overcome Constitutional restraints and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 5 ([9]–[10])

AO1 [5]; AO2 [5]

The candidate demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of how Presidents have overcome Constitutional restraints and deploys this to produce an exemplary response to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). [10]

10

4 Background

The US Senate is a directly elected chamber with extensive powers of scrutiny over legislation, executive actions and executive appointments. The Senate also has the power to remove a President through the power of impeachment. US Senators are enormously powerful individuals in their own right. By contrast, the unelected Lords appears to lack both democratic legitimacy and any significant powers of scrutiny. Candidates should fully explore the obvious contrasts between the two chambers. Some balance should be attempted, however. In spite of its lack of formal powers, the Lords has proved itself to be a formidable opponent of governments, highlighting inadequacies in policies and obstructing them. The Senate's scrutinising powers may be said to be partly constrained by the desire of Senators to be re-elected and the executive's capacity to assist them in this objective. Weaker answers will tend to be unbalanced and offer a limited range of evidence. Stronger answers will both compare and contrast and will have greater evidence.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence/examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who produces a one sided/unbalanced answer with no assessment or evaluation can achieve a maximum of Level 4

- A candidate who refers to only one political system can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [2]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of the Senate and Lords and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

AO1 [3]; AO2 [5]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of the Senate and Lords but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [8]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of the Senate and Lords but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

AO1 [5]; AO2 [11]; AO3 [4]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of the Senate and

Lords and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([21]–[25])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [14]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of the Senate and Lords and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[25]

25

5 (a) Background

There would appear to be much justification for the claim that Prime Ministers enjoy more legislative freedom than Presidents. Prime Ministers control the legislature because they have an overall majority in the Commons. Few pieces of executive legislation fail and few Bills that the Prime Minister does not support succeed. The Prime Minister sits in the Commons and, through party discipline and loyalty, is able to have his/her legislative way. The contrasts with the President are obvious and should be explored by candidates. By way of balance, candidates could consider the ways in which Presidents circumvent the legislative constraints upon them and the problems that Prime Ministers face in securing the passage of their legislation. As the question does not explicitly refer to the legislature, candidates may introduce other issues such as the role of cabinet in restraining the Prime Minister or President or even the limiting effect of alliances such as the European Union.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence/examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who produces a one sided/unbalanced answer with no assessment or evaluation can achieve a maximum of Level 4
- A candidate who refers to only one political system can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [3]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the legislative freedom of the President and Prime Minister and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [6]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the legislative freedom of the President and Prime Minister but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [9]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the legislative freedom of the President and Prime Minister but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good.

A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1 [7]; AO2 [12]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the legislative freedom of the President and Prime Minister and uses this to fully address the requirements of the

question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

AO1 [8]; AO2 [15]; AO3 [7]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the legislative freedom of the President and Prime Minister and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[30]

30

Or

(b) Background

Some observers argue that, while the US President may be more powerful, within the domestic sphere the UK Prime Minister has greater independence and power. The President is constrained by the Separation of Powers, by checks and balances, perhaps by a hostile Congress and by a range of constitutional constraints. The UK Prime Minister does not have a similar set of restrictions and is able to act with much more autonomy. The alternative view is that Prime Ministers do face restrictions on their power to act independently. These restrictions can be imposed by Parliament, by the Cabinet, by external organisations or by events. American Presidents have an impressive array of weapons that allows them to get around the restraints imposed upon them. In discussing this candidates may wish to make a distinction between the domestic and foreign spheres.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence/examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who produces a one sided/unbalanced answer with no assessment or evaluation can achieve a maximum of Level 4
- A candidate who refers to only one political system can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [3]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and Prime Minister and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [6]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and Prime Minister but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is

satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [9]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and Prime Minister but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1 [7]; AO2 [12]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and Prime Minister and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

AO1 [8]; AO2 [15]; AO3 [7]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and Prime Minister and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[30]

30

Option B: The United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland

Section A

1 Background

The various reviews of the Irish constitution that have taken place over the past two decades have, as the Source notes, been broadly positive. While identifying that some reform is necessary, the reviews have concluded that the fundamental principles of the constitution are still appropriate today. They have also concluded that the reform of the constitution through referenda and judicial review have helped to update the constitution and maintain its relevance. This view, with supporting evidence, should form half of an answer. The other half should consist of the view that the constitution is not fundamentally sound and has not served the Irish people well. Candidates may refer to the abortion issue, the constitution's position on women and the family, the persistence of overtly Christian and Catholic ethos, the difficulties in changing the constitution. Other relevant evidence is also admissible. Candidates need to support both arguments with relevant evidence. Weaker answers will tend to rely upon the Source and provide little further evidence. Better answers will be balanced and will offer a range of evidence.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence or examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who fails to refer to the Source at all, even implicitly can achieve a maximum of Level 4
- A candidate who fails to evaluate/assess/provide any balance can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [3]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about the constitution and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or contains no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [6]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about the constitution but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is

some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [9]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about the constitution but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1 [7]; AO2 [12]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about the constitution and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

AO1 [8]; AO2 [15]; AO3 [7]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the debate about the constitution and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3). [30]

30

Section B**2 Background**

The principle of collective responsibility is found in both the British and Irish political systems and therefore candidates may refer to either political system or both. The principle applies to members of the government. Government ministers can openly debate and express their disagreement with policy within cabinet or other government meetings. Once a decision has been taken and accepted as government policy all ministers are obliged to support the policy. If they are unable to do so then the principle states that they must resign.

Up to [2] for each relevant point, up to a total of [5]. (AO1 [5])

If no example is included a maximum of [4] can be awarded.

[5]

5

3 Background

TDs spend a much greater amount of their time in their constituencies than do elected representatives in many other political systems. The reason why TDs must be so active in the performance of their representative role and in carrying out constituency work is that it is essential if they are to secure election at the next general election. This is due, firstly, to the extent of brokerage within Irish political culture. Secondly, the STV electoral system creates not only inter-party competition but also intra-party competition. Securing re-election demands that TDs are seen to be effective constituency representatives and this role comes before that of legislator or scrutiniser of the executive.

- If a candidate refers to only one means by which the President can overcome restraints, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded
- If no examples/evidence are included, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1 [1]; AO2 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of why TDs spend so much time in their constituencies and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of why TDs spend so much time in their constituencies but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant general or irrelevant material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

AO1 [3]; AO2 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of why TDs spend so much time in their constituencies but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question. The response contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 4 ([7]–[8])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [4]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of why TDs spend so much time in their constituencies and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 5 ([9]–[10])

AO1 [5]; AO2 [5]

The candidate demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of why TDs spend so much time in their constituencies and deploys this to produce an exemplary response to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). [10]

10

4 Background

There are some obvious contrasts between the Lords and Seanad in terms of size and in terms of how the chamber is determined. There is no elected element to the Lords but there is to the Seanad. The idea that both Houses somehow be reflective of the make-up of their respective societies is not supported by the evidence of their composition. In terms of functions there are some considerable similarities with both chambers having legislative, scrutiny and recruitment and legitimation functions. The contrast comes in the exercise of these powers. In spite of a number of prominent exceptions, the Lords is a much more active chamber when it comes to legislation and scrutiny of the executive. Governments of both complexions have suffered at the hands of an assertive House of Lords. By contrast, the Seanad's record on legislation and scrutiny is a very poor one.

Weaker answers will tend to be unbalanced and offer a limited range of evidence. Stronger answers will both compare and contrast and will have greater evidence.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence/examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who produces a one sided/unbalanced answer with no assessment or evaluation can achieve a maximum of Level 4

- A candidate who refers to only one political system can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [2]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the composition and functions of the Lords and Seanad and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

AO1 [3]; AO2 [5]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the composition and functions of the Lords and Seanad but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [8]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the composition and functions of the Lords and Seanad but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

AO1 [5]; AO2 [11]; AO3 [4]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the composition and functions of the Lords and Seanad and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([21]–[25])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [14]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the composition and functions of the Lords and Seanad and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3). [25]

25

5 (a) Background

The context for this question is the contrast between the single-party governments found in the UK and the coalition governments that have become the norm in the Republic of Ireland. One view is that British governments are strong because, being single-party, they are united. This means they are durable and able to take tough decisions. By contrast, Irish governments are said to be weak because unity is fragile, disagreements common and the collapse of the coalition a regular occurrence. One alternative view is that British governments are themselves coalitions of different factions of the same party with all the difficulties that result from that. Yet another view is that Irish governments, conscious of the consequences of losing power, have proved to be quite resilient.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence/examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who produces a one sided/unbalanced answer with no assessment or evaluation can achieve a maximum of Level 4
- A candidate who refers to only one political system can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [3]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the stability of British and Irish governments and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [6]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the stability of British and Irish governments but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [9]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the stability of British and Irish governments but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1 [7]; AO2 [12]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the stability of British and Irish governments and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

AO1 [8]; AO2 [15]; AO3 [7]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the stability of British and Irish governments and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[30]

30

(b) Background

Scrutiny of the executive is one of the principal functions of the legislature in both the UK and Republic of Ireland. The scrutiny mechanisms in Parliament and the Oireachtas are similar, largely because the Irish system is based upon the Westminster model. It is the view of many that Parliament employs these mechanisms more effectively. The localism that is such a central feature of Irish politics means that TDs prioritise constituency work over engaging in debates, questioning ministers on policy or participating in Dail Committees. The Seanad is little more than a talking shop rather than an effective scrutinising body. An alternative view is that increased executive dominance in the UK has undermined Parliament's power to scrutinise the executive. When a government has a large majority it is able to control Parliament, using a wide range of powers to neutralise the effectiveness of debates, Question Time and Committees.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

- A candidate who fails to refer to any evidence/examples can achieve a maximum of Level 3
- A candidate who produces a one sided/unbalanced answer with no assessment or evaluation can achieve a maximum of Level 4
- A candidate who refers to only one political system can achieve a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1 [2]; AO2 [3]; AO3 [1]

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of scrutiny of the executive in the UK and Republic of Ireland and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited. (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

AO1 [4]; AO2 [6]; AO3 [2]

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of scrutiny of the executive in the UK and Republic of Ireland but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. An argument or explanation is

constructed although communication and structure tend to be narrative or descriptive. There is some use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1 [6]; AO2 [9]; AO3 [3]

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of scrutiny of the executive in the UK and Republic of Ireland but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good.

A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1 [7]; AO2 [12]; AO3 [5]

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of scrutiny of the executive in the UK and Republic of Ireland and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made (AO1). There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached (AO3).

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

AO1 [8]; AO2 [15]; AO3 [7]

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of scrutiny of the executive in the UK and Republic of Ireland and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3).

[30]

30

Total

100