



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2015

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

TUESDAY 26 MAY, AFTERNOON

**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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A

1 Background

One of the biggest debates in American politics today is about the Constitution. As the Source states, the challenge facing the Constitution is providing government which is both strong and accountable. Criticised by both the left and right in America, for entirely different reasons, the Constitution continues to be a political issue. On the one hand, there is the belief that in spite of its flaws the Constitution provides a good framework for government which may be slower than some would like but which is safer. On the other, there are increasing calls for major changes to the Constitution with some on the right wing thinking it needs to be rewritten entirely. Both arguments should be present in better responses and should be utilised to address the core of this question which centres on the extent to which political problems in America today are exacerbated or alleviated by the Constitution. Issues such as overly powerful government as represented through the raft of legislation since 9/11 (much of which, it is alleged, infringes upon civil liberties); the increasingly cumbersome bureaucracy which does not seem able to deal effectively with natural disasters such as hurricane Katrina; or even the battles which Presidents often face when trying to bring in necessary and sometimes even popular legislation. 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.

An answer that contains no evidence/examples cannot be awarded higher than Level 3.

An answer that is totally unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

An answer that makes no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about to what degree the Constitution has created strong but accountable government 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about to what degree the Constitution has created strong but accountable government 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 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about to what degree the Constitution has created strong but accountable government 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 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about to what degree the Constitution has created strong but accountable government 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 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the debate about the extent to which the Constitution has created strong but accountable government 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]

Section A**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

30

Section B

2 Background

The term limited government refers to the belief and, in the American system, the practice, of aiming for government which is effective but also constrained. It is premised on the belief that unrestrained government would lead to an abuse of power. In practice this leads to in-built mechanisms to prevent individual branches of government becoming too powerful which in the American system translates into restrictions on the Executive branch in particular. In a smaller scale it is also used to refer to the belief that government should be limited to the areas where it is absolutely necessary and that governments should be as non-interfering as possible. If a relevant example is not included, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

With the constant pressure of having to seek re-election, the effective performance of their legislative role is a major priority for members of Congress. Congressional members will be extremely active in trying to secure benefits for their area in the time honoured process of “bringing home the bacon.” The strength and power of American Congressional Committees reflects this tendency to be constituency focused whilst at the same time satisfying the American desire for limited government which is more concerned with careful and laborious legislative consideration rather than the quick passage of bills. Candidates can note in particular the strength of certain committees such as the Appropriations Committee or the House Rules Committee when making their responses.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of what impact Congressional committees have on legislation 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 marks; AO2: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of what impact Congressional committees have on legislation 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 marks; AO2: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of what impact Congressional committees have on legislation 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 marks; AO2: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of what impact Congressional committees have on legislation 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 marks; AO2: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of what impact Congressional committees have on legislation 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 nature of the US Constitution and the fact that the US Senate is an elected body both serve to suggest that the US Senate is much more effective at holding the Executive to account than is the case with the Lords and the UK Prime Minister. There are a wide range of Constitutional powers which candidates can refer to in order to strengthen this side of their argument such as the ratification powers possessed by the Senate and the strength of individual Senate Committees such as the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Judiciary Committee. However it would be wrong to totally underestimate the powers and impact of the House of Lords. There is growing evidence of the effectiveness of the Lords in holding the UK Executive to account by opposing legislation – 40% of which then fails to pass – and like the Senate the Lords have recognised expertise in some areas such as European Affairs which UK Executives tend not to ignore. Balanced responses will recognise both of these positions and use them to develop a logical and well evidenced argument.

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. An answer that contains no reference to examples/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

An answer that only compares one form of scrutiny can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 2 marks; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the role of the Senate and House of Lords in holding their respective executives to account 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 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the role of the Senate and House of Lords in holding their respective executives to account 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 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the role of the Senate and House of Lords in holding their respective executives to account 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 marks; AO2: 11 marks; AO3: 4 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the role of the Senate and House of Lords in holding their respective executives to account 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 marks; AO2: 14 marks; AO3: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the role of the Senate and House of Lords in holding their respective executives to account 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

25

5 (a) Background

The debate over the extent to which the UK Prime Minister has become more presidential is a well established one. Those who believe this is the case argue that Cabinet Government has been eroded and the PM not only dominates the executive but Parliament as well. Critics of the view point to extensive evidence that PMs are far from becoming presidential, not least when they have to head up a coalition government.

The argument that US Presidents are increasingly limited in their powers is a less well established one. Supporters argue that the “Imperial Presidency” has passed and the President is now constrained by Congress, by the Supreme Court and assertive state governments. For these reasons, current presidents are less powerful than their predecessors. The alternative view is that the President remains a hugely powerful figure. Constraints on their powers exist but do not amount to a serious weakening.

Candidates will compare and contrast the powers of the PM and President but should seek to address the issues raised in the question.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced. An answer that contains no relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the powers of the Prime Minister and President and whether these are changing 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the powers of the Prime Minister and President and whether these are changing 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 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the powers of the Prime Minister and President and whether these are changing 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 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the powers of the Prime Minister and President and whether these are changing 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 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the powers of the Prime Minister and President and whether these are changing 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

5 (b) Background

One ingredient of a democratic political system is that the legislature should not be a puppet of the executive but should possess a strong degree of independence to act as a scrutiny and legislative body. This theory seems to operate more effectively in the USA, largely because of the stricter application of the principle of separation of powers. The greater power of party in Britain and the fact that the executive is part of the legislature in the UK also contribute to a much greater degree of executive control.

But this is not the complete picture. Executive dominance in the UK is never certain and the Commons has proven repeatedly that the government cannot treat it with contempt. The last decade has been a period of increased parliamentary independence.

It would also be wrong to underestimate the capacity of the executive in the US to manipulate and control the House of Representatives, especially when the same party is in control of both the White House and House of Representatives.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence.

Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

An answer that makes no reference to relevant examples/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of executive control over the legislature in the UK and USA 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of executive control over the legislature in the UK and USA 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).

AVAILABLE MARKS

Level 3 ([13]–[18])**AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of executive control over the legislature in the UK and USA 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 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of executive control over the legislature in the UK and USA 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 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of executive control over the legislature in the UK and USA 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).

[30]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

Section B**70****Option A****100**

Option B: The United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A

1 Background

The economic and political crises of the last number of years have provoked a frenzied debate about how the political institutions in the Republic contributed to the crises and how those institutions need to be reformed to prevent any repetition. One argument is that an entirely new constitution is required rather than mere tinkering with existing structures. The Source suggests that the electoral system, the Oireachtas and the Presidency all have to be transformed in order to rid Ireland of the corruption, localism and cronyism that have blighted society. Further, piecemeal reform will not resolve the problems of the constitution.

The alternative view is that the constitution has successfully adapted to changing circumstances over the past 70 years and is capable of being further updated. A new constitution would mean that the many valuable aspects of the existing document would be lost and with possible catastrophic consequences for the country.

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. An answer that contains no evidence/examples cannot be awarded higher than Level 3.

An answer that is totally unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that makes no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])**AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 1 mark**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether the constitution needs to be replaced 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether the constitution needs to be replaced 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 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether the constitution needs to be replaced 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 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether the constitution needs to be replaced 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 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether the constitution needs to be replaced 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

Section A**30**

Section B

2 Background

The term three line whip is employed in both the British and Irish political systems. It refers to an instruction given by party whips to backbenchers. It is the highest level of instruction and backbenchers are expected to vote in divisions as their party instructs. Three line whips are therefore part of the system of party discipline that is so much a feature of British and Irish politics. Failure to act on a three line whip will usually result in some form of sanction being applied to an MP or TD.

If a relevant example is not included, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

The constitution is the first limit on the Taoiseach's power to appoint Cabinet members, specifying an upper limit on the number of ministers. Second, the norm in Irish politics is one of coalition government. All recent Taoisigh have had to surrender some appointment power to their coalition partner. Third, a Taoiseach has to take account of the factions within their own party, taking care to include potential leadership rivals. Regional representation is another consideration that a Taoiseach has to take into account.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the limits on the Taoiseach's power of cabinet appointment 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 marks; AO2: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the limits on the Taoiseach's power of cabinet appointment 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 marks; AO2: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the limits on the Taoiseach's power of cabinet appointment 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 marks; AO2: 4 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the limits on the Taoiseach's power of cabinet appointment 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 marks; AO2: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of the limits on the Taoiseach's power of cabinet appointment 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

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 tend to be unbalanced and offer a limited range of evidence. Stronger answers will both compare and contrast and will have greater evidence. An answer that contains no reference to examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

An answer that only compares one form of scrutiny can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])**AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 2 marks; AO3: 1 mark**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny records of the Commons and Dail 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 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 2 marks**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the powers of the scrutiny records of the Commons and Dail 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 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the powers of the scrutiny records of the Commons and Dail 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 marks; AO2: 11 marks; AO3: 4 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny records of the Commons and Dail 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 marks; AO2: 14 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny records of the Commons and Dail 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

25

5 (a) Background

This question deals with the representative role of MPs and TDs and the impact this has upon their other functions. It is believed that TDs are obliged to put much more emphasis upon the performance of their representative role than is the case with MPs. There are several reasons for this including the impact of the STV electoral system, the level of intra-party competition and the culture of localism that pervades Irish politics. MPs are not subject to the same pressures and they are, therefore, more likely to put their party before their constituents.

On the other hand, it has to be recognised that party is also very important in Irish politics. Although there are more independents in the Dail than the Commons, most TDs are elected on a party ticket and are expected to remain loyal. MPs cannot ignore their constituents and there is evidence that the representative function of MPs has become more significant in recent years. Having said this, MPs are very much “party animals” and many would argue that they would follow Disraeli’s advice and not only damn their principles but also their constituents in favour of their party.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced. An answer that contains no relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])**AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 1 mark**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the factors influencing MPs and TDs in performing their representative role 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the factors influencing MPs and TDs in performing their representative role 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).

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 3 ([13]–[18])**AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the factors influencing MPs and TDs in performing their representative role 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 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the factors influencing MPs and TDs in performing their representative role 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 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the factors influencing MPs and TDs in performing their representative role 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

5 (b) Background

As the Irish Republic follows the Westminster model, it is not surprising that both systems are, in theory, based upon the principle of Cabinet government. Policy is decided and decisions taken collectively and ministers are bound to those decisions arrived at. There are those who would argue that the position of the cabinet has been eroded in both systems as the powers of the PM and Taoiseach have expanded. It has been suggested that this has gone further in the UK because of the prevalence of coalitions in the Republic in the last quarter century. The Taoiseach who presides over a coalition must involve the cabinet to a much greater extent in order to preserve the

coalition. This effectively limits the tendency to centralise power in the hands of the Taoiseach.

Recent events have led some to suggest that Cabinet government has been strengthened in both systems. The Coalition Government in the UK since 2010 has brought about a new era of collective cabinet decision making. The economic crisis and death of the “Celtic Tiger” has helped to bring about a new type of politics in the Republic, one in which the Taoiseach is no longer able to act in the manner of Ahern or Haughey.

The alternative view is that trend towards the concentration of power in the hands of the PM and Taoiseach is inexorable.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence.

Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

An answer that contains no relevant evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 3 marks; AO3: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of the Cabinet in UK and Irish politics 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about the significance of the Cabinet in UK and Irish politics 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 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about the significance of the Cabinet in UK and Irish politics but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about the significance of the Cabinet in UK and Irish politics 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 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the debate about the significance of the Cabinet in UK and Irish politics 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]

Section B

Option B

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

70

100

100

