



ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2017

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

THURSDAY 8 JUNE, 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

The Founding Fathers took care when writing the Constitution to include a formal method of amendment as they realised that it would need to change over time to suit a variety of social and economic changes. In addition, the ability of the Supreme Court to informally amend the Constitution using the power of judicial review has greatly enhanced the flexibility of the Constitution and has arguably provided the most effective way of allowing the Constitution to remain a living and relevant document. In spite of this, there remain some persistent problems caused by the Constitution. The source refers to the rigid nature of the formal amendment process yet the use of judicial review and other methods of informal amendment have arguably allowed the Constitution to remain flexible. There have been claims that in some cases it can be too flexible, e.g. in the case of executive power with Presidents increasingly using Executive Agreements, Recess Appointments and Legislative Riders as a way of getting around constitutional restraints.

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 makes no use of the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that makes no reference to 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 debate about the extent to which the Constitution can be considered flexible 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 the extent to which the Constitution can be considered flexible 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 the extent to which the Constitution can be considered flexible 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 the extent to which the Constitution can be considered flexible 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 can be considered flexible 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS**2 Background**

The term 'Presidential Veto' refers to the Presidential power to outright refuse to sign and thereby reject any legislation they are opposed to. This is one of the checks and balances built into the US political system and is designed to give the president an additional legislative power in a system which makes it difficult for the executive's legislative programme to pass. However, the term itself does not feature in the Constitution instead it is implied by the regulations laid down in Article One for passing legislation. The president can have his veto overturned by Congress but this requires a two-thirds majority which can be difficult to achieve. Presidents will let it be known that they intend to veto bills in order to get alterations they want made to legislation before it reaches them. The ideal situation for a President is what is called a "pocket veto" which is a veto by default and can only happen if a bill is presented for approval within ten days of the end of a congressional session thereby allowing a President to veto the bill by taking no action at all. For a brief period Presidents enjoyed an additional veto power called 'the line item veto'. However, this was removed after a Supreme Court ruling in 1998. Presidents had repeatedly called for this and Clinton had briefly gained this ability to veto sections of a bill rather than the whole thing by the 1996 Line Item Veto Act. Candidates should give a clear explanation of the meaning of the term with an appropriate example in order to access the full available.

If no relevant example is included, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

One of the core principles of the US Constitution is the need for checks and balances in order to prevent dominance by one branch over the others. This is reflected in the variety of methods for scrutiny which are granted to the legislative branch by the Constitution and those which have grown by convention in the years since the Constitution was written. The main mechanism for scrutiny is undoubtedly the powerful Congressional Committees which in both the Senate and the Representatives carry a lot of weight have real powers and the resources to produce damaging and far reaching reports. Presidents ignore these committees at their peril and they need to be taken seriously. In addition each legislative branch has specific powers of oversight with the ultimate threat being the ability to start the impeachment process.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of how Members of Congress scrutinise the Executive 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 how Members of Congress scrutinise the Executive 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 how Members of Congress scrutinise the Executive 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 how Members of Congress scrutinise the Executive 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 how Members of Congress scrutinise the Executive 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 standard traditional view is that Congressional members are much better in carrying out their representative role than their UK counterparts. This view is based on a number of observations; the need for Congressional members to keep their constituency happy is paramount as there is less emphasis on party based voting. Getting re-elected in particular relies on doing the right thing for your constituency. There is similarly slightly less emphasis on party within Congress which results in individual Congressional members being less bound by the whip and therefore more prepared to vote along constituency based lines rather than simply follow party guide lines as happens in the UK. Congressional members have a good track record of providing for their constituencies with pork-barrel legislation, getting riders on executive bills in order to support them and log-rolling. All of these practices point to a strong representative function however, some argue, there is evidence that the US parties are requiring more and more adherence to the whip and it is inaccurate to say that there is little party based voting. Likewise with much bigger constituencies to represent than is the case in the UK the point could be made that it would be impossible to represent their constituents fully and increasingly there are claims that there is a large section of the US electorate who feels totally unrepresented and alienated by the political system and this is reflected in poor voter turnout. The traditional view of MPs is that they are largely party animals and do what the whip tells

them, making constituency representation a poor third on their list of priorities. However, it is clear that MPs make the most of opportunities to raise constituency matters during adjournment and other debates and continue to bring forward Private Members Bills many of which have been stimulated by an issue raised by a constituent. Similarly the size of constituency in the UK is much smaller and arguably easier to represent. It is important in answering this question that candidates can take into account all of these issues and use them to present a balanced response.

- An answer that makes no reference to any evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

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.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Members of Parliament and Members of Congress carry out 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 ([6]–[10])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the role of extent to which Members of Parliament and members of Congress carry out 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).

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Members of Parliament and Members of Congress carry out 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 extent to which Members of Parliament and Members of Congress carry out 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 ([21]–[25])

AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 14 marks; AO3: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the extent to which Members of Parliament and Members of Congress carry out 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).

[25]

25

5 (a) Background

It is a commonly held belief that the UK Prime Minister is able to both dominate and totally control and ignore their cabinet colleagues. Dominant PMs such as Thatcher and Blair are cited as examples of an over-bearing PM style described very often as presidential. Equally there is a tendency to regard the US President as able to totally ignore their cabinet and to side-track it in favour of the use of the White House Staff and high profile special advisers. In both systems, however, relationships within the Executive branch are rather more complex than this suggests and are as much to do with political circumstance, style of leadership and size of their relevant majorities. It is clear that not all UK PMs ignore or indeed side-track their cabinet colleagues and those that do often find themselves in a dangerously isolated, if not politically perilous, position. Likewise, US Presidents can and do rely heavily on good Secretaries of State and in spite of the lack of collective responsibility can formulate good working relationships with their cabinet colleagues.

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 evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that has no balance 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 ability of UK Prime Ministers and US Presidents to ignore their cabinets 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 ability of UK Prime Ministers and US Presidents to ignore their cabinets 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 ability of UK Prime Ministers and US Presidents to ignore their cabinets 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).

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 ability of UK Prime Ministers and US Presidents to ignore their cabinets 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 ability of UK Prime Ministers and US Presidents to ignore their cabinets 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

The conventional view of MPs as legislators concentrates on the problem of executive dominance. The high prevalence of party based voting, strict party discipline and in-built government majority both on the floor of the Commons and in Public Bill committees leaves little room for individual MPs to radically derail a government bill. Other parliamentary mechanisms such as executive control of the timetable and the ability to use a guillotine motion only makes the situation worse. On the other hand, it is possible for MPs to introduce Private Members Bills and despite a relatively low success rate, some very important legislative changes have been initiated using this mechanism. There is also a noticeable increase in backbench rebellions and in recent years a number of government bills have been altered or halted after it became clear that there was a high level of dissent amongst MPs and the likelihood of a challenging result for the government. The US system has a very different approach with the president really only having the power of persuasion when passing legislation and individual Members of Congress having much more power to get their legislation enacted. The powerful Congressional committees which see bills emerge from the committee stage unrecognizable and provide opportunities for Congressional members to add pet projects or find ways to include amendments which would help their constituents. If a group of Congressional members can come together on a project they are even more likely to be successful. However, the existence of the presidential veto and the powerful behind the scenes bargaining which takes place between the Executive Office with key committee members

does give the president some leverage and it can be argued that the great legislative power is used to amend legislation but not necessarily to create their own bills.

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 evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that has no balance 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 legislative powers of both MPs and Members of Congress 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 legislative powers of MPs and Members of Congress 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 legislative powers of MPs and Members of Congress 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).

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 legislative powers of MPs and Members of Congress 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 legislative powers of MPs and Members of Congress 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 A****AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

70

100

Option B: The United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Section A

1 Background

The Source was written before the referenda on same-sex marriage took place. The yes vote in favour of same-sex marriage can be interpreted as yet further evidence of how the constitution can and has evolved to meet the needs of Ireland in the 21st century. Indeed, the constitution is almost unrecognisable as that passed in 1937, having been fundamentally altered by referendum and by judicial review. The Catholic and nationalist elements of the 1937 constitution have been stripped away as Bunreacht na hEireann has been changed in response to a changing Irish society.

Critics of the constitution challenge this judgement and argue that it fails to meet the needs of Ireland today. The Source refers to how the constitution continues to regard the traditional nuclear family as the norm, in spite of the fact that so many Irish people no longer live in this type of family. The thorny issue of abortion has still not been satisfactorily resolved. The constitution still upholds an antiquated view of women. Critics also argue that the constitution continues to produce a type of politics in which parochialism thrives and governments are not effectively held to account.

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 makes no use of the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that makes no reference to 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 debate about whether the constitution has kept pace with the changes in Irish society 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 has kept pace with the changes in Irish society 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 has kept pace with the changes in Irish society 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 has kept pace with the changes in Irish society 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 has kept pace with the changes in Irish society 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

Candidates may answer this question from an Irish or British perspective or both. Answers should detail how a backbench revolt is when MPs, who are not members of the leadership team within their party, reject the instructions of party whips. This can take the form of abstaining from voting as their party dictates or even voting contrary to the party's wishes. Such revolts can occur within the governing and the opposition parties. For an MP to do this they must profoundly disagree with their party's position.

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

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

The Irish Seanad has been attacked in many ways. First, its composition is far from democratic and the government in the Dail invariably has a majority in the Seanad. Many of those in the Seanad are being rewarded for loyalty to their party rather than for their qualities as legislators. In terms of actions, the Seanad has been attacked as a toothless body that fails to either scrutinise the executive's legislation or hold it to account. Its record in both regards is woeful. Critics also point to the remarkably generous payments made to members of the Seanad, suggesting it is very poor value for taxpayers' money.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of criticisms of the 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 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 criticisms of the 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 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 criticisms of the Seanad 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 criticisms of the Seanad 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 criticisms of the Seanad 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 powers available to the PM and the Taoiseach in controlling their cabinets are very similar. 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. This also affected the PM between 2010 and 2015 but no longer does so.

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the control exercised by the PM and the Taoiseach over their cabinet 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 control exercised by the PM and the Taoiseach over their cabinet 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 control exercised by the PM and the Taoiseach over their cabinet 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 control exercised by the PM and the Taoiseach over their cabinet 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 control exercised by the PM and the Taoiseach over their cabinet 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

The trend towards greater executive dominance has led to allegations that legislatures have lost much of their law making function. Rather than making laws, MPs and TDs have been reduced to rubber stamping executive proposals. Most legislation is government legislation and most government legislation passes successfully. However, it could be argued that the multi-party nature of the Dail makes it a more effective legislative body because the executive in the UK is so dominant

The suggestion that MPs are even more lobby fodder than TDs has some substance. Party loyalty and discipline, tight control of legislation by government whips and the careerist ambitions of MPs are three of the reasons why MPs have little impact upon legislation. It could, however, be argued that these factors are just as significant in the case of TDs. What is more, because TDs are preoccupied with constituency work they play even less part in creating, scrutinising and amending legislation. It could be legitimately argued that TDs are less effective legislators than MPs.

It could also be argued that MPs today are significantly less likely to be mere 'lobby fodder' than their predecessors.

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

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 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 legislative records of the Commons and the 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 ([7]–[12])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the legislative records of the Commons and the 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

AVAILABLE MARKS

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 legislative records of the Commons and the 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 ([19]–[24])

AO1: 7 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the legislative records of the Commons and the 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 ([25]–[30])

AO1: 8 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the legislative records of the Commons and the 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).

[30]

30

AVAILABLE
MARKS

5 (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. Critics argue that lack of accountability has contributed to the corruption and cronyism that is so much a feature of Irish politics.

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. A lack of accountability is not just a feature of Irish politics.

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 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 executive scrutiny by the legislature in the UK and 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 marks; AO2: 6 marks; AO3: 2 marks

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of executive scrutiny by the legislature in the UK and 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).

AVAILABLE MARKS

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

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

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

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of executive scrutiny by the legislature in the UK and 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]

Section B**Option B****Total****AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

70

100

100