



ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2018

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

MONDAY 11 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

One of the primary purposes of those who wrote the US Constitution was to produce a document that would protect the rights of American citizens. This was reinforced by the passage of the Bill of Rights that gave formal expression to this purpose. This objective came out of the sense of oppression felt by those who designed the Constitution and candidates should recognise this. It is anticipated that candidates will detail how the Constitution was designed to protect rights, through its ambiguity and the role it granted to the Supreme Court. Candidates will also describe how it has steadily evolved to extend those rights to women, African Americans and others whose full rights were not guaranteed by the original document.

In providing a balanced response, candidates are most likely to identify ways in which some feel that the Constitution still fails to protect the rights of all. The Source is likely to feature strongly but better answers should go beyond this to identify other areas where the Constitution can be said to have failed. Many Feminists would argue that the Constitution fails to fully protect the rights of women. Controversy continues over the rights of sexual minorities. Many on the left would argue that the Constitution fails to protect the rights of the poorest in American society.

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 reference to the Source – Maximum Level 3
- An answer that contains no balance – Maximum Level 4
- An answer that contains no evidence/examples – Maximum Level 3

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about how far the Constitution protects the rights of all citizens 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 how far the Constitution protects the rights of all citizens 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 how far the Constitution protects the rights of all citizens 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 how far the Constitution protects the rights of all citizens 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 how far the Constitution protects the rights of all citizens 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS**2 Background**

The Electoral College is a mechanism employed in the election of the US President. Those who wrote the Constitution wished to protect state interests and therefore the President is not elected by a headcount of US citizens but by a more complicated method. The candidate that wins a majority in each state wins all the electoral college votes for that state. Each state's number of college votes is based primarily upon its size. The candidate that wins an absolute majority of electoral college votes is duly elected. This can result in a candidate winning a majority of electoral college votes without winning a majority of the popular vote, as was the case in 2016.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

Senate committees have a key role to play in the formulation and passage of legislation. Their powers are so considerable that at any one of many committee stages a bill may be killed off altogether, e.g. if the Chair of the committee does not support the bill it may be pigeon holed and will probably not even go to the full committee for consideration. The role of the Ways and Means Committee and finally the Conference Committee tasked with drafting the very last version of the bill prior to going to the president for approval, are both crucial. In addition, Committees have an important role to play in scrutinising and approving presidential nominations to the judiciary and to executive positions. Committees also have a role in overseeing the actions of government departments and can hold hearings and take evidence. The Senate can also establish select or special committees to examine particular areas of concern.

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

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the roles of Senate Committees 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 roles of Senate Committees 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 roles of Senate Committees 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 roles of Senate Committees 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 roles of Senate Committees 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

As chief executives in their respective systems, the President and Prime Minister have a wide range of appointment powers. In simple numerical terms the President appoints more positions. The President is able to choose from a broader range of candidates in appointing the cabinet as they are not constrained by the same restrictions facing a PM. Both are able to appoint a wide range of officials, diplomats and military leaders. The PM, under the prerogative powers, is able to have a say in appointments that are denied to the President, such as members of the upper house of the legislature. On the other hand, the President can nominate members of the Supreme Court, a power now relinquished by the PM. One key contrast that candidates should note is that Presidential appointments often have to be ratified by Senate, unlike those made by the PM.

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 unbalanced answer can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer with no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the appointment powers of the President and PM 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).

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 2 ([6]–[10])**AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 2 marks**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the appointment powers of the President and PM 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 appointment powers of the President and PM 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 appointment powers of the President and PM 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 appointment powers of the President and PM 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

In theory, the British is a Cabinet Government system, in which power is exercised collectively by a group of leading ministers. By contrast, the US system is a Presidential one, in which the President is unquestionably the chief executive. Candidates should display show some understanding of the theoretical position.

The growing power of the President and PM within their respective political systems is a major theme of political studies in both societies. For some considerable time after the Second World War there was something of a consensus that power in both systems was becoming increasingly concentrated in the hands of the chief executive. This was expressed in the ideas of the “Imperial Presidency” and “Prime Ministerial Government.”

In more recent times, the idea of growing dominance has been undermined. It is now clear that British PMs are seriously constrained by cabinet colleagues, by their party, by coalition government and by “events.” At the same time, Presidents have found their powers, at least domestically, increasingly restricted by opposition within Congress.

On the other hand, the PM and President are still the most powerful individuals within their respective systems. They enjoy a range of formal and informal powers that enable them to exercise considerable control within their system. Candidates should seek to compare the reality of the powers of the PM and President and the constraints on those powers.

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

- An answer that is very one-sided can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

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 President and Prime Minister within American and British political systems 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 President and Prime Minister within American and British political systems 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

AVAILABLE MARKS

(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 President and Prime Minister within American and British political systems 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 President and Prime Minister within American and British political systems 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 President and Prime Minister within American and British political systems 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

(b) Background

This question requires candidates to discuss the extent to which the performance of their representative role is the number one priority of MPs and Members of Congress. The statement in the question suggests that the representative demands upon MPs are less than those on Members of Congress. This would be a widely held position. The reasons given include the contrasts between the two systems in terms of party loyalty and discipline, the frequency of elections, how candidates are funded and popular expectations of what an elected representative should do.

On the other hand, it is often argued that Senators are more likely to be concerned with national issues and not simply focused on the need to seek re-election as is the case with members of the House of Representatives. There is also considerable evidence of the significance of party affiliation on the actions of Members of Congress. The domination of the party has been regarded as a distinctly British feature but this may be too simple a contrast. It could also be argued that the representative role is very important for MPs, especially those who find themselves with only a narrow margin over other parties.

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

- An answer that is very one-sided can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

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 representative role for Members of Congress and MPs 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 significance of the representative role for Members of Congress and MPs 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 significance of the representative role for Members of Congress and MPs 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 significance of the representative role for Members of Congress and MPs 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 significance of the representative role for Members of Congress and MPs 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

One of the most frequently made criticisms of Bunreacht na hÉireann is that the Catholic Church played a pivotal role in its design. As a result, the document is very much a statement of Catholic values. Critics argue that the confessional character of the constitution remains unchanged even though Ireland is no longer a monolithic Catholic society, if it ever was. The Source gives some of the ways in which the constitution expressed Catholic values: language, divorce and the Special Position of the Catholic Church. Other areas were the ban on contraceptives, the role of women, the definition of the family and, of course, abortion. Those critical of the constitution argue that it remains Catholic in tone and in content, especially on abortion.

Those who defend the constitution argue that it has changed massively since the 1960s. Change has occurred through formal amendment and by judicial review. Candidates should detail some of the major ways in which the constitution has changed and some of the areas in which it has remained unchanged.

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 reference to the Source – Maximum Level 3
- An answer that contains no balance – Maximum Level 4
- An answer that contains no evidence/examples – Maximum Level 3

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

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

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

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

Level 4 ([19]–[24])**AO1: 7 marks; AO2: 12 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

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

Level 5 ([25]–[30])**AO1: 8 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks**

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

[30]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

Section A**30**

Section B

AVAILABLE
MARKS**2 Background**

A motion of no confidence can take place in both the Irish and British systems. It occurs when the Commons or Dail is asked to vote on whether the house has confidence in the government or not. The vote can be triggered by a government trying to silence its opponents or by those opponents. If defeated in a motion of no confidence a government is expected to resign and call a general election. More recently, the term has also been applied to internal cabinet moves to overthrow a PM or Taoiseach and candidates may refer to this. Full answers must include the traditional definition of the term.

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

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

Oireachtas committees have been significantly reformed over the past twenty years with a view to making them more powerful and respected oversight bodies. However, critics argue that this objective has not been achieved. Committees do not scrutinise specific government departments and have a diffuse role; they have a poor record of investigating and challenging the government; TDs and Senators have poor attendance records and do not take committee work seriously; governments pay scant regard to committee reports and findings.

Any other relevant criticism.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of criticisms of Oireachtas committees 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 Oireachtas committees 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 Oireachtas committees 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 Oireachtas committees 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 Oireachtas committees 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

4 Background

The defeat of the referendum to abolish the Seanad was not only a surprise but once more focused attention on its value as an institution. Critics argue that the Seanad has very little value as legislative body: it is government dominated, has very constrained legislative powers and has a dismal record in scrutinising and amending government legislation. By contrast, the Lords has played a very significant role in scrutinising and amending Bills, in spite of the restrictions on its powers.

There is, however, some evidence of a Seanad revival, with members being more assertive and active in challenging executive legislation. Irish governments can no longer rely upon a totally passive Seanad. On the other hand, it remains the case that the Lords is very much the less powerful chamber within the British system and, faced with a strong and determined government, its options are limited.

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

- An unbalanced answer can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer with no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

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

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

Level 2 ([6]–[10])**AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 5 marks; AO3: 2 marks**

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the legislative records of the Lords and Seanad but there are major gaps in this

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

Level 3 ([11]–[15])

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

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

Level 4 ([16]–[20])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 11 marks; AO3: 4 marks

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

Level 5 ([21]–[25])

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

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

25

5 (a) Background

As both the UK and Irish systems of government are based upon the Westminster Model it is clear that there will be many similarities in the powers and roles of the British Prime Minister and Irish Taoiseach. The main differences arise because of the tendency of Irish governments in the past twenty years to be coalitions. This reality weakens the position of the Taoiseach in terms of appointment and Cabinet control. The effect of this has been to make recent Irish leaders more “chairmen” rather than “chiefs.” Without the limitations of coalition, British PMs have had much greater ability to dominate their cabinet, as exemplified by Thatcher and Blair.

This standard view has been challenged in recent years by the apparently weaker PMs such as Brown, Cameron and, perhaps, May. The reasons for the inability of recent PMs to dominate their cabinets will likely form a significant part of answers to the question. Candidates should balance this with consideration of the issues facing Irish leaders in recent years. It is notable that, in spite of his problems in controlling cabinet, Enda Kenny survived longer than David Cameron.

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

- An answer that is very one-sided can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the power of the PM and Taoiseach to dominate 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 ([7]–[12])

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

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the power of the PM and Taoiseach to dominate their cabinet and 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 power of the PM and Taoiseach to dominate their cabinet and 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 power of the PM and Taoiseach to dominate 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 ([25]–[30])**AO1: 8 marks; AO2: 15 marks; AO3: 7 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the power of the PM and Taoiseach to dominate 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). [30]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

(b) Background

The significance of localism and brokerage in Irish politics have long been recognised and this forms part of the context of this question. The representative function of TDs has traditionally been regarded as their most important, with the roles of legislator and scrutineer being seen as secondary. TDs secured their position largely on the basis of their record as local representatives. By contrast, MPs largely achieved and retained their positions on the basis of party affiliation. This gave them the freedom to concentrate more on what the question terms as national issues.

However, it has been suggested that some (but not all) TDs are now taking a greater interest in national issues since the collapse of the 'Celtic Tiger.' Irish citizens now expect their TDs to hold their government to account, given that their failure to do so in the past had such dire consequences for so many. On the other hand, MPs cannot neglect their constituency duties and hope to be reselected by their local association. MPs who have slim majorities will most certainly have to pay close attention to their representative role.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence.

Stronger answers will have more evidence and be better balanced.

- An answer that is very one-sided can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

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 representative function of MPs and TDs 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 significance of the representative function of MPs and TDs 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 significance of the representative function of MPs and TDs 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 significance of the representative function of MPs and TDs 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 significance of the representative function of MPs and TDs 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