



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2016**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

THURSDAY 2 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.

Section A

1 Background

The US Constitution was founded on a number of core principles which reflected the concerns and preoccupations of the Framers. Its aim was to create a closer union between the states, establish justice, provide defence and to ensure liberty. The Founding Fathers were determined that the type of governance it would provide would be limited and that tyranny or abuse of power should be avoided at all costs. Hence the core principles were designed to provide for effective government whilst preventing the accumulation of power in any one section. Four guiding principles are clearly identified as follows; the Separation of Powers, Checks and Balances, Federalism and the aim to achieve limited government. Candidates should be clear about these principles, how the Constitution has enacted them and the extent to which these are still upheld/relevant to US political life. On the one hand, there are those that argue that these principles have been compromised as America has grown; that in spite of checks and balances the US Executive has become more and more powerful; and that the nature and degree of federalism is constantly changing in favour of the Federal government. Some would argue that there is now evidence to suggest these principles are a hindrance to good government. Others would say that the core principles still provide a good blueprint on which to found a political system. In spite of apparent problems, such as gridlock, the principles remain relevant and are a key aspect of American political culture.

Candidates are expected to be able to discuss the key issues in a balanced manner with reference to relevant political evidence and use of key political concepts.

- An answer that makes no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that lacks all balance can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has no evidence 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 debate about the extent to which the principles of the Constitution remain relevant today. 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 principles of the Constitution remain relevant today 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 principles of the Constitution remain relevant today 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 principles of the Constitution remain relevant today 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 principles of the Constitution remain relevant today 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 term 'lame duck', literally meaning a duck which is unable to keep up with the flock and is easy prey for predators, was first used in the context of American politics in the mid-19th century. A 'lame duck President' is one who is either in the last two years of their second term or who is serving the remainder of their term immediately before the inauguration of a new President. It is more commonly used to refer to the former scenario. This period is characterised by difficulty in gaining media attention, difficulty in getting proposals passed and an increase in Congressional resistance. It has been observed that this set in with President Obama's administration both earlier and harder than with previous Presidents.

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

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

Constitutional restraints were put in place to prevent executive dominance and therefore are a cornerstone of the US Constitution. However increasingly Presidents have been able to find ways around these constraints: by using Executive Orders, making Recess Appointments and using pilot projects as a way to get pet programmes off the ground. Candidates are expected to understand the main Constitutional Restraints placed upon the president and the various ways they can navigate this in order to get their own programme completed.

Candidates may legitimately refer to other mechanisms and tactics employed by the President to overcome restraints. If only one mechanism is referred to, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. An answer that contains no evidence 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 how Presidents can overcome constitutional restraints and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 2 marks

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

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of how Presidents can overcome constitutional restraints but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt

at answering the question. The response contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 4 ([7]–[8])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 4 marks

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

Level 5 ([9]–[10])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 5 marks

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

[10]

10

4 Background

Conventional wisdom would hold that Congressional Representatives have much greater powers of scrutiny than their British counterparts. The strength of congressional committees, the robust powers given to them by the Constitution, the weaker party discipline and the US culture of limited government all combine to give Representatives much greater scrutiny power. On the other hand, the UK has a range of powers not available in the US such as PMQs, face to face challenges in the House of Commons and debates. UK Select Committees which have also seen their power and prestige enhanced in recent years, though lack the subpoena or investigative powers of House Committees.

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

- If only one method of scrutiny is referred to, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
- An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that contains no relevant evidence 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 scrutiny powers of the House of Commons and House of Representatives 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 scrutiny powers of the House of Commons and House of Representatives 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 scrutiny powers of the House of Commons and House of Representatives but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([16]–[20])**AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 11 marks; AO3: 4 marks**

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

Level 5 ([21]–[25])**AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 14 marks; AO3: 5 marks**

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of the House of Commons and House of Representatives 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

Both the President and Prime Minister have a number of powers and corresponding limitations on those powers. The President's powers are granted by the Constitution and there have been claims that over the years the Presidency has become more 'imperial' as a result of the executive accruing power during the late twentieth century. On the other hand, there are a number of significant restrictions on the powers which a President exercises. They can at best persuade members of Congress to support their proposals and the system of checks and balances allows both Congress and the Supreme Court considerable ability to interfere with the President's domestic role. By comparison the Prime Minister's powers are greatly enhanced by the fact that, as leader of the biggest party in the House of Commons, the PM can virtually guarantee legislative compliance. Control of the parliamentary timetable and high levels of party discipline, even within the committee system, add considerably to the power of the PM. In recent years the UK executive has been described by some as "Presidential" which is a reference to the ability of the UK PM to exercise control over their cabinet colleagues. However, in terms of the actual operation of power in the two systems it is clear that this term is somewhat of a misnomer as in fact the Prime Minister has much more power on a day to day basis.

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

- A totally unbalanced response can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that contains no evidence 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 similarities and differences between the US President and the UK Prime Minister and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

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

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks

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

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

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

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

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

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

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

(b) Background

The conventional wisdom holds that the US executive is more easily resisted by its legislature than is the case in the UK. There are numerous reasons for this, such as the separation of powers and checks and balances, the tradition of less stringent party loyalty and the powerful committees in the US system. Conversely, the UK executive has been accused of being

too powerful and almost an 'elective dictatorship'. However, there are still occasions when the US Congress finds it difficult to resist a President, for example during an international crisis or if the President makes a direct appeal to the US public for support. Likewise, it is not impossible for both the House of Commons and the House of Lords to resist executive control. The increase in the number of backbench rebellions and the government's willingness to do U-turns on unpopular policies give us an indication of this. The House of Lords has proven to be a formidable defender of citizens' rights and has attempted to stop executive legislation on a number of occasions, not all of which result in the legislation getting through as the Parliament Act isn't always invoked. In addition the dominance of the UK executive is very much affected by the political environment, size of majority and state of the economy and no government ever has complete control over the legislature.

Weaker answers will lack balance and have limited concrete evidence. Stronger answers will have more evidence and have greater balance.

- A totally unbalanced response can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that contains no evidence 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 ability of Congress and Parliament to resist their respective executives 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 Congress and Parliament to resist their respective executives 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 Congress and Parliament to resist their respective executives 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 ability of Congress and Parliament to resist their respective executives 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 Congress and Parliament to resist their respective executives 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

Section A

1 Background

The view in the Source is broadly in line with many of the reviews of the Irish constitution that have taken place over the past two decades. These reviews have been broadly positive, identifying that some reform is necessary but also arguing that much necessary constitutional change has taken place. The reviews have concluded that the fundamental principles of the constitution are still appropriate today. They have also concluded that the reform of the constitution, through referenda and judicial review, has helped to update the constitution and maintain its relevance. This view, with supporting evidence, should form half of an answer. The other half should consist of the view that the constitution is not fundamentally sound and has not served the Irish people well because it has failed to keep pace with the changes in Irish society. Candidates may refer to the abortion issue, the constitution's position on women and the family, the persistence of an overtly Christian and Catholic ethos, the difficulties in changing the constitution. Other relevant evidence is also admissible.

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 reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that lacks all balance can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has no evidence 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 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

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

2 Background

Collective responsibility is a guiding principle of government in both the Republic of Ireland and the UK and candidates may answer it from either perspective or both. The principle states that all members of the cabinet (and junior ministers as well) are free to disagree over policy when it is being determined in cabinet. However, once the policy has been agreed upon a minister must publicly endorse it or resign. The principle also includes the notion of the confidentiality of Cabinet discussions.

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

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

The mechanisms available to the Dail in its scrutiny of the executive are very similar to those of the Commons. TDs can ask questions, both written and oral, of individual ministers and the Taoiseach. TDs can debate the operation of government policy using several mechanisms. In conjunction with Senators, TDs take part in joint committees of the Oireachtas, scrutinising both legislation and ministerial actions. Outside the Dail, TDs can employ the media to hold the government to account. Members of the governing party also have the opportunity of using party meetings to scrutinise their frontbench colleagues.

If only one mechanism is referred to, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. An answer that contains no evidence 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 how TDs can 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 TDs can 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 TDs can 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 TDs can 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 TDs can 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 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.

The suggestion that MPs are even more deserving than TDs of the description of ‘lobby fodder’ 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.

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

- An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that has only one area of comparison can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that contains no relevant evidence 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 powers of MPs and TDs to determine legislation and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

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

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

Level 3 ([11]–[15])**AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 8 marks; AO3: 3 marks**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the powers of MPs and TDs to determine legislation 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 powers of MPs and TDs to determine legislation 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 powers of MPs and TDs to determine legislation 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]

5 (a) Background

Ireland is now well into the second generation of political leaders for whom coalition government is the norm. This is a result of the weakening of support for the two major parties in the Republic, the wavering strength of Labour and the rise of other parties, especially Sinn Fein. Following the events of the last ten years the shape of Irish politics has become even more complicated and there is every prospect that this will continue into the future, under the STV method of election.

The First Past the Post electoral system in the UK delivered single party government and two dominant parties on a regular basis until 2010. Even in the absence of electoral reform, the UK is developing a more complicated party structure as support for the two main parties continues to decline. One view is that the UK is moving towards a much more multi-party system, with coalition government becoming much more common. The alternative interpretation is that the factors that make the British system a two dominant party polity remain unchanged.

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

- A totally unbalanced response can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that contains no evidence 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 party structures of the UK and Republic of Ireland and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[30]

30

(b) Background

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

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

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

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

- A totally unbalanced response can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that contains no evidence 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 Prime Ministers in the UK and Republic of Ireland and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

AO1: 6 marks; AO2: 9 marks; AO3: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about the powers of Prime Ministers in the UK and Republic of Ireland but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and

evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

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

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

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

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

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

Section B

Option B

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

70

100

100