



Rewarding Learning

ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
January 2014

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

assessing

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

MONDAY 13 JANUARY, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

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

Quality of candidates' responses

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

Flexibility in marking

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

Positive marking

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

Types of mark schemes

Mark Schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication. These questions are indicated on the cover of the examination paper. Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of Response

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

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

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

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

Quality of Written Communication

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

Section A

1 Background

One of the primary purposes of those who wrote the US Constitution was to produce a document that would prevent tyranny and guarantee citizens rights. The political structure of the institutions with an intricate set of checks and balances reflects this desire. Numerous amendments were added to guarantee citizens rights, specifically the Bill of Rights. In the 19th century, later amendments were added to guarantee the rights of former slaves, the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments were all directed to this purpose. Further amendments were added in the 20th century to improve citizen's rights in other areas such as women's voting rights. Alongside this, runs the concurrent and constant updating of the Constitution by the Supreme Court and its power of judicial review and the use of legislation to try to achieve freedom and equality for all.

On the other hand, critics would challenge the idea that the Constitution has provided freedom and equality for all. They would claim that in spite of numerous legal attempts to improve equality across a range of different groups there still remains a disparity in the treatment and living conditions of various groups. This applies not only in terms of African-Americans but also for other minority groups. In the post-9/11 atmosphere, a case could be made that the number of groups who remain unprotected by the Constitution has increased, due to a raft of anti-terrorist legislation.

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

An answer that makes no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that contains no relevant evidence beyond the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is totally unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

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

[30]

30

Section A

30

Section B

2 Background

The term 'judicial review' refers to the power of a higher court to declare laws and actions of government to be unconstitutional. This power exists in both the US and UK systems and candidates can use examples from either to illustrate and explain this concept. It is expected that candidates will be able to clearly define the term, explain fully how this aids democracy and give an example of an actual judicial review case.

[1] for a relevant example.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

Constituency work is vital for members of Congress. Both House and Senate members place a high premium on representing their constituents. The Constitution requires them to be residents of the state they represent and in some states, House members must reside in the district they represent – the locality rule. House members facing re-election every two years are well aware of the need to please their constituents, as a number have lost their seats for failing to do so, e.g. Senator Elizabeth Dole lost her re-election bid in 2008 for paying too few visits to the state and being out of touch with the voters of North Carolina. As a result, members of Congress use a wide range of methods to find out their constituents' views and to try to bring as many benefits to their constituency as possible.

An answer that refers to only one possible reason can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. 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 why Congressional members spend so much time on constituency work 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 why Congressional members spend so much time on constituency work 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 why Congressional members spend so much time on constituency work 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 why Congressional members spend so much time on constituency work 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 why Congressional members spend so much time on constituency work 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 and the culture of limited government all add to this view. On the other hand, the UK has a range of powers not available in the US such as PMQ's, face to face challenges in the House of Commons, debates and of course, the select committees which have had their power and prestige enhanced in recent years.

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

An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that has only one area of contrast 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).

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

The US President is supported by a highly developed and formalised system of advisers that is rightly seen as at the heart of government in the United States. Candidates should identify this system. These advisers are enormously significant figures and, in the opinion of some, are more powerful than cabinet members. The Chief of Staff has, in particular, become a pivotal position within the White House. The British system is much less developed and formalised and the Prime Minister is advised by many fewer individuals than the President. To this extent, it is true that advisers are more powerful in the US than in the UK. However, there is little question that the UK has been catching the US up in the past twenty years as advisers have played a more significant role. Alastair Campbell (and his fictional representation in Malcolm Tucker) is seen to typify the new breed of advisers, wielding more power than cabinet ministers. It could be argued that, given the informal nature of the British constitution, there is greater potential for advisers to exercise power.

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

An answer that contains no reference to examples/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is totally unbalanced/one-sided can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the role of Presidential and Prime Ministerial advisers 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 role of Presidential and Prime Ministerial advisers 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 role of Presidential and Prime Ministerial advisers 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 role of Presidential and Prime Ministerial advisers 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 role of Presidential and Prime Ministerial advisers 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

Both the President and Prime Minister have a number of powers and corresponding limitations on these 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 a 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 executive 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.

An answer that contains no reference to examples/evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is totally unbalanced/one-sided can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

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

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the powers of the President and the 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 powers of the President and Prime Minister but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and

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

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

AO1: 7 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 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 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 a 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

Section B

70

Option A

100

Section A

1 Background

The Source highlights a number of areas where, critics allege, the constitution has clearly failed to adapt to a changed Irish society. It is argued that the role of women proscribed, is no longer in line with the reality of the 20th, never mind 21st century. Similarly, the idea that a family can only legitimately be based upon marriage, is totally at odds with the practice of many younger Irish people. In these ways, and in other key respects, such as the abortion ban and the confessional language, the constitution has failed to adapt to modern Irish society.

The alternative view is that the constitution has been and is being constantly updated through the mechanisms of referendum and judicial review. The constitution is unrecognisable as the document introduced by de Valera. Major changes in society are reflected in the constitution and have been facilitated by it.

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 contains no relevant evidence beyond the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is totally unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

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

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

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

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

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

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

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

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

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

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

[30]

30

Section A

30

Section B

2 Background

A vote of confidence is a feature of parliamentary democracies such as the UK and the Republic of Ireland. It involves the Commons or the Dail voting on the issue of whether it does or does not have confidence in the Government. If a majority vote that they do not have confidence, the Government is expected to resign. A vote of confidence may be instigated by the Opposition as a way of holding the Government to account, or even in the hope of bringing the Government down. The Government may, itself, initiate a vote of confidence as a way of silencing opponents within its own party, as John Major did when Prime Minister.

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

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

TDs can perform their representative role both inside and outside the Dail. Inside they can ask questions, participate in debates, vote on Bills or introduce Private Members Bills. Outside the Dail they can hold surgeries, communicate with officials, use the media to highlight constituent concerns and, in a wide variety of other ways, represent those they hope will re-elect them. A large part of the TD's time is therefore spent on constituency work. The reason for this is that, under the STV system of Proportional Representation, TDs are in a battle for survival with both party colleagues and opposition TDs. This electoral system also allows the independent local representative to be elected. Localism and brokerage are also key elements of Irish political culture. For these reasons, TDs must be seen to be active and effective representatives.

An answer that refers to only one possible reason can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. 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 why TDs spend so much time on their representative role and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or 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 why TDs spend so much time on their representative role but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant 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 why TDs spend so much time on their representative role 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 why TDs spend so much time on their representative role 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 why TDs spend so much time on their representative role 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 head of their respective executives, the Prime Minister and Taoiseach enjoy a range of appointment powers. As the UK constitution is an informal one, the powers of the PM are the result of convention and custom, but are clearly defined for all that. The powers of the Taoiseach are set out in Bunreacht na hEireann. There are considerable similarities between the powers of the two leaders to appoint cabinet members, junior ministers and a range of other official posts. The PM exercises the patronage powers of the Monarch and this gives him or her more appointment power than the Taoiseach. The scale of the UK executive compared to the Irish also results in Prime Ministers making many more appointment decisions.

Until 2010 it would have been an important difference that the PM had sole control over who became a minister, in contrast to the situation in Ireland. This is, of course, no longer the case.

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

An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that has only one area of contrast 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 PM and Taoiseach 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 appointment powers of the PM and Taoiseach 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 PM and Taoiseach 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 PM and Taoiseach 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 PM and Taoiseach 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

Scrutiny of the executive is one of the principal functions of the legislature in both the UK and Republic of Ireland and committees are one of the principal scrutiny devices. In the UK, the two Houses have their own committees while the Dail has a number of joint committees made up of both members of the Dail and the Seanad. While Public Bill Committees in the UK have often justifiably been condemned for their inadequate scrutiny of legislation, Select Committees have been regarded positively, in spite of their limited powers.

In Ireland, Dail Committees have been judged to be largely ineffective in spite of them having considerable powers. It is a case of committees failing to make use of powers and TDs not taking committee work seriously. This may be a result of TDs putting their constituency role before their work in the Dail.

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

An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is totally one-sided or unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

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

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the record of committees in the Commons and Dail 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).

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

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

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

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

[30]

30

(b) Background

MPs and TDs have very similar legislative powers. As members of the legislature in political systems in which the principle of parliamentary sovereignty applies, MPs and TDs have the power to decide what does or does not become law. Both are involved in legislative scrutiny of executive Bills and have the power to amend and vote against them. Both can, in theory, introduce their own legislation and seek support for it from colleagues. The similarities are considerable.

In practice, the higher levels of brokerage and localism that operate in the Irish Republic have meant that TDs have often failed to make use of their powers and are seen as less effective legislators. However, the high levels of party discipline and loyalty that operate in the UK have prevented MPs making full use of their powers. The contrasts between TDs and MPs may not be that great at all.

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

An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is totally one-sided or unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the legislative roles 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 legislative roles 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 legislative roles 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 legislative roles 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 legislative roles 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]	30
Section B	70
Option B	100
Total	100