



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2014**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

assessing

Comparative Government

[AQ211]

TUESDAY 20 MAY, 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

The Founding Fathers took care when writing the Constitution to include a formal method of amendment as they realised that it would need to change over time to suit a variety of social and economic changes. In addition, the ability of the Supreme Court to informally amend the Constitution using the power of judicial review has greatly enhanced the flexibility of the Constitution and has arguably provided the most effective way of allowing the Constitution to remain a living and relevant document. In spite of this, there remain some persistent problems caused by the Constitution. The source refers to the continuing debate regarding gun laws; a debate which seems nearly incomprehensible to those outside of America and which highlights one of the downsides of having a written document. There have also been questions raised about the Electoral College method of selecting a president and the argument that the checks and balances have caused the legislature to be often ineffective in terms of output of legislation, while at the same time, not stopping the executive from accruing more power.

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 fails to make reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

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

An answer that contains no evidence/examples beyond the Source 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 Constitution fails to meet the needs of twenty-first century America 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 fails to meet the needs of twenty-first century America 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 fails to meet the needs of twenty-first century America 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 fails to meet the needs of twenty-first century America 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 fails to meet the needs of twenty-first century America 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 'separation of powers' refers to a theory of government which sees power distributed between three branches of government – the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. These branches act both independently and interdependently. In the US political system, this system is described as one of 'shared powers', as each institution is separate but they all share powers through an intricate system of checks and balances. Candidates should give a clear explanation of the meaning of the term with an appropriate example in order to access the full available marks.

One mark will be awarded for a relevant example.

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

The Senate has a key role to play in confirming presidential appointments, as part of the checks and balances built into the US political system. Perhaps the most well-known of these is the Senate's role in confirming Supreme Court justices. The power of the Senate has been clearly illustrated by the many occasions when Presidents have failed to get their first choice appointed due to the rigour of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In addition to this, the Senate also confirms presidential nominees for the US Cabinet. The Senate also plays a role in confirming a range of other judicial nominations for the trial and appeals justices of the federal court and the highest ranking offices in the armed forces. Candidates will be expected to give a detailed account of how the appointment process works, the rationale behind it and to provide a good range of examples to illustrate the points being made.

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

An answer that refers to only **one** way in which the Senate can influence Presidential appointments 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 the Senate influences Presidential appointments 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 the Senate influences Presidential appointments 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 the Senate influences Presidential appointments 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 the Senate influences Presidential appointments 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 the Senate influences Presidential appointments 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

It tends to be assumed that representatives in the United States devote a great deal of time to serving the needs of their constituents and in “bringing home the bacon.” They have much more independence from party and executive control than MPs and this enables them to focus on their constituency role, thus securing their own electoral position. By contrast, MPs owe their election to their party, with the result that they will put party loyalty and interests before that of constituency. An MP who consistently disregards party instructions in the interests of their constituents will pay the price of de-selection. However, MPs cannot simply disregard the interests of their constituents. They are elected to represent an area and are expected to do so to the best of their ability. There is also evidence of MPs being increasingly willing to defy their party and put constituency interests first.

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 is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

An answer that focuses only on one point 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 effectiveness of Congressmen and MPs in representing those that elected them 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 effectiveness of Congressmen and MPs in representing those that elected them 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 effectiveness of Congressmen and MPs in representing those that elected them 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 effectiveness of Congressmen and MPs in representing those that elected them 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 effectiveness of Congressmen and MPs in representing those that elected them and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively (AO1). There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar are excellent throughout. A thoroughly convincing and logical argument is constructed which displays highly effective communication and presentation of ideas. There is precise and wide-ranging use of appropriate political vocabulary and a clear and logical conclusion is reached (AO3). [25]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

25

5 (a) Background

The conventional view of MPs as legislators concentrates on the problem of executive dominance. The high prevalence of party based voting, strict party discipline and in-built government majority both on the floor of the House and in Public Bill committees leaves little room for individual MPs to radically derail a government bill. Other parliamentary mechanisms such as executive control of the timetable and the ability to use a guillotine motion, only makes the situation worse. On the other hand, it is possible for MPs to introduce Private Members Bills and despite a relatively low success rate, some very important legislative changes have been initiated using this mechanism. There is also a noticeable increase in backbench rebellions and in recent years a number of government bills have been altered or halted after it became clear that there was a high level of dissent amongst MPs and the likelihood of a challenging result for the government. The US system has a very different approach with the president really only having the power of persuasion when passing legislation. A much lower rate of party based voting, the frequent instance of the president facing a hostile Congress dominated by the opposing party and the tendency of members of Congress to vote according to constituency needs, all make the situation worse. This frequently leads to gridlock and presidents find it very difficult to get their legislation passed in a form resembling that which they originally intended. However, the existence of the presidential veto and the powerful behind the scenes bargaining which takes place between the Executive Office and key committee members, does give the president some leverage.

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 contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the legislative powers of both MPs and members of Congress and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high

degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

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

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

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

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

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

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

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

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

5 (b) Background

The US Constitution gives executive power solely to the President. By contrast, the UK system is one of collective Cabinet government in which a group of ministers exercise executive power. Answers to this question should make this contrast clear. However, this rather straightforward contrast has become blurred in recent years with the growth of the power of the Prime Minister. It is argued, by some, that Cabinet Government has been undermined by the growing dominance of the PM, who has increasingly come to resemble his US counterpart. Recent Prime Ministers, backed by powerful non-elected advisers, have by-passed the Cabinet, with the result that the Prime Minister is no longer *Primus Inter Pares* but simply “first”. The arrival of Coalition Government in 2010 has caused some to revise this judgement. At the same time, some have pointed out that while the President has executive power, they are often unable to exercise it in the face of a hostile Congress. To this extent the President is not simply first.

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 contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the relative positions of the US President and British 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 relative positions of the US President and British 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 relative positions of the US President and British 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 relative positions of the US President and British 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 relative positions of the US President and British 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]

Section B

Option A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

70

100

Section A

1 Background

The Source highlights a number of areas where, critics allege, the Constitution has failed to protect the rights of all Irish citizens. It is alleged that the rights of women, of those who cohabit rather than marry, of homosexuals and other minority groups have not been upheld by the Constitution. It has also been argued that the Constitution spectacularly failed to protect young people from being abused by clergy and others. Some critics also allege that the Constitution failed to prevent the development of a form of politics that led to the financial crisis of recent years and thus failed to protect the rights of the vast majority of working Irish people.

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. The rights of individuals are recognised and protected and the Constitution has evolved to extend that protection.

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 fails to make reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

An answer that is completely unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4. An answer that contains no evidence/examples beyond the Source 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 Constitution protects individual rights 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 protects individual rights 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 protects individual rights but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided (AO1). There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2). The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary (AO3).

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

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

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about the extent to which the Constitution protects individual rights 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 protects individual rights 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

A cabinet revolt is when a significant number of members of the cabinet mount a challenge to the leadership of the Prime Minister or Taoiseach. As both the UK and Irish systems are based upon the principle of collective cabinet government, a revolt can be an extremely serious matter that can bring down the government or lead to the overthrow of the leader. Revolts are more likely when the government is a coalition and Ireland provides many examples of such challenges; the most recent being when the Greens refused to back Cowen, thus bringing about the collapse of the last Irish government. However, even single party governments can experience revolts, the demise of Thatcher being one such case.

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

(AO1: 5 marks)

[5]

5

3 Background

Critics argue that Question Time fails to meet any of these objectives, other than allowing TDs to represent those who elected them. TDs do use it to hold the executive to account but major issues of national importance are rarely debated. As one commentator noted, Question Time is rarely watched by anyone other than “drunks and insomniacs”.

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

An answer that refers to only **one** criticism of Question Time can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

AO1: 1 mark; AO2: 1 mark

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Question Time and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or no evidence or examples (AO1). There is little analysis of political information, arguments and explanations (AO2).

Level 2 ([3]–[4])

AO1: 2 marks; AO2: 2 marks

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

Level 3 ([5]–[6])

AO1: 3 marks; AO2: 3 marks

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Question Time but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the

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

Level 4 ([7]–[8])

AO1: 4 marks; AO2: 4 marks

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

Level 5 ([9]–[10])

AO1: 5 marks; AO2: 5 marks

The candidate demonstrates precise knowledge and understanding of the criticisms of Question Time 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 principle of Parliamentary Sovereignty operates in both the UK and Republic of Ireland and for this reason legislative power, in theory, lies with MPs and TDs. No Bill can become law without the approval of the Commons and Dail. In practice however, the executive in both systems has increasingly dominated the legislative process and the most Bills are government initiated. One contrast between the two systems is that TDs have been even less involved in making laws because they are more preoccupied with constituency representation than their UK counterparts, a consequence of the STV electoral system.

In recent years government MPs have been more assertive and have shown a degree of independence that has resulted in them being less willing “lobby fodder”.

Governments have had to make concessions to get their Bills approved and have even had legislative proposals defeated. In Ireland, TDs have been criticised for their disinterest in national legislative matters, although there is evidence that there is something of a revival in Dail legislative activity.

Many candidates will address this question by comparing the legislative powers of MPs and TDs and such an approach will be credited.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

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

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the legislative powers 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

or examples (AO1). There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems (AO2). Spelling, punctuation and grammar contain significant errors. An argument or explanation, if present, is ill-informed and poorly constructed. The level of communication and use of political vocabulary are both limited (AO3).

Level 2 ([6]–[10])

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

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the legislative powers 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 ([11]–[15])

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

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the legislative powers 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 ([16]–[20])

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

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the legislative powers 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 ([21]–[25])

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

The candidate demonstrates precise, exhaustive and almost flawless knowledge and understanding of the legislative powers 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). [25]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

25

5 (a) Background

Both the Lords and Seanad have faced constant demands for their abolition on the grounds that they make no significant contribution to their respective political systems. Both are subservient chambers and both lack democratic legitimacy. Their powers are limited and their impact is minimal.

This would seem to be more true of the Seanad than the Lords. Even during the 1980s and 90s it was argued that the Lords was playing an important role in resisting dominant executives. The reform of the Lords seems to have rejuvenated the House and it has played an important role in legislation and in scrutiny. By contrast, the Seanad has continued to be roundly condemned both for its composition and lack of activity.

Answers that compare the composition and powers of the Lords and Seanad will be credited.

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

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

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

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

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

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

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

5 (b) Background

Ireland has been governed continuously by coalition governments for the past 25 years and it would appear that this is likely to continue. The STV system of election and the long-term decline in support for both Fianna Fail and Fine Gael are the main reasons why coalition government has become the norm in the Republic. By contrast, the coalition that resulted from the 2010 General Election in the UK was a rarity. Informal agreements between the party in power and other parties may have operated in the past but formal coalitions, involving two or more parties jointly exercising power, have been very rare outside wartime.

The norm in recent years has therefore been that the Taoiseach has chaired the cabinet and has had to accommodate coalition partners. By contrast, the PM has been able to dominate or run the government as the power of the cabinet has been eroded and the PM's control has increased. Those who challenge this analysis would argue that, even before 2010, the PM had not been able to run the government, in the sense of totally dominating it. The cabinet is alive and well. Prime Ministers have been forced to chair the cabinet rather than run it.

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 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 ability of the Prime Minister and Taoiseach to dominate their governments 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 the Prime Minister and Taoiseach to dominate their governments 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 the Prime Minister and Taoiseach to dominate their governments 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 the Prime Minister and Taoiseach to dominate their governments 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 the Prime Minister and Taoiseach to dominate their governments 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

