



**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2019**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AGP11]

THURSDAY 6 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

The main purpose of the mark scheme is to ensure that examinations are marked accurately, consistently and fairly. The mark scheme provides examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. It also sets out the criteria which they should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses.

Assessment objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to:

- AO1** Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and debates.
- AO2** Analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and theories; identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences between the political systems studied.
- AO3** Construct and communicate coherent arguments making use of a range of appropriate political vocabulary.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 17- or 18-year-old which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses 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.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do 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 of a 17- or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for tasks or 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.

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

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 to 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.

For conciseness, quality of written communication is distinguished within levels of response as follows:

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

Level 5: Quality of written communication is of a high standard.

In interpreting these level descriptions, examiners should refer to the more detailed guidance provided below:

Level 1 (Inadequate): The candidate makes only a very limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack any clarity and coherence. There is very little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is consistently unclear.

Level 2 (Limited): The candidate makes only a limited selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. The organisation of material may lack clarity and coherence. There is little use of specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar may be such that intended meaning is not clear in places.

Level 3 (Satisfactory): The candidate makes a reasonable selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with some clarity and coherence. There is some use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently competent to make meaning clear.

Level 4 (Good): The candidate makes a good selection and use of an appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a good standard of clarity and coherence. There is good use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently good standard to make meaning clear.

Level 5 (High Standard): The candidate successfully selects and uses the most appropriate form and style of writing. Relevant material is organised with a high degree of clarity and coherence. There is widespread and accurate use of appropriate specialist vocabulary. Presentation, spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a sufficiently high standard to make meaning clear.

Option A: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the United States of America (USA) and the United Kingdom (UK)

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

Section A: The Government and Politics of the USA

- 1** The term “executive order” refers to a power enjoyed by the President. Executive Orders are issued by United States Presidents and are generally directed towards officers and agencies of the US federal government. Executive orders may have the force of law, if based on the authority derived from statute or the Constitution itself. The ability to make such orders is also based on express or implied Acts of Congress that delegate to the President some degree of discretionary power.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “executive order”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “executive order”. An example may be included to support the response. If no supporting example is given, a maximum of three marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “executive order”. A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: 5 marks)

If no relevant example is given, a maximum of [4] marks can be awarded. Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

5

2 Background

The Source identifies one way in which the Senate can restrict the power of the Executive when it refers to how one of the most powerful committees in the Senate effectively blocked a key proposal of the President by refusing to fund it. The Senate, it is said, controls the purse-strings. Candidates should refer to this power in their response and include another way in which the Senate can act to check the Executive. Other ways can include the blocking of Presidential appointments, refusing to ratify treaties, as part of the legislature, overturning a Presidential veto, acting as the ‘jury’ in the case of Presidential impeachment.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid way with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid way and offers a more developed explanation.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid way and provides a full explanation of a valid way.

If no reference is made to the Source, a maximum of [6] marks can be awarded. If no evidence is provided, a maximum of [8] marks can be awarded.

10

Apply criteria for each valid way. One of the ways identified must come from the Source, the other from own knowledge.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

3 Background

Members of the House of Representatives are obliged to be very active in the performance of their representative role because of the shortness of their elected term in office. It is often said that members of the House are permanently in electioneering mode. The key factor in re-election is the perception of how effective the Representative has been in meeting the needs of their district. Another reason is that Representatives must raise a high proportion of their election funds themselves and they do this within their own district. The 'bring home the bacon' culture of US politics dictates that Representatives have to constantly serve local interests.

If only one reason is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

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

Any other relevant reason.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of why Representatives focus so much 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 includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of why Representatives focus so much 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 irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of why Representatives focus so much on their representative role but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of why Representatives focus so much on their representative role and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of why Representatives focus so much on their representative role and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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. [15]

15

4 Background

The Source identifies the development of the EXOP as one key factor that has increased the power of the President. It is widely accepted that the EXOP has been employed by Presidents since 1939 to extend their powers beyond those set out in the Constitution. At the same time, other formal and informal developments have contributed to a greater concentration of power in the White House and candidates should explain some of these. The growth in Presidential power has been greater under some Presidents than others due to the specific conditions under which they operated and answers may take account of these factors.

The Source also advances the counter-argument. It is assumed that a President whose party has a majority in both Houses will see their powers enhanced but this is not always the case. Similarly, other Presidents have been able to exert Presidential authority in even the most unfavourable circumstances.

Many would take the view that the evidence of gridlock and inertia in the US political system illustrates that the concentration of power in the hands of the White House is less apparent today than thirty or forty years ago.

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 argument and evidence.

An answer that contains no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that contains no evidence 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])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the President

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. There is little analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the President 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. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the President 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. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the President and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the debate about whether power is increasingly concentrated in the hands of the President 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. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

[30]

30

**Section B: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics
of the USA and UK**

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

5 Background

It is widely accepted that the Senate's legislative powers far outweigh those of the Lords and it is anticipated that candidates will explain two ways in which the Senate has greater power. The Senate has equal legislative power to the House whereas the Lords is clearly the legislative inferior to the Commons. The Senate can 'kill' Bills outright as opposed to the "guerrilla tactics" employed by the Lords. Senators have much greater power to amend legislation to enable them to perform their role as state representatives. Senate Committees have much greater power over the nature and prospects of Bills.

If there is no evidence provided, a maximum of [8] marks can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid difference with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid difference and offers a more developed explanation.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid difference and provides a full explanation of the difference.

Apply criteria for each valid way.

(AO1: 2 × 5 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

6 (a) Background

Candidates may choose to begin by explaining that the British system is based on the principle of collective Cabinet Government in contrast to the US system where this principle is absent and the President is the sole elected leader of the Executive. The fact that the PM is not directly elected by the UK electorate and is head of the executive, as a result of being leader of the majority party in the Commons, means that Prime Ministers, of necessity, must govern with their cabinet. This is not the case for the President. The President cannot be replaced by a member of their cabinet, unlike the PM. It is also anticipated that most candidates will observe that the Constitution does not refer to the cabinet, that the President has a free hand in choosing cabinet members, that cabinet meetings are rare and that Presidents often ignore their cabinets altogether. This will allow for effective comparison with the UK.

Candidates should attempt to balance this picture by reference to the argument that the power of the PM over their cabinet has increased over the past 50 years. While recent PMs have been relatively weak, there was a significant shift in power to the PM from the 1960s onwards. This reached its peak during the Thatcher and Blair governments.

An answer that contains no evidence 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])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of the cabinet in the US and UK 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. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. 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.

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the significance of the cabinet in the US and UK 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. 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. 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.

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the significance of the cabinet in the US and UK 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. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. 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.

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the significance of the cabinet in the US and UK and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. 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.

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the significance of the cabinet in the US and UK 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. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. 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. [30]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

(b) Background

One approach to this question may take the form of explaining the scrutiny mechanisms available to Congress and Parliament, with direct comparison of these mechanisms. This approach should be supported with relevant examples. An alternative approach would be to consider how those who devised the US system intended that Congress should be a powerful scrutiny body, checking and even controlling the Executive. By contrast, the UK system had no similar blueprint. Rather it has evolved over the centuries as have the scrutiny powers of Parliament. It is safe to assume, therefore, that Congressional powers of scrutiny are greater than those of Parliament and, on paper, this is the case. The mechanisms available to Congress such as the Committee system, the power of veto and the ability to impeach, are not present or are much weaker in the UK.

On the other hand, Parliament does have a number of scrutiny mechanisms not available to Congress, such as Question Time. The fact that members of the UK Executive sit in Parliament creates the potential for greater scrutiny, unlike the US where the Executive is separate. The UK Executive, unlike the US, depends upon a majority in the Commons and this means it can be defeated in Parliament and its policies frustrated. For these reasons, the level of scrutiny between the two systems may not be as wide as it first appears.

An answer that contains no evidence 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])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of Congress and Parliament 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. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. 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.

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of Congress and Parliament 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. 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. 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.

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of Congress and Parliament 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. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. 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.

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of Congress and Parliament and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. 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.

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the scrutiny powers of Congress and Parliament 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. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. 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.

[30]

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

100

Option B: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom (UK)

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

Section A: The Government and Politics of the Republic of Ireland

1 Background

A “hung Dáil” refers to a situation in which no party has an overall majority in the Lower House of the Oireachtas and the formation of a single-party government is impossible. It is now the norm for the outcome of Irish elections to be a “hung Dáil”, necessitating the formation of a coalition government. The party that has the largest number of seats enters into negotiation with one or more other parties in order to secure a majority. The outcome of the 2016 election meant that the “hung Dáil” resulted in a minority government, with Fine Gael securing the support of independents but still not having an overall majority.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “hung Dáil”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “hung Dáil”. An example may be included to support the response. If no supporting example is given, a maximum of three marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term “hung Dáil”. A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: 5 marks)

If no relevant example is given, a maximum of [4] marks can be awarded. Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

5

2 Background

It has long been recognised that localism and brokerage are central features of Irish political life. TDs are expected to serve their constituents and to be seen to do so. Securing re-election demands that TDs are actively involved in constituency work. The Source states that TDs “prioritise local issues over national”. Should it be necessary, a TD will be expected to vote in the Dáil to protect local infrastructure and services, even if this means defying their own party. TDs are also expected to use their time in the Dáil to secure advantages for their local area, such as hospitals and investment. Brokerage involves acting as an intermediary between state institutions and constituents. TDs are expected to act for constituents on welfare issues, planning appeals and taxation. They are also expected to attend constituents’ funerals.

If no reference is made to the Source, a maximum of [6] marks can be awarded.

If no evidence is provided, a maximum of [8] marks can be awarded.

Any other relevant limitation.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid way with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid way and offers a more developed explanation.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid way and provides a full explanation of the limitation.

Apply criteria for each valid limitation. One of the limitations identified must come from the Source, the other from own knowledge.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately. [10]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

10

3 Background

Any Taoiseach must consider a range of factors when it comes to choosing the members of their cabinet. First, they are constrained by the Irish constitution in terms of numbers and who can be a cabinet member. Second, all recent Irish cabinets have been coalitions and this massively influences what a Taoiseach can do. The Taoiseach must also take into consideration the ideological divisions within their party and ensure that all factions are represented. Other factors influencing the choice of cabinet members are seniority, gender, geography and ethnicity.

If only one factor is identified, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Any other relevant reasons.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the factors affecting the Taoiseach's choice of cabinet members 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. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 2 ([4]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the factors affecting the Taoiseach's choice of cabinet members 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. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 3 ([7]–[9])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the factors affecting the Taoiseach's choice of cabinet members 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.

There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 4 ([10]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the factors affecting the Taoiseach’s choice of cabinet members and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 5 ([13]–[15])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the factors affecting the Taoiseach’s choice of cabinet members 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. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

[15]

15

AVAILABLE
MARKS

4 Background

As an institution, the Dáil is based upon the Westminster Model and consequently, the scrutiny mechanisms available are similar to those in the House of Commons. These mechanisms include Question Time and Written Questions, Dáil Committees, Debates and various forms of opposition from the non-governing parties. Candidates should explain the mechanisms available and then seek to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of each of them.

However, it has often been asserted that the effectiveness of Dáil scrutiny has been undermined by the amount of time that TDs are required to spend in their constituencies and involved in representing their constituents. As a result, scrutiny of the executive is poor because TDs see it as being less important than their primary function. This argument has to be explained and evaluated. Many argue that much legislative and other scrutiny takes place informally, as TDs within the governing parties make their leaders clear on what they will and will not stand for.

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 argument and evidence.

An answer that contains no reference to the Source can be awarded a maximum

of Level 3. An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of Level 3. An answer that is unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of the Dáil as a scrutiny body 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. There is little analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of the Dáil as a scrutiny body 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. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of the Dáil as a scrutiny body 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. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of the Dáil as a scrutiny body and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the effectiveness of the Dáil as a scrutiny body 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. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation

of political information, arguments and explanations. 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. [30]

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

Section B: A Comparative Study of the Government and Politics of the Republic of Ireland and the UK

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

5 Background

One obvious difference between the Seanad and the Lords is that there is, to some extent, an elected element to the former whereas the Lords is an entirely unelected body. A second difference is that members of the Lords are there for life, while Senators periodically lose their positions and have to be re-elected/appointed. A third difference is that some members of the Lords owe their position to heredity while this is not the case with the Seanad.

An answer that contains no evidence can be awarded a maximum of [8] marks.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate identifies a valid difference with little or no development.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid difference and offers a more developed explanation.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid difference and provides a full explanation of the difference.

Apply criteria for each valid similarity/difference.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

6 (a) Background

There was, in the past, a high degree of consensus that the UK Prime Minister had much greater control over their cabinet than their Irish counterpart. The reason for this was the prevalence of coalition governments in the Republic as opposed to the single-party governments in the UK. This consensus was at its height during the premierships of Thatcher and Blair, both of whom seemed to dominate their cabinets. In spite of a brief period of coalition government in the UK, the norm remains one of single party government, which creates the potential for PM dominance.

However, this consensus has broken down in recent years. Recent British PMs have appeared to be prisoners of their cabinets rather than in control of them. Collective Responsibility, in the past a key tool of Prime Ministers in controlling their colleagues, has become something of a joke. Ministers not only openly disagree with the PM but also make their own ambitions abundantly clear. In the Republic of Ireland, Taoisigh continue to struggle with the challenges of coalition and minority governments. However, Irish leaders seem to have found ways to cope with this situation with the result that the contrasts between the two systems are not as clear as they would have been in the past.

An answer that contains no evidence 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])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the degree of control of the Prime Minister and Taoiseach over their cabinets and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. 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.

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the degree of control of the Prime Minister and Taoiseach over their cabinets but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. 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. 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.

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the degree of control of the Prime Minister and Taoiseach over their cabinets but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. 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.

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the degree of control of the Prime Minister and Taoiseach over their cabinets and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. 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.

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the degree of control of the Prime Minister

and Taoiseach over their cabinets and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. 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. [30]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

30

(b) Background

As the Irish political system is based upon the Westminster Model, MPs and TDs have very similar legislative powers. MPs and TDs are members of legislatures in which the principle of parliamentary sovereignty applies and thus 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 introduce their own legislation and seek support for it from colleagues. Another common feature of both systems is that the Executive dominates legislation and this undermines the view that either MPs or TDs are effective legislators.

However, there are significant differences between MPs and TDs. 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. This is the case with scrutiny of government Bills and with the introduction of Private Members Bills. On the other hand, the high levels of party discipline and loyalty that operate in the UK have prevented MPs making full use of their powers. The extraordinary number of independent TDs in the Republic means that they are not similarly tied when it comes to legislation.

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 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])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the legislative role 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. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. 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.

Level 2 ([7]–[12])

The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of the legislative role 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. 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. 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.

Level 3 ([13]–[18])

The candidate demonstrates satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the legislative role 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. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. 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.

Level 4 ([19]–[24])

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the legislative role 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. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. 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.

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the legislative role 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. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. 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.

[30]

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

100