



ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2022

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AGP11]

WEDNESDAY 25 MAY, 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.

COVID-19 Context

Given the unprecedented circumstances presented by the COVID-19 public health crisis, senior examiners, under the instruction of CCEA awarding organisation, are required to train assistant examiners to apply the mark scheme in case of disrupted learning and lost teaching time. The interpretation and intended application of the mark scheme for this examination series will be communicated through the standardising meeting by the Chief or Principal Examiner and will be monitored through the supervision period. This paragraph will apply to examination series in 2021–2022 only.

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 impeachment refers to what is perhaps the ultimate check and balance within the US system. It is the power of Congress to level charges against officers of the federal government, including the president. There are several grounds for impeachment including “treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors.” Both the House and Senate are involved in the process with the latter having the power to try and convict but only by a two-thirds majority. Few successful impeachments have occurred but the threat itself can have a significant effect. Candidates may refer to impeachment in other systems but the main focus should be upon the USA.

Level 1 ([1])

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

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “impeachment”. 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 “impeachment”. A relevant example will be used to support the response.
(AO1: 5 marks) If no example is given, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

2 Background

The Source identifies that the Presidential Veto is one way in which Congressional checks can be overcome. A president may refuse to sign a Bill or may employ a pocket veto. Candidates should explain what the veto process is and should seek to identify and explain another way in which a president can frustrate Congressional intentions. These include Executive Orders, Executive Agreements, Signing Statements, the use of federal funding and other devices.

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. An example may be included to support the response.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate identifies a valid way and provides a full explanation of a valid way. A relevant example is included.

Apply criteria for each valid way. One of the ways identified must come from the Source, the other from own knowledge. If there is no reference to the source, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded. If there is no relevant example, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

If there is no reference to the Source, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded. If there is no relevant example, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

3 Background

The disparity between the number of Bills introduced in Congress and the number that succeed is remarkable and consistent. One reason for this is the complicated nature of the US legislative system that provides many opportunities for Bills to be defeated. When the two Houses are controlled by different parties, this is another powerful reason why many Bills fail to make it. Increased partisanship has made this reason even more significant. The powers of committees to effectively 'kill' a Bill is another as is the power of the president to veto. Members of Congress, especially Members of the House of Representatives tend to only vote for laws that are perceived to benefit their district.

If there is no relevant evidence, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded.

Any other relevant reason.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of why so few Bills become laws in the USA 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 so few Bills become laws in the USA 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 so few Bills become laws in the USA 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 why so few Bills become laws in the USA 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 so few Bills become Laws in the USA 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 one reason why the US system has failed to prevent the growth in presidential power and candidates should seek to include this in their response. Other factors that have contributed to the growth of the “Imperial Presidency” should also be identified and explained. These factors may include the shift in power from the states to the federal government, the growth of the EXOP, the demands of a modern capitalist economy, the president’s role as Commander in Chief of an increasingly interventionist USA. There are other relevant factors.

However, others would challenge the dominant president thesis. Many recent presidents have struggled to achieve many of the objectives that they declared when they assumed office. Opposition from Congress, gridlock, partisanship, the system of checks and balances and the legacy of their predecessors have all served to frustrate presidents. While outgoing presidents may claim to have been successful, often the evidence does not support this. Presidential control over Congress is far from complete.

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. If there is no relevant evidence a maximum of level 3 can be awarded. If there is no reference to the source, a maximum of level 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in the response, a maximum of level 4 can be awarded.

If there is no relevant evidence, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded.

If there is no reference to the Source, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded.
If there is no balance in the response, a maximum level of 4 can be awarded.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the extent to which the president is able to control Congress 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 extent to which the president is able to control 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. 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 extent to which the president is able to control 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. 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 extent to which the president is able to control Congress 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 extent to which the president is able to control 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. 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 USA and UK**

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

5 Background

The much greater freedom of US representatives to introduce Bills in comparison to the constraints faced by MPs will feature in many answers. In the UK, the executive dominates the legislative process. The involvement of Committees at a much earlier stage in the USA is another key difference as is their power to terminate a Bill. The greater capacity of Members of the House of Representatives to attach amendments may also be discussed. In the UK, the Commons is the dominant House with the power to overrule the Lords. In the USA the Senate's approval of a House Bill is needed.

If there is no relevant evidence/example, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

Any other valid difference.

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 which may include supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

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

Apply criteria for each valid way.

(AO1: 2 × 5 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

6 (a) Background

In terms of democratic authority, Senators have significantly more than the unelected members of the Lords. Senators are national political figures many of whom have an eye on the White House. Few Lords are nationally recognised and none are contenders to be Prime Minister. In terms of legislative powers, Senators are in a different league from Lords. The same is true of the scrutiny powers of members of the two Houses. On the face of it, the contrasts between the two Houses are stark.

However, over the past 25 years the Lords has had a greater political impact than its powers and authority should allow it. Often the Lords has played the role of the 'Real Opposition' to governments when the Official Opposition has been unable to do so. Government legislative plans have been frustrated. Government actions have been scrutinised and challenged. Ministerial attacks upon the "undemocratic" Lords confirm that they must be doing something. So, while individual Lords may not be household names, as a collective body they are more than just "extras".

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons.

If a response has no evidence/examples, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in terms of argument/political system, a maximum level of 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the contrasts between the Senate and the Lords 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 contrasts between the Senate and the Lords 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 contrasts between the Senate and the Lords 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 contrasts between the Senate and the Lords 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 contrasts between the Senate and the Lords 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]

30

(b) Background

It is well documented that there has been a steady growth in the number of Presidential and Prime Ministerial personal advisers. At the same time, the most important personal advisers have become recognised individuals at the heart of policy making. The Chief of Staff is now recognised as central to any president. There is no similar position in the UK but individuals such as Bernard Ingham, Alistair Campbell and Dominic Cummings have all come to be core advisers to PMs. It is argued that this move to reliance on advisers marks a shift in power away from Cabinet.

This argument does not really stand up as far as the US is concerned because the Cabinet has never really had the degree of influence that it has in the UK. This lack of reliance upon the Cabinet is nothing new in the USA. At the same time, it could be argued that members of the Cabinet in the USA remain powerful figures with control over huge departments and massive

budgets. In relation to the UK, it could be argued that predictions of the death of Cabinet are premature. When PMs are brought down, as most are, it is often because they have lost the support of their Cabinet. Reliance on personal advisers may be a measure of a weak PM rather than a strong one.

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons.

If a response has no evidence/examples, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in terms of argument and political system, a maximum level of 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of the Cabinet and of personal advisers in the USA 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 and of personal advisers in the USA 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 and of personal advisers in the USA 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 and of personal advisers in the USA 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 and of personal advisers in the USA 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]

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

30

100

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

1 Background

A confidence and supply agreement usually occurs when there is a hung Dáil and no one party has an absolute majority of seats. The most usual outcome in such circumstances is the formation of a coalition government. However, where this is not possible a party (or a group of independents) that is not in government will support the government in motions of confidence and budget votes. This support will take the form of voting with the government or abstaining. Such agreements have operated in both Ireland and in the UK in recent years.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term “confidence and supply agreement”.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term “confidence and supply agreement”. 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 “confidence and supply agreement”. A relevant example will be used to support the response.

(AO1: 5 marks) If no example is given, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

5

2 Background

One reason why Ireland has become a more multi-party system is, as identified in the Source, the Irish electoral system. The Single Transferable Vote method of election allows for smaller parties and for independents to gain seats in the Dáil. Brokerage, clientelism and localism also contribute to the situation where such candidates can build up a local support base. The loss of support for the two big parties because of the 2008 economic crash has not been entirely reversed and continues to benefit their smaller rivals. Both Sinn Fein and the Greens have become an established part of the party mix in the Republic.

Any other relevant limitation.

Level 1 ([1])

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

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

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

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

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

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

If there is no reference to the Source, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded. If there is no relevant example, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

3 **Background**

One of the most common reasons given for the inadequate scrutiny of the executive by the Dáil is the fact that TDs are required to spend so much of their time involved in constituency work if they are to secure re-election. The result is that the scrutiny mechanisms that are available are not fully utilised. For example, Question Time has been derided as a pointless exercise other than for allowing TDs to say that they raised constituency issues. Debates, similarly, are poorly attended and used as opportunities for making speeches or issuing statements defending the government. Dáil committees are overworked, under-resourced and ignored by the executive. The best statement of the value of Dáil scrutiny remains Bertie Ahern's observation that if you spend all day in the Dáil you would get nothing done. If there is no relevant evidence, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded.

Any other relevant reasons.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the criticisms made of scrutiny by the Dáil 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 criticisms made of scrutiny by the Dáil 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 criticisms made of scrutiny by the Dáil 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.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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 the criticisms made of scrutiny by the Dáil 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 criticisms made of scrutiny by the Dáil 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 Irish system was once seen as producing governments that were weak and unstable compared with the strong and stable executives that were typical of the UK. It was argued that the coalitions which were the norm in Ireland resulted in ineffective governments that were unable to act due to party differences. Most governments rarely lasted their full term because the coalition partners fell out. The Source argues that this is no longer the case and that Ireland now has governments that are capable of acting and that do manage to survive. The Source suggests that the reason for this is that parties in the Republic have accepted the reality of coalition and are therefore willing to compromise and negotiate with other parties to create a functioning government. The negotiation of “supply and confidence” agreements is one clear indication of this.

For balance, candidates may argue that it is premature to conclude that consensual politics now reigns in Ireland. The Varadker government may not be typical but just a one-off. The normality of fractious coalitions, policy stalemates and government collapses, so typical of Ireland in the past, will be re-established.

Weaker answers display limited understanding of the question, will tend to rely upon the Source and provide little further evidence. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, will be balanced and will offer a range of argument and evidence. If there is no relevant evidence, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded. If there is no reference to the Source, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in the response, a maximum level of 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the

nature of governments in the Republic of Ireland and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material 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 nature of governments in the Republic of Ireland but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. 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 nature of governments in the Republic of Ireland but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. 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 nature of governments in the Republic of Ireland 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 nature of governments in the Republic of Ireland and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. 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]

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

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

5 Background

The most obvious difference is that committees in the Oireachtas are joint, comprising both TDs and Senators. The same committee carries out both scrutiny of departmental actions as well as legislative scrutiny which is not the case in the UK. There are committees in the Oireachtas that have a broader remit than just focusing on one department. The government in Ireland has a majority on committees as they mirror the makeup of the Dáil. The degree of government control in the UK is not so complete. UK Committees, especially Select, tend to be more assertive. If there is no relevant evidence/example, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

Any other valid difference.

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]

10

6 (a) Background

Prime Ministers in the UK and in the Republic of Ireland have a tendency to be removed from office before they would wish to depart. The question then arises as to why this is so. In both systems it is rare that the opposition parties are the primary reason. The statement in the question suggests that British PMs are more likely to be brought down by the actions of the Opposition and it is anticipated that candidates will reject this analysis. The history of most recent PMs is that it is their own colleagues who, directly or indirectly, have caused their demise. This reflects the fact that the major parties in Britain are composed of different factions and any PM will have serious rivals within the ranks of their own Cabinet. The challenge facing any PM in the UK is to keep the factions within their party and Cabinet under control.

The contrast with the Irish Republic is that a Taoiseach faces a greater challenge. Not only are they likely to face opposition within Cabinet from their own party rivals. They also have to deal with their coalition partners who may wish to bring down a Taoiseach in hope of achieving a better deal in any subsequent coalition.

So while the opposition in both systems may seek to exploit a Prime Minister or Taoiseach's problems they are rarely the primary cause.

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, tend to rely upon the Source, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons. If a response has no evidence/examples, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in terms of argument/political system, a maximum level of 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the threats to a Prime Minister or Taoiseach and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. 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 threats to a Prime Minister or Taoiseach but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. 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 threats to a Prime Minister or Taoiseach but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. 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 threats to a Prime Minister or Taoiseach 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.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the threats to a Prime Minister or Taoiseach and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. 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]

30

(b) Background

TDs would seem to be required to meet the needs of their constituents to a much greater degree than MPs. This is partly a result of the different electoral systems that operate in Ireland and in the UK. TDs are vulnerable as a result of the intra-party competition caused by the STV electoral system. The culture of localism and brokerage also necessitates that TDs are seen to be, first of all, constituency representatives. The same pressures do not apply to MPs. As a consequence, the Dáil is much less well attended than the Commons and TDs spend a greater proportion of their time on constituency work than MPs. This is the basis of the jibe that TDs are just messengers.

On the other hand, few MPs are able to neglect their constituencies and most are active in constituency work. Being regarded as a good local MP does pay electoral dividends as MPs who are seen in this way are able to hold their seat when the national tide is running against their party. It is also the case that many TDs are actively involved in national politics in addition to performing their local representative role.

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons. If a response has no evidence/examples, a maximum level of 3 can be awarded. If there is no balance in terms of argument and political system, a maximum level of 4 can be awarded.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the constraints faced by 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,

