



Rewarding Learning

**ADVANCED
General Certificate of Education
2022 RESERVE SERIES**

Government and Politics

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

[AGP11]

TUESDAY 28 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.

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** A Presidential Veto is the power of the president to refuse a Bill or Joint Resolution from Congress. The president has ten days (excluding Sundays) to sign a bill passed by Congress. A regular veto occurs when the President returns the legislation to the house in which it originated, usually with a message explaining the rationale for the veto. This veto can be overridden only by a two-thirds vote in both the Senate and the House.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term 'Presidential Veto'.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term 'Presidential Veto'. An example may be included to support the response. If no supporting example is given, a maximum of 3 marks can be awarded.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

The candidate provides a full explanation of what is meant by the term 'Presidential Veto'. A relevant example will be used to support the response. If no example is given, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

5

2 Background

The Source identifies that Senate approval for significant Presidential nominations for executive positions is required as one way in which the independence of any president is limited. An answer should explain this limitation and seek to identify and explain another way in which Congress can limit presidential independence, for example, through control over the budget, through amending or killing presidential legislative proposals, by refusing to endorse presidential foreign policy initiatives.

Any other relevant way.

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 example/evidence, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

3 Background

Congressional Committees make up an important part of the legislative process and provide an important part of the checks and balances present in US politics.

After a bill has had its first reading in Congress the bills are then assigned to a committee. It is important to note that the committee stage comes before the Second Reading, unlike in the UK where it comes afterwards. In the House of Representatives, the Speaker will decide which committees will receive the bill. It is similar in the Senate but with the Majority Leader deciding where the bill should go. Once they have been placed into committee, it is up to the committee to decide on which bills they are going to 'hear'. Many bills will never get heard by the committees, this means that they are said to be 'pigeon holed'.

If a bill does get heard, then it is at this stage that Pork Barrelling happens the most. Committee members will add in amendments to the bills to benefit their constituents. Sometimes the amendments will have nothing to do with the original bill itself. Bills may die even if they are heard by the committee. If they can't get reported out of committee, then they die.

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

Any other relevant reason.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the role of Congressional Committees in the legislative process 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 is inadequate. 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 role of Congressional Committees in the legislative process 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 role of Congressional Committees in the legislative process 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 satisfactory. 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 role of Congressional Committees in the legislative process 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 generally good. 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 role of Congressional Committees in the legislative process 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 of a consistently high standard. 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

[15]

15

4 Background

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.

However, others have argued that presidential power and control over Congress have steadily grown, as argued in the Source. The factors that have contributed to the growth of the “Imperial Presidency” should 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.

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 reference to the Source, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
 If there is no relevant evidence a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
 If there is no balance and the response is one-sided, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

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 is inadequate. 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 satisfactory. 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 generally good. 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 of a consistently high standard. 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 USA and UK**

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

5 Background

The representative role is a very important part of being a Member of the House of Representatives and an MP. In both systems, the expectation is that Members and MPs will actively work on behalf of constituents and there are many similarities in how they do so. One way in which they do so is by holding meetings, or surgeries, where they meet individuals with issues that they are seeking the help of the representative in resolving. Another similarity is the holding of general 'town hall' meetings where debates over some issue facing the constituency or district take place. Members and MPs are also expected to raise local issues in the legislature during debates. Members and MPs also perform 'ceremonial' tasks within their area, such as attending school events.

Any other similarity.

Level 1 ([1])

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

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate identifies a valid similarity and offers a more developed explanation which may include supporting evidence.

Level 3 ([4]–[5])

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

Apply criteria for each valid way.

If no relevant evidence is given, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

6 (a) Background

In terms of democratic authority, Senators have infinitely more power 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".

If no evidence is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If the response is unbalanced/one-sided, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

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.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the contrasts in powers 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 is inadequate. 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 in powers 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 in powers 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 satisfactory. 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 in powers 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 generally good. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate 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.

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Level 5 ([25]–[30])

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the contrasts in powers 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 of a consistently high standard. 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

In theory, there is a major gap in the status of Cabinet in the UK and USA. The UK system is one of collective Cabinet government in which the PM is simply ‘first among equals’. In the USA, the president is a singular chief executive and the Cabinet exists and operates at the discretion of the president. Candidates should demonstrate, even implicitly, some understanding of these differences. Candidates should also demonstrate understanding of the argument that the increasingly ‘presidential’ nature of the role of the PM has, in the view of many, led to the undermining of the position of the Cabinet in the UK. The reasons for this should be identified. As a result, it is claimed that the Cabinet in the UK increasingly resembles that of the US Cabinet in terms of power and status.

For balance, candidates may argue 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.

If no evidence is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
If the response is unbalanced/one-sided, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

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

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of Cabinet 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 is inadequate. 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 Cabinet 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 Cabinet 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 satisfactory. 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 Cabinet 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 generally good. 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 Cabinet 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 of a consistently high standard. 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

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

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

1 Background

One of the features of the Single Transferable Vote system of proportional representation that operates in the Republic of Ireland is multi-member constituencies. Constituencies are much larger than in the UK and elect as many as five TDs rather than the single MP in the UK. Parties will therefore put up several candidates within the same constituency and voters are able to choose between candidates of the same party.

Level 1 ([1])

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term 'multi-member constituency'.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term 'multi-member constituency'. 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 'multi-member constituency'. A relevant example will be used to support the response. If no example is given, a maximum of 4 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

5

2 Background

The Source identifies the Irish electoral system as one reason for the decline of the two parties. Although the electoral system has remained unchanged since the foundation of the state, it has allowed for the growth of new political parties and for the election of independent TDs. This has been particularly the case over the last fifteen years, leading to the decline of FF and FG. Other reasons for the electoral decline are the diminished significance of 'civil war' politics in Ireland; the modernisation of Irish society and culture; the decline of deference; the growth of environmental concerns; the fall-out from the economic crisis of the last decade.

Any other relevant reason.

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 way.

Apply criteria for each valid reason. 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 example/evidence a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded.

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

3 Background

Most legislation in Ireland is initiated by the executive but TDs still have a wide variety of ways in which they can influence Bills. First, they can introduce a Private Member's Bill on an issue that they feel strongly about. Second, they can debate, amend and vote on Bills during their passage through the Dáil. Backbenchers in one of the parties that make up the executive can revolt, although this is relatively rare in Ireland. This may be because backbench TDs are generally consulted by their party leaders at the pre-legislative stage, another way that influence can be exerted.

If there is no reference to evidence/examples, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded

Any other relevant way.

Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the ways in which backbench TDs can influence legislation and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar is inadequate. 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 ways in which backbench TDs can influence legislation but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 ways in which backbench TDs can influence legislation but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. 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 ways in which backbench TDs can influence legislation 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 generally good. 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 ways in which backbench TDs can influence legislation and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. 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]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

15

4 Background

The Irish system is often seen as producing weak and unstable governments compared with the strong and united executives that are typical of the UK. It was argued that the coalitions result in ineffective governments that are unable to act due to party differences. Most governments rarely last their full term because the coalition partners fall out. The Irish norm is one of fractious coalitions, policy stalemates and government collapses.

However, some argue that there is a growing maturity among the Irish political elite and a growing acceptance that multi-party politics is the reality and that parties have to adapt to this. The popularity of the traditional big two parties has been, in part, affected by voter disenchantment with the inability of political leaders to deliver stability and continuity.

Weaker answers will 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 reference to the Source, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
If there is no evidence, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
If an answer is unbalanced/one-sided, a maximum of Level 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 is inadequate. 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 satisfactory. 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 generally good. 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 of a consistently high standard. 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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

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

AVAILABLE
MARKS

5 Background

There are significant similarities in the powers of the Seanad and the House of Lords but also some differences. The Seanad was designed to be very much a secondary part of the Oireachtas and its powers are a reflection of this. The Seanad can only delay a Bill for 90 days before it becomes law with Dáil approval. It can only delay a money Bill for 21 days. The Lords can delay ordinary Bills for a much longer period and has been able to use this extended power to prevent a Bill becoming law, something the Seanad is very rarely able to achieve. On the other hand, the Seanad, with the support of one-third of the Dáil, has the power to refer a Bill to the President as being of such national importance that a referendum on the issue is required. The Lords has no similar power. Candidates may point out that, as the Seanad is largely controlled by the executive because of the Taoiseach's power of appointment, that it has little 'power' to scrutinise as opposed to the Lords.

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.

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

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

6 (a) Background

In both the UK and in Ireland, the majority of MPs and TDs are a member of a political party. This is especially so in the UK where the number of independent MPs has always been tiny. In both systems the route to becoming an elected representative is through membership of a party. As a result, the party is able to exert significant control over members and both the UK and Irish systems have a high degree of party discipline.

One key difference between the two systems is the high number of independent TDs in Ireland in comparison to the UK. A second difference is that the influence of localism in Ireland is such that TDs will sometimes act in favour of their local area and against their party. This does happen in UK politics but to a much lesser extent.

Candidates may also point out that rebellions against party have become much more common in recent years. MPs have been more assertive and independent minded, challenging the point of view in the question. In Ireland, party rebellions are less common.

If no evidence is given, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

If the response is unbalanced/one-sided, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

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.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of party in the UK and Ireland and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. 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 is inadequate. 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 party in the UK and 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. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 party in the UK and 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. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. 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 party in the UK and 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. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. 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 party in the UK and 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. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar of a consistently high standard. 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

The Irish political system is largely based upon the Westminster model and, consequently, there are many similarities in the scrutiny mechanisms that operate in the Oireachtas and in Parliament. Candidates will seek to establish these similarities but answers must move on to identify and explain the differences between the two systems in terms of scrutiny. In Ireland, the primary reason for this is that TDs are, of necessity, primarily engaged in constituency work and leave the government to get on with running the country. By contrast, MPs are much more concerned with national issues and therefore make much greater use of their powers. In addition, the Lords is a much more effective scrutiniser of the government than the Seanad.

On the other hand, it could be argued that scrutiny is not that effective in the UK, especially when the government enjoys a comfortable majority in the Commons. The executive is able to push through its policies in spite of opposition. It could also be argued that TDs in Ireland have become much more active in challenging the executive following the economic crisis that nearly led to state bankruptcy. The expectation is no longer that the government can be just left to get on with things.

If no evidence is given a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.
If the response is unbalanced/one-sided, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

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.

Level 1 ([1]–[6])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of scrutiny in the UK and Ireland and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. 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 is inadequate. 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 scrutiny in the UK and 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. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are limited. 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 scrutiny in the UK and 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. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is satisfactory. 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 scrutiny in the UK and 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. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally good. 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 scrutiny in the UK and 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. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. 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