

New  
Specification



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED**  
**General Certificate of Education**  
**2018**

---

## **Government and Politics**

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

**[AGP11]**

**MONDAY 11 JUNE, AFTERNOON**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **General Marking Instructions**

### ***Introduction***

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

### ***Assessment objectives***

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to:

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

### ***Quality of candidates' responses***

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

### ***Flexibility in marking***

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated answers, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

### ***Positive marking***

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 17- or 18-year-old GCE candidate.

### ***Awarding zero marks***

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

### ***Types of mark schemes***

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

### **Levels of response**

In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement.

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

### **Quality of written communication**

Quality of written communication is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

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

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

**Section A: The Government and Politics of the USA**

- 1** The term ‘pork-barrelling’ refers to the actions of elected representatives when they seek to gain benefits for their constituency. These benefits include agricultural subsidies, defence projects and infrastructural development that are paid for through national taxation but which benefit a local area. Elected representatives achieve these benefits by being willing to back the executive in Congress. The President will seek to gain Congressional support for legislative actions by offering pork to elected representatives in return for their vote. Members of the House of Representatives are judged by how effective they are in ‘bringing home the bacon.’

**Level 1 ([1])**

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term ‘pork-barrelling’.

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term ‘pork-barrelling.’ 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 ‘pork-barrelling.’ A relevant example will be used to support the response.

**(AO1: 5 marks)**

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately. [5]

5

**2 Background**

Opposition within Congress has become a fact of life for recent US presidents. Overcoming this opposition in order to achieve their policy goals is therefore a major preoccupation of presidents. The Source identifies one mechanism that presidents can employ in order to do this: Executive Orders that do not require Congressional approval but which allow the president to act. In addition to this mechanism, presidents can use their formal power of veto, the pocket veto, recess appointments, emergency orders, executive agreements, signing statements and their control over ‘pork.’

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

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

**(AO1: 5 marks × 2)**

- An answer that fails to provide one example can be awarded a maximum of [8]

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

10

### 3 Background

It is frequently argued that US Presidents can be weak domestically but have significantly more power when it comes to the conduct of foreign policy. The main reason for this contrast is that Congress is determined to exert much greater control over the President when it comes to the pursuit of domestic policy but grants the President much more freedom in the conduct of foreign affairs. Congressional ambivalence may be a consequence of representatives being required to deliver tangible benefits for their electoral district. This means paying close attention to domestic policy to extract concessions for their area. Another possible reason is that the constitutional limits imposed on the President in the conduct of foreign policy are less stringent than those faced in pursuit of domestic policy. The President can, for example, make Executive Agreements with other states that do not require Congressional approval. A third factor is the political culture of the USA: there is a strong tendency to see foreign policy as the prerogative of the President.

- An answer that deals with only how Presidents conduct domestic and foreign policy can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

#### Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of Presidential control over domestic and foreign policy 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 are 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 Presidential control over domestic and foreign policy 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 Presidential control over domestic and foreign policy 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 Presidential control over domestic and foreign policy 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 Presidential control over domestic and foreign policy 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[15]

15

**4 Background**

Critics of the US political system argue that it is frequently dysfunctional and prevents the proper governance of the United States. The Source suggests that the separation of powers between the Executive and Congress frequently results in gridlock. The Source also gives candidates evidence of how gridlock has led to issues such as failure to advance gun control and the shut down of federal government because of the inability to agree a budget. In addition, there is a wide variety of other features of the US system that could be said to prevent effective government: Federalism, the fact that different parties often control the Presidency and Congress, the effect of the electoral system, the power of lobby groups. All could be said to create problems for the effective government of the US.

On the other hand, there are those who argue that limited government is exactly what the US system is intended to produce. The multiple checks and balances within the system prevent tyranny and the centralisation of power. The result is policies that enjoy widespread support. The argument is that the US system results in “good government” as opposed to the “elective dictatorship” found in the UK.

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

- An answer that is totally unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that fails to refer to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that contains no examples beyond the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the debate about the Constitution's role in providing effective government 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 are 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 debate about the Constitution's role in providing effective government 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 debate about the Constitution's role in providing effective government 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 debate about the Constitution's role in providing effective government 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 debate about the Constitution's role in providing effective government 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

30

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

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

**5 Background**

There are many obvious differences between Public Bill and Standing Committees, largely as a result of the latter being much more powerful bodies. One obvious difference is the permanency of Standing Committees. This leads to a second difference in terms of the much greater expertise of members of Standing Committees. Candidates may also highlight differences in the remits of the two types of committee or differences in their powers, with the power of subpoena likely to figure in many responses. Candidates may also refer to differences in when committees begin their consideration of Bills and to differences in funding and to Executive power to curtail committee discussions.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

Apply criteria for each valid way.

**(AO1: 2 × [5])**

- An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of [8]

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

10

**6 (a) Background**

This is a question about the extent to which the representative role of members of the US Congress and British Parliament takes precedence over their other roles, such as legislating and scrutinising the executive. When representatives focus on “local” issues, as referred to in the question, they are prioritising their representative function. By contrast, when they focus on legislating and scrutinising they are prioritising national issues. The statement in the question partly expresses a widely held view that Members of the House are under much greater pressure to be seen to be acting in the interests of their district. By contrast, MPs have greater freedom to concentrate on national issues as their re-election does not depend primarily on their record as a local representative.

On the other hand, the view in the statement is a simplification of the reality. In the UK, Lords clearly have no constituency representative function to perform. MPs cannot simply ignore their constituency and many spend a great deal of time engaged in representing their area. In the USA, Senators have a reputation for being much more concerned with national issues due to their six year term of office. Candidates should seek to balance their response with some information of this sort.

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

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

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of local and national issues for Members of Congress and Parliament and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. There is little recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 local and national issues for Members of Congress and Parliament but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. 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 local and national issues for Members of Congress and Parliament but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is a reasonable attempt at comparing political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 local and national issues for Members of Congress and Parliament and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 local and national issues for Members of Congress and Parliament and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [30]

**(b) Background**

This question addresses the issue of how the powers of the US President and UK PM have evolved in recent years. The statement in the question suggests there is a growing gap between the two, implying that the PM has significantly less power. Both the President and Prime Minister have a number of powers and corresponding limitations on those powers. The President's powers are granted by the Constitution and there have been claims that over the years the Presidency has become more 'imperial' as a result of the executive accruing power during the late twentieth century, through implied or informal powers. On the other hand, there are a number of significant restrictions on the powers which a President exercises. They can at best persuade members of Congress to support their proposals and the system of checks and balances allows both Congress and the Supreme Court considerable ability to interfere with the Presidents domestic role. By comparison the Prime Minister's powers are greatly enhanced by the fact that, as leader of the majority party in the House of Commons, the PM can usually guarantee legislative compliance. Control of the parliamentary timetable and high levels of party discipline, even within the committee system, add considerably to the power of the PM. In recent years the UK executive has been described by some as 'Prime Ministerial' rather than 'Cabinet' government. However, in terms of the actual operation of power in the two systems it is clear that the Prime Minister has much more power domestically. On the other hand, Presidents have much more latitude where foreign policy is concerned. In addition, Presidents have been able to employ a range of tactics to achieve their objectives.

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

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

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the powers of the US President and British PM 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 are 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 powers of the US President and British PM 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 powers of the US President and British PM 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 powers of the US President and British PM 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 powers of the US President and British PM 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

30

**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** Judicial Review refers to the power of members of the High or Supreme Court to determine if a decision taken by a public body is illegal or unconstitutional. A review usually begins with a member of the public approaching the court to appeal against a decision that directly affects them. The Court will then review the decision in the light of the law and will determine if the public body has acted “ultra vires”. In the Republic of Ireland judicial review was, from the 1960s onwards, a major way in which the constitution was informally amended and the law changed. The laws on contraception, abortion and marriage were all amended as a result of judicial review cases.

**Level 1 ([1])**

The candidate offers a basic explanation of what is meant by the term ‘judicial review’.

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term ‘judicial review.’ 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 ‘judicial review.’ A relevant example will be used to support the response.

**(AO1: 5 marks)**

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[5]

5

**2 Background**

Irish governments are now, almost invariably, coalitions and may also be minority governments. As a result, the Taoiseach’s power to sack ministers is severely curtailed when the ministers involved are not from the Taoiseach’s own party. This is the limitation identified in the Source. Candidates should explain this and should, from their own knowledge, identify and explain another limitation. This can include the limits that the constitution imposes; the need to have gender and regional balance in the cabinet; the need to ensure that party factions are represented and that ‘big beasts’ are included.

Any other relevant limitation.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

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

(AO1: 5 marks × 2)

- An answer that fails to provide one example can be awarded a maximum of [8]

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

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

10

### 3 Background

Dáil Éireann has a history of having many more independent representatives than would be the case in the UK House of Commons. This is especially so in recent years, with the result that independents now find themselves in government with Fine Gael. The primary reason for the greater number of independent TDs is the Single Transferable Vote system of election employed. This gives independents a much greater chance of securing election than they would have under “First Past the Post.” A second reason is the significance of localism and brokerage in Irish politics. This means that individuals with a proven track record of local representation can command enough support to secure election to the Dáil. Another factor is the significance of personality in Irish politics, allowing high profile independents to have extended political careers.

- An answer that deals with only how TDs carry out their representative role can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

Any other relevant reasons.

#### Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the high number of independent 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 reasons for the high number of independent TDs but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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 reasons for the high number of independent TDs but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 reasons for the high number of independent TDs and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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 reasons for the high number of independent TDs and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[15]

15

**4 Background**

The “Chairman or Chief” distinction has frequently been employed to categorise Irish political leaders. In recent years, with the prevalence of coalition government, most leaders have fallen into the ‘Chairman’ camp. The Source provides evidence of this in the case of Enda Kenny: not only is Mr Kenny unable to remove Independent Alliance ministers from the government but sections of his own party are in open rebellion. This suggests that the Taoiseach is in a very weak situation, a pattern that has been the case since the economic crisis of 2008 and, arguably, even prior to that date. The Taoiseach’s ability to appoint and dismiss ministerial colleagues, to formulate policy, to ensure cabinet backing for policies are all significantly limited.

On the other hand, it remains the case that a Taoiseach does have significant powers with which to control the cabinet. S/he is, without question, the most significant individual within cabinet and in this regard can exercise a degree of control. The fate of all ministers depends on the Taoiseach and this can be used to keep ministers in line. In spite of everything, Enda Kenny (at the time of writing) remains Taoiseach: few would have predicted that he would have survived longer than David Cameron.

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 arguments and evidence.

- An answer that is totally unbalanced can be awarded a maximum of Level 4.
- An answer that fails to refer to the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.
- An answer that contains no examples beyond the Source can be awarded a maximum of Level 3.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the power of the Taoiseach to control the cabinet 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 are 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 power of the Taoiseach to control the cabinet 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 power of the Taoiseach to control the cabinet 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 power of the Taoiseach to control the cabinet 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 power of the Taoiseach to control the cabinet 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately.

[30]

30

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

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

**5 Background**

Question Time in the Dáil was, in many ways, based upon the Westminster model. There are, therefore, many similarities between QT in both chambers: written and oral questions; advance notice; supplementary questions; the televising of Question Time; answers prepared by officials. However, there are also some differences between the two: the amount of time that the Taoiseach has to spend answering questions is greater than the PM. QT in the Dáil takes place on three days as opposed to four in the Commons. Any other relevant difference.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

Apply criteria for each valid similarity/difference.

**(AO1: 5 marks × 2)**

- An answer that contains no evidence/examples can be awarded a maximum of [8]

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

10

**6 (a) Background**

The 'upper house' in both the Irish and British systems has been the subject of considerable controversy. Both have faced calls for their abolition. The statement in the question suggests that the case for abolishing the Seanad is much stronger than that for Lords abolition. This would be a standard view and candidates should explain the thinking behind this view. This would involve comparing the powers of the Seanad and Lords and, more importantly, their records in legislating and scrutinising the executive. This comparison will support the view that the Lords has been the more effective body over many years.

On the other hand it is argued that the Lords too has limited powers and, given the expense in maintaining it, offers a poor return. The Lords is also a totally undemocratic body and unrepresentative of British society. By contrast, the Seanad has some claim to being democratically chosen and representative. The Seanad's powers are, in theory, significant and could, in practice, make it a more effective body than it has been to date. There is also some evidence that Senators are becoming more active in recent years than their predecessors.

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

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

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the arguments for retaining the Seanad and 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 are 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 arguments for retaining the Seanad and 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 arguments for retaining the Seanad and 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 arguments for retaining the Seanad and 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 vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

**Level 5 ([25]–[30])**

The candidate demonstrates accurate, detailed and comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the arguments for retaining the Seanad and 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [30]

**(b) Background**

Holding the executive to account is one of the key functions of a legislature in any democratic political system. This question asks for a comparison of the effectiveness of Parliament and the Oireachtas in this respect and makes the assertion that the former is the better scrutinising body. This would be a view held by those who argue that the emphasis that TDs have to place upon the performance of their representative role means that they do not place as much importance on holding government to account. Although the mechanisms of scrutiny in the two systems – debates, questions, committees – are similar, MPs make much greater use of them. TDs, by contrast, are too busy running after constituents. The Lords has a record of giving governments of both types a “bloody-nose”, something the Seanad has conspicuously failed to do.

This analysis is open to challenge. Some have argued that executive dominance in the UK makes effective scrutiny impossible: like ‘heckling a steam-roller’ as one MP famously said. Party loyalty and discipline give the executive considerable freedom, especially when the Opposition is so disorganised as has been the case since 2015. It has also been suggested that the seismic events of the last ten years have led to a much more assertive Dáil. TDs are no longer content to leave the government alone to govern.

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

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

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the records of Parliament and the Oireachtas in scrutinising the executive 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 are 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 records of Parliament and the Oireachtas in scrutinising the executive 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 records of Parliament and the Oireachtas in scrutinising the executive 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. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 records of Parliament and the Oireachtas in scrutinising the executive 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 records of Parliament and the Oireachtas in scrutinising the executive 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.

Any other valid material will be rewarded appropriately. [30]

**Total**

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

30

**100**