



*Rewarding Learning*

**ADVANCED  
General Certificate of Education  
2023**

---

## **Government and Politics**

Assessment Unit A2 1

Comparative Government

**[AGP11]**

**WEDNESDAY 24 MAY, MORNING**

---

**MARK  
SCHEME**

## **General Marking Instructions**

### ***Introduction***

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

### ***Assessment objectives***

Below are the assessment objectives for GCE Government and Politics.

Candidates should be able to:

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

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

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

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

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

### ***Positive marking***

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

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

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

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

Mark schemes for tasks or questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

### **Levels of response**

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

The following guidance is provided to assist examiners.

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

### **Quality of written communication**

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

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

Level 1: Quality of written communication is inadequate.

Level 2: Quality of written communication is limited.

Level 3: Quality of written communication is satisfactory.

Level 4: Quality of written communication is good.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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** Partisanship refers to a lack of co-operation between rival political parties. Bipartisanship (in a two-party system) is the opposite. It happens when parties seek to find common ground on an issue. It involves compromise and the setting aside of extreme positions. In the past, US politics was marked by periods of bipartisanship between the Democrats and Republicans but this has become less common in recent years.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

The candidate offers a more developed explanation of what is meant by the term 'bipartisanship'. 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 'bipartisanship'. A relevant example will be used to support the response. If no supporting 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 the House is able to frustrate a president through its control over the Budget and candidates should explain the power of the House in this regard. Candidates should identify and explain another way in which Congress can obstruct a president including, blocking a president's legislative proposals or putting forward legislation at odds with the wishes of the President; overturning a presidential veto; voting to impeach a president or other officials; initiating hearings; rejecting presidential nominations.

Any other valid 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 no example is given, a maximum of 8 marks can be awarded

If there is no reference to the source, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded

**(AO1: 5 marks × 2)**

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

### 3 Background

The primary reason why Members of the House spend so much time on their representative role is unquestionably that they are permanently in electioneering mode. The short term enjoyed by Members forces them to be constantly seeking to persuade voters that they are an active and successful constituency representative. Representatives are also dependent on local support to fund their campaigns. The political culture of the US reinforces the idea of the Representative as a local advocate. Representatives are also at risk of being unseated by a local challenger from within their own party.

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

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

Any other relevant reason.

#### Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of why Representatives devote so much time to their representative role and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material. The response contains general statements and/or includes no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar 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 why Representatives devote so much time to their representative role but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar 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 why Representatives devote so much time to their representative role but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar 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 why Representatives devote so much time to their representative role and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis

and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are of a consistently high standard. A cogent and coherent argument is constructed which displays clear communication and presentation of ideas. There is extensive use of appropriate political vocabulary and a reasoned conclusion is reached.

**Level 5 ([13]–[15])**

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

15

**4 Background**

Those who support the view that the president has become increasingly powerful point to a range of factors including 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. In addition, presidents have made creative use of a range of powers including Executive Orders, Executive Agreements, Signing Statements, the power to declare a National Emergency. There are other relevant factors.

However, the statement in the question takes the opposing view and is a rejection of the dominant president thesis. Many recent presidents have struggled to achieve many of the objectives that they declared when they assumed office. Opposition from Congress, gridlock, partisanship, the system of checks and balances and the legacy of their predecessors have all served to frustrate presidents. It is also the case that a one-term president may see many of his/her policies overturned by the successor before they have become established.

It is anticipated that candidates will draw upon the Trump (and Biden) presidencies to debate this issue but better responses may draw upon a wider range of presidents.

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 no evidence is presented a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If an answer is unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If there is no reference to the source a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the extent to which power in the US has shifted away from the president and makes little attempt to answer the question. The answer is ill-informed and/or has a high degree of irrelevant material and/or makes general statements and/or contains no evidence or examples. There is little analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar 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 extent to which power in the US has shifted away from the president but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is 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 power in the US has shifted away from the president but there are some gaps in this knowledge and understanding. The response makes a reasonable attempt at answering the question and contains relevant material along with some more general material. Relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is sound analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is generally good. A structured argument is constructed, displaying effective communication and presentation of ideas. A suitable conclusion is reached and there is good use of appropriate political vocabulary.

**Level 4 ([19]–[24])**

The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of the extent to which power in the US has shifted away from the president and uses this to fully address the requirements of the question. Accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made. There is clear and full analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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 power in the US has shifted away from the president and deploys this to produce an exemplary answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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

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

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

**5 Background**

Candidates are likely to focus on the greater powers of House committees, especially that of subpoena, their greater resources and support mechanisms, their greater ability to determine and amend legislation in comparison to those in the Commons. Some candidates may note that the Commons Liaison Committee does have the power to directly question the PM, something House committees are unable to do.

Any other valid difference.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

Apply criteria for each valid way.

**(AO1: 5 marks × 2)**

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

**6 (a) Background**

There is a long-standing debate about whether US Presidents are more powerful than UK Prime Ministers within their respective political systems and it is anticipated that candidates may refer to this debate. This would involve discussion of the theoretical differences between the two executives, that is, that Presidents are singular executives while Prime Ministers are the head of a collective executive. The contrast between theory and reality will likely feature in many responses.

The question states that any differences between the two executives are disappearing and the standard explanation for this is that Prime Ministers have been increasingly dominant at the expense of their cabinet colleagues. The reasons given for this evolution should be given.

For balance, candidates can question the idea of Prime Ministerial dominance. It is also possible to challenge the idea that Presidents are the more powerful executive given the constraints on Presidential power. These constraints do not come from the cabinet in the USA, which remains the creation of the President. The central question is whether the British cabinet has the same standing and many believe that Johnson's cabinets confirm such a conclusion.

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



argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons. If no evidence is presented, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If the answer is unbalanced in terms of argument, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If an answer is unbalanced in treatment of the two systems a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the differences in the powers of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers 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 differences in the powers of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is 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 differences in the powers of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers 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 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 differences in the powers of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers 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 differences in the powers of US Presidents and UK Prime Ministers 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]

AVAILABLE MARKS
30

**(b) Background**

The long-standing assumption was that political parties mattered a lot less in the US than they did in the UK. In Britain an MP owed their position to their party and there was little chance of election outside a party. As a result, party loyalty and discipline were both very strong and the party in power was able to count on both to pursue its policy objectives. Disraeli's famous advice to "damn your principles, stick to your party" was the rule in the UK. By contrast, in the US party loyalty and discipline were much less significant. Members of Congress were much more independent and willing to put the interests of their area before those of party.

These assumptions have been challenged by the growth of partisanship in the US over the past 25 years. As US politics has become more ideologically polarised, the significance of party has increased and members of Congress are often party loyalists first. Votes in Congress are marked by high levels of party voting. At the same time, in the UK, there has been some evidence of MPs being less willing to be 'cannon fodder' for their party and to display a greater independence. The Lords remains a body where party loyalty remains weak.

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons. If there is no evidence a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If the answer is unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If an answer is unbalanced in the treatment of the two systems, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the significance of party 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 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 party in the USA and UK but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is 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 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 party 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 party 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**

A 'hung Dáil' refers to a situation in which no party has an overall majority in the Oireachtas following a General Election. The formation of a single-party government is therefore impossible. The party that has the largest number of elected TDs enters into negotiations with one or more other parties or Independent TDs. The objective is to secure agreement that would lead to the formation of a coalition government. A hung Dáil is now the norm following any Irish General Election.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

If no supporting 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 one form of brokerage as sorting out constituents' social security problems. A second form of brokerage should not come from the Source and may include a wide range of activities that TDs normally engage in. These may include sorting out planning issues, dealing with local government officials on behalf of constituents, speaking with civil servants.

Any other relevant limitation.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

The candidate identifies a valid form and provides a full explanation of the form. Apply criteria for each valid form. One of the forms identified must come from the Source, the other from own knowledge.

**(AO1: 5 marks × 2)**

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

If there is no reference to the source, a maximum of 6 marks can be awarded

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

[10]

10

### 3 Background

Although the scrutiny record of TDs has often been criticised, they do possess an impressive range of powers of scrutiny. Backbench TDs can ask written and oral questions of Ministers. They can participate in debates in the Dáil on the government's policies and record. There are various stages in the legislative process when they can examine government Bills and propose amendments or even, by voting, reject a Bill outright. Along with members of the Seanad, TDs can participate in joint Oireachtas committees that can examine executive proposals and actions. Outside the Dáil, TDs can use the media and social media to criticise the government.

If an answer contains no relevant evidence, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded

If only one way is included, a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded.

Any other relevant means.

#### Level 1 ([1]–[3])

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of how backbench TDs can scrutinise 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. 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 how backbench TDs can scrutinise 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. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is 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 how backbench TDs can scrutinise 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. 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 how backbench TDs can scrutinise 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. 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 how backbench TDs can scrutinise 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. 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]

15

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

#### **4 Background**

Backbench TDs have often been criticised for their poor record when it comes to involvement in the legislative process. Authors such as Chubb, Coakley and Gallagher and O’Toole have taken the view that TDs are very poor legislators and one major reason for this is the impact of localism and brokerage. The route to a successful political career in Irish politics lies through creating and sustaining a solid voter base and the surest way of achieving this is by being a dedicated servant of local people. Even those serving in the executive are not immune to this pressure to act as broker for their constituents. As Bertie Ahern saw it, if a TD were to spend all day in the Dáil they would get nothing done. As a result, the executive has a relatively free hand when it comes to legislating.

The alternative view is that TDs are not failures in the role of lawmakers. They are able to express their views on executive legislative proposals before they are even introduced, if they belong to one of the governing parties. They can, and do, participate in the debates and votes on legislation. They can introduce their own legislation. They are able to rebel against the government if they belong to a governing party. The parties that have gained ground in Ireland over the past decade are not as willing to defer to the executive and have shown a keen interest in legislation.

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, a maximum of level 4 can be awarded.

#### **Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the record of TDs as lawmakers 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 record of TDs as lawmakers but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is 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 record of TDs as lawmakers 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 record of TDs as lawmakers 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 record of TDs as lawmakers 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]

AVAILABLE  
MARKS

30

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

**AVAILABLE  
MARKS**

**5 Background**

The most striking difference between the Lords and the Seanad is the absence of anything like Hereditary Peers in the latter. Another contrast is that the entire Lords is unelected unlike most Senators who do face election, albeit on very restricted franchises. The Taoiseach also has the power to immediately appoint Senators while the PM has to take the rather slower route of choosing Life Peers. Candidates may also contrast the socio-economic composition of the two bodies.

Any other valid difference.

**Level 1 ([1])**

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

**Level 2 ([2]–[3])**

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

**Level 3 ([4]–[5])**

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

**(AO1: 5 marks × 2)**

Any other valid information will be rewarded appropriately.

10

**6 (a) Background**

Coalition government has now become the norm in the Republic of Ireland and, as a result, modern Taoisigh have had to manage a government consisting of at least two or more parties. Managing a government such as this requires the Taoiseach to be much more of a collegiate leader, 'chairing'; the government rather than dominating it. By contrast, single-party government is the norm in the UK and the power and status of the PM would seem to have increased at the expense of the cabinet. This has enabled PMs to act as 'chiefs', in the sense of dominating the executive.

However, the reality is more complex. In Ireland, some Taoisigh have, in spite of coalition government, been able to achieve a degree of dominance over their administrations. This could be said of Ahern, Kenny and Varadker, although some would challenge this. In the UK, since 2010, there has been periods of coalition government, of virtual minority government, of open cabinet revolt and government collapse. Modern British PMs arguably have to display the qualities of a chair if they are to manage the divisions in their parties and governments.

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons. If no evidence is presented a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If an argument is unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If an answer is unbalanced in treatment of the two systems, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.



**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

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

answer to the question. The most relevant and accurate evidence and examples are deployed to illustrate points made extremely effectively. There is exceptionally thorough and clear analysis and evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is highly effective comparison of political systems. Spelling, punctuation and grammar are 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**

One of the great puzzles of Irish politics remains why the Irish people voted in a referendum in 2013 to retain the Irish Seanad rather than abolish it. In the view of many, the Seanad was an expensive irrelevance that made little or no contribution to Irish political life. In terms of influencing legislation, scrutinising the executive or contributing to national debates about the future of the country, the Seanad was a failure. By contrast, the House of Lords continued to be active in all three areas, especially in being consistent pain in the government's backside.

Those opposed to abolition argued that the Seanad does play an important part in Irish politics. It provides a voice to many groups and parties in Irish society whose views are not adequately represented in the Dáil. Senators do openly debate major questions. They also participate in joint Oireachtas committees with TDs and therefore have a major input into policy. Critics of the Lords argue that its powers are exaggerated and it can do little other than delay the inevitable. The lack of democratic legitimacy is a major limiting factor of the Lord's power.

Weaker answers will display limited understanding of the question, provide limited evidence and make limited comparisons. Better answers will have a clear understanding of the question, be balanced, offer a range of argument and evidence and will make effective comparisons. If no evidence is presented a maximum of Level 3 can be awarded. If an argument is unbalanced, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded. If an answer is unbalanced in treatment of the two systems, a maximum of Level 4 can be awarded.

**Level 1 ([1]–[6])**

The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of the arguments for and against the Seanad 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 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 and against the Seanad and the Lords but there are major gaps in this knowledge and understanding and only a limited attempt is

made to answer the question. The response contains some relevant material but also significant irrelevant or general material. Some relevant evidence or examples are provided. There is limited analysis and simple evaluation of political information, arguments and explanations. There is some recognition of basic similarities and differences between political systems. The quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar is 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 and against the Seanad 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 arguments for and against the Seanad 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 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 and against the Seanad 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 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**