

2. Socialism is a political ideology whose existence was made prominent in the 1800s by Marx and Engels, when they wrote the Communist Manifesto, having observed what was happening at the time of the Industrial Revolution, with the exploitation of workers in factories for the purpose of profit within a capitalist system. At the heart of socialist ideology is collectivism, meaning that people are inherently good and will look after one another, creating a society that works for the benefit of everyone, rather than a society that benefits the individual. Socialism advocates a strong welfare system and the idea that the rich should make a strong financial contribution to the State in order to give the less privileged opportunities to lead the most fulfilling lives they can. Therefore Socialism advocates equality of opportunity and this can only be achieved by closing income gaps and achieving greater economic equality. Political systems refer to the way that societies are run by governments and so this essay will aim to prove that Socialism has in fact little relevance in modern political systems.

In the UK, we are currently governed by a conservative government. While it can be argued that ideology hasn't got as much relevance in the UK as it used, there are still very prominent characteristics of conservative ideology that have been and are put in practice. With reference to conservatism, at the heart of it is the idea of individualism, meaning that people are self-seeking and solely responsible for their success or failure in life, whether they lead happy lives or not, since individualism does not favour government intervention to help those who are disadvantaged. It therefore favours a system based on meritocracy, which means that if people work as hard as they can, they will get awarded accordingly to their efforts, whereas if people for example are living in poverty or are not living fulfilling lives, then it's solely the individual's fault. Since 2010 in the UK, there has been Conservative Party influence and that's been evident through the policies that they have put through and the outcome of these policies. In other words, the very fact that a party with somewhat leftist policies hasn't been in power in Westminster for 7 years in the UK shows how little relevance Socialism has on modern day political systems. Very recently in May 2017, Theresa May announced further cuts to disability benefits, which shows conservative ideology being put into practice. Further evidence of a lack of socialist influence is the fact that funding for the NHS in England is at an all time low, and this fits with the idea of individualism, that it's not the government's responsibility to ensure that health care accessible to everyone. However, it can be argued that in Scotland, socialist ideology is more prominent, with the NHS being the best performing in Scotland due to increased funding and the fact that tuition fees have been abolished in Scotland. Free education and accessible health care for everyone is a key aspect of socialist ideology, and it's clear that this Socialism has great relevance in Scotland's political system.

Similarly to the UK, in the USA it can be argued that Socialism is even less relevant and this can be proved by the very fact that Healthcare has never been and still isn't free at the

point of delivery, as it is in the UK. It can be argued that when Obama introduced the Affordable Care Act in 2010, he clearly tried to introduce more socialist policies and the Affordable Care Act has in fairness resulted in a record number of people being insured and thus a record number of people having access to preventive care, such as vaccinations and cancer screenings. The very fact that the Act had succeeded in insuring a record number of people shows that socialism began to have some relevance in US politics but now Trump aims to scrap it, though as of yet he has faced strong opposition but now he has cleared the way by gaining enough votes to repeal Obamacare, and replace with something that would involve lower taxes for the general public. Low taxes are a key feature of conservative ideology, so it's evident that socialism will continue to have little relevance in US politics.

While it's evident that in both the USA and the UK, Socialism has no relevance, it can be argued that socialism would have much more relevance in the UK if Jeremy Corbyn won the 2017 General Election. In Labour's 2017 Manifesto, Corbyn pledged to re-nationalise the railways, Royal Mail, and partly electricity. Nationalisation of public services/industries is a key aspect of socialist ideology. This is because socialism aims to guarantee the "full fruits of the industry" as it was stated in the (now) scrapped Clause IV of the Labour Manifesto which was present since the beginnings of the Labour Party. Socialism argues that Nationalisation ensures that services are owned by the government in order to work in favour of the people. When those get privatised, they get sold off to private companies and so reduce the service's that each public service provides to the ones that have proved to be most profitable. For example, it's more likely for a train from a privatised rail company to breakdown since the private companies tried to save money and spend as little as possible on its manufacturing, even though this may be dangerous, but the point of privatisation is that it is profitable. At the heart of socialist ideology is that these services function for the purpose of satisfying the general public rather than profit, so if Corbyn was to win the election, we could see a return to Socialism becoming more relevant in our political system. Furthermore, Corbyn pledged to scrap tuition fees which could be a milestone for UK politics, since tuition fees have been introduced in 1999 by Tony Blair, who was then the leader of the Labour Party, ironically enough.

While in the UK there is the prospect of some form of socialism becoming relevant if Corbyn were to win the general election, there is no prospect of Socialism becoming more relevant in Romania, for example. While in theory all access to health care is free, many doctors refuse to offer their services unless they are paid. In other words, the healthcare system is incredibly corrupt. The reason for this is that doctor's pay is significantly lower than it is in the UK for example; The minimum wage in Romania is about a tenth of what it is in the UK. Furthermore, private healthcare is by miles much safer and better quality than public healthcare is, although both require some cash payment, except private healthcare is much more expensive. This simply shows how irrelevant socialism is in Romania's political system, and by far a lot more irrelevant than it is in the UK. The main difference is, so that in the UK there is the prospect of Socialism becoming much more relevant whereas in Romania, there is absolutely no prospect of that.

It can be argued that the reason why socialism is so irrelevant in modern political systems is because the general public are no longer interested in socialist and collectivist policies being pursued, arguably with the emergence of a middle class since the 1970s. According to the Geert Hofstede scale that measures how individualistic a country is by taking into consideration public opinions, the UK is currently the third most individualistic country in the world, behind Australia and the United States respectively.

This clearly shows that there is a real lack of public will to contribute financially to public services such as the NHS and to generally financially contribute for the benefit of society as a whole. Interestingly, around 97% of the British public believe that the NHS should be free at the point of delivery, however increased spending for its funding is at an all time low and so is public support for increased spending. This shows that while people may appreciate healthcare in the UK being currently free at the point of delivery, there is no desire for a financial contribution on their behalf and so it can be argued that if the British public are lacking the will to spend more money on maintaining a free NHS, then they are most likely to vote for parties that will either lower taxes or keep them the same for the benefit of the individual, rather than society as a whole. There is also pretty much no prospect of Labour winning this upcoming general election as the general public is not interested in socialist politics and this is evident with polls putting Theresa May ahead of Jeremy Corbyn. Finally, Corbyn stated that the abolition of tuition fees in England would result in £48 billion being collected in tax revenue, and as it is evident by the individualistic nature of the English public, there is very little chance that people would vote for that.

It can be argued that the case is quite the opposite in Scotland, with a stronger will for Socialism being relevant in UK politics since people are more willing to spend money to invest in public services, a clear example being the fact that the NHS is best performing in Scotland out of the entire UK. The Scottish National Party have been in power for 10 years now and their popularity seems to grow and be maintained so this in itself shows that the Scottish public's will for Socialism being relevant in a political system is significantly more stronger than it is in England. While the SNP are not exactly a socialist party themselves, they have put forward and maintained socialist policies.

To conclude, Socialism does have little relevance in modern political systems, particularly in England and more so in the United States, however it has more relevance in Scotland. Since the Conservatives have been in power, their sole aim is to reduce government debt by imposing austerity cuts, which involves cuts to services such as the NHS, cuts to benefits necessary for people to get by, and reducing funding in the infrastructures of schools. Ex-PM's (David Cameron) cuts hit the poorest the hardest, particularly those living in the North of England, and with Theresa May reducing disability benefits and reducing child benefits to the government giving financial help to parents who only have two children. The very fact that people voted for this and will seem to do so at the next general election, shows that neither governments nor the public themselves wish for Socialism to have more relevance in Britain's political system.

3. A codified institution refers to the branches of a political system (the executive, the legislative and the judiciary) making laws, blocking laws or blocking actions that are seen to interfere with the entrenched constitution. An entrenched constitution contains articles that are very hard to amend and so any action that one of the branches makes it has to comply with the articles. In the UK, there is an uncodified institution which means that since there is parliamentary sovereignty, meaning that the legislative branch is the superior body in the UK, it can overturn any actions taken by the UK Supreme Court or the Executive, and the legislative branch can also repeal, amend or introduce new Acts much more easily than it can in the States, where the constitution is entrenched. In the USA, there is the Bill of Rights which is incorporated within the US constitution, which outlines citizens' rights whereas in the UK there is the Human Rights Act that essentially had to be implemented by EU law but now it can be completely scrapped since the UK chose to leave the European Union. This essay will aim to argue that perhaps a codified institution may not be preferable to an uncodified institution, by looking at executive branch and legislature actions, as well as judicial branch actions taken in the UK and the USA.

In the USA, in order to amend the codified constitution, there needs to be a 2/3 majority vote in both houses. It can be argued that in some ways, a codified institution is not preferable to an uncodified one; One right of citizens in the USA is the right to bear arms, and despite Barack Obama during his presidency having a Democratic majority in both houses, he struggled to introduce much stricter gun control laws since this interfered with the codified institution, and so the Supreme Court was able to strike down his executive bills easily, because bearing guns is a US citizen's right. Two of his executive laws failed to become legislation, one which involved people on the Federal Terror Watchlist to be denied the right to a gun, which failed to go through by about 10 votes in Congress, and the second one he introduced was an amended version of the original, which also failed to become legislation. It can be argued that many congressmen and women who voted against those gun control measures simply complied with the codified institution, knowing that if the bill got through Congress, it would still get struck down by the Supreme Court during the bill's final stages. Obama also tried to prevent millions of illegal immigrants getting deported during sometime in 2013 but their place in the States could not be secured as it interfered with one of the articles within the codified institution and so the Supreme Court prevented Obama from taking such action. This shows just how influential the codified institution is on decisions made by both the Supreme Court and Congress and perhaps in this case, it is not preferable to an uncodified institution, especially when it comes to stricter gun laws, given the US's reputation for frequent mass shootings and gun-related deaths. It can be argued that perhaps a codified institution is too powerful, given that Obama had democratic majorities in both houses and his gun proposals should have at least reached the Supreme Court stage, but arguably there was apathy among the congressmen and women, and so they struck his proposals down, just because they knew the bills would not go past the Supreme Court.

In the UK, depending on one's view on this particular issue, it can be argued that a codified institution may be more preferable. During the time David Cameron was prime minister, the executive had to comply with a UK Supreme Court decision that meant that 24,000 sex offenders were not indefinitely kept on the sex offender register, therefore not being 'labelled for life'. A codified institution may mean that such a decision could not have been taken by the Supreme Court as it would have had to comply with the codified institution, and so the outcome of this would have been in the executive's favour and the general public's who supported the executive's view on this. In the US, it can be argued that a codified institution is not preferable on certain issues such as gun control, whereas in the UK, depending on one's view it can be argued either way, depending on the general public's view on the issue. It can be argued that a codified institution is preferable on this particular case from the executive's point of view since such a decision may not have been taken by the UK Supreme Court as it would have been unconstitutional.

In the USA, it can be argued that a codified institution is preferable from perhaps the general public's point of view. This is because many people in both the UK and the USA did not agree with the US executive's bill to ban people from eight Muslim countries from entering the US altogether and so despite President Donald Trump having a Republican majority in both houses, the bill was deemed unconstitutional because it interfered with the entrenched constitution. In this case, it can easily be argued that a codified constitution is preferable to an uncodified one since it blocked the President's bill to ban their immigration to the States on completely racist grounds. In other words, the codified institution ensured that people's rights to enter the country is not denied and since immigrants make up a significant chunk of the employees and employers in the UK, perhaps the codified institution ultimately did the US economy a favour, so in that sense a codified institution is preferable to an uncodified one.

In the UK where the constitution is uncodified, it can be argued that a codified institution is preferable, since many people and politicians themselves in the UK were angered after the EU referendum vote, that a parliamentary vote was necessary before the Government was able to trigger Article 50. A codified institution would mean that there Parliamentary Sovereignty would no longer exist, and so maybe people would have preferred that a codified institution should state that referendums are not merely just advisory, and that the Parliament would have to comply with the decision taken by the public without a parliamentary vote. However, it can be argued that in this case a codified institution is neither preferable or preferable, since the Parliamentary vote turned out in favour of triggering Article 50 anyway. In the US however, many would argue that in that particular case, a codified institution proved to be a great check on the power of the President, many which would consider it to be highly unethical if the ban was kept in place. The ban itself was an executive order which would bypass Congress but the codified institution gave the Supreme Court the power to strike it down. Overall, it can be argued that a codified institution in both cases is preferable depending on the majority's view on the decision of an issue that had been taken by the executive or judicial branch, whether this decision was affected by a codified institution or not.

It can be argued that an uncodified institution is more preferable than a codified institution since the Government can introduce collectivist initiatives or deliver on collectivist pledges that benefit the whole of society. Since the UK Supreme Court is the highest tier in the UK judiciary, naturally this means that there is also an uncodified constitution in Scotland. Two main things that affect whether a piece of legislation is scrapped or goes through is the size of the executive (whether the executive is a majority government, minority government or coalition government) and how opposed the parliament is to the executive's piece of legislation. One reason why an uncodified institution is preferable was when Conservatives during the 2010 coalition with the Liberal Democrats put forward a bill to start repealing the Human Rights Act but the bill turned out to be unpopular and so the parliamentary vote blocked the Conservative's plan to start repealing the Human Rights Act then. In theory, MPs are supposed to represent the views of their constituents in Parliament through parliamentary votes and so it can be argued that the uncodified institution allowed for this to be the case. It can be argued that in this case an uncodified institution is preferable to a codified one since it allowed MPs to represent their constituents' views on the bill at the time. Similarly to the UK, it was the case in Scotland when the now repealed Offensive Behaviour and Threatening Communications at Football Act was repealed by a parliamentary vote in 2016, since the SNP are currently a minority government and so the uncodified constitution allowed the legislative branch (parliament) to repeal the bill. It can be argued that many MSPs simply represented the views of their constituents; There had been many protests from Motherwell, Rangers and Celtic fans regarding the Act. It can be argued that to those people and many MSPs who shared their view, an uncodified constitution is preferable since it allowed for an Act to be repealed that was highly unpopular.

To conclude, a codified institution is not preferable to an uncodified one since an uncodified one has allowed for many members of the general public to be represented by their MPs since their able to easily strike down legislation that wasn't popular. However, a US codified institution has its significant advantages since it prevented President Donald Trump from taking action that could be considered by many as highly unethical and also a sign that he may abuse so his presidential powers and so in that sense, a codified constitution is preferable because it helped prevent the executive from abusing powers in a way that an uncodified institution may not have been able to allow for such a thing. It can be argued in many ways that both an uncodified or codified institution are neither preferable or preferable; For example, many people were upset by the fact that the codified institution prevented Obama from taking action for more gun control while others were happy that he was not able to do such a thing, as they consider their right to bear arms to be a very precious aspect of being an American citizen. This is the same in the UK, an uncodified constitution may not be preferable to a lot of people on a specific issue, whereas on other issues, it may be preferable. For example, Obama couldn't get exactly what he wanted initially from the Affordable Care Act since it would have taxed people too much and that would have interfered with a codified institution, whereas in the UK, access to healthcare is free under the NHS, and so the Government was able to set tax rates at a high enough level to ensure that the NHS is still free at the point of delivery. So from many people's perspective, an uncodified constitution is better than a codified one.

4. Covert observation is a research method which involves a researcher going undercover to analyse and experience the lives of a group of people they wish to study, such as a gang or perhaps a group of politicians and life where corruption is prevalent in a particular country. Covert observation's major advantage is that it allows a researcher to get first hand experience of a situation/as it allows for very in-depth conclusions to be made about the life style the people are studying are leading. However, a covert researcher requires years of training and experience before they can carry out their investigations since the reason for their presence is not known by the people they are studying and so they must learn how to control their body language and be aware of it too so that they don't give away their reason for their involvement with that specific group. Covert observation automatically raises ethical issues (since it means that the participants cannot give any form of consent whatsoever on being observed and their behaviour being a taken note of and results published without their consent), otherwise it defeats the purpose of the research, which is that the participants are explored in their 'natural surroundings', behaving normally. This is another disadvantage of covert observation since the researcher has to be very subtle when taking notes, otherwise the participants may become uncomfortable and fail to behave normally/naturally, which can then invalidate the researcher's results. Overt observationists have to devise a method of taking notes that is codified in a way that it makes sense to them so that it's subtle and they also have to learn to retain information as it may not be appropriate at all for them to be seen scribbling by the other participants. This can make the participants start behaving unnaturally and is known as the Hawthorne Effect, which means that people stop acting naturally when they feel that there is something unusual or not right about the presence of the person who happens to be the researcher. An example of the Hawthorne Effect was in William Whytes' study (Street Corner Society) from a few decades ago when the leader of the gang told Whyte that 'before I used to do things by instinct, but now I have to think, 'what would Whyte want to know about it?' Another disadvantage is the ethical issues centred around illegal actions that the researcher may witness, but for the purpose of social science research, they would refuse to report it because it would disrupt the 'natural ways' of the participants and thus invalidating their research. An example of this was in the study 'A View From The Boys' when the researcher was receiving stolen goods. This of course puts the researcher and their institution in a very bad light and could damage their reputation.

A few years ago, the BBC did a documentary on ordinary russians' love for President Putin. The guy from the BBC was an overt observationist but to others he was just a person who was interviewing individuals about their opinions on Putin, and how people proudly presented him with their own personal shrines dedicated to President Putin.

The nature of covert observation means that a researcher may be limited by their physical characteristics to gain access to a group, without explaining the reason why they are there. In this sense, covert observation is very limiting because a researcher may not be able to study the group of people that was most relevant to their research purposes and so ultimately, a researcher may not get the most fruitful results possible. There can also be hierarchies within an institution, particularly if the researcher is observing people in a professional environment (in order to investigate corruption), and so they would never be able to gain access to rooms/meetings that could make their research and analysis really fruitful. An advantage however of covert observation is that they are not participating and so there is no danger of 'going native'. This means that a researcher could become so involved with participation in a particular group, that they lose the focus of the research or fail to make objective analysis on the situation or may even get distracted from taking key notes that would help explain behaviours.

In covert observation, it may be possible to record discussions/scenarios if done very subtly, which means that a researcher will have access to accurate information and quotes from the participants to provide for a more enhanced analysis. However, this raises a lot of ethical issues around consent and a lack of voluntariness, meaning that people did not give their permission to either be recorded or observed in the first place, and any ethical issues in social science research can easily damage researcher's and institution's reputations easily; Ethical issues around this are frowned upon by people. The only ethical issue that is not involved in Participant Observation is that people are not bribed with anything or forced to disclose something since the whole point of participant observation is to observe people in their natural habitats and behaving as they normally would.

5. It can be argued that source A is not trustworthy since it says that the source is adapted, which means that it can be biased in order to suit the author's view, making the source unreliable. However, the background of the author is given and since his background is in the field that the article was written about makes the source more reliable. There are no details however listed of how to contact the author with any queries about any of the information so maybe this was done on purpose if some of the information is not accurate on purpose. The background of DataDial is given which makes the source more reliable but since the team is so small (of 15 people) it makes the source less reliable since between 15 people there is little opportunity for cross checking information and the work that they produce. The fact that they've worked with a wide range of sectors makes them more credible, because it shows that they have experience and are versatile in the ways that they promote sites for clients. The fact that Matt is one of the most influential SEOs in the UK means that he is well-respected and known for his quality work and so it makes this source more reliable and likely to be trustworthy. The fact that he has a large Twitter following shows that he is well-known and respected, meaning that his work more often than not is of very high quality, meaning that it's trustworthy.

However, the fact that DataDial is a 'net' website and not a government website can mean that the information used is less likely to be valid, making the source untrustworthy. One thing that does make the data reliable however is the fact that the source is clear, since it is coded in such a manner to represent the patterns/colours of the various parties, and are clearly headlined showing which parties reached the highest number of people on the different social media platforms. The fact that graphs are also given exact numbers makes the source more reliable. However, the source may be totally not valid since it doesn't state the sample number, and for any research to be valid, a sample of 1000 people must be used at least. Also the fact that there is no numeric identification for the amount of people that UKIP reached further emphasises that the data may not be valid, since the other parties that are listed all have a numerical value of people they've reached via social platforms. An advantage however of the source which makes it trustworthy is the layout itself which is simple and clear, showing that the researcher may not have any intentions to be economical with the truth about their research or be biased, which can make the source more trustworthy. Also the fact that the author explains what the Klout score is which makes the data clearer and therefore more reliable. There is however no mention whatsoever over how this research was carried out and when it was carried out, and how soon those findings were published after the research was finished. This can make the source both unreliable and not valid. Furthermore, when they explained the Klout score, there is no clear definition of what they mean by people responding to something being shared on social media, and people respond in various ways depending on the social media platform. The fact that they didn't explain what they meant by public response on social media makes the source most likely to be not very valid and not very trustworthy either.