

1) The electoral system is used to elect a governing body to power. There are 3 types of governments the first being Presidential where the executive is the main body of leadership. Russia and the US fall under the semi-presidential system where the executive and legislature overlap whilst the UK has a parliamentary system whereby the Prime Minister is in both the executive and legislature. Most countries have a representative system where the public elect people to represent them which can be a range of parties that promote different views. The hypothesis argues that the electoral system is the only thing that promotes or

discourages the use of multi-party system, thus saying that this is the main factor. However, party policies as well as increase media use encourages and discourages multi-party. This essay will therefore argue that electoral systems are important in encouraging or discouraging multi-party representation but other factors influence as well to a lesser extent.

The First Past the Post system is a 'winner takes all' system whereby the voters get one vote and the person who receives the most votes wins. It is a recognised system as it is easy to use which can be seen with a 66% voter turnout rate in the 2015

general election and 55% turnout rate in the most recent 2016 Presidential election. It is also favoured as it tends to create a majority government as seen in the 2015 election with the Conservatives having the majority. However, it does not encourage multi-party representation, instead creating, usually, a two party system. This is due to the nature of the vote. Currently, the Conservatives have over half the seats in the house of commons when they only won 37% of the vote, whilst UKIP received 4 million votes and only got 7 seats. Because of this it shows that it discourages

multi-party representation as smaller parties are less likely to be voted in due to the constituent boundaries. This is also shown in America where ~~Trump~~ First Past the Post is used for the electoral college vote in determining the President. Once again this discourages multi-party representation as the two candidates tend to be Republican and Democrat, with Trump being elected for having the most electoral college seats. Whilst the senate has only 3 seats that don't fall into the Republican or Democrats, showing that the electoral system plays an important role in discouraging

Multi-party representation as it tends to create a majority two-party government decreases multi-party representation.

However, other electoral systems work better to encourage multi-party representation. The single transferable vote (STV) is a proportional representation vote, where voters rank candidates in order of preference. It has been said to encourage multi-party representation as the use of ranking allows numerous parties to be in power. In Scotland it is used for the Council elections. The city of Edinburgh now has 5 parties working

together to help run Edinburgh correctly. This system encourages multi-party representation as it is created to enable the breakdown of the two-party system. Although the SNP's have 19 councillors and the Conservatives 18 it allows other parties to work alongside each other. However, the STV system is also used in Malta to elect their governing body. In the most recent election the government is dominated by Labour with 39/89 seats being there. This creates a two-party system, once again discouraging multi-party representation due to the lack of elected representatives. Therefore,

the electoral system, once again, has been shown to be ~~the most~~ ~~in~~ important in encouraging or discouraging multi-party representation as it dictates which candidates are elected.

In previous years the use of party policies used to be the most important thing in deciding who would represent the public in government.

Each party produces a manifesto in the UK that decides / states what the party hopes to achieve. In 2015 the conservative government pledged to stop the cap of uni

places available to students whilst Jeremy Corbyn, in his recent manifesto, wants to drop all university fees. In the 2015 election the SNP party received 56 seats due to their campaign against Labour and with their message of acting as a barrier to the conservative power. ~~However~~, This shows that due to ^{party} public policy the minor party, in UK context, of the SNP were able to win a substantial number of seats and have managed to take a stand on matters such as Trident. However, in the USA the Green party has 58,000 members but does not have any control over the Presidency

or congress purely because of the electoral system used to represent parties whilst in Scotland minor parties made up 30% of the vote but have been dominated by Labour and Conservatives. This shows that party policies encourages multi-party representation, however the electoral systems are the most important factor as they decide which parties get elected, favouring a two-party system.

In recent years, the use of media has risen considerably. In the UK 70% of people have facebook whilst 68% of all

people in America have some sort of social media. This increase has led to the encouragement of multi-party representation as smaller parties have been able to raise awareness and increase profile. In the 2015 election 70% of the newspaper stories focussed on how the leaders were viewed, however, this mainly focussed on the two main leaders of Conservatives and Labour, therefore discouraging multi-party representation as the other parties are not receiving as much attention. However, in this year's general election both Theresa May

and Jeremy Corbyn have refused to take part in TV debates which saw the absence of Conservatives and Labour on the most recent Scottish TV debate. This will therefore, encourage multi-party representation if the two-dominant parties are not campaigning on TV to the public, raising popularity of those minor parties. However, many argue that due to the absence of the two parties viewing rates will be lower, thereby, not impacting multi-party representation. In comparison in the United States, the media purely tends to focus on the Republicanist Democrat

with Fox News taking the side of the Presidency when Obama was President. This therefore shows that the media allows multi-party messages to be spread however, it prevents the election of multi-party representation due to the fact that it doesn't share the space equally and the electoral system ultimately prevents the use of multi-party representation. Therefore, showing it is the key factor.

In conclusion, this essay has shown that electoral systems are very important in encouraging or discouraging

Multi-party representation. This is because it prevents minor parties being elected instead focussing on a two-party system which, in the UK, tends to be a majority. Whilst the Senate or Congress and the Presidency are kept separate, the electoral system still keeps it dominated by two parties showing it discourages multi-party representation. Although party policies are important in deciding which way an individual will vote, the electoral system keeps the system two party. This is the same with the media as, as the influence has increased, the

Coverage tends to be of the two-dominant party thus discouraging multi-party representation. An alternative hypothesis would be that the electoral system is the only factor encouraging or discouraging multi-party representation however, this would be rejected as other factors influence to a lesser extent. Therefore, this essay has argued that electoral systems are a very important factor in encouraging or discouraging multi-party representation.

3) A country's constitution is the legal document where the rules and laws as well as the powers are written down or stated. The United Kingdom has an uncodified constitution which is very rare, with most countries including the United States being codified. The hypothesis states that uncodified constitutions are preferable to codified constitutions. This means that they work better and provide the government and public the clarity ~~pre~~ needed to run. However, this essay will argue that although they are preferable on some

levels Codified constitutions work better for powers shared within government, controlling the executive, maintaining the legislature, increasing judicial powers. ~~and maintaining leader elections.~~

A codified constitution increases clarity when diffusing power to government bodies. In the US and Russia, there exists regions/states where representatives are chosen. In America this is 2 representatives from each state are sent to the senate which creates a fair and equal representation of each state. In Federal government,

which 10% of the world are, there exists a minimum of two houses where the decisions are made. However, although providing clarity it does not prevent tensions increasing between federal government and states. This was shown during Obama's leadership when 40% of state government refused financial support from the government. This shows that although it provides clarity in codified constitutions does not prevent tension. Meanwhile the uncodified constitution of the UK has created an imbalance of political power between government and

local authorities, the power imbalance has resulted in the central government trying to influence policy in local areas which hasn't been received well, such as the 20 mph speed limits in zones in Edinburgh. To try and fix this the government appointed Andy Burnham as Manchester's mayor to try and resolve the political imbalance, however, it has failed to do so. This therefore, shows that although the codified constitution creates tension it allows a better share of power due to the 10th Amendment and nature of States rights which

exists in America.

A codified constitution allows more controls to be applied on the executive.

In America, the executive needs backing from congress on declaring war as seen in 2003 with the Iraq war as well as aiding a war such as Syria. This two tier system, stated in the codified constitution, allows the executive to be controlled as it needs the majority support from the representatives. However, throughout his Presidency, Obama issued 250 executive orders which means they are passed without

Congress' Support. This shows that the control of the Executive in by the legislature is limited but many argue that Obama's executive orders were issued due to the lack of democratic support in congress, criticising the codified constitution. Meanwhile in the United Kingdom the executive is also curbed, with some arguing even more. In 2014, Cameron was prevented by Parliament to declare war on Syria, which shows the lack of power the executive has. However, the SNP introduced the Cragging order preventing the party members from voting or speaking against the pay.

This therefore shows that an uncodified constitution, although controlling the executive, doesn't do this to the same level as a codified one, stating that a codified one is more preferable.

The use of a codified constitution allows the legislature to be maintained. In the United States ~~the~~ Congress is made out of the majority of Republicans and Democrats which allows the two-party system to be run smoothly. However, due to the fact the Presidency and Congress

are separate it can cause issues in making changes and passing laws. This was seen during Obama's presidency when Government was shut for 2 weeks due to the lack of agreement. In some ways this shows that a codified constitution is not beneficial in maintaining legislative as it prevents work but it can also argue that the simplistic nature of the system provides clear guide lines of practical. However, in Russia the Duma is dominated by the United Russia Party with it winning 54% of the vote and over 75% of the seats. This therefore shows that a codified constitution can

discourage the use of democracy and a balance of power. In the UK, however, the House of Commons is usually a majority government apart from the 2010 coalition between Liberal Democrats and Conservatives. Although I may argue this isn't a true picture of democracy it allows Acts and decisions to be passed helping the UK run better.

However, some times party members vote against their party as seen in 2014 when 91 Conservatives voted against House of Commons reforms. This then shows that this uncodified nature increases

the ability to pass things but also creates a bigger sense of pay disloyalty showing that a codified constitution is more preferable.

Finally, a codified constitution enhances the judiciary. In America the judicial system is much more political with federal judges and supreme court judges openly supporting a specific party. Throughout his leadership Obama appointed 320 federal judges with 91 being Democrats in September 2016. This allows the political and judicial system to run more fairly as the part judicial system

is balanced with members from both parties but also acting alongside the President. However, this has also been seen as undemocratic and unfair as the judicial system and government should be kept separate. In 2016 Obama's recommendation for a Supreme Court judge was rejected whilst Trump's approved. This then shows that the codified constitution is not seen as preferable in all circumstances. In the UK, the judicial system is viewed as much weaker and less influential as it is not connected with politics. However,

it prevented Article 50 being triggered by Theresa May without majority support from Parliament which increased its influence. Therefore, when dealing with judicial cases the hypothesis is correct in ~~creating and~~ being more preferable.

In conclusion, the hypothesis is incorrect in stating that uncodified constitutions are preferable to codified constitutions. This has been shown as codified constitutions enable a clarity to be given on sharing powers, controls the executive to a higher extent and allows the legislature to be maintained.

through party loyalty and voting. Although an uncodified constitution is more favourable to issues surrounding judicial areas due to the distancing of politics from it, this is only one specific area so can not be used to support the hypothesis. An alternative hypothesis could be that codified constitutions are completely preferable to uncodified but that would ignore the fact that uncodified constitutions support the judiciary better. Therefore, this essay has argued that codified constitutions are more preferable than uncodified constitutions on the majority of

topics surrounding the democratic running of government.

4) Participant observation is when the researcher observes an individual carrying out daily life to get a true picture of social reality. It can either be overt or covert or in this case covert which means that the participant is unaware that they are being observed. To research the corruption in politics covert participant observation will allow the researcher to increase the validity of the research as it will enable a true picture of social reality to be given.

Covert Participation observation has the advantage that the individual being watched will act normally, reducing the bias that may be introduced if the individual was aware of what was being taken place. It also allows the researcher to gather a vast amount of detail as whether there was corruption in politics as they would be allowed access to the inside of the party / parties, increasing the validity. *

However, due to the fact that it is covert it raises ethical problems as the individual has not consented

to being observed. As well as this the rates of reliability are decreased as its a qualitative research method which prevent the experiment being consisted, repeated or unaffected by personal bias. Covert participant observation can take a long time as the researcher needs to be affiliated and trusted within the political party. This further more reduces the reliability and increases the breach of ethical reasoning as a falsehood is being created.

Other research methods such as the qualitative method of semi-structured

interviews would increase the ethical nature as the participant would be aware of the situation making it overt. Lord Ashcroft and his Red dawn investigation used semi-structured interviews enabling him to see why the Labour party had lost support. Whilst Paul Cairney used semi-structured interviews to find out about fracking in the UK and abroad. A semi-structured interview could use a mixture of open and closed questions to find out whether there was corruption in politics, increasing validity as a true picture of social reality would be given.

However, semi-structured interviews may lead to the introduction of bias as the interviewer may influence the answers given by the participant. As well as this due to the nature of corruption in politics the researcher may not receive honest or accurate answers and a small number of participants could be sampled reducing the reliability.

Overall, covert participation observation would enable the researcher to get a true picture of social reality, in this case corruption in politics as the research is being carried out

Secretly. However, due to the fact that it's covert it causes ethical reasons in connection with consent. Other research methods such as semi structured interview increase the ethnical part of it however, due to the nature of the topic and the lack of quantitative data the research is unable to be repeated and therefore effect personal bias. Therefore a better method for investigating would be overt participation observation as it allows the researcher to see if corruption exists within politics but also allows the ethnical issues to be addressed.

* Covert participation observation would be the best research method when dealing with issues such as the MP's expenses scandal as it shows corruption within politics.

5) In order to assess the extent to whether or not source A can be considered trustworthy we must analyse the source's origin, content and methodology used to support the content. In doing so we must evaluate the reliability which is the extent to whether or not the source is consistent, repeatable and unaffected by personal bias as well as the validity which is the

Source) extent to which the results give a true picture of social reality and are accurate and relevant to the topic which is social media and the penetration by major UK political parties.

The source has a title of, "social media penetration by major UK political parties," which immediately makes it trustworthy as it headlines what the source will be about giving the reader context. The source contains a web address of "www.data.dia.net," this also increases the trustworthiness as it enables the data presented to be queried or expanded on allowing the reader to access all the facts. However, the

Source was published in 2010 making it less trustworthy as more recent research could show the increasing use of social media by political parties.

The content of the source is labelled clearly with "Facebook" and "Twitter" being examined with the data being presented in a clear understandable way. This increases the trustworthiness as it enables clear comparisons to be made.

The research has collected quantitative data which increases the reliability as it is consistent, repeatable and unaffected by personal bias. The source shows that the conservatives have 23,533

facebook friends and 21,323 Twitter followers showing that it has a very high public following showing that it is penetrating ~~UK~~ Social media. However, small parties such as BNP only have 1,584 facebook friends and 1,904 Twitter followers showing that not every political party is penetrating social media. ~~However, the source is less trustworthy as the "complete" secret is not explained~~

Source A was "adapted from a blog post by Mark Sawyer." This makes it less trustworthy as the whole information may not be presented reducing the

Validity as a true picture of social reality has not been given. The source states that "Dataclia" has 15 members making it less trustworthy as the range of researchers is less. However, it has been established for "12 years," which makes it useful as it is recognised and has with a range of different clients such as "Autism, charity (and) children." showing they are regarded by a range of organisations. The source also states that "Matt is one of the most influential SEO's," with 35.4k followers on Twitter. This makes the source more reliable as he is well regarded and has the ability to gain research on social

Media with a large understanding himself on the increase use.

The source is trustworthy as it specifically the individual metric, in a way that is easy to understand and is clear. It also clearly states what a "kilot score," is as well as a "complete score," backing up the content in showing the increase penetration of social media by political parties.

Overall, Source A is considered trustworthy to a large extent as it provides detailed accounts of how major UK party penetrate social media. As well as clearly outlining origin and methodology in order for source A to be considered

More trustworthy a wider range of social media such as snapchat and instagram could be analysed to show younger voters penetrated by political parties. As well as this qualitative data could be used alongside the quantitative to give a true sense of social reality as opinion could be heard on whether or not social media is being penetrated by major UK political parties.