

Commentary on candidate evidence

The candidate evidence has achieved the following marks for each question of the question paper.

Candidate 1

Question 2 (a)

The candidate was awarded **20/20 marks** as follows:

Knowledge and understanding scope and development (8 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** for this section. The candidate addresses three aspects, each with detailed description. These aspects include codified and uncoded constitutions, flexibility and process of amendment and key constitutional principles (such as federalism, separation of powers, parliamentary supremacy, unitary state). The candidate splits some of these aspects up but in their response covers enough scope to meet the criteria for Three aspects each with detailed descriptions.

The candidate has three or more aspects that are developed, with extended explanation and/or relevant exemplification. For example, Royal Prerogative, the use of federal troops, the right to bear arms, gender recognition bill, equal marriage, state, and nation response to COVID 19 and John Locke. These aspects are developed, with extended and accurate explanations and development of points. A high level of conceptual understanding surrounding constitutions is given.

Analysis (6 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they make a number of analytical comments. For example:

- ◆ interpretation of consequences of US constitution being inflexible
- ◆ inconsistencies between the US and the UK constitutions
- ◆ links between power of states and federal government
- ◆ relative importance of central government in UK/USA
- ◆ interpretation of avoiding tyranny of majority
- ◆ understanding of underlying order and structure of US constitution

Structure (2 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they do present their evidence in a well-structured manner, with a clear line of argument throughout.

Conclusions (4 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. A developed and well-argued conclusion with justification. That directly address and evaluate the central issue in the question. The candidate gives an evaluation regarding the future of constitutions.

Candidate 2

Question 2 (b)

The candidate was awarded **18/20 marks** as follows:

Knowledge and understanding scope and development (8 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** for this section.

The candidate addresses four aspects, each with some description. These aspects include removal of executive by impeachment or vote of no confidence, limits on the power of appointment, limits on role as commander in chief and limits due to constitutional constraint. Candidate could meet the criteria for 5 marks in scope. However, as they also achieve **4 marks** for development a maximum of 4 was awarded.

The candidate has three or more aspects that are developed, with extended explanation and/or relevant exemplification. For example, Richard Nixon/Donal Trump impeachment, Theresa May vote of no confidence, Rishi Sunak and Joe Biden nominations, Obama and Thatcher's time as head of executive branch. These aspects are developed, with extended explanation and relevant exemplification. The commander in chief section is not as well developed but the other section makes up for this. The candidate received **4 marks** for this section.

Analysis (6 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they make a number of analytical comments. For example:

- ◆ consequence of winning vote of no confidence
- ◆ relative importance of impeachment
- ◆ inconsistencies between appointment limits
- ◆ interpretation of powers surrounding commander in chief (**2 marks**)
- ◆ contradictions between term limits in USA/UK

Structure (2 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they do present their evidence in a well-structured manner, with a clear line of argument throughout.

Conclusions (4 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks**. A straightforward conclusion that deals with and evaluates the central issue in the question. The candidate gives an evaluation that the UK executive has less constraints. The information given has already been awarded marks elsewhere in the response.

Candidate 3

Question 3 (a)

The candidate was awarded **3/20** marks as follows:

Knowledge and understanding scope and development (8 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** for this section. The candidate received marks for two aspects each with some description. The candidate received this for making reference to the SNP and the dominant idea of escape from Brexit in 2019 general election. They also make reference to the Conservatives 'Get Brexit done' key idea.

No marks were awarded for development as the SNP development is incorrect referencing 45% of Scottish Parliament seats. It was not clear what election the candidate was making reference to. There was no development in the Conservative section making reference to the dominant ideas having a 'huge impact' on the electoral performance. No further details were provided on this so no marks were awarded.

Analysis (6 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because they failed to make any valid analytical comments on the impact on the electoral performance between or within a political party.

Structure (2 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **0 marks** because they failed to present a clear structure that address the issue in the question. The candidate identifies the issue but does not address it in the essay.

Conclusions (4 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **1 mark**. The candidate gives a straightforward conclusion regarding the impact of the SNP and Conservatives dominate ideas. No evaluation or development is given.

Candidate 4

Question 3 (a)

The candidate was awarded **20/20** marks as follows:

Knowledge and understanding scope and development (8 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **8 marks** for this section. The candidate addresses three aspects, each with detailed description. These aspects include the dominant ideas of the Labour party during their time as 'old labour' and 'new labour'. The aspects focus on Education, Economy and Defence. Each aspect has detailed descriptions. This would allow the candidate to meet the criteria for Three aspects each with detailed descriptions.

The candidate has three or more aspects that are developed, with extended explanation and/or relevant exemplification. For example, reference to Michael Foot, Tony Blair, private schools, tax increases, role of Labour on the international stage and the role of the middle classes. A high level of conceptual understanding is given along with relevant exemplification.

Analysis (6 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **6 marks** because they make a number of analytical comments. For example:

- ◆ consequence of 'old labour' taxation policy
- ◆ consequence of 'new labour' tax policy.
- ◆ comparison of far-left policies impact on electoral performance
- ◆ inconsistency of the state's role in intervening in voter's lives
- ◆ comparison of Labour's policies with Conservative Party
- ◆ relative importance of policies on winning votes in Southern England

Structure (2 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **2 marks** because they do present their evidence in a well-structured manner, with a clear line of argument throughout.

Conclusions (4 marks available)

The candidate was awarded **4 marks**. A developed and well-argued conclusion with justification. That directly address and evaluate the central issue in the question. The candidate repeats some information from the essay but uses this information to construct a well-argued conclusion.