



General Certificate of Education

Government and Politics
5151/6151

GOV4 **Comparative UK/USA**
Government

Mark Scheme

2007 examination - January series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING AS/A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS

Introduction

The AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principles of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

Using a levels of response mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic, source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

Examiners should initially make a decision about which Level any given response should be placed in. Having determined the appropriate Level the examiners must then choose the precise mark to be given within that Level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the Level, where that Level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest whether the middle mark is unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the Level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?"

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

**A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS, EXCLUDING SYNOPTIC UNIT
(GOV4, GOV5, GOV6, GOV7)**

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (a) (Total: 8 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	Levels 3–4 (2 marks) The candidate demonstrates a good to excellent knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s). Where appropriate, the candidate produces accurate and/or relevant examples to illustrate points made.	Levels 3–4 (3–4 marks) The candidate applies a good to excellent range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.	Levels 3–4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary. The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion.
	Levels 1–2 (1 mark) The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s). The candidate produces few or inaccurate examples and/or limited evidence to illustrate points made.	Levels 1–2 (1–2 marks) The candidate applies a limited range of concepts and makes little or limited use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.	Levels 1–2 (1 mark) The candidate communicates explanations or arguments with limited clarity and effectiveness using limited political vocabulary. The answer may lack either a clear focus on the question or a sense of direction. A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.

A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS, EXCLUDING SYNOPTIC UNIT
(GOV4, GOV5, GOV6, GOV7)

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (b) (Total: 12 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (5–6 marks)</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate fully addresses the requirements of the question and provides developed and effective to comprehensive interpretation. The answer also provides clear to accurate evidence and, where appropriate, good to excellent examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Levels 3 – 4 (3–4 marks)</p> <p>The candidate applies a good to excellent range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.</p>	<p>Levels 3–4 (2 marks)</p> <p>The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary. The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (3–4 marks)</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate clearly addresses the requirements of the question and provides sound interpretation and contextual awareness. The answer includes good examples to illustrate points made.</p>		
	<p>Levels 1–2 (1–2 marks)</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates slight to basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate makes a very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question and provides little to partial and reasonably effective interpretation. Answers offer limited or little evidence and few or inaccurate examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Levels 1–2 (1–2 marks)</p> <p>The candidate applies a limited range of concepts and makes little or limited use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.</p>	<p>Levels 1–2 (1 mark)</p> <p>The candidate communicates explanations or arguments with limited clarity and effectiveness using limited political vocabulary. The answer may lack either a clear focus on the question or a sense of direction. A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.</p>

**A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS, EXCLUDING SYNOPTIC UNIT
(GOV4, GOV5, GOV6, GOV7)**

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (c) (Total: 20 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (7–8 marks) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates excellent contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes excellent examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7–8 marks) The candidate displays excellent awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is an excellent focus on the specific question asked. There is a clear evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a sophisticated awareness of viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>Appropriate parallels and connections are clearly identified together with comparisons. A wide range of concepts is used.</p>	<p>Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity. Excellent use is made of political vocabulary to construct cogent and coherent arguments. The answer has a clear sense of direction, culminating in a conclusion that flows from the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer clearly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates sound contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) The candidate displays sound awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is a clear focus on the question. There is a sound evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays good awareness of viewpoints and issues. There is good recognition of parallels and comparisons. Appropriate concepts are used.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions well. Good use is made of political vocabulary to construct clear arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate produces an answer with a conclusion linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (c) (continued)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them. The answer makes a limited attempt to address the question and demonstrates contextual awareness covering part of the question.</p> <p>The answer includes simple examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) The candidate displays limited awareness of the implications and demands of the question resulting in a restricted focus. There is a limited evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays partial awareness of viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>There is some recognition of basic parallels and comparisons with a limited use of concepts.</p>	<p>Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and conclusions adequately with a limited use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion is offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) The candidate demonstrates a slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and a limited awareness of the relationships between them. There is little attempt to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The answer includes few, if any, examples which may be inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question and focus is lacking. Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial, with little awareness of viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>There is little, if any, recognition of parallels and comparisons. The use of concepts is superficial and naïve.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The answer relies upon narrative, which is not fully coherent. There is little or no use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion, if present, is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

**A2 GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS, EXCLUDING SYNOPTIC UNIT
(GOV4, GOV5, GOV6, GOV7)**

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Questions 2, 3 and 4 (Maximum 40 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates excellent contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes excellent examples to illustrate points made. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations as well as accurate evidence and relevant examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13–16 marks)</p> <p>The candidate displays excellent awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is an excellent and sustained focus on the specific question asked. There is clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues.</p> <p>Appropriate parallels and connections are clearly identified together with well-developed comparisons. A wide range of concepts is used and developed.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <p>The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity. Excellent use is made of political vocabulary to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. The answer has a clear sense of direction, culminating in a conclusion that flows from the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</p> <p>The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer clearly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates sound contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes developed and effective interpretations or explanations and also clear evidence and good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9–12 marks)</p> <p>The candidate displays sound awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is a clear focus on the question. There is a sound evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays good awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is good recognition of parallels and comparisons. Appropriate concepts are used and developed.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5–6 marks)</p> <p>The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions well. Good use is made of political vocabulary to construct clear arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate produces an answer with a conclusion linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Questions 2, 3 and 4 (continued)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them. The answer makes a limited attempt to address the question and demonstrates contextual awareness covering part of the question.</p> <p>The answer includes a partial and reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (5–8 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question resulting in a restricted focus. There is a limited evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a partial awareness of differing viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>There is some recognition of basic parallels and comparisons. Arguments and explanations are undeveloped with a limited use of concepts.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and conclusions adequately with a limited use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion is offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) The candidate demonstrates a slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and a limited awareness of the relationships between them. There is little attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness, if any, of the context of the question, with little interpretation and few, if any, examples often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1–4 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question and focus is lacking. Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial.</p> <p>Analysis shows little awareness of differing viewpoints and issues. There is little, if any, recognition of parallels and comparisons. Arguments, explanations and use of concepts are superficial and naïve.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) The answer relies upon narrative, which is not fully coherent. There is little or no use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion, if present, is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

1

Total for this question: 40 marks

- (a) Explain the term *fixed terms of office* used in the extract. (8 marks)

Fixed terms of office seen in the provisions of the US Constitution: Election day - first Tuesday after the first Monday in November every 4th year; two year terms for the Representatives, six for the senators (with staggered elections), four for the President. Can only be changed by constitutional amendment. Means events cannot be controlled for electoral reasons. No advantages of timing as in the UK where the Prime Minister (PM) advises the Monarch on the dissolution of Parliament this giving advantages to the government of the day in electoral timing. Constraint from the 1911 Parliament Act which lays down maximum five year terms, but within that PM's can time elections to the advantage of their party (numerous examples of both 'good' and 'bad' timing).

- (b) Using the extract and your own knowledge, explain the reason why Parliament and Congress are **not** mirror-images of their societies in socio-economic terms. (12 marks)

Legislatures in the UK and US seen as not socially representative or 'microcosms' of the people that they represent (seen in extract) 'male', 'white', 'middle class' and 'middle aged'. Statistical evidence available from both countries to demonstrate this with regard to age, gender, class and ethnicity. Over-preponderance of representatives with law and business background especially in the US. Candidates need to say why.

Reasons why they do not 'look like' the people that they represent are numerous and are a good discriminator, eg political 'dynasties' in both countries, growth of 'career politicians' with a background only in politics, the 'macho' nature of politics that deters women, the First Past the Post system of election which favours the 'safe' candidates, the 'glass ceiling', the need for high educational standards to 'understand' politics with its emphasis on debate, age for 'experience' (constitutional age requirements in the US). Senate in particular seen as a 'millionaires club', need for large amounts of money for election in the US (cf the UK where the party provides the funding) candidates may make reference to the composition of the Lords where the membership is appointed cf elected and there may be evidence of the greater representation of women and ethnic minorities because of this. Reference may be made to changes brought about in the 2006 Mid Term elections of the election of the first women speaker or all women shortlists (Labour) and Cameron's A-list candidates in the UK.

At the top end, candidates may speculate on whether it is possible to actually get a microcosm of the people elected given the system itself or the inherent inequalities in both societies or indeed whether it is actually desirable in a representative democracy.

- (c) Compare and contrast the influences on members of the US Congress and the UK Parliament when voting within their respective legislatures. (20 marks)

What is being looked for here is the understanding of the fact that elected representatives in both the UK and the US (including the house of Lords which can also be discussed) have numerous pressures on them when voting (in the legislative chambers or in the standing and select committees) and have different loyalties when acting as representatives of the people. This involves analysis of their 'conflicting roles' with responsibilities as 'national' legislators, but also as representatives of Districts, States and Constituencies (all with different needs and expectations). The varying influence of party (loyalty and discipline) is crucial with an analysis of its importance in the UK (with reasons) and its relative lack of importance in the USA (with reasons). Good candidates may also discuss the fact that in both the UK and the US representatives have particular ideological standpoints (left or right, liberal or conservative) and individual consciences which may influence the way that they vote (eg leading to backbench rebellions in the UK or the different kinds of voting seen on 'conscience' issues in all chambers on issues such as abortion or euthanasia) (seen in Free Votes in the House of Commons). There may be reference to the influence of pressure groups (and PACs in the US) on voting behaviour. Good candidates will refer to concepts such as 'pork barrelling' and 'log-rolling' in the US and the 'lobby fodder' analysis of MP's voting behaviour in the UK. At the very top end, expect analysis of 'all politics is local' arguments and the Burkeian view of representation (delegates or representatives). It may be argued that it all depends on the type of issue they are voting on within Congress and Parliament. At the higher levels of response expect references to 'models' of representation such as 'Trustee', 'Delegate' and 'mandate'.

2

Total for this question: 40 marks

To what extent have the constitutional reforms of the Blair Governments since 1997 brought the UK closer to the US in constitutional terms?
(40 marks)

The question has a clear focus on the many significant *constitutional* reforms carried out by the Labour Governments since 1997 that it is argued have brought about a 'constitutional revolution' or a 'new constitutional settlement in the UK'. Candidates will be aware that many of these reforms such as the Scotland and Wales Act (devolution of power) and the Human Rights Act (Incorporation of the European convention of Human Rights into UK law) *appear* to have brought the UK nearer to some of the constitutional practices of the US such as federalism and guaranteed rights under the Bill of Rights. However, there must be, for the higher levels of marks regard to the *to what extent* part of the question which would demand an assessment of the provisions of the codified US constitution, which are difficult to change (through the amendment process) and which still determine the way in which the US is governed. For higher marks, candidates should demonstrate this understanding of the US Constitution as 'fundamental law' laying down a system of 'constitutional government' and protected by the Supreme Court. It will be recognised that even although there have been *various* constitutional changes brought about in the UK, because of Parliamentary Sovereignty these could be removed or changed at any time in future by a simple parliamentary majority because of the uncodified British constitution. Devolved power can be taken back, the ECHR's can be 'derogated from', and the UK can even be brought out of the EU if a future Parliament so wishes. At the higher level of response, candidates may suggest that the UK constitutional changes have been mere 'tinkering' and piecemeal changes Reform eg House of Lords and Freedom of Information and the UK, unlike the US, does not have a written codified document laying down the rules, and interpreted by a Supreme Court and they may, for higher marks, analyse *why* this is the case. It will be up to the candidates to use any of the constitutional reforms as their evidence but the responses will be judged on the examples and evidence chosen from both countries in order to back up the analysis and evaluation in response to the 'to what extent' part of the question which should be a strong discriminator.

3**Total for this question: 40 marks**

Consider the view that judicial independence is undermined by the selection and appointment processes of the judiciary in the UK and the US. (40 marks)

In the response to this question it should be recognised that judicial independence is a key principle of any liberal democracy and a constitutional principle related to the separation of powers protecting the freedom of the judicial branch of government from interference from the other two branches, thus protecting civil liberties and the rights of citizens. Judges in both countries have security of tenure (unless impeached in the USA, or removed by an Address from both Houses of Parliament in the UK). This means that judges are independent from the other branches of government and are not accountable to them or controlled by them. However, it can be argued that the *selection and appointment processes* of the judiciary in both countries may undermine this constitutional principle and it will be up to candidates to evaluate the *extent* of this undermining at the higher levels.

In the US the 'political' nature of the process will be analysed by recognition of the debates surrounding presidential nomination of Supreme Court Justices and the *reasons* for their choices, eg Republican nomination of Justices demonstrating conservative views of judicial restraint and a 'strict construction of the words of the Constitution (with the use of examples from Republican President nominations in recent times). Candidates should give as examples controversial nominations such as Bork (Reagan) Clarence Thomas (Bush 41) or Harriet Miers (Bush 43). Similarly, Democratic Presidents will choose judges who will demonstrate more liberal views of judicial activism and a 'loose construction' of the words of the Constitution. At the higher levels, expect answers demonstrating *why* nominations are so controversial particularly around 'litmus test' issues such as abortion, prayers in school and affirmative action. Candidates should also include analysis of the Senates 'Advise and Consent' power over judicial nominations and their confirmation power may be used politically to block unfavourable appointments (particularly when there is divided government in Washington) again demonstrating the political nature of the process. It will be recognised that the judicial appointment process is also not seen as 'neutral' in the UK with the role of the Lord Chancellor (Secretary of State for Constitutional Affairs) and the PM's role in appointments using the Prerogative powers of the Crown. The new Judicial Appointment Commission is likely to be known at the higher level of response and the *reasons* for the changes to the appointment process by the Blair Government (relating to the separation of power principle).

Candidates may legitimately refer to the *kinds* of people appointed to the senior ranks of the judiciary with allegations of 'cronyism' and 'male, white, upper middle class dominance' and whether this matters.

It will be made apparent at the higher level of response that the processes are very different in both countries because of the different systems, but it will be recognised that when judges are appointed judicial independence is guaranteed and they are not under 'political control' or removable (as Eisenhower was known to regret!) as seen in many autocratic dictatorships. The level of response will be determined by the level of analysis backed up by strong examples and evidence for the arguments.

'A US President is ultimately far more powerful than a UK Prime Minister simply because of the greater resources at his disposal as head of the executive branch of government.' Discuss. (40 marks)

The question asks about the nature of executive power and how it is exercised, with candidates having to make an assessment about whether the President's power relates to the huge resources at his disposal (Executive Depts, Exop, the federal bureaucracy) of the UK PM in a system where power is found within the government depts headed by Ministers. The key words are *ultimately* (which invites a discussion of executive power) and *simply because of* (which invites the discussion of *other* influences on the way in which power is held and exercised). The aim is to avoid a more straightforward response of who is more powerful. The question demands an understanding of the debate over the nature of presidential power and how easy it is to actually exercise it given the American system of government with its constitutional limitations, separation of powers and checks and balances which may make it difficult for the President to *BE POWERFUL HOWEVER MANY RESOURCES HE HAS AT HIS DISPOSAL*. Within this context therefore, it is possible for candidates to argue that the UK PM may in fact be *more* powerful (especially in domestic policy) despite the lack of prime ministerial resources and a huge personal bureaucracy (even including the growing resources found in No. 10). Many candidates will be expected to refer to the idea of a 'bifurcated Presidency' with greater powers in the conduct of foreign policy of domestic but even this may be disputed by well informed candidates.

Essential to the overall argument is the nature of the single executive in the US and the collective executive in the UK *despite* arguments relating to the weakness of the US President (Imperilled rather than Imperial) and those relating to the 'Presidentialisation' of UK government and politics. (Bi-laterals, No. 10 Policy Unit, Role of special advisers, Press Office).

At the very highest level, candidates may question the 'control' that an American President has over the federal depts and their associated agencies with discussion of 'Agency capture' and 'going native' arguments and the overall difficulty of exercising any power in a 'separated system where power is shared'.