IQM3006 Assessment 2

Teacher standardisation reference

TEACHER REFERENCE · KEEP SEPARATE FROM THE EXERCISE

Reference commentary and the associated source-answer marks. Apply the current scheme and authorised decisions.

Exercise 1 · B1 · 5 marks

Question: A fictional proposed law would restrict advertising aimed at children. A children's charity submits research to MPs, while an industry association meets ministers. Explain one advantage and one disadvantage of these influences on parliamentary law-making, and identify one way parliamentary scrutiny can test their claims.

The mark shown for each extract is the proposed mark for the complete source answer from which it was selected. The extract alone may not evidence the whole response, particularly for an essay.

Extract 1

The children's charity may provide specialist research about how advertising affects children and evidence about harms that MPs might not otherwise see. That can improve the policy's factual basis and help Parliament identify which advertising practices need regulation. The industry association may explain how different restrictions would affect businesses, compliance costs and practical enforcement, so lawmakers can avoid rules that are impossible to operate. A disadvantage is that access and evidence may be unequal: an organised industry body may have more time and money to lobby ministers, and each side may select evidence that supports its interest. That could produce a law which protects commercial interests more than children or excludes less-resourced voices. A parliamentary committee could question representatives from both groups, publish their written evidence and test claims against independent research before amendments are debated.

Associated source-answer mark	5/5
Reference commentary	All five scheme points are developed: advantage and contextual explanation, disadvantage and its effect, and a valid scrutiny method.

Extract 2

The charity has an advantage because it can give MPs evidence about children and the effects of adverts. The industry association can explain whether the restriction will be expensive or difficult for companies to follow. A disadvantage is that groups may only choose evidence which supports what they want, and the industry may have more access to ministers. This could mean children's interests are not given equal weight. A committee could call both groups to give evidence and compare their claims before debating the Bill.

Associated source-answer mark	3/5
Reference commentary	Advantage, disadvantage and scrutiny are present, but the contextual effect of the disadvantage is only partly developed.

Extract 3

The charity can give useful information about children. The industry can tell ministers about business costs. The disadvantage is that lobbying can be unfair because a big company has more money. Parliament can ask questions in a committee.

Associated source-answer mark	2/5
Reference commentary	Relevant influences, disadvantage and scrutiny are identified, but explanations are minimal.

Exercise 2 · C1 · 15 marks

Question: Two fictional neighbouring states increase military spending after a border dispute. They also continue trading and establish a joint commission to exchange information about troop movements. Compare realism and liberal institutionalism as explanations of these actions. Assess which explanation is more convincing, or whether a combination is needed.

The mark shown for each extract is the proposed mark for the complete source answer from which it was selected. The extract alone may not evidence the whole response, particularly for an essay.

Extract 1

Realism explains the increased military spending through insecurity, self-help and uncertainty. After a border dispute, each state cannot rely on a central authority to protect it. One state's defensive spending can look offensive to the other, creating a security dilemma in which reciprocal precautions increase tension. Realism also explains why a joint commission might be accepted pragmatically: information may help a state judge the other's intentions and protect its national interest without assuming lasting trust. Continued trade does not disprove realism because states can cooperate when exchange serves security or economic interests, while still preparing for a possible conflict. Liberal institutionalism explains the same events through interdependence and institutions. Continuing trade raises the economic cost of war, and the joint commission creates repeated contact, shared information and rules for communication. A combined account is most convincing because the dispute produces a realist security dilemma while institutional cooperation manages its risks.

Associated source-answer mark	14/15
Reference commentary	Strong 13–15 band: direct comparison, scenario application, security dilemma, institutional mechanisms and a supported combination judgement.

Extract 2

Realism says the states increase military spending because they are worried about security after the border dispute. There is no world government that can guarantee their safety, so each state prepares itself. Liberal institutionalism says trade makes war more costly and the commission can share information and reduce mistakes. The military spending is better explained by realism, while the trade and commission are better explained by liberal institutionalism. A combination is useful, although the scenario does not tell us the states' private motives.

Associated source-answer mark	10/15
Reference commentary	9–12 band: sound understanding and comparison, but concise evidence, limited institutional evaluation and a brief conclusion.

Extract 3

Realism says the countries spend more on the army because they are worried about the border. States have to protect themselves because there is no world police. Liberal institutionalism explains that trade means they need each other and a commission can help them talk. Realism explains the military spending and liberalism explains the cooperation, so both are needed.

Associated source-answer mark	6/15
Reference commentary	5–8 band: basic theory and some scenario comparison, largely descriptive with minimal evaluation.

Exercise 3 · C2 · 15 marks

Question: A fictional parliament is considering restrictions on public demonstrations. Supporters emphasise safety and access to essential services; critics emphasise freedom of expression and assembly. Compare how parliamentary law-making and judicial protection of rights can respond to these competing concerns. Assess one strength and one limitation of each, drawing on the UK Human Rights Act 1998 where relevant.

The mark shown for each extract is the proposed mark for the complete source answer from which it was selected. The extract alone may not evidence the whole response, particularly for an essay.

Extract 1

Parliament can debate a proposed restriction, hear evidence from police, service providers and civil-liberties groups, amend the wording and hold ministers politically accountable. Its strength is a general prospective rule with democratic accountability; its limitation is that majority pressure or unequal lobbying may make it broader than necessary. Courts can examine a concrete dispute and ask whether interference with expression and peaceful assembly is prescribed by law, pursues a legitimate aim and is necessary and proportionate. Under the Human Rights Act 1998, compatible interpretation is required so far as possible; a section 4 declaration of incompatibility does not itself invalidate an Act. Judicial independence is a strength, while cost and limited access to litigation are limitations. The institutions should complement each other.

Associated source-answer mark	14/15
Reference commentary	Strong 13–15 band: compares institutional roles, applies qualified rights and proportionality, states HRA effects and evaluates strengths and limitations.

Extract 2

Parliament can debate the restriction and hear the arguments about safety, access and freedom. It can change the proposal and is accountable to voters, which is a strength. A weakness is that a majority may pass a restriction which affects a smaller protest group unfairly. Courts can hear a person’s challenge and decide whether the restriction is lawful and proportionate. The Human Rights Act requires compatible interpretation where possible, and a declaration of incompatibility does not itself cancel the Act. Court cases are slow and expensive, so both institutions should work together.

Associated source-answer mark	9/15
Reference commentary	9–12 band: relevant comparison, HRA application and strengths/limitations are present but underdeveloped.

Extract 3

Parliament can make a law to stop demonstrations causing danger and blocking roads. It can debate the law and change it. Courts can protect freedom of speech and assembly when someone brings a case. Under the Human Rights Act they can look at whether a restriction is fair, but they cannot always cancel an Act of Parliament. Safety matters, but peaceful protest should not be stopped without a good reason.

Associated source-answer mark	5/15
Reference commentary	5–8 band: basic Parliament, court and HRA knowledge, with little comparison or proportionality analysis.

Exercise 4 · D1 · 30 marks

Question: Evaluate the view that global governance can reduce conflict and poverty only when it serves the interests of powerful states. Use relevant examples, including the United Nations and one other international actor or mechanism, and reach a reasoned conclusion.

The mark shown for each extract is the proposed mark for the complete source answer from which it was selected. The extract alone may not evidence the whole response, particularly for an essay.

Extract 1

The view contains an important explanation of why global governance can be selective, but the word “only” is too strong. The UN Security Council’s permanent-member veto can block action and powerful states control resources, but UN diplomacy, humanitarian work and development can also pursue shared interests. The World Bank’s lending can reduce poverty through infrastructure, health or education, while voting influence and conditionality give wealthier states greater weight. The evidence supports a conditional conclusion: power sets important limits, yet rules, cooperation, implementation and accountability can generate effects beyond the preferences of the most powerful.

Associated source-answer mark	26/30
Reference commentary	25–30 band: balanced and developed, uses UN and World Bank critically, distinguishes power/activity/outcomes and reaches a sustained conditional conclusion.

Extract 2

Powerful states have a lot of influence over global governance. The UN Security Council has permanent members and one of them can veto a decision, so a conflict may not be stopped if a powerful country does not agree. The World Bank gives loans for roads, schools and development, although richer countries have more influence. Global governance is affected by powerful states, especially in wars and money, but it is not true that it can only work for them.

Associated source-answer mark	14/30
Reference commentary	13–18 band: reasonable understanding and relevant examples, but brief evaluation and only partly supported conclusion.