IQM3006 Assessment 2

Teacher standardisation exercise

TEACHER EXERCISE · MARK-FREE COPY
Compare the selected responses against the current mark scheme before consulting the separate reference.

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.

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

UID IQM3006_A2-TE-2026-S

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.

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____

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.

Creditworthy evidence: _____

Missing or weaker evidence:

_____

Provisional mark and rationale:

_____