



Coimisiún na Scrúduithe Stáit
State Examinations Commission

Leaving Certificate 2020

Marking Scheme

Politics and Society

Higher Level

Note to teachers and students on the use of published marking schemes

Marking schemes published by the State Examinations Commission are not intended to be standalone documents. They are an essential resource for examiners who receive training in the correct interpretation and application of the scheme. This training involves, among other things, marking samples of student work and discussing the marks awarded, so as to clarify the correct application of the scheme. The work of examiners is subsequently monitored by Advising Examiners to ensure consistent and accurate application of the marking scheme. This process is overseen by the Chief Examiner, usually assisted by a Chief Advising Examiner. The Chief Examiner is the final authority regarding whether or not the marking scheme has been correctly applied to any piece of candidate work.

Marking schemes are working documents. While a draft marking scheme is prepared in advance of the examination, the scheme is not finalised until examiners have applied it to candidates' work and the feedback from all examiners has been collated and considered in light of the full range of responses of candidates, the overall level of difficulty of the examination and the need to maintain consistency in standards from year to year. This published document contains the finalised scheme, as it was applied to all candidates' work.

In the case of marking schemes that include model solutions or answers, it should be noted that these are not intended to be exhaustive. Variations and alternatives may also be acceptable. Examiners must consider all answers on their merits, and will have consulted with their Advising Examiners when in doubt.

Future Marking Schemes

Assumptions about future marking schemes on the basis of past schemes should be avoided. While the underlying assessment principles remain the same, the details of the marking of a particular type of question may change in the context of the contribution of that question to the overall examination in a given year. The Chief Examiner in any given year has the responsibility to determine how best to ensure the fair and accurate assessment of candidates' work and to ensure consistency in the standard of the assessment from year to year. Accordingly, aspects of the structure, detail and application of the marking scheme for a particular examination are subject to change from one year to the next without notice.

In considering this marking scheme, the following should be noted:

- The detail required in any answer is determined by the context and the manner in which the question is asked and by the number of marks assigned to the response in the examination paper.
- Words, expressions or phrases must be correctly used in context and not contradicted, and where there is evidence of incorrect use or contradiction, the marks may not be awarded.
- As a general rule, if in doubt about the validity of any response, examiners must consult their advising examiner before awarding marks.
- The suggestions, examples etc. in the scheme are not exhaustive and alternative valid responses etc. are acceptable.

The procedure for marking consists of:

- Careful reading and analysis of all the responses
- Allocation of marks to the components according to the agreed scheme.

SECTION A

Question 1

There are 12 questions of which candidates must answer 10

50 marks - 10 x 5 marks

(a) Two accurate pieces of information about the role of the Party Whip 2 marks + 2 marks

Good description 2M
Fair description 1M
Irrelevant description 0M

One argument in favour or against the party whip system

1 mark

Fair description 1M
Irrelevant description 0M

(b) Two accurate reasons to explain the statistics

3 marks + 2 marks

3m to the first accurate explanation followed by 2m to the second explanation
e.g.

Very good explanation	3M		
Good explanation	2M	Good explanation	2M
Fair explanation	1M	Fair explanation	1M
Irrelevant explanation	0M	Irrelevant explanation	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(c) Two accurate reasons for enforcement of border controls

3 marks + 2 marks

3m to the first accurate explanation followed by 2m to the second explanation
e.g.

Very good explanation	3M		
Good explanation	2M	Good explanation	2M
Fair explanation	1M	Fair explanation	1M
Irrelevant explanation	0M	Irrelevant explanation	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(d) Relevant conclusion about how language is used in the media **5 marks**

Very good argument	4 - 5M
Good argument	2 - 3M
Fair argument	0 - 1M

(e) Relevant explanation connecting the image with the social contract **5 marks**

Very good explanation	4 - 5M
Good explanation	2 - 3M
Fair explanation	0 - 1M

(f) Two accurate pieces of information about the European Council **3 marks + 2 marks**

3m to the first accurate explanation followed by 2m to the second explanation
e.g.

Very good answer	3M		
Good answer	2M	Good answer	2M
Fair answer	1M	Fair answer	1M
Irrelevant answer	0M	Irrelevant answer	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(g) Two relevant reasons supporting option chosen **3 marks + 2 marks**

Very good description	3M		
Good description	2M	Good description	2M
Fair description	1M	Fair description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M	Irrelevant description	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(h) Valid explanation **3 marks**

Very good description	3M
Good description	2M
Fair description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M

Valid example **2 marks**

Good description	2M
Fair description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M

(i) Two accurately described elements of the UNDRD

3 marks + 2 marks

Very good description	3M		
Good description	2M	Good description	2M
Fair description	1M	Fair description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M	Irrelevant description	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(j) Two accurately described initiatives

3 marks + 2 marks

Very good description	3M		
Good description	2M	Good description	2M
Fair description	1M	Fair description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M	Irrelevant description	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(k) Two relevant points about this initiative

3 marks + 2 marks

Very good description	3M		
Good description	2M	Good description	2M
Fair description	1M	Fair description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M	Irrelevant description	0M

Note: If the first point is awarded 2M or less, mark the second description out of 3M

(l) Named theorist

1 mark

Outline of theory

4 marks

Very good description	4M
Good description	3M
Fair description	2M
Weak description	1M
Irrelevant description	0M

SECTION B

(a) Critique of quota sampling

5 marks + 5 marks

One positive aspect

Very good description	4 - 5M
Good description	2 - 3M
Fair description	0 - 1M

One negative aspect

Very good description	4 - 5M
Good description	2 - 3M
Fair description	0 - 1M

(b) Two reasons why disability is a human rights issue

5 marks + 5 marks

Very good answer	4 - 5M
Good answer	2 - 3M
Fair answer	0 - 1M

(c) Critique of the presentation of data in Document B

20 marks

One positive aspect

10 marks

Very good description	8 - 10M
Good description	4 - 7M
Fair description	0 - 3M

One negative aspect

10 marks

Very good description	8 - 10M
Good description	4 - 7M
Fair description	0 - 3M

(d) Compare and contrast the sources of data in Document A and B

20 marks

Very good answer	16 - 20M	clear, accurate answer, insightful
Good answer	11 - 15M	relevant answer, lacking insight
Fair answer	6 - 10M	limited answer, lacking clarity
Weak answer	0 - 5M	contradictory or confused answer

(e)	Relevance of the data in Document A to national policy & decision-makers	20 marks
	Very good	16 - 20M independent, insightful description
	Good	11 - 15M relevant description, lacking insight
	Fair	6 - 10M limited description, lacking clarity
	Weak	0 - 5M contradictory or confused description

(f)	Conclusions about socio-economic circumstances of people with disabilities	10 marks
	Very good conclusion	8 - 10M
	Good conclusion	4 - 7M
	Fair conclusion	0 - 3M

	Challenges people with disabilities face in their daily lives	10 marks
	Very good conclusion	8 - 10M
	Good conclusion	4 - 7M
	Fair conclusion	0 - 3M

(g)	Marx quote related to people with disabilities	50 marks
------------	---	-----------------

Discussion	30 marks
-------------------	-----------------

Very Good	24 - 30M	focused, insightful
Good	17 - 23M	coherent, relevant
Fair	9 - 16M	limited, flawed
Weak	0 - 8M	confused, inaccurate

Documents and wider learning	20 marks
-------------------------------------	-----------------

Very Good	16 - 20M	comprehensive use of references
Good	11 - 15M	basic use of references
Fair	6 - 10M	limited use of references
Weak	0 - 5M	use of references is vague or inaccurate

SECTION C

Marking the discursive essay:

1. Read the entire essay without allocating any marks.
2. Mark the essay using the marking criteria and total the marks.
3. Review total mark awarded using the grade band descriptors.
4. To finalise the total mark review again using the criteria.

MARKING CRITERIA

	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Weak
Introduction (I)	Directly addresses, clarifies and contextualises the issue.	Directly addresses and contextualises the issue.	Issue is reasonably addressed with limited contextualisation.	Issue is vaguely addressed with no contextualisation.	Issue is vaguely or completely misunderstood.
10 marks	9 - 10	7 - 8	5 - 6	3 - 4	0 - 2
Knowledge (K)	Clear and critical understanding. Extensive knowledge of the issue.	A very good logical essay based on a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the issue. No significant omissions or errors.	A reasonable essay based on a basic knowledge but limited understanding of the issue. Contains minor omissions and errors.	A confused essay based on a vague understanding of the issue. Contains major omissions and errors.	A weak essay showing little or no knowledge of the issue. Information may be incorrect or contradictory.
20 marks	18 - 20	14 - 17	10 - 13	5 - 9	0 - 4
Evidence (E)	Identifies and interrogates convincingly a broad range of relevant, authoritative and credible sources of evidence.	Identifies and interrogates a sufficient range of relevant, authoritative and credible evidence.	Identifies and interrogates a limited range of evidence with an over reliance on unsubstantiated data.	Evidence presented is simplistic or confused. Evidence is only vaguely relevant to the topic.	Little or no evidence presented / evidence is not relevant to the issue.
20 marks	18 - 20	14 - 17	10 - 13	5 - 9	0 - 4
Analysis & Synthesis (A)	An excellent argument based on a critical and perceptive analysis of the evidence.	A very good argument based on a critical and perceptive analysis of the evidence.	A good argument based on a basic analysis of the evidence.	Argument is flawed with limited evidence of analysis / superficial analysis with significant inaccuracies.	Argument is poorly constructed, confused or illogical. Analysis is poor.
15 marks	13 - 15	10 - 12	7 - 9	4 - 6	0 - 3
Evaluation (V)	Comprehensively integrates comparative / alternative perspectives. Draws insightful, independent conclusions & confidently justifies own position.	Very good integration of comparative /alternative perspectives into the argument. Draws very good independent conclusions & clearly justifies own position.	Good integration of comparative / alternate viewpoints in to the argument. Draws independent conclusions & justifies own position	Limited comparative / alternative perspectives and viewpoints. Limited independent conclusions & justification of own position	No comparative perspectives or viewpoints. No independent conclusions or justification of own position
15 marks	13 - 15	10 - 12	7 - 9	4 - 6	0 - 3
Cohesion (C)	Organisation and management of views and opinions is excellent. Excellent focus and clarity throughout. Excellent construction.	Organisation and management of views and opinion is very good. Very good focus and clarity throughout. Very good construction.	Organisation and management of ideas is basic. Reasonable construction	Organisation and management of ideas is limited and confused Poor construction.	Essay lacks structure, organisation, coherence, focus, context and clarity.
20 marks	18 - 20	14 - 17	10 - 13	5 - 9	0 - 4

ESSAY GRADE BANDS

H1 90 - 100 Marks	H2 80 - 89 Marks	H3 70 - 79 Marks	H4 60 - 69 Marks	H5 50 - 59 Marks	H6 40 - 49 Marks	H7 30 - 39 Marks	H8 0 - 29 Marks
Response is coherent; well-structured and supported by relevant, accurate and varied evidence using comparative evidence. A thorough grasp of the requirements of the task is obvious as is understanding and independent thinking. Engagement with the topic is in-depth and judgements and conclusions offered are comprehensively justified. This answer exhibits detailed knowledge based on critical thinking, deep insight, sharp focus, accomplished argument and is supported by a range of evidence and sources.	Response focuses clearly and coherently on the question posed. Arguments are very well structured and unified supported by relevant, accurate and varied evidence. Points are very well organised and there is a very good coherent argument present using comparative viewpoints. There is very good critical engagement with the topic. Independent judgements and conclusions offered have very reasonable justification.	Response focuses clearly on the question set. The demands of the question are well understood. Points tend to be well supported by accurate and relevant evidence. Points are well organised and there is a coherent argument present. There is evidence of critical engagement with the topic and judgements and conclusions offered have reasonable justification.	Response shows a basic understanding of the question. Response reasonably addresses the question set. Knowledge of the issue is basic. Points made will be relevant and will be supported by some valid references and illustration. There may be a sense however, that some points are left to stand alone and are not fully integrated into a unified argument. There will be some judgements and independent conclusions offered with limited justification.	Response shows that the question is reasonably well understood. Knowledge of the issue is limited and answers make tentative points and use limited evidence that is valid and appropriate. Points made are limited and evidence is not developed into a forceful, unified argument. There is limited critical engagement with the topic resulting in answers which lack an integrated independent conclusion.	Response shows that the question is only partially understood. Response lacks clear focus and will tend to wander from the point or from point to point. Summary and repetition often take the place of discussion. Knowledge of the issue is very limited with very little evidence to support the points being made. There is very limited or no critical engagement with the topic. Judgements and conclusions offered are vague or personal with very limited justification. Re-reading may be necessary to discover meaning.	Response shows that the question has been partially understood and the response is poorly focused. A few valid points may be stated but not purposely linked to make an argument and there is no evidence to support any of the points made. There is no evidence of critical engagement with the topic. The candidate has not formed a judgement, drawn independent conclusions or offered justification for their own opinion or position.	Response shows that the question will be very poorly understood or completely misunderstood. A very poor answer which, at best, offers only fragmented pieces of information with little or no relevant points. No relevant arguments offered or evidence to support any claims made. Response is very poor and lacks focus and the reader is confused. Some points might be totally inaccurate or irrelevant to the question.

Note: Be careful not to penalise skilful brevity, nor to reward unwarranted length.

