

Mark Scheme (Standardisation)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in  
Government & Politics (6GP03/3C)

Paper 3C: Processes in the USA

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6GP03\_3C\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	
1.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The issues which have influenced Latino voting in recent elections include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• immigration reform in recent years, e.g. the failed attempt by President Obama to get the Dream Act through Congress in 2010, DACA the Democrats have supported immigration reform; after the presidency of George W. Bush, Republicans have been hostile, and the 2012 presidential candidate Mitt Romney favoured a plan which entailed illegal immigrants 'self-deporting'. Donald Trump statements with regard to immigration and the Mexican wall prompted widespread Latino registration for the 2016 primaries</li> <li>• welfare provision, e.g. widening access to health care, maintaining food stamps spending, expanding the federal role in education, etc. Latinos are typically poorer than the majority population and Democrats have a more consistent record in promoting welfare provision</li> <li>• social issues, such as gun control and contraception. Latinos are typically liberal on issues such as gun control and are fairly evenly divided about abortion</li> <li>• foreign policy especially the relationship with Cuba: Florida Cubans in particular have tended to support the Republicans who have been more consistently hostile to the Castro regime.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.</p>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	
2.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The reasons the role of pressure groups in US politics has been controversial include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• campaign donation – creates the appearance of corruption and puts pressure on congressmen to please donors, which may lead to constituents’ interests and/or the national interest being neglected</li> <li>• lobbying – knowledge and contacts of lobbyists gives benefit to wealthy groups who can afford to hire them, the ‘revolving door’ creates a self-serving elite of politicians and lobbyist</li> <li>• iron triangles – will protect policies and programmes which benefit only a wealthy minority</li> <li>• infiltration of the federal bureaucracy - usually by corporate interests, skews policy implementation in their favour, ‘regulatory capture’</li> <li>• direct action – subverts democracy and in some cases, e.g. attacks on abortion clinics and doctors, illegal</li> <li>• pressure groups use their financial muscle to disproportionately influence the initiative process in many states.</li> <li>• Foreign policy, pressure groups are sometimes accused of skewing US Foreign policy to their advantage or the advantage of other nations.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.</p>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	
3.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The ways caucuses can be seen as a better method of candidate selection than primaries include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• caucuses are a traditional form of civic engagement for local communities, and an active and participatory form of democracy</li> <li>• in caucuses where voters can move from non-viable groups, they reduce the number of wasted votes (some primaries are winner takes all)</li> <li>• from the point of view of parties, caucuses, unlike primaries, give close control over proceedings and who can vote – open primaries are subject to ‘raiding’</li> <li>• caucuses are cheaper to run because they are staffed by volunteers, whereas primaries are financed by the state tax payer.</li> </ul> <p>The ways caucuses can be seen as a worse method of candidate selection than primaries include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• because of the time required, public nature and sometimes arcane procedure, caucus turnout is usually very low, often around 10%, and attract more ideologically driven voters – primaries attract a more representative cross section of the electorate</li> <li>• because of the large number of meetings, candidates with extensive organisation and money may have an advantage</li> <li>• the organisational problems of a voting format comprising many separate meetings.</li> <li>• Primaries usually have a smoother vote count and a more reliable result.</li> <li>• Public nature of caucus participation may influence voters whereas primaries use a secret ballot.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.</p>	



<b>LEVELS</b>	<b>DESCRIPTORS</b>
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	
4.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The political impact of affirmative action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initially there was bipartisan support for affirmative action programmes and both Presidents Johnson and Nixon oversaw their introduction</li> <li>• but since the 1970s it has contributed to party polarisation: the Republican Party has been hostile to affirmative action and the Reagan administration in particular actively sought to undermine it; since the Johnson presidency, the Democratic Party has been consistently sympathetic to affirmative action</li> <li>• it has caused problems for both parties in recent years: Democratic support and Republican hostility have become more muted recently as they seek to avoid antagonising key constituencies, with the result that in recent years affirmative action has largely disappeared from political campaigns</li> <li>• it was one of the factors prompting the defection of the 'Reagan Democrats' to the Republican Party in the 1980s</li> <li>• it has given rise to a state-level resistance movement and there has been a series of referendums banning its use</li> <li>• The Supreme Court has heard a succession of cases and it has become a significant part of the court's agenda. The court has narrowed the scope of affirmative action schemes, adding to its reputation for controversy</li> <li>• political representation – majority-minority districts have increased African-American representation in Congress. Sonia Sotomayor sees herself as a product of affirmative action</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.</p>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 2</b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Level 1</b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	
5.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The arguments which support the theory of party decline include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• parties are unable to organise government to deliver a political programme – decreasingly valid, as party control in Congress has strengthened</li> <li>• pressure groups have taken over the role of parties in financing election campaigns – in the wake of <i>Citizens United</i>, increasingly valid though parties still have a significant role in funding elections</li> <li>• parties don't control the selection of their own candidates –still the case, even after introduction of 'super-delegates' to party conventions, e.g. success of Trump in the Republican primary</li> <li>• parties are loose coalitions which lack a coherent ideological identity - this has become less valid in recent years as the Democratic Party has become more clearly liberal and the Republican Party more conservative</li> <li>• US voters 'split their tickets' between candidates of different parties- decreasingly valid, spilt ticket voting has declined in recent years</li> <li>• the percentages of strong party identifiers have declined</li> <li>• elections are increasingly candidate centred and campaign ads will frequently not mention a party name</li> <li>• technology enables candidates to communicate directly with voters rather than traditional parties rallies and meetings</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.</p>	

<b>LEVELS</b>	<b>DESCRIPTORS</b>
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(6-10 marks)</b></p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-5 marks)</b></p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

Question Number	
6.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Factors which make Congress the branch of government most likely to produce success for pressure groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• power of Congress over legislation and money</li> <li>• multiple blocking points within the congressional legislative process</li> <li>• expense of elections and dependence of members of Congress on pressure groups for finance</li> <li>• 535 potential points of access</li> <li>• apparent ease with which regulations on donation and lobbying can be circumvented.</li> </ul> <p>Factors which make Congress the branch of government less likely to produce success for pressure groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• limited influence of individual members of Congress</li> <li>• limited ability of Congress to act in an organised or coherent way</li> <li>• veto power of the president.</li> </ul> <p>Factors which make the executive the branch of government most likely to produce success for pressure groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• power of the president to set the political agenda</li> <li>• power of the president to persuade Congress – ‘the bully pulpit’</li> <li>• power of the federal bureaucracy over the implementation of policy</li> <li>• power of the president to issue executive orders.</li> </ul> <p>Factors which make the executive the branch of government less likely to produce success for pressure groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• difficulty of getting access to the president himself</li> </ul> <p>Factors which make the judiciary the branch of government most likely to produce success for pressure groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• power of the Supreme Court over the constitution</li> <li>• relatively inexpensive.</li> </ul> <p>Factors which make the judiciary the branch of government less likely to produce success for pressure groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• difficulty of getting a case heard</li> <li>• uncertainty of getting the right verdict</li> <li>• court decisions may be ignored or only partly implemented.</li> </ul>	

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.



<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

Question Number	
7.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Arguments that the Electoral College is no longer fit for purpose include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• all of the original rationale for the Electoral College has disappeared and it is now a constitutional anachronism</li> <li>• the winner is not guaranteed a majority of the popular vote (or may even lose the popular vote), and consequently may lack legitimacy</li> <li>• the Electoral College gives some voters more clout than others; extra weight is given to voters in smaller rural states (alternatively - smaller states tend to be safe for one party or the other and are consequently ignored by candidates) and the campaign is concentrated in 'swing states'</li> <li>• the long history of 'faithless electors'</li> <li>• third parties are penalised</li> <li>• the exaggeration of the winning margin of ECVs compared to the percentage of the popular vote gives the winner an artificially strong mandate.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments that the Electoral College is still fit for purpose include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Electoral College is an important element of the federal identity of the constitution</li> <li>• the Electoral College requires candidates to campaign across all regions of the US, when a national vote might enable them to concentrate on the major cities or regions of strength, or create an incentive to campaign in major media markets</li> <li>• since the pursuit of ECVs determines the nature and course of the campaign, it is invalid to criticise the Electoral College for failing to reflect the popular vote</li> <li>• since only <i>one</i> president is being elected, disadvantaging third parties is arguably not as significant as in an election for a legislature</li> <li>• administration is simplified by being the responsibility of the states and problems such as recounts are confined within one state</li> <li>• 'faithless electors' have never affected the result</li> <li>• the concept of a mandate is of limited relevance in a separated system; however 'strong' a president's mandate, congressmen and senators will regard themselves as having their own mandate and will not feel any duty to support the president's agenda.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.</p> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <p>A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence.</p>	

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.

<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

Question Number	
8.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Factors which suggest that the two major parties now have no significant ideological overlap include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• since the 1970s, the base of the Democratic Party has identified with 'big government' and liberal social causes, such as affirmative action, gay rights, abortion rights and gun control; since 2008 President Obama and Democrats in Congress have advanced (or attempted to advance) a number of liberal causes including health care reform, gender equality of pay, immigration reform, gun control etc</li> <li>• the Reagan presidency established the core values of the Republican Party as social and fiscal conservatism; these were reinforced subsequently by the dominance of the Christian Right and more recently by the rise of the Tea Party movement; the House Republican leadership has supported a series of 'Ryan budgets' which aim to cut taxes and drastically reduce government spending, and state Republican governments have actively sought to reduce the availability of abortion; they have been almost unanimously hostile to the agenda of President Obama.</li> </ul> <p>Factors which suggest that the two major parties still have some significant ideological overlap include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• despite ideological polarisation, the parties remain broad coalitions and at least some of the differences between them are more rhetorical than substantive; both parties still subscribe to the 'American creed' and in particular support the role of religion in public life; it is still almost impossible to be a self-confessed atheist and run for public office (there is only one in Congress currently)</li> <li>• under President Clinton, the Democrats moved back towards the centre; he campaigned for and achieved a balanced budget, campaigned on 'welfare, a second chance not a way of life' and signed the Republican Congress's welfare reform bill in 1995, and extended the federal death penalty</li> <li>• President Bush campaigned as a 'compassionate conservative': the major domestic policy initiative of his presidency was the No Child Left Behind education bill, co-sponsored in the Senate by Ted Kennedy; he signed a \$534BN prescription drug benefit addition to Medicare in 2003 and the TARP program in 2008</li> <li>• President Obama has adopted a more conciliatory persona abroad than President Bush, but in substance American foreign policy is arguably unchanged; he doubled the number of troops in Afghanistan, and Guantanamo Bay remains open</li> <li>• domestically, he re-affirmed the Hyde amendment's prohibition of federal funding on abortion through executive order and, in attempting to revive the economy and in 'bailing out' the banks and auto-makers, he followed the policies of his predecessor.</li> </ul>	

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

Some limited knowledge and understanding, some attempt to make a relevant response to the question, but superficial and undeveloped.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

A range of clear knowledge and understanding, explicitly addressing the question, with supporting detail or evidence

<b>AO1</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations.
<b>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.

<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions.

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<b>Level 1 (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

