



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel A Level
In Politics (9PL0) Paper 3A

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 or 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.

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

Summer 2019

Publications Code 9PL0_3A_1906_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

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.

Guidelines for Question 1(a)

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining the ways in which interest groups in the USA are more effective at protecting civil rights than pressure groups in the UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US interest groups have more access points than UK pressure groups due to the federalist system of government • US interest groups are more able and more likely to make use of the federal court system than UK pressure groups because they can use <i>amicus curiae</i> and have been very successful in the past, particularly in civil rights cases • US interest groups are more able to make direct links with US members of congress and the executive through iron triangle networks whereas this is more regulated in the UK through the Register of Members' Interests 	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the ways in which interest groups in the USA are more effective at protecting civil rights than pressure groups in the UK.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This allows US interest groups more opportunities to raise civil rights issues and potentially have impact on policy because they can operate on a national level with the US Congress as well as at state level because the US Constitution reserves many areas of policy for state governments to deal with, whereas the Westminster Parliament tends to dominate UK politics and is the main focus for lobbying by pressure groups in the UK • The role of the US Supreme Court in particular to interpret the US Constitution gives interest groups a further access point and makes the US Supreme Court a focus for interest group activity in areas that may not have been directly legislated on, whereas UK pressure groups are generally less likely to use the judicial route because the UK Supreme Court is unable to declare Acts of Parliament unconstitutional

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> US interest groups are more able to use direct lobbying and electoral funding to help influence the political agenda whereas regulations on funding in the UK are more strict The lack of party discipline in the US Congress also gives US interest groups more opportunities to influence the political agenda, unlike the UK where the political agenda is controlled by the executive 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This allows US interest groups to directly affect the legislative process by, for example, suggesting amendments or proposing legislation. Pressure groups in the UK can and do also suggest amendments or legislation, but are unable to form iron triangles because of the fusion of powers in the UK system. The rise of PACs and Super PACs in the US has increased the ability of interest groups to indirectly campaign in favour of or against certain parties/policies/candidates, whereas campaigning in the UK is more strictly controlled by the Electoral Commission, making pressure groups in the UK less likely to directly campaign in elections This allows US interest groups to lobby individual congressmen to introduce debates or legislation related to their issue, whereas in the UK pressure groups need to get the attention and support of the government to have their issue placed on the political agenda
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1). Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Level 4	10-12	Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
---------	-------	--

Guidelines for Question 1(b)	
AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)	
AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.	
Candidates who refer to only one country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.	
Accept any other valid responses.	

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining the ways in which devolution in the UK and federalism in the US differ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devolution in the UK is a fairly recent phenomenon, only being introduced in 1999 in Scotland and Wales and Northern Ireland after referendums in the regions, whereas federalism is one of the founding principles of the US system of government The UK Constitution is not a formally entrenched one, which means that devolution was passed by an Act of Parliament, unlike federalism in the US which is entrenched in the US Constitution 	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) examining the ways in which devolution in the UK and federalism in the US differ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that the principles behind devolution are more flexible and more easily amended, as was the case after the 2014 Scottish independence referendum when an increase in power was promised to the Scottish Parliament after a close result in favour of unity. Federalism, however, is a more permanent feature of the US system of government. This means that devolution can, in theory, be revoked, or can be expanded with additional powers or further devolution being granted. For example, with the expansion of devolution with the introduction of mayors in London and Manchester. Whereas historically in US federalism, the balance of power between the states and federal government has fluctuated with the actions/laws of President/Congress and the interpretation of the constitution by the Supreme Court. It is also highly unlikely that secession of states in the US would be granted or sought by individual states.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Devolution bodies have a fusion of powers whereas federalism enshrines separation of powers in the state governments• Legal sovereignty in the UK still remains with the central government unlike in the US where legal sovereignty is considered to be shared between the state and federal governments• Federalism in the US is equal amongst the states whereas devolution is asymmetric in the UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The devolved bodies have executives that are drawn from the legislative bodies, whereas both the states and the federal government elect executives separately from the legislature• This means that the UK central government is still ultimately able to revoke the powers of the devolved bodies and make decisions on their behalf e.g. on Brexit, whereas the state and the federal governments have powers explicitly granted or reserved to them by the US Constitution• This means that the individual states in the US have equal powers to make legislation or to try to influence national legislation, whereas the experience of devolution in the UK depends on the region you live in. For example, the Scottish Parliament was originally given limited tax powers whereas the Welsh Assembly was not
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Section B

Guidelines for Question 2

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of the USA, including comparative theories and UK politics (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve Level 4.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
2	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when analysing the different legislative powers of the UK Parliament and the US Congress (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The US Congress is considered to have more significant legislative powers than the UK Parliament as it has more independence from the executive due to separation of powers• Legislative power is shared equally between the US chambers, but the House of Lords in the UK is considered to be a revising chamber rather than playing an equivalent legislative role to the House of Commons	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when analysing the different legislative powers of the UK Parliament and the US Congress (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The US Congress has legislative powers explicitly granted in Article I of the US Constitution, unlike the UK Parliament, and can overturn any presidential veto over legislation- this power is not available to the UK Parliament• This means that the power of the House of Lords in particular is more limited when proposing, amending or blocking legislation, as the Lords can only delay legislation for up to one year and can ultimately be overruled by the House of Commons. However, the chambers of Congress must both agree legislative proposals and amendments before they can be passed, and neither house can overrule the other

- The US Congress has more control over financial legislation than the UK Parliament
- The US Congress ability to pass legislation is hampered by gridlock more often than the UK Parliament because of the separation of powers

Candidates may refer to the following when considering structural theory:

- US Constitution is codified with explicit powers for each House, unlike the UK

Candidates may refer to the following when considering rational theory:

- Prime Minister can use these systems to dominate the legislative process, while a president experiencing divided government may experience gridlock

Candidates may refer to the following when considering cultural theory:

- While bills raising revenue always begin in the House of Representatives, the Senate also has the power to amend and pass such bills, whereas the House of Lords cannot introduce money bills or delay them for more than one month
- The separation of powers in the US means that both houses must agree on the format of a bill before it can be passed to the president for signing, and also means that the US president is reliant on the US Congress to introduce and debate their legislative programme. With divided government,-- this becomes more difficult and can lead to gridlock e.g. in 2013 there was a federal government shutdown. The UK Parliament, however, rarely suffers from this kind of division and gridlock because of the fusion of powers that allows the government to dominate the legislative process through the party system

Candidates may refer to the following when considering structural theory:

- The US House of Representatives and Senate have explicit powers over key areas which allows them to dominate key legislative policy areas such as domestic policy (the House) or foreign policy (the Senate), whereas both Houses of Parliament are expected to deal with all issues

Candidates may refer to the following when considering rational theory:

- Individual prime ministers can use individual popularity with the electorate or their party along with strong majorities to persuade parliament to pass legislative programmes- as in the case of Blair- whereas US president who have divided governments may struggle to pass legislation even with individual popularity e.g. Obama

Candidates may refer to the following when considering cultural theory:

- This means that the UK executive can reasonably expect to pass the majority of their legislation, despite opposition, particularly with a strong

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Party systems are stronger in the UK than the US <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<p>parliamentary majority, whereas US presidents are reliant on party leaders within Congress for support e.g. Trump has struggled to repeal or reform Obamacare despite his party controlling both houses</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>
--	--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis (AO1). Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1). Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

AO1 (10 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.

Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(a)	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Constitution has a system of checks and balances to prevent any one branch dominating policy such as foreign policy Presidential power in foreign policy depends on the willingness of Congress to grant funds Presidential power in foreign policy can be limited by other factors such as public opinion, which Congress is very responsive to Congress has become increasingly willing to check presidential power over foreign policy through the committee system 	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that the president must consult with Congress on certain actions such as treaties Presidential actions in deploying troops or allocating funding for trade or aid in executive agreements must be approved by Congress In the digital age public opinion on foreign policy is often polarised by an increasingly dogmatic media, and presidents who may need to run for re-election or who are reliant on Congress to allocate funds or approval must pay heed Committees can investigate issues or vote on funding or to approve or reject presidential proposals which can put pressure on presidents to rethink proposals 	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therefore presidents cannot act unilaterally when dealing with other countries This can be difficult to achieve for presidents to achieve for controversial policies, especially in times of a divided government where foreign policy may not align with one or both chambers of Congress This is particularly true in an election year when media coverage can make or break a candidate's electoral chances and so presidents cannot rely on support for their foreign policy in Congress, especially it is perceived as weak or controversial by the public or the media This is particularly true in times of divided government when Congress is more likely to challenge a president of the opposing party, especially if they appear to be more likely to gain support within Congress for opposition

	<p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presidents have the constitutional power to dominate foreign policy as they are the designated commander-in-chief • Presidents can make executive agreements with other countries without formal ratification by Congress • Supreme Court rulings have previously confirmed that presidents should be dominant in foreign policy • Presidents have become increasingly willing to use executive orders to create foreign policy without the need for legislation 	<p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, presidents can deploy troops into active combat without consulting Congress first as long as they do not declare war • This gives presidents the opportunity to make links and agreements with other countries that do not require formal debate or approval by the legislative branch. This has increased over time. • This includes the use of executive agreements, which have been ruled to have the same legal status as treaties, thus increasing the power of the president to act alone in foreign policy • While executive orders may still require authorisation from Congress for funding of troops or projects, this still adds to the power of the president when considering the use of executive orders for 'emergency' actions or developing relations with countries 	<p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is less likely that Congress will refuse any funding for troops who already 'in the field' as this may lead to media and public criticism which may harm individual popularity • Therefore, presidents may still act arbitrarily without consultation with the other branches of government without any formal limitations on this power, with the increased use of executive agreements suggesting this has become the preferred method of conducting foreign policy for modern presidents • This therefore allows modern presidents to act without fear of agreements being declared unconstitutional • This adds to the perception that in foreign policy the president is 'imperial' and does not have to rely on approval from the legislative branch for his policies
--	---	---	---

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

AO1 (10 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.

Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(b)	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest groups are more likely to ensure the effective working of the Constitution because they are able to take on a significant role in the US political system because the separation of powers and checks and balances can limit effective government • Interest groups allows for an alternative method of ensuring the Constitution can be updated to despite the long and arduous amendment process • Interest groups play a vital role in challenging some aspects of the Constitution which have been criticised as being unfit for a modern democratic society • Federalism means that state governments have reserved powers over issues not explicitly referenced in the Constitution, thus allowing interest 	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest groups can therefore fill the political vacuum caused by the frequent gridlock between the branches of government and also within the branches that separation of powers can create • Interest groups are able to campaign to uphold the key principles of the Constitution either through new legislation or <i>amicus curiae</i> or initiating cases • This includes some of the amendments themselves e.g. the 2nd amendment, the electoral process, the amendment procedure itself, the system of checks and balances, which have become difficult to amend because they are embedded in the culture of US society • This is especially important in issues related to civil rights where interest groups have been able to use state 	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In times of divided government it can be very difficult to gain agreement amongst all groups on the shape of a bill and so many bills fail which means that the role of interest groups and lobbying becomes vital for ensuring members of Congress seek compromise and agreement • This means that much interest groups have the power to make amendments to the political system by directly influencing legislation through lobbying or through the courts e.g. same-sex marriage was legalised through <i>Obergefell v Hodges</i> • Therefore some aspects of the Constitution are arguably kept in place because they are traditional features of US society and government rather than features of a modern democratic society and only the campaigning of interest groups helps to ensure democracy is upheld • Interest groups are therefore able to ensure the Constitution works effectively by targeting state governments as well as the federal

	<p>groups another access point for upholding the Constitution.</p> <p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest groups are not always necessary to guarantee the Constitution works effectively as the system of checks and balances and the separation of powers does still effectively ensure that legislation is carefully considered and carries majority support • Interest groups who may have disproportionate power because of political links or campaign finance are prevented from having undue influence over the constitution by the amendment procedure, which was designed to be difficult and time-consuming to avoid rapid or controversial changes being made too easily • The development of judicial review, allows the Supreme Court to be the more effective protector of the US Constitution, as this allows the court to rule on aspects of modern society that could not be provided for in the Constitution e.g. on issues of privacy <p>CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE</p>	<p>initiatives and propositions and the state courts.</p> <p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This prevents any one part of government dominating another and forcing through rushed legislation, even in a time of united government, as intended by the founders of the Constitution • The difficulty in amending the Constitution has been demonstrated in the past, with lengthy debates over proposed amendments to ban flag-burning which is at odds with the 1st amendment guaranteeing free speech • The Constitution was designed to be brief and ambiguous to allow the political system to develop as necessary to meet the needs of an evolving society <p>CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE</p>	<p>government, often using state laws and rulings to then go on to challenge constitutional issues on a federal level.</p> <p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore, the Constitution still allows society to be protected from one dominant political group in government without the courts or interest groups • This suggests that the amendment procedure actually benefits society and is a democratic way of ensuring the constitution works effectively by preventing potential amendments that could affect individuals or groups of individuals adversely being brought about by powerful interest groups • This makes the Constitution more flexible than it first seems and allows the Supreme Court to directly make changes without the need for a formal amendment such as the legalising of same-sex marriage on <i>Obergefell v Hodges</i>, whereas interest groups are reliant on the support of elected officials or the Supreme Court itself to have an impact on the working of the Constitution <p>CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE</p>
--	--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It could be argued that the Constitution is <u>not</u> well protected by interest groups or the Supreme Court, particularly as the power of judicial review has arguably grown beyond that intended by the Founding Fathers <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Campaigns by interest groups- particularly on controversial issues- which are often related to constitutional matters, for example, always not heard by the Supreme Court as they may choose to avoid hearing such cases for fear of causing conflict with the legislature or the executive <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This means that some parts of the Constitution or issues related to the Constitution are not operating effectively in the modern era, as the Constitution is open to interpretation in places and yet is not always being discussed by the courts <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>
--	---	---	---

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

AO1 (10 marks)

Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3)

AO2 (10 marks)

Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.

The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.

Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(c)	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presidential and congressional elections have been criticised for being too focused on fund-raising at the expense of policy-particularly with the frequency of House elections • The Electoral College has led to criticisms that campaigns focus too much on a small number of key states • Presidential campaigns have become too long, with the 'invisible primary' starting as soon as the results are announced • Presidential and congressional election systems allow too much focus on the individual rather than parties or policies 	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This has led to claims that the winner of US elections are not necessarily the most qualified but the most wealthy or most able to raise money • As some states tend to be 'swing states' with large number of Electoral College votes, campaigns in close elections are too focused on voters and policies that affect those states rather than a national campaign • This can lead to the perception that by the time the actual election takes place that the result is a foregone conclusion, particularly as there is a long nomination process as well • This makes the election campaign more about personality rather than policy 	<p>Agreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This therefore prevents many potential candidates from aspiring to the presidency/prevents Congressmen from focusing on their constituents and leads to a focus on the ability to raise money rather than the ability to design and pass policy • This means that some voters or issues in key states may have a disproportionate effect on the formation of policy during campaigns • This can lead to voter apathy and a perception that the result is largely decided by party bosses who have nominated the candidates rather than a truly democratic process • The impact of this increases polarisation in US society between the parties, especially with controversial candidates, and can also lead to a disassociation between the voter and political parties, where candidates are perceived as individuals rather than representatives of a party

	<p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long campaigns and the expense of elections are inevitable in such a large country • The Electoral College successfully produces presidents so does not need to be reformed- there is no real demand for reform • Presidential and congressional elections can make use of primaries or caucuses to choose candidates • Congressmen still have to consider the needs of their constituents during their terms of office, as well as the need to raise funding <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates who cannot raise a 'war chest' of campaign funds are seen as 'outsiders' with little chance of success as they will not be able to conduct a lengthy or truly nationwide campaign with limited funds • Demands to reform elections largely centre around funding rather than the process itself • Primaries encourage participation and give wider choice, while caucuses encourage more knowledgeable selection of candidates • As Congressmen are still reliant on the 'folks back home' for votes, and often for donations to their campaigns <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<p>Disagreement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is therefore necessary for candidates to be able to organise large amounts of funding for their campaign, either from personal wealth or other activities in order to be able to compete in the electoral process • Therefore, the process fulfils its ultimate role of producing presidents with popular support that is distributed across the country • Therefore, enhancing democracy • This suggests that the system still allows Congressmen to fulfil their representative functions as they must focus their efforts on policies that help their constituents to use in re-election campaigns <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>
--	--	--	---

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of political information with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of political information, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many of which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging comparative analysis of political information with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within political information, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of political information, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions without much justification (AO3).
Level 3	13-18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of political information with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within political information, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of political information, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19-24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of political information, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25-30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

