



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme

June 2003

GCE

Government and Politics

Unit GOV5

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING

Introduction

The AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, the weightings are different. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principals of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

Using a levels of response mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is what precise mark should be given within a level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:-

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?
- generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?
- well presented as to general quality of language?"

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

ASSESSMENT MATRIX

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 4	Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations, and provide accurate evidence and up to date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.	Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts and theories, using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.
Level 3	Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationships between them, producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrating sound contextual awareness. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.	Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories, using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct clear arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display an awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is a clear recognition of parallels and connections together with some comparisons. There is good evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 2	Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of political institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them, producing answers with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation, with some not very detailed examples to illustrate points.	Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider political information and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
Level 1	Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete knowledge of political institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationships between them, with very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the content of the question with little interpretation and few examples often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.	Discussions are supported by few if any concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations are sparse and incomplete. Analysis shows little awareness of differing viewpoints and very few parallels and connections will be used to establish comparisons. Evaluations of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations will be superficial and naive.	Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent and conclusions are not adequately related to the preceding discussion.

Unit GOV5 – The Politics of the USA

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(a) 8 marks	Levels 3-4 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate a good understanding of the Term “soft money” as it applies to the financing of US elections and a recognition that “soft money” is unregulated money as opposed to the “hard money” the direct contributions to campaigns that are regulated through FECA from the 70s.	Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks) Candidates apply an appropriate range of developed concepts and theories concerning “soft money” in the financing of US elections, using political vocabulary to provide clear and cogent explanations of the loopholes in FECA which has allowed for the raising and spending of huge amounts of soft money in terms of “party building activities”, “get out the vote registration drives” and “issue advocacy” advertisements. The concept of “soft money” is related to the power of money in US politics. Examples of “soft money” may be given to substantiate arguments and to provide evidence. Very good candidates are aware of recent legislation (in Congress 2002) to regulate soft money (The Shays Meehan Bill) or previous attempts (McCain-Feingold) showing excellent contextual awareness.	Levels 3-4 (2 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from or is linked to the discussion.
	Levels 1-2 (1 mark) Candidates demonstrate an outline understanding of the term “soft money” which is less than comprehensive. There is limited knowledge of the difference between “soft” or unregulated campaign finance and “hard money” and no evidence is given with regard to a definition.	Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) Candidates apply a limited range of concepts and theories regarding soft money in US elections, offering a limited analysis and evaluation of its importance in the financing of American elections. Little evidence or few examples are given to illustrate points made.	Levels 1-2 (1 mark) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately, with a straightforward narrative or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship with the proceeding discussion may be modest or implicit.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(b) 12 marks	<p>Level 4 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the increasing importance of money in US elections some of which are contained within the source such as the “permanent campaign”, “technocratic and relentless campaigning” the size and diversity of the country, the use of electronic media and the importance of TV advertising. Knowledge not in the extract could include primary elections, modern campaigning techniques, the huge number of contests involved and the need to win electoral college votes. It may relevantly be argued that election candidates build up huge “war chests” to deter potential challengers. Reward knowledge and understanding of the nature of all US election campaigns and what is needed to win them in terms of electoral finance.</p>	<p>Level 4 (4 marks) Candidates apply a wide range of concepts and theories to explain the increasing expense of US elections such as the decline of party (therefore more personal contests and more need to raise personal war chests) the increasing role played by PACs the nature of the modern election campaign with pollsters, media advisers and political consultants, and the need to transport campaign teams through the geographically, socially and ethically diverse USA. Candidates are able to introduce relevant and substantial arguments which explain the importance of campaigns conducted through the electronic media compared with the role played by party activists in the past. The increasing use of primaries and “invisible primaries” have lengthened the campaign and therefore the amount of money spent on it. Evidence from past elections is introduced to substantiate arguments relating to the increasing costs of modern election campaigns in the USA.</p>	<p>Levels 3-4 (2 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with a clear sense of direction ending with a conclusion, which flows from or is linked to the discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(b) (cont'd)	<p>Level 3 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate a fairly sound knowledge of some of the reasons for the increasing importance of money in US elections but their answers are not as comprehensive as Level 4 and often lack the required examples and evidence necessary to reach the higher level. There is however a focus on the question and some evidence integrated into the answer either from the extract or from outside it but relevant to the question.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories to analyse the increasing costs of modern US election campaigns. There is good evaluation of some of the evidence using some examples to back up points made. Candidates provide analysis of some of the reasons for the increasing importance of money, but the evidence is not wide ranging and is less explained than a Level 4 answer. Some of the evidence in the extract may be ignored or underdeveloped, and the evidence from outside the extract, for example reference to the role of primaries in increasing the cost of elections in the USA, may be very limited.</p>	<p>See level above.</p>
	<p>Level 1-2 (1-2 marks) Candidates are only able to demonstrate a limited awareness of a very few reasons for the increasing role of money. They may fail to go beyond or may be not even identify the reasons given in the extract. At this level the candidates may simply copy from the extract.</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) Candidates apply a limited range of concepts and theories to explain the increasing cost of US elections with a limited ability to construct any analysis and explanations. Analysis, if any, is at a very simple level, and few examples are given and limited evidence is introduced. Even the extract may be ignored.</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 (1 mark) Candidates communicate arguments adequately, with straightforward narrative or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship with the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) 20 marks	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate excellent knowledge and understanding of the numerous factors involved in explaining the “success” of modern candidates in both presidential and congressional elections (so evidence can be provided from both kinds of elections in the USA) using appropriate political vocabulary and a sense of political realism. They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the questions and show good contextual awareness and include detailed knowledge of the numerous factors which influence “success”. The candidates may argue that money IS the most important factor by the use of evidence relating to rich candidates winning, or the ability of rich candidates to refuse federal “matching funds”. However, it is likely that Level 4 candidates take a route which identifies other factors involved in winning an election such as policies, images, the party identification of the voters, the role of the electoral college, the political “mood” of the times and so on, and also relate the examples that show that money does not always “buy” success.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> <p>Candidates confidently apply a comprehensive range of political concepts and theories identifying and explaining the numerous factors which may lead to either success or failure of presidential and congressional candidates at elections in the US. They are able to analyse and synthesise information and to construct coherent arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of either the importance of money dominated campaigning with examples OR the relative importance of OTHER factors such as record in office, political experience (“Washington insiders or outsiders”), the importance of image and “personalised politics” or the policy issues found in the “platforms” of the candidates and the parties. Good candidates may of course link these factors TO the money raised and spent in the campaign. At this level candidates should be able to refer to the success or failure of candidates in recent elections in the US, presidential or mid-term, to use examples and evidence, for example Clinton’s win in 92 (“It’s the economy, stupid”) with less financial backing than Bush senior, and GW Bush’s ‘win’ in 2000 with a very well financed campaign.</p>	<p>Level 4 (4 marks)</p> <p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) (cont'd)	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) However, candidates are able to demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the complexity of modern US elections and the numerous factors involved in the success of some candidates (presidential and congressional), e.g. name recognition and the “failure” of others to win either a senate or house seat or the presidency. Examples and evidence from the recent US elections are used in order to substantiate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) The failure of Perot in 92 to win any electoral college votes after spending \$60 million may be introduced to show that money does not always buy “success”. It is up to candidates to recognise the numerous factors and argue a strong case. There is a clear and full evaluation of the numerous arguments involved with strong evidence and examples to back up the arguments.</p>	

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) (cont'd)	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates display some sound knowledge and understanding of some of the reasons for both the “success” and “failure” of candidates in recent US elections. The answers illustrate several factors that may be involved in producing “success” but do not have the range of depth of a Level 4 answer. Answers are produced which contain some of the arguments described above and there is some clear evidence backed up by some good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories, using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information concerning the numerous factors involved in electoral success, with examples drawn from presidential or congressional candidates (successful or otherwise) in elections in the USA. Clear arguments are constructed making reference to some of the evidence available from recent elections and the candidates within them. Examples are used to back up arguments raised, and there is a clear recognition of issues, parallels and connections. There is a good evaluation of the principal factors involved in electoral success such as the candidate’s image and policies as well as the amount of money raised for the campaign.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) (cont'd)	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of one or two factors influencing “success” or the lack of it in US elections. They may accept the main thrust of the question, agreeing that it is money alone that determines success. They produce answers which show only a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. There may be some attempt at interpretation with some examples given.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider the many factors used to explain electoral success or the lack of it in the USA, and only begin to construct arguments and explanations for these. They offer limited analysis but show some awareness of some of the varying factors involved. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations but with very little evidence and few examples to substantiate points made. “Success” may be perceived in quite simplistic terms.</p>	<p>Level 2 (2 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates display some slight and incomplete knowledge of factors influencing electoral success in the USA, producing answers with only a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness of the context of the question with little interpretation or explanation, and few if any examples given.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates’ discussion of factors influencing electoral success in the USA is not adequately supported by the use of theories and concepts. Few arguments and explanations are constructed, and there are few parallels, connections and comparisons are made. Evaluation of explanations for the differences is superficial and naïve with no evidence or examples presented to back up any explanation.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 (40 marks)	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political parties in the USA and their impact on American politics. At this level they recognise the provocative nature of the question with its invitation to either accept or to challenge the main thrust of the statement. They may take the view that US parties are like “Tweedledum and Tweedledee” with few differences between them, giving an illustration of their similarity, such as their acceptance of market economics, or the constitutional provisions OR challenge this by pointing to the differences in ideology and policies found by examining their party platforms, for example in areas such as economic management or social issues such as abortion or civil rights or foreign policy issues such as “hawkish” or “doveish” views. Candidates may show excellent contextual awareness by reference to the nature of US political parties as vast internal coalitions with more differences within than between them in terms of ideological views.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks)</p> <p>Candidates confidently apply a comprehensive range of well developed political concepts and theories relating to the role of parties and their impact on American politics. At this level there is awareness of the catch-all, big tent, pragmatic and centrist nature of US parties with their focus on winning elections rather than ideological principle. As a result candidates recognise the factors which make them appear similar with supporting evidence. There is knowledge of the debate surrounding the internal differences within the parties such as the differences between conservative and liberal democrats or moderate and radical right republicans. The factionalised nature of the parties and their internal coalition nature is recognised and evidence of this is presented. The lack of ideological cohesion and the similarities between the parties may be challenged by other candidates who take a view that there are clear divisions between the parties in terms of both ideology (liberalism and conservatism) and policies (economic, social, environmental, foreign).</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks)</p> <p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 (cont'd)	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Answers include detailed and comprehensive evidence relating to either the similarities between the parties or the differences found between them. This may include reference to the conservatism of the Republicans and liberalism of the Democrats. Appropriate political vocabulary is deployed and the answers have a sense of political realism. Up to date examples and evidence are given to substantiate points made relating to the parties as they operate in the modern conditions of American politics.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Whether US political parties “dominate the political system” is open to debate with evidence and examples. For instance candidates may accept this thesis with evidence that all Presidents and almost all members of congress have been from the 2 parties. On the other hand other candidates may point to some success of third parties and independent candidates in recent American elections. Similarly the dominance aspect of the question may be challenged by some candidates who see US pressure groups as being more dominant within the political system than the parties who are often perceived as weak institutions. At a high level candidates see this question as one relating to the nature of US parties and the explanations for the characteristics that they display.</p>	

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 (cont'd)	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sound knowledge and understanding of the nature of modern American political parties and their operation in American politics. There is a clear attempt to address the requirements of the question and sound contextual awareness. Answers include some developed and effective interpretations and explanations, with clear evidence and good examples used to illustrate points made. This level of answer may not put forward sophisticated evidence regarding either similarities or differences, or internal differences but the answer still addresses the provocative and challenging nature of the question.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates apply a wide range of concepts and theories using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information regarding the role of political parties in American politics. There is a good evaluation of the main concepts and arguments involved in political party ideology and activity in the USA. Clear arguments and explanation are constructed to explain and evaluate their similarities and differences and these are substantiated with relevant examples and evidence regarding their nature and role. There is some evaluation of the principal concepts involved such as US liberalism and conservatism and the recognition of the parties as vast internal coalitions and the reasons for this.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 (cont'd)	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of the importance and role of political parties in American politics with a more limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and the answer may be more descriptive of the parties and their views. They may demonstrate some contextual awareness covering part of the question such as a focus on similarities OR differences. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples about parties to illustrate the points being made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to explain the role of parties in American politics, and only begin to construct arguments and offer explanations for their similarities and differences. They may accept the thrust of the quotation without any challenge. They offer only a limited analysis showing some awareness only of viewpoint surrounding their role and characteristics. There is a simple attempt to evaluate the arguments about the role and nature of US parties within the political system, with limited evidence and examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of the role of political parties in American politics and answers show only a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only a superficial awareness of the role played by parties with little interpretation or explanation and few, if any, examples being offered to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates' discussion of the role and characteristics of political parties in American politics is not adequately supported by the use of political concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations are not fully constructed and there is little awareness of differing viewpoints on their role. Evaluation of explanations of their similarities and differences is superficial and naïve.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 (40 marks)	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the role and nature of PACs in American politics and the controversial nature of their activities. They recognise that there are strong arguments on both sides of the “help” or “hinder” debate and are able to present evidence for both. The role of PACs in both raising election finance and their involvement in interest group activity is understood as is their role relating to supporting (or opposing) presidential and congressional candidates at elections through financial donations and the distribution of campaign finance to candidates. Different examples of PACs are given as is their variable power and influence particularly in their influence on congressional voting behaviour and roll call votes. Up to date evidence is given to substantiate points made and the focus of the answer relates to the democracy aspect of the question rather than a simple description of what PACs are and what they do.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates apply a comprehensive range of well developed political concepts and theories relating to the activities of PACs in US democracy. These are used to construct clear arguments both in favour of and against the activities that they perform within the electoral and political systems. The arguments in their favour would relate to first amendment rights, raising money for political candidates, supporting or opposing candidates or issues and therefore performing valuable democratic functions. However, candidates are aware of the numerous criticisms of the role played by PACs in particular to their “buying” of candidates through finance especially through “bundling”, “targeting” of opponents, the use of independent expenditures and “soft money” and the subsequent argument that members of Congress are “bought” by PAC’s and the result is “influence-peddling” and unfair influence over congressional legislation. They are also criticised for leading to the dominance of “single issue politics” in the USA. Links could also be made with the “incumbency factor” in US politics, the weakening of parties and the dominance of money.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 (cont'd)		Level 4 (13-16 marks) Analysis and evaluation is thorough and convincing and is backed up with impressive evidence and examples, for example the PACs connected to Enron.	

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 (cont'd)	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding of the role and activities of PACs and the nature of the debate surrounding their activities in a democracy producing answers with a clear attempt to address the requirements of the question and demonstrating sound contextual awareness of PACs and the role they play vis-à-vis interest groups and election finance. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations and explanations with clear evidence, backed up by relevant examples to substantiate points made. There may be less balance than in a Level 4 answer and the answer may lack the precise arguments and evidence expected at Level 4 with less focus on the “help” and “hinder” democracy aspect of the question.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories using political vocabulary to analyse and evaluate information regarding the activities of PACs in the USA. Clear arguments and explanations are constructed and candidates provide analysis and evaluation of some of the main arguments both for and against their activities in a liberal democracy and the way in which they either “help” or “hinder” democracy. There is a clear understanding of differing viewpoints, parallels and connections, and good evaluation of the key concepts and arguments such as “influence-peddling” or “targeting”. The answer may be more unbalanced than at Level 4 with fewer examples and evidence presented to back up the analysis.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 (cont'd)	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of the role played by PACs in the US political system with a more limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering only a part of the question, such as a description of the activities of PACs only and a failure to link them to interest groups and parties. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation, with not very detailed examples or evidence to illustrate points made. They may only present one side of the argument and fail to address the “help” or “hinder” part of the question.</p>	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider the arguments for and against the activities carried out by PACs in the USA. Candidates offer a limited analysis which shows some awareness of differing viewpoints and reasons for them. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations, and some limited evidence used to illustrate these.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of the role and activities of PACs and the debate concerning these. Answers show only a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only a superficial awareness of the context of the question, with little interpretation or explanation and few examples if any are given.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates discussion of the arguments surrounding the activities of PACs is not adequately supported by the use of concepts. Arguments and explanations are not fully constructed. Analysis does not show awareness of different viewpoints, and few parallels or connections are made to establish comparison. Evaluation is superficial and naïve, with little or no evidence presented.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 (40 marks)	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the widespread nature of split ticket voting in US elections, and the reasons for its prevalence among American voters as they vote for different and separate parties on their ticket such as Republican for President but Democrat for Senator. They produce answers which fully address the requirements of the questions including detailed and comprehensive explanations and interpretations of STV with up to date examples to illustrate the points being made. Reference is made to the differences between presidential and congressional elections in the USA because of the separation of powers and the timed nature of US elections. A Level 4 answer explains the fact that American voters split their tickets because they can. Factors such as incumbency, the records of the individual candidates and their success in “bringing home the bacon” from the federal pork barrel to their States/districts whether there is an “open” contest, the expenditure of the candidates may be relevantly introduced as a means of explaining STV.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates confidently apply a comprehensive range of well developed concepts and theories to explain the incidence of split ticket voting in American elections, such as voter de-alignment, issue and candidate voting, weak parties, the incumbency factor, pork barrelling and credit-claiming and the rise of independency amongst voters with little party identification or loyalty to either parties or candidates. Appropriate political vocabulary is used to analyse and synthesise information and to construct coherent arguments and explanations. Examples may be given of split ticket voters such as many Southern voters who vote Republican at Presidential level but continue to support Democratic congressional and state candidates. There is a clear and well-developed understanding of the differences between voting for president and voting for a senator or representative in terms of representation of American voters. There may also be reference to the federal nature of US elections which may also add to the prevalence of STV as voters vote for different parties on their long ballots.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 (cont'd)	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) The recognition of the weak and weakening nature of party in the USA, and the rise of “independent” voters open to influence and highly volatile are likely to be factors introduced as an explanation and voters therefore, are likely to be influenced more by issues (issue voting) or by the personal qualities of the candidates (candidate voting). Candidates also produce answers with effective explanations of the consequences of STV, such as the prevalence of divided government in Washington that has been increasingly common in the modern period, and the results of that government such as “gridlock”. It is up to candidates to speculate as to whether this was actually the desire of voters to provide “checks and balances” within the system, or simply a consequence of the way that they voted.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) There is a clear and full evaluation of the probable results of STV such as a democratic president facing a republican Congress as in 1996, or a republican president facing a democratic Congress as Bush in 88. The link between the wishes of the voters and “grid-locked government” in Washington is analysed effectively with appropriate evidence and examples. Very good candidates may recognise that a system of divided government in DC may bring voters the best of both worlds, e.g. lower taxes but higher public spending on the entitlement programmes.</p>	

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 (cont'd)	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of split ticket voting in the USA and its impact of Government in Washington. They produce answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question, and demonstrate sound contextual awareness regarding the reasons for the behaviour of American voters as they vote for candidates from different parties in presidential and congressional elections. Answers also include developed and effective interpretations or explanations, and provide clear evidence, backed up by good examples to illustrate points made, including reference to voting behaviour from recent American elections.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise information regarding the explanations for the incidence of split ticket voting and its consequences. They construct clear arguments and explanations, showing an awareness of different viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is a good evaluation of the principal concepts involved, and the main arguments and explanations using relevant evidence and examples to substantiate points made. The arguments are not as strong and detailed as a Level 4 answer and the consequences of STV may not be as thoroughly analysed.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 (cont'd)	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of split ticket voting in American elections, with a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation, with some not very detailed evidence and examples of split ticket voting to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider reasons for the existence and significance of split ticket voting by American voters. They begin to construct some arguments and explanations, but offer limited analysis showing awareness of different viewpoints. There is a simple attempt to evaluate arguments and explanations, and some limited evidence to illustrate these.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate slight and incomplete knowledge of split ticket voting in American elections, and answers show a limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial knowledge of the context of the question with little interpretation or explanation. Little evidence and few examples if any, are introduced into the answer.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates' discussion of the explanations for the existence of split ticket voting and its consequences is not adequately supported by the use of concepts. Arguments and explanations are not fully constructed, and there is little analysis showing awareness of different viewpoints. Evaluation is superficial, and there is little or no evidence of examples presented in the answer.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Answers rely on narrative which is not fully coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>