



GCE MARKING SCHEME

GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS AS/Advanced

SUMMER 2012

INTRODUCTION

The marking schemes which follow were those used by WJEC for the SUMMER 2012 examination in GCE GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS. They were finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conferences were held shortly after the papers were taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conferences was to ensure that the marking schemes were interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conferences, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about these marking schemes.

GP1

Q.1 (a) What is meant by the term '*opinion polls*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: a sample of voters asked about how they will/did vote.
- Developed description may include: how samples are generated, how honest people are in polls, the accuracy of polls in predicting results, importance of polls for parties and leaders.
- Example: YouGov, Mori, exit polls.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why the images of party leaders are important in elections. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: give minor party leaders equal status with major party leaders, a chance to get the message across, a chance to affect voting especially in crucial marginal seats.
- Beyond the extract: 'bandwagon effect' of good showing by the leader, importance of short-termism in determining how people will vote, potential disaster of a negative performance by a party leader, reflection in polls (e.g. Brown 2010 and 'bigot' incident).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) 'Geographical region is more important than other factors in determining how people vote in elections.' Discuss. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- The significance of region as a factor: traditional party loyalties in the nations of the UK and English regions, importance of third and minority party voting in some areas, impact of devolution, North-South divide, polarisation, importance of local factors, volatility of voting in different types of elections even in the same region, changes in party dominance.
- The relative significance of other factors such as class and party alignment, age, recency factors such as issues, media coverage and campaigns, the significance of electoral systems and frequency and types of elections in determining how people vote, casting different votes in different elections, significance of tactical and protest voting in by-elections and general elections, non-participation.
- Examples from recent elections.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.2 (a) What is meant by 'Single Transferable Vote'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: a form of PR where voters express preferences for candidates and their votes are then translated into seats won.
- Developed description may include: droop formula for the quota to be reached ($[\text{votes}/\text{seats}+1] +1$). Fair reflection of what voters wanted when first and second preferences (and even beyond this) are taken into account. Has drawbacks of its own, for example, it is relatively complicated and may remove the link between votes cast-candidate-party.
- Examples: Australia, New Zealand, Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain the strengths and weaknesses of the Additional Member system. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: weakness is confusion between two different types of AM, a strength is the retention of AM-constituency links through the First Past the Post part of it.
- Beyond the extract: ensures fairness as parties have representation 'topped up' through the party lists, weaknesses is that this gives parties too much control over who some AMs are through controlling the list.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) 'The more proportional electoral systems are the most suitable ones for Wales and the UK.' Discuss. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- Strengths and weaknesses of those systems that have an element of proportionality, for example AMS (in Wales, Scotland, London) closed and open party lists (EU elections, STV).
- Strengths and weaknesses of those systems with little or no proportionality, for example, Alternative Vote, Supplementary Vote (all directly elected mayors including London) FPTP (a substantial part of AMS).
- Answers should focus on proportionality – whether this makes a system a good one or not, and on strengths of non-proportional systems such as member-constituency link, whether this is the most important consideration for a system.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.3 (a) What is meant by the term '*candidate*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: someone who puts themselves up for elections.
- Developed description may include: domination of parties over candidate selection, poor representation of certain groups as candidates – ethnic groupings, women, women-only shortlists, differences in candidatures between different types of elections.
- Example or specific facts.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain the main functions of political parties. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: they control for whom we vote (parties rather than individuals), parties form governments either alone or in coalition, they generate political ideas.
- Beyond the extract: important as a method of political participation, they provide the recruiting ground for representatives and then ministers; they educate.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) Analyse the view that in Wales and the UK today there are more differences within political parties than between them. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- Extent of conflict within parties with examples: factions and splits, wings and sub-groups, issues that have caused/cause major rifts within parties, for example, Europe, war on terror / Iraq, extent of acceptable cross-party co-operation in coalitions.
- Analysis of the extent of differences between parties in the UK today: those issues and ideas where there is consensus, and those where there is conflict, the roles of minor parties in bringing different perspectives to the table, consensus versus adversarial models of politics.
- Candidates should address the issue of where more conflict is to be found.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.4 (a) What is meant by '*insider status*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: pressure groups that operate within the governmental system.
- Developed description may include: corridors of power, consultation and influence, 'behind the scenes', lobbying, expertise, help with implementation.
- Example or specific facts.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why social movements are popular in contemporary Britain. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: use of new technologies to communicate ideas and mobilise support, celebrity endorsement, commitment of members to the single issue or cause the social movement campaigns for.
- Beyond the extract: appeal to young people, an alternative way to political parties to influence politics – parties seem unpopular and outdated by comparison, feeling of belonging to something worthwhile (aims are often linked to high ideals such as fairness and ending poverty).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) 'Governments pay too much attention to groups and movements that have a high media profile, and not enough attention to those who do not.' Discuss. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- Relative success of groups with high media profiles: outsider groups and social movements, analysis of the benefits that a high media profile can bring, the successes it may achieve, for example, celebrity endorsement (Ghurkas, Live Aid/8), mass mobilisation of support (Fuel Lobby, Countryside Alliance) but also of the potential drawbacks of media attention (the group is regarded as permanently outside by decision-makers).
- Relative success of groups that do not court publicity: insider groups, expert groups, 'hostage' groups, those that are consulted anyway because of expertise, those that work through 'behind closed doors' lobbying, lack of success of some groups that cannot afford publicity and represent minority interest so are ignored by governments.
- Different successes of groups and movements at different levels of government: UK, Europe, devolved institutions.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

GP2

Q.1 (a) What is meant by the term '*constitutional reforms*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: changes to the way Britain is governed, the rules.
- Developed description may include: certain statutes deal with the rules of how the country is run, such as who can vote, what governmental institutions exist and what their relationships are to each other and to citizens. Constitutional reform escalated after 1997.
- Example or specific fact: House of Lords reform, devolution, reform of Westminster voting system.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain how devolution demonstrates that the British Constitution is flexible. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: differing structures in each nation – different voting systems, different powers, different structures, response to different histories and cultures.
- Beyond the extract: devolution amended the Union without destroying it, shows how the Constitution can be evolutionary, is still evolving and allows differing, local solutions to exist, is a move towards separation of powers, even federalism.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) Assess the view that the British Constitution fails to limit the power of government. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- Formal and informal checks and balances.
- The adequacy of statutes in limiting the powers of government, constitutional status of some, like EU Treaties and the HRA which subsequent legislation cannot override, growing trend for major reforms to be subject to a referendum, compared to ease with which governments can change constituency size or pass other constitutional statutes using a Parliamentary majority.
- Adequacy of conventions in limiting government powers, scope of conventions, ease of alteration, Royal Prerogative.
- Adequacy of judges in limiting government powers, scope of judicial review, protection of rights, judicial independence.
- Role of other informal checks such as the media.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples . Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth or range of analysis is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/example. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/ examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.2 (a) What is meant by the term '*backbench MPs*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: MPs who are not members of the government or the shadow team.
- Developed description may include: sometimes they are aspiring ministers, many are happy to be a good backbencher scrutinising government and representing constituents. Supposed to be disciplined by Whips.
- Example or specific fact: name a backbench MP.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why Select Committees are important in Parliament. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: they are the main way of scrutinising the government, there are over forty of them, they are backbench committees, they have independence from government in their agendas, they publish reports, MPs take them seriously.
- Beyond the extract: reports are public and potentially damaging, government has to respond, they can ask for civil servants to appear, their proceedings are televised, they are expanding their role.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) Discuss whether AMs in Wales and MPs at Westminster represent their constituents well. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- AMs and MPs represent their constituents well as they are subject to the popular vote at elections if they don't. Opportunities to raise constituents' interests in debates and questions (expect detail of NAFW and Westminster systems, for example, adjournment debates. Examples of particularly good 'constituency MPs'. Backbench MPs – chances to legislate on behalf of constituents. Petitions to MPs and (more easily) AMs. Social representation – the backgrounds and profiles of AMs and MPs.
- Use of technology at Cardiff Bay compared to Westminster. Also 'cash for questions', 2010 Expenses Scandal and other issues of sleaze at Westminster – where do constituents figure in an MP's loyalties? Do representatives pay more attention to the views of pressure groups than constituents? The control of parties rather than constituents over selection and removal might figure. Question whether all AMs represent constituents well given that the electoral system means that 20 AMs are elected on a party list for a huge constituency, whereas others have smaller constituencies won by FPTF.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth or range of analysis is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.3 (a) What is meant by the term '*Secretary of State for Wales*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: the person in the Cabinet responsible for Wales.
- Developed description may include: leads the Wales Office, reduced role since devolution, residual functions and powers post-GOWA 2006.
- Example or specific fact: name of the / a Secretary of State for Wales.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain the constraints on the powers of the First Minister. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: some issues that affect Wales can only be decided in Westminster, the extract mentions defence, social security, foreign affairs, the role of the Secretary of State for Wales.
- Beyond the extract, powers are laid down in GOWA 2006 – a constitutional constraint, small pool of talent in the NAFW as far as patronage goes, small Cabinet (restricted by GOWA) constraints of coalition government from 2007.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) 'The modern core executive makes it impossible for any individual to acquire too much political power.' Discuss. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- Arguments that this is so might include: the complicated nature of relationships within the core executive model, interdependence and collegiality, co-operation and collective responsibility, theories of PM power such as elastic premiership, constraints on individuals, resources available to them.
- Arguments against this might include: the possibility of building power bases within the core executive (Treasury, Cabinet Office) theories of PM power such as spatial leadership, the growth of personal/departmental special advisers, the unaccountable and unelected nature of much of the new core executive, secrecy, news and media management.
- Credit references to the core executive in Wales as well as Westminster, and other examples from the nations of the UK.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth or range of analysis is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.4 (a) What is meant by the term '*local councillors*'? [5]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- Definition: local people who set priorities for local services, chosen by the local population through elections.
- Developed description may include: types of local councils, some description of the services they provide, some details about local council elections.
- Example or specific fact: names of local councillors.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.

(b) Using your own knowledge as well as the extract, explain why it can be claimed that local democracy is in decline. [10]

Credit **could** be given for the following:

- From the extract: local council spending and functions taken largely under central control in the 1980s (i.e. local government now lacks independence from central government – 'enabling' councils) almost permanent control of some councils by one party, unrepresentative nature of councillors for example age.
- Beyond the extract: turnout for local elections is pitifully low, they are dominated by national issues often, lack of people coming forward to be councillors, lack of interest.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
3-5	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples from the extract and wider knowledge.	3-5	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (c) 'Of all the issues facing local government today, the most significant is funding.' Discuss. [25]

Credit **could** be given for discussing and evaluating the following issues:

- Analysis of the significance of funding issues – lack of funds generally, over-reliance on central government funding, alternatives to the Council Tax, unfairness in how funding is allocated, between regions/councils and services, unequal service provision as a result.
- Evaluation of the relative significance of other problems for local government, which might include: lack of local engagement, voter apathy, unrepresentative profiles of councillors, lack of expertise of 'amateur' councillors, debates over the future functions of local government – to deliver local democracy or to deliver local services? The rise of 'enabling' councils; political issues such as the domination of councils by one group, or how to make a multi-group 'hung' council work, the roles of independent councillors.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-7	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth or range of analysis is displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	6-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	3-5	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	3-5	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-2	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

GP3a

Q.1 (a) Explain the roles of the national party conventions.

[10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Choosing/confirming presidential and vice-presidential candidates.
- Deciding a party platform.
- Promoting party unity.
- Enthusing voters.
- Giving a national platform to aspiring candidates.
- Conventions, importance of the TRS
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'Elections in the USA are as democratic as they can be.' Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Constitutional basis of USA elections, the democratic ideal.
- Openness of candidature (e.g. Obama, Clinton, Palin 2008).
- Frequency and diversity of elections, types of primaries, different fixed terms, responsiveness to electors.
- Protection of interests of the states through the electoral college and senate elections.
- Protection of interest of electors through primaries, House elections, presidential elections and direct democracy.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Unfair influence of money, attempts to regulate campaign finance.
- Advantages of incumbency and coat-tailing.
- Domination of only two parties, corruption.
- Failings of the Electoral College, role of Supreme Court in 2000.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.2 (a) Explain the emergence of 'Compassionate Conservatism' in the Republican Party. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Legacy of the Reagan era.
- Factions in the party.
- Redefining the Republican party as fiscally conservative but socially compassionate under George W Bush – moving it to the centre, No Child Left Behind, workfare programmes, support for traditional families.
- The 2000 election – need to effectively fight Gore and Democrats in the middle ground.
- Challenge of the Tea Party to compassionate conservatism.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Discuss the view that American political parties lack ideology. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Cross-party support for 'American values' such as democracy, opportunity, 'Big Tent' parties.
- Concentration of policies and ideas from both parties in the centre, examples.
- Lack of any far-right or socialist party successes.
- Need for compromise as a result of the system, very difficult to push a programme through (ideologically based or not).

Counter-arguments might include:

- Reaganism as an ideologically concentrated programme.
- Emergence of Green politics, Nader.
- The importance of liberalism and conservatism in underpinning the policy positions of the main parties, examples in practice.
- Split ideologies within parties, such as the Tea Party.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

- Q.3** (a) Explain why there seems to be a gender gap in support for the Democrats and the Republicans. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Most females vote Democrat.
- Traditional views of Republican party on issues regarded as 'female' issues, e.g. abortion, the family, more progressive views of Democrats on these issues.
- Link to age: more younger women are politically active and tend to vote Democrat, older women tend not to be and older voters generally support the Republicans.
- Importance of gender in voting behaviour, high profile female candidates and office-holders, role-models.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'The rise of independent and swing voters is the most significant factor explaining voting behaviour in the USA.' Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Debates about party identification: alignment and de-alignment.
- Types of independents, the actual extent of independent voters' volatility.
- Recent trends, how it affects each party.
- Swing voters and split-ticket voting. Examples from recent elections.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Other models of voting behaviour: sociological, rational choice and dominant ideology models.
- Influence of age, gender, ethnicity, religion, socio-economic status, education, issues, candidates and image, self-interest, media, etc.
- Issues of voter registration and non-voting. Examples from recent elections.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.4 (a) Explain why the gun lobby is so powerful in the USA.

[10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Constitutional right to 'bear arms', recent Supreme Court decisions.
- Massive and committed membership, powerful pressure groups, for example the National Rifle Association.
- Money: donations to political parties (especially Republican), funding of ads.
- Close relations with powerful friends in Congress.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding isare basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Critically evaluate whether pressure groups in the USA undermine democracy and the national interest. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- The influence of corporations, Iron Triangles.
- Examples of pressure group reward for political access, influence over legislation, positive and/or negative, e.g. pharmaceutical lobby, the gun lobby, abortion groups and defence industry.
- Examples of groups in society who do not benefit from interest group activity.

Counter-arguments might include:

- First amendment rights to freedom of expression.
- Range and types of US pressure groups, multiple access points.
- Examples of issues where there are many groups with competing views and no dominance by large groups.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

GP3b

Q.1 (a) Explain why some liberals distrust the idea of democracy. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Idea of majority rule, the tyranny of the majority, rule of the 51%.
- Danger of loss of interests of minorities.
- Elitist nature of the majority in industrialised societies – class, education, occupation.
- The hijacking of democracy by groups, the subordination of the individual.
- Possibility of authoritarianism through an appeal to populism.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Assess whether liberal thinking has had more impact on the Liberal Democratic Party than on any of the other political parties in the UK. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- The impact of liberal thought on Lib Dem policy, for example, social responsibility, the rights of minorities, state intervention to create social justice, constitutional reform to give more effect to individuals.
- The divide in the party between classical liberals (economic liberalism but less social liberalism) and social liberals.
- Effects of being coalition partners from 2010, general lack of electoral success otherwise.
- The extent of the impact of liberal thought on the other parties – classical economic liberalism and decentralisation of the New Right, social conservatism in the Conservative party, compared to Conservative views of the rights of minorities, the role of the individual and authority.
- Liberal nature of British socialism, Labour governments and rights of minorities, equality and rights legislation, New Labour and individualism, constitutional reform, criticism of some Labour policy as illiberal, for example, law and order measures, civil liberties implications.
- Liberalism in the policies of minority parties such as Plaid Cymru, those that are distinctly illiberal such as the British National Party.
- Extent to which Britain is, anyway, a liberal society and almost all parties can be described as 'liberal', widespread support for liberal democracy, pluralism and social and legal justice.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.2 (a) Explain why socialists reject the idea of private property ownership. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Definition of private property ownership: wealth, capital.
- Unjust: wealth generated by collective effort should be owned in common.
- Morally corrupting: property breeds acquisitiveness and places materialism above other values.
- Divisive: property ownership fosters conflict between classes, between employers and employed.
- Marxist view: abolition, how this is to be achieved.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'The main argument amongst socialists has been about means, and not ends.' Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- The debate within socialism about 'means': revolutionary socialism in the past and present, the point at which revolution can stop (if ever) the fundamental significance of change, the tendency of revolutionary socialism towards dictatorship, evolutionary socialism – Fabianism, gradualism extension of political democracy, the tendency of democratic socialism to compromise, work within the system, lose its edge.
- The debate within socialism about 'ends': competing definitions of socialism, fundamentalist socialism and the replacement of capitalism, revisionist socialism and an accommodation with capitalism, the debate between communists and social democrats, the extent of common ground in socialist visions of the future, the relevance of socialism as the importance of social class declines.
- The interconnectedness of means and ends.
- The ideological debate versus the political reality of what is achievable for socialists in different circumstances.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.3 (a) Explain the importance of traditional institutions and values to conservatism. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Traditional institutions, for example, the church, the family, the monarchy.
- Traditional values, for example, marriage, religion, order, authority, morality.
- Provides a link to the past, the accumulated wisdom of generations.
- Provides a sense of security and endurance, stability and continuity rather than turmoil and change.
- Tendency for conservatives to 'conserve'.
- Importance to paternalistic, one-nation conservatives, importance to the New Right and to social conservatives.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Evaluate the view that conservatism is more about the retention of power than about ideology. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- Traditional conservatism and its emergence as 'opposition to change', a negative ideology in effect.
- Underlying principles or core values of traditional conservatism that could be said to form a set of conservative ideological principles – essentially negative view of human nature, natural disposition of certain classes to rule, hierarchy and paternalism, order and authority, traditional institutions and values, property.
- The pragmatic nature of conservatism: changes to conservative ideology in response to electoral circumstances, e.g. the 1980s, the early 21st century; the ideology of the New Right, the ideology of social or compassionate conservatives; extent to which these arose as a political necessity, the extent of their intellectual and ideological underpinning.
- Conservative opposition to ideology, conservatism as an anti-ideology; lack of vision of an ideal form of society's scepticism, reaction to other ideologies, adaptability, survival.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.4 (a) Explain why post-colonial nationalism is anti-western.

[10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Definition of post-colonial nationalism.
- Tendency for post-colonial regimes to become totalitarian, anti-western liberal democracy.
- Importance of tribalism, need for unity, pluralism would undermine this, civil war.
- Perception of colonial western exploitation, reaction against this on independence.
- Popularity of socialism as a post-colonial ideology, rather than liberalism (more popular in the west).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

(b) 'Nationalism is a destructive ideology.' Discuss.

[30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- Extreme forms of nationalism: those that promote war and conflict, e.g. fascism, Nazism.
- Darwinist theories of nationalism, struggle between nations in which some are subdued; aggressive nationalism and hegemony, cultural domination, colonial and post-colonial nationalism; racialism; issues with defining a 'nation', regionalism.
- Nationalism as a positive ideology: 'organic society', unity in times of crisis, the positive benefits of a sense of national identity, the extent to which this can be created.
- Nationalism as a dominant ideology in the 20th and 21st centuries, the pursuit of self-determination.
- Roles of culture and politics, legitimacy for states through nationalism.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

GP4a

- Q.1** (a) Explain the importance of the principle of separation of powers in the US Constitution. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Three separate branches of government: legislature, executive, judiciary.
- Separation of personnel of the three branches in the constitution, contrast with the UK (overlap).
- 'Partial agency', not total separation of operation and function – checks and balances on each brand on the other two with examples, both a barrier to unilateral action and an assurance of good government – considered, measured, checked.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Assess critically the argument that the US Constitution puts too much emphasis on the protection of the rights of citizens and the states. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- The importance of the Bill of Rights and the Power of the Supreme Court to protect it.
- Difficulty of amending the constitution and bringing it up to date, e.g. the right to bear arms.
- The un-enumerated rights of the states and citizens (Tenth Amendment) compared to enumerated rights of federal government and the complicated checks and balances on federal government.
- Frequency of elections and differing constituencies of Senate and House as means of protecting citizens' and states' rights, federalism.

Counter-arguments might include:

- The fundamental underlying principle of limited government.
- Lack of changes to the constitution, implying that the balance is about right.
- Ability of federal government to interpret the constitution to give itself increased powers, e.g. the elastic and commerce clauses; the massive growth of federal government in the twentieth century and the need to protect citizens and states from its encroachment.
- Holistic nature of the constitution rather than a competition for power between the three branches (mutual dependence).
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.2 (a) Explain the significance of Congress's power of impeachment. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Part of constitutional system of checks and balances: ultimate Congressional sanction against executive and judiciary as it can result in removal, 'political equivalent of the death penalty'.
- No similar sanction for other two branches over Congress.
- Both parts of Congress involved.
- Effects, e.g. Clinton's reputation was permanently affected, even though he survived Senate trial, Nixon resigned rather than be impeached, impeachment of justices.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) How far do you agree with the description of Congress as *an 'inefficient and ineffective legislature'*? [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Drawbacks of the legislative system, e.g. length of time it takes, perpetual need for compromise, pork-barrelling, filibuster, co-equal powers of each chamber.
- Inability of the administration to push a programme through, difficulties caused by lack of party discipline, gridlock.
- Incumbency and the committee system; disproportionate influence of interest groups, examples.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Significant powers of Congress, e.g. elastic clause / commerce clause, power of impeachment.
- Positive benefits of compromise: likely to attract more widespread support.
- Benefits of incumbency: experience.
- Congressional oversight of activities of the execution including the federal bureaucracy, power of the purse.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.3 (a) Explain the factors a President will consider when appointing a cabinet. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Need for policy specialists/experience.
- Need for experience in handling Congress.
- Need to reward others in the race for President, e.g. Clinton 2008 and avoid party splits.
- Balance in terms of region, race, gender, age, faction/ideology.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'Conflict is the main feature of relations between the President and Congress.'
Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Difficulties Presidents face with Congress, e.g. lack of party leadership position, often a lack of a party majority, gridlock.
- Need to persuade, log-roll and compromise.
- Mechanics of Presidential/Congressional relations, influence through Congress of pressure groups, clientilism, Iron Triangles.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Factors making Presidential/Congressional relations smoother, e.g. the role of EXOP.
- Periods of one-party dominance of Congress and the Presidency.
- Relative constitutional position of Congress: a check on executive power, friction is a feature of US government.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.4 (a) Explain why appointments to the Supreme Court are important. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Presidential nominations as a political weapon, examples.
- Lifetime tenure, length of potential influence.
- Small number of justices: the political leaning of each is important.
- Strict/loose constructionists, swing justices.
- Nature of Supreme Court decisions: in effect, new laws.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'The Supreme Court's power of judicial review is less significant than critics often claim'. Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Constraints on the powers of the Supreme Court: e.g. it cannot decide which cases to hear, it has no power to enforce decisions, e.g. *Brown vs the Board of Education 1954*.
- It is pre-eminently a legal, not a political body.
- Periods of judicial restraint: Supreme Court decisions governed by *stare decisis*, tendency to reinforce precedent rather than change things – the Rehnquist and Roberts courts.
- Strict constructionist judges.

Counter-arguments might include:

- The impact of landmark decisions such as *Brown vs Board*, *Roe vs Wade*, *Gore vs Bush*.
- Periods of judicial activism when the Supreme Court leads America in changing moral values, examples, the Warren and Burger courts.
- Loose constructionist judges, swing justices, the importance of dissents.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

GP4b

Q.1 (a) Explain the main arguments of the anti-global movement. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Multi-national and transnational corporations destroy local communities and cultures, exploit cheap labour and destroy local environments.
- International organisations such as the IMF, UN exist to promote the interests of larger industrialised nations over smaller, Third World nations.
- Intervention around the globe is used by some countries to promote their own aims (links with anti-war movement).
- Globalisation stifles diversity in all forms – e.g. economic, political.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Assess whether international economic, cultural and political intervention can ever be justified. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments that international intervention cannot be justified might include:

- Role of international organisations in upholding western liberal norms and promoting capitalism and western-style democracy at the expense of indigenous cultures, economic systems, forms of political organisation.
- Unilateral intervention by superpowers to uphold their own interests, legality of seeking regime changes, or of forcing aid on a country against the wishes of the government.
- Results are hardly ever better, either for the target state or the state that intervenes.

Arguments that international intervention can be justified might include:

- The legal authority given to interventions to keep the peace by the United Nations.
- Humanitarian grounds for intervention, oppressive regimes, lack of human rights.
- Economic and environmental reasons for interventions.
- Nations that are a perceived threat to international security, terrorism.

Arguments of sovereignty versus responsibility, impacts on international relations:

- Non-state 'intervention': the impact of multi-national and transnational corporations, benefits and drawbacks.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.2 (a) Explain why the idea of sustainability is controversial.

[10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- Opposition to industrialism: challenges the foundations of western capitalist culture, at its most extreme it means a completely different approach to economic activity, 'Buddhist economics'.
- The 'tragedy of the commons', sustainability implies loss of freedoms, greater restrictions on access to common resources.
- Would mean greater role for government: imposing controls or punitive taxes.
- Biggest target is energy use, reduction in fossil fuel use, renewable energy.
- Controversy within the environmentalist movement itself: 'light' and 'dark' green thinking.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited is examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'Green thinking can only be successful on a local rather than a global level.'
Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following

- The importance of individual effort, local initiatives, the implications of 'dark' green thinking for society – greater role for local communities and individuals, goal of 'zero growth', completely different approach to economic activity, 'Buddhist economics'.
- The difficulties facing attempts to place environmental thinking at the top of the global agenda: anthropocentrism, industrialism, debates about core environmentalist themes such as climate change, summits, examples.
- A counter-argument might include: ecology as a network of inter-relationships, ecocentrism, holism, Gaia hypothesis; the extent to which any meaningful environmental progress has to be global, the need for regulation to promote sustainability; the environmental movement and its global successes through pressure groups and party politics, examples; the insignificance of local efforts in a global world.
- The tensions within environmentalism; 'shallow' and 'deep' ecologism; the relationship between environmentalism and other ideologies.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.3 (a) Explain the main differences between liberal feminism and radical feminism. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- First and second stage feminism, tendency for liberal feminism to be middle-class.
- Liberal feminist attitude to women as individuals, along with men, emphasis on equality and opportunity.
- Radical feminist view of patriarchal society, sisterhood.
- Public/private divide: liberal feminist view that gradual reform is needed in the public sphere, acceptance in part of female role in the domestic sphere.
- Radical feminist view of public/private divide: reform needed in both, sexual oppression is the most fundamental feature of society and revolutionary reform is needed to change society.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) Critically examine the view that feminism has achieved so much success that there is no longer any future for the women's movement. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- Critique of successes of feminism/the women's movement: political, social, economic and cultural achievements – right to vote, growth of numbers of women in public life. Equal Opportunities legislation, culture changes to roles of women, e.g. in workplace, gay and lesbian rights, abortion, education; actual versus perceived successes depending on feminist viewpoint; extent of assimilation and continued patriarchy.
- Fragmentation of modern feminism: post modern feminism which calls into question the male/female divide, undermining the need for feminism at all, extremes of radical feminism (political lesbianism, 'women-identified women') incoherence and confusion of modern feminism, 'Third Wave'.
- Challenges for the women's movement in the modern world: growth of religious extremism; liberal democratic responses to economic downturn – cuts to jobs, welfare, and how these affect the position of women, reactionary feminism 'equal but different'.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.

Q.4 (a) Explain why the protection of minority rights is important in multiculturalism. [10]

Credit **could** be given for explaining the following:

- 'Diversity within unity'.
- Maintenance of political distinctiveness for national minorities, e.g. Wales within the UK, Maoris in New Zealand. This might involve devolution, ceding of sovereignty, federalism.
- Allow immigrant and indigenous groups to maintain their cultural distinctiveness: possible clash with norms and values of the wider society, e.g. Sharia law, exemptions for religious reasons.
- Address issues of social injustice: positive discrimination to increase representation of ethnic groups in public life for example.
- Controversies: e.g. integration vs ghettoisation.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2
4-6	Knowledge and understanding is accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.	3-4	Argument is clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation.
1-3	Knowledge and understanding is basic in detail with limited evidence/examples.	1-2	Argument is limited in terms of coherence and focus.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant explanation.

- (b) 'Attempts by the state to promote multiculturalism are bound to fail.' Discuss. [30]

Credit **could** be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- Issues arising from attempts by states to promote national culture and identity, controversies surrounding the extent to which this approach hinders multiculturalism.
- Negative reactions to attempts to protect minority rights including political reactions, responses to perceived 'political correctness' and inequalities, special rights of some groups.
- Ghettoisation and lack of integration; arguments of liberal and pluralist multiculturalism about the role of the state.
- Arguments about the relative success of political, economic, social, cultural and religious measures to promote multiculturalism.
- Reassertion of national identity as a strengthening of multiculturalism; debates about devolution and federalism; successes of legislation in the area of minority rights, positive discrimination.
- Extent to which multiculturalism has pervaded the thinking of western liberal democracies in the twentieth to twenty-first centuries.
- Cosmopolitanism and global citizenship – the relevance of multicultural policies.
- Any other relevant material.

Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with a range of relevant evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth and range of knowledge are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	9-12	Differing viewpoints are clearly structured and focused, providing a convincing explanation. Depth and range of analysis are displayed though not necessarily in equal measure.	7-8	The argument is clearly structured and sustained, using appropriate political vocabulary; accurate spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4-7	Content is reasonably accurate but less detailed using some evidence/examples from both sides of the argument. Depth or range of knowledge is displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis is displayed.	4-6	The argument is clear using some political vocabulary; some inaccuracies in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1-3	Content is described in basic detail with limited evidence/examples from both sides of the argument OR reasonably accurate but a one-sided view only.	1-4	Argument is limited and basic in terms of coherence and focus.	1-3	The argument is basic and limited in clarity and structure; errors in spelling punctuation and grammar.
0	No relevant knowledge or understanding.	0	No relevant analysis.	0	No relevant argument is constructed.



WJEC
245 Western Avenue
Cardiff CF5 2YX
Tel No 029 2026 5000
Fax 029 2057 5994
E-mail: exams@wjec.co.uk
website: www.wjec.co.uk