



GCE MARKING SCHEME

GOVERNMENT & POLITICS AS/Advanced

JANUARY 2012

INTRODUCTION

The marking schemes which follow were those used by WJEC for the January 2012 examination in GCE GOVERNMENT & 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.

Unit	Page
GP1	1
GP2	9
GP3a	17
GP3b	25
GP4a	33

(As there was no entry for GP4b, a paper was not set and, consequently, there is no Mark Scheme).

GP1

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

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: voting for a party or candidate who is not your preferred choice in order to achieve a desired electoral outcome.
- Developed description may include: greater prevalence in by-elections, perceived extent in recent elections, link to voter volatility, parties that benefit from tactical voting, link to electoral systems, e.g. FPTP.
- Example or specific facts.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 voting behaviour has become more volatile. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: tactical and protest voting, disillusionment with parties and politics, decline of partisan alignment.
- Beyond the extract: impact of different electoral systems on how people vote, different parties contesting different elections, e.g. in Wales compared to UK elections, rise in importance of short-term factors, more floating voters.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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 whether short-term factors are more important in determining voting behaviour than long-term factors. [25]

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

- The importance of issues and rational choice models of voting behaviour.
- The importance of campaigns and images, the media, opinion polls.
- The importance of the votes of some groups and their volatility, e.g. young people / first-time voters, significance of new media in shaping their voting intentions.
- The importance of partisan alignment and continuing high levels of loyalty to some parties amongst some groups of voters and in some areas.
- The significance of social class as a determinant of voting behaviour.
- Issues of non-participation, marginalisation from the voting process.
- Examples from recent elections.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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.2 (a) What is meant by '*consensus politics*'? [5]

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

- Definition: where most parties agree on most basic principles/policies.
- Developed description may include: opposite of adversarial politics, decisions made by wide-scale agreement within and outside parties and Parliaments, non-ideologically driven, pragmatic, co-operation of parties in government.
- Example or specific facts: the periods post-1945 and post-Thatcher, agreement on mixed economy and welfare state, more lately on responsible fiscal policy, terrorism, coalition governments, etc.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 of coalition governments. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: radical policies, more radical than one party alone would be brave enough to attempt, necessity of breaking down old-style adversarial politics and find new and more adventurous ways of making government work, negotiation, compromise.
- Beyond the extract: coalitions can usually command bigger majorities than single-party governments and can get a programme through more easily, there is a broader range of expertise and ideas available to the government in a coalition, more representative of electorate's wishes, time of crisis.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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) 'Referendums should be used more frequently in the UK'. Discuss. [25]

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

- Arguments in favour of more referendums which might include: chance to voice opinions between elections, help to decide cross-party, local or controversial issues, or important issues that arise after an election and are not 'mandated', encourage participation and engagement, help redress democratic deficit, ease of doing so using new technologies.
- Arguments against the greater use of referendums which might include: binding results, lack of understanding of the issues by voters, undermining central principle of a representative democracy, who decides which issues are relevant for holding a referendum.
- Examples: devolution referendums 1979, 1997, local referendums on pub opening, Sunday shopping, etc, lack of referendum on Lisbon Treaty, Iraq, referendums on AV voting system, in Wales on greater powers to the NAW, 2011.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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 '*Liberal Democrats*'? [5]

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: political party formed by merger of Liberals and SDP, partner in coalition government 2010, third party in UK politics.
- Developed description may include: held balance of power in hung Parliament 2010, ideas and policies.
- Example or specific facts, e.g. naming the leader, any local Liberal Democrat representatives.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 third and minority parties find it difficult to get candidates elected. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: they have less money than the major parties, less UK-wide support, and often single-issue so fail to gain support across a broad-ranging programme, the main parties often have policies anyway in their areas.
- Beyond the extract: no realistic chance of forming a government so pointless voting for them, lack of media coverage, lack of leaders of stature, appeal to narrow range of voters.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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) Analyse whether political parties still have any useful role to play in British politics. [25]

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

- Greater popularity of pressure groups as a means of securing change, apathy produced by tendency for all the main parties to move to the centre-ground and present broadly similar programmes to the electorate, distrust of party politicians – 'sleazy', theories of party decline, voter identification decline, slump in mass membership, candidates standing and gaining success in elections at all levels without the benefit of traditional parties behind them, e.g. from Westminster and Welsh contexts, greater use of coalitions which cross party boundaries.
- However, parties are important in providing information and choice at elections, establish the ideological framework of UK politics, generate policies and ideas, provide a route to political success and leadership in the UK, importance of work of parties in formation of governments that can work – experience of Wales 2007, UK 2010.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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 'lobby'? [5]

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: to pressurise for something to be done, to try to persuade decision-makers of your point of view, to petition.
- Developed description may include: different forms of lobbying – direct, through public pressure, through use of professional lobbyists, through contacts with civil servants and representatives.
- Example or specific facts.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 links with government are important to pressure groups. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: because of the multiple opportunities to affect the process through civil servants – getting their issue onto the political agenda, consultations at Green and White Paper stages, aid in drafting a bill, implementation stage, and MPs (Stage 4).
- Beyond the extract: insider status, regular influence through civil servants, 'hostage' groups, corridors of power, more chance of success than through 'outsider' methods.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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) Evaluate the importance of membership and resources as factors affecting the political influence of pressure groups and social movements. [25]

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

- Membership in terms of numbers – social movements compared to small cause groups, in terms of how active the membership is – sectional interest groups compared to dedicated activists, in terms of their expertise – groups that are regularly consulted for advice, etc.
- Resources in terms of money and what influence it can buy – a professional PR staff, lobbying firms, retainers to representatives, 'winning and dining', etc. Other ways in which resources count, such as withdrawal of labour of key groups.
- Other factors and their importance, such as celebrity endorsement, media attention, economic leverage, use of new technology to mobilise support.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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.

GP2

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

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: giving power away from the centre of British politics, to the nations and regions.
- Developed description may include: devolution to Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland since 1997, attempts at devolution to the English regions.
- Example of specific fact, referenda statistics, GOWA 2006.
- Any other relevant material.

A01	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 political importance of the Human Rights Act. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: it has limited the sovereignty of Parliament in Westminster by binding future Parliaments, all legislation has to comply with it, it is a sort of super-statute.
- Beyond the extract: has given greater power to judges to overturn the decisions of the executive, has placed rights at the centre of the constitution, has better entrenched civil liberties (or candidates may argue it has not).
- Any other relevant material.

A01		A02	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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) 'The British Constitution is now as codified as it needs to be.' Discuss. [25]

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

- The extent and adequacy of codification so far – House of Lords reform of composition, reform of UK electoral system, devolution, HRA; statutes; Treaties.
- The extent to which important parts of the constitution remain uncoded – powers of the Core Executive especially the UK Prime Minister, ways of operating a coalition government, the Royal Prerogative, conventions.
- The extent to which the piecemeal nature of the constitution needs further tidying up, or works well as it is; flexibility and adaptability, inconsistency and unsuitability, executive dominance and excessive secrecy.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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.2 (a) What is meant by the term '*matters reserved to the UK government*'? [5]

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: issues that cannot be decided in Wales, but have to be decided in London.
- Developed description may include: set out in the GOWA 2006, fields and matters for Wales can be added to, a full Parliament might have more powers in Wales.
- Example or specific fact: defence, law and order.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 the petition system enhances representation and democracy in Wales. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: puts issues on the political agenda that might not get there otherwise, allows ordinary citizens to change laws and policy, gives AMs the information to ask better questions of the executive.
- Beyond the extract: engages citizens in politics, is a form of direct democracy, protects minorities.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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 whether we have 'elective dictatorship' in Wales and Westminster.[25]

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

- Arguments supporting executive dominance and Parliamentary/Assembly weakness, e.g. near-monopoly of the executive over legislation, weaknesses of scrutiny and questioning systems, party discipline and control of Whips, career MPs, use of the Royal Prerogative, lack of numbers of AMs to effectively scrutinise in Wales, representation.
- Arguments in favour of Parliamentary and Assembly effectiveness in controlling the executive and scrutinising it, in producing good quality legislation and in representing constituents well, e.g. good points of select and scrutiny committees, trend for PM and First Minister to be questioned regularly in committee, examples of governments having to compromise and alter legislation, examples of executives being questioned more rigorously, Parliamentary/Assembly oversight of expenses and standards, Petitions system in Wales.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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 '*Cabinet*'? [5]

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: senior ministers appointed by the PM.
- Developed description may include: c.22 top ministers, most in charge of a department, where all decisions are made (or not – Cabinet decline); Cabinet Committee.
- Example or specific fact: name top Cabinet post(s); a current Cabinet minister.
- Any other relevant material

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 Prime Ministers reshuffle their Cabinets. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: because it is an important part of their power of patronage because an election changes the pool of talent you can choose from, because Cabinet ministers resign.
- Beyond the extract: factions – include like-minded ministers to support the PM, or even those who oppose you, bind them to collective responsibility as a way of control, promote and fast-track good people.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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 claim that political leadership in Wales and Westminster has now become presidential. [25]

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

- Arguments that it has – media management and attention for the PM/First minister, prerogative powers, patronage, marginalisation of Cabinet at UK level, role of PM as world statesman, centralisation of power around the PM in the core executive, examples of highly individual leaders.
- Arguments that it has not – Lack of support for the PM compared to a US president, no PM's Department, ability of Cabinet to undermine a PM, theories of power relationships within the core executive and the constraints of operating within the EU, constraints on First Minister, e.g. GOWA, coalition governments, theories of PM power.
- Appreciation of the differences between a presidential and a Prime Ministerial or Parliamentary system, for example, the PM's or First Minister's relationship to the legislature.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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 '*European Parliament*'? [5]

Credit could be given for the following:

- Definition: the legislature of the EU.
- Developed description may include: has MEPs from all over Europe, wide spectrum of party representation, powers and roles.
- Example or specific fact: name of an MEP.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are accurate and detailed, using a range of relevant evidence/examples.
1-2	Knowledge and understanding are 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 impact of EU law on member states. [10]

Credit could be given for the following:

- From the extract: they decide how to interpret the legislation from the EU, have to ensure that domestic legislation is consistent with EU law, have to ensure that EU law is given effect.
- Beyond the extract: importance of member state agreements – opt-outs, referendums, veto, influence of member states through the Council of Ministers, areas of legislation covered by the EU, and not, reluctance of some member states to implement EU law.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
3-5	Knowledge and understanding are 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) 'The European Union is becoming more and more centralised.' Discuss. [25]

Credit could be given for the following:

- Arguments for discussing and evaluating the following issues: organisation and working that this has brought about – especially the changes under the Lisbon Treaty, majority voting in the Council of Ministers means a coalition of key states can dictate, the powers of the Commission, appointment of EU President 2010, possibility of common foreign and defence policies, army.
- Arguments against this might include: the importance of the principles of subsidiary and 'pooled sovereignty', the influence of member states in every EU decision especially through the council of Ministers, use of referendums to decide major changes, opt-outs and veto's, the possibility of a federal Europe rather than a European super-state.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		AO3	
8-10	Content is accurate and detailed with relevant evidence/examples. Depth and range of knowledge is 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 why the system of primaries in US elections can be criticised. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Different types of primaries – open, closed, blanket.
- Effects of front-loading of primaries, early primaries such as New Hampshire; Super (and Super-Dooper) Tuesday.
- The invisible primary.
- Effects of primaries on party unity.
- The importance of money.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

(b) 'Recent elections have confirmed the media as the most significant factor affecting the outcome.' Discuss. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Importance of traditional media communication such as 'ads' and TV debates, negative campaigning.
- Use of the new media for communication with voters, image concerns for the candidates in recent elections.
- Citizens United.

Counter arguments might include :

- Money, new fundraising methods to get around finance restrictions (e.g. Obama and the Internet, importance of individual donations compared to 527s and PACs).
- Sea change in politics.
- Impact of the candidates themselves.
- Issues in recent elections such as 9/11 and the War on Terror, the need for healthcare reform, race issues.
- Impact of the system itself – the electoral college in 2000.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 factions exist in the Democratic Party.

[10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Need to respond to the break-up of the 'solid South' since the 1960s.
- Differences between old fashioned liberal Democrats, and more modern New Democrats, finding a new position since the loss of more conservative Democrats to the Republican party.
- Debate in the party about the way to respond to the Reagan era, to the disaster of the 2000 presidential election, to the divisive legacy of Clinton, to the presidency of George W Bush.
- Lack of central organisational and ideological control (unlike British parties).
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) 'For the main political parties in the USA, the economy causes more disagreement than any other issue.' Discuss. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Traditional differing viewpoints of Democrats and Republicans on the economy – basically welfare programmes vs. tax cuts.
- The relationships of the Bush administration to business and attitudes to regulation (e.g. Enron) attitude to public spending compared to the Obama approach to these issues and bank regulation.
- Other examples of inter-party differences in the past on the economy, e.g. Clinton vs Bush.
- The impact of globalisation in restricting room for movement, global economic crisis and the need for both parties to woo corporate America.
- Lack of a socialist perspective in politics in the USA.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Relative importance of inter-party disagreement on other issues, e.g. abortion, America's foreign policy.
- Tea Party Republicans, their objections to Democrat spending and 'Big Government'.
- Strength of intra-party disagreement on the economy and other issues, factions.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 significance of religion as a factor influencing voting behaviour in the USA.

[10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Tendency for Catholics and Jews to vote Democrat and
- Protestants to vote Republican.
- The Bible Belt and other pockets of concentrated religious faith,
- correlation of attendance at religious services to voting, the
- Religious Right.
- The connection of religion to moral/ethical policies such as
- abortion, voters', parties' and candidates' stances on this,
- morally conservative and morally liberal standpoints.
- The anomaly of a secular state, guaranteed religious freedom with
- religion has on politics in the USA.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) Analyse whether short-term factors are now more important than core voting coalitions in determining voting behaviour in the USA. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- The significance of **recency factors** affecting voting behaviour.
- Issues, the global situation.
- Candidates themselves (their experience, media image, etc).
- The significance of 'independent' voters, the issue of declining party identification.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Identification of 'core' voting groups for the main parties – by class, region, age.
- The 'New Deal Coalition' and its break-up, the '50:50' nation, red vs blue.
- The strength and loyalty of these core groups in recent elections, e.g. loyalty of the black vote to Democrats but only 13% of voters in 2008, the break-up of the 'solid South', the emergence of the 'solid North-East'.
- The significance of emerging groups such as Hispanics.
- The benefits of incumbency and effects of low turnout, especially for local and Congressional elections.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 there are so many pressure groups in the USA. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Federalism and numerous access points.
- First amendment rights, freedom of expression, pluralism, democracy.
- Mutual dependence of the government and pressure groups – iron triangles.
- Congress / pressure group links – revolving door.
- Roles of PACs in campaign finance.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) Assess whether corporate groups **or** issue groups have more influence in the American political system. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

For corporate groups the arguments might include:

- Influence of corporate America at various levels, e.g. iron triangles, campaign finance, ties to the Republican party in particular.
- Corporate lobbying, processes of contacting Senators and Congressmen, influences on them.
- Efforts to restrict and regulate the influence of corporations.
- Recent Supreme Court rulings.

For issue groups the arguments might include:

- Types of issue groups, the relative success of their different methods.
- National examples such as the gun lobby, local examples.
- Popular protest and direct action.
- The potential impact of new media in mobilising large-scale opinion behind an issue.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 liberal views on the role of the state. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Classical vs modern liberal approaches.
- The primacy of the individual, attitudes to individual freedoms, the extent of choice.
- The role of the state in welfare, promotion of opportunity, equality and the economy.
- The role of the state in moral affairs and progressive liberalism.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) Evaluate the view that by celebrating individualism, liberalism denies any important role to society. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- Differing liberal views on individualism – early liberal thought, 'possessive individualism', atomism, individual freedom and liberty, libertarianism, the right to choice, equality; later liberal thought on social responsibility, altruism and welfare, social liberalism.
- Differing liberal views on society – classical liberal theories of negative freedom, the absence of constraints, a minimal role for society or the state; modern liberal views on positive freedom, the role of society in enabling individuals to exercise freedom and choice, safeguarding rights for the most disadvantaged.
- The liberal debate about reason and justice – individual reason and the ability of individuals to achieve their own goals, antipathy to paternalism, the power of self-interest and egoism, the role of the state and society in promoting equality and justice against this background.
- The role of society in promoting liberal moral values and rights – toleration, pluralism, democracy, civil society, the liberal response to postmodernism and multiculturalism, liberalism today and tensions within it.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 class conflict is important in the development of socialism. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Significance of social class as the main division of society to socialists, definitions.
- Traditional socialist views of class polarisation, exploitation of the proletariat and class war.
- Social democratic views of class as income and status issues, the need to narrow the class gap through class harmony rather than destruction.
- The decline of class politics as a result of post-industrialisation and the response of socialism to this.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) 'Socialism is dead and the obituaries have been written.' Assess the accuracy of this view of socialism today. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

- The struggle to redefine socialism in the modern world, the political, economic and social dimensions.
- The relevance of revolutionary socialism and Marxism to the modern world, the impact of the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989, the resilience of capitalism and dilution of class consciousness, post-modernism; the response of Marxists – redefinitions, post-Marxism and neo-Marxism.
- Social democracy and social justice, ethical socialism, the legacy (e.g. the Welfare State, a mixed economy) the crisis of social democracy and its response to unelectability, its retreat from the 1980s onwards.
- The extent to which revisionist socialism (e.g. the Third Way, communitarian socialism) represents a coherent socialist ideology; the relevance of core socialist principles and ideas to the liberal-capitalists twenty-first century, the response of socialism to globalisation and rampant capitalism, the potential for socialist rebirth, 'clear red water' and the Welsh context.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 private property in modern conservatism. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Different sorts of property ownership – land, buildings, wealth/savings, shares, art.
- Its importance to feelings of security and confidence, respect for tradition, 'stake in society', property as a means of promoting conservative values – law and order, authority and paternalism.
- The importance of thrift and saving in order to accrue property, investment and individual wealth accumulation, individual ownership as a statement of the negative role of the state (against socialist views of common ownership).
- The importance of property to social bonds between generations – inherited wealth, custodial care of property.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) Analyse the extent to which the New Right has undermined traditional conservatism. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following

- The ideas of the New Right - association with Thatcher and Reagan, extent of 'newness' of ideas, roots in classical liberal economics and individualism, aspects of neo-conservatism within the New Right such as respect for law and order, national security, links with aspects of traditional conservatism.
- The extent of the differences between the New Right and traditional one-nation, paternalistic conservatism such as differences about the role of the state socially and economically, the existence of 'society', Britain's role in the world, populism.
- The extent of the survival of traditional conservatism – one-national paternalism, 'social conservatism' and 'compassionate conservatism', the reaction to the New Right by modern conservative leaders (e.g. Bush, Cameron).
- The extent of the legacy of the New Right in modern conservatism, e.g. conservative reactions to economic crisis and the role of the state, laissez-faire, cuts, the ability for conservative governments to be radical and not just managerial.
- Candidates may dispute the notion of conservatism as a fixed ideology, pragmatism and adaptability as opposed to fundamental fixed ideas, impact of coalition government in the UK.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 the importance of national self-determination to nationalists. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Central to the concept of the nation-state, the foundation of nationalism.
- Fundamental right of all people who claim nationhood – to establish a state and determine how it should govern itself, issue of sovereignty, difficulties of defining nationhood.
- Justification for struggles against imperialism and empire.
- National identity and national sentiment.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

(b) 'Nationalism is irrelevant in a global and international world.' Discuss. [30]

Credit could be given for discussing the following:

- The extent to which globalisation and internationalism have made nationalism irrelevant – cultural, social, technological, political and economic developments; supranationalism, co-operation, multi-national corporations, issues of national security in a polarised world, the viability of nation-states.
- The (perhaps greater) appeal therefore of other ideologies which have a global and international dimension such as liberalism or socialism.
- Reactions to globalisation; the strengthening of ethnic identities and the growth of post-colonial nationalism, the maintenance of national identities in an increasingly complex world, types of federalism, e.g. the EU, the UN that preserve the importance of nation-states.
- Extreme reactions that transcend nationalism, e.g. religious fundamentalism, the role of nationalism as an alternative to more destructive and aggressive developments.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 constitutional relationship between the federal government and the states. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Federalism – its changing nature, phrases of federalism, e.g. dual federalism, co-operative federalism, new federalism.
- Enumerated and un-enumerated powers, the tenth amendment (all remaining powers to the states and the people).
- 'Implied' powers of the federal government, e.g. the 'elastic' clause.
- Concurrent powers of the federal government and the states, e.g. taxation.
- Any other relevant material.

A01		A02	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) 'The US Constitution is irrelevant to the actual operation of government in the USA today.' Discuss. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Ways in which government operates outside constitutional rules and constraints, e.g. the increasing power of the federal government, log-rolling and committees in Congress, the role of the Federal bureaucracy.
- Difficulty of amending the constitution and bringing it up to date.
- Debates about whether the constitution prevents the efficient and effective working of government in the USA.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Ways in which the constitution is still relevant – enumerated federal powers and the interpretation and use of these by President and Congress, e.g. the elastic clause and the commerce clause.
- The importance of the Bill of Rights.
- The Supreme Court and judicial review.
- Debates about the current relevance of the philosophical ideas that underpin the constitution – liberty, rights, checks and balances.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 importance of Congressional oversight.

[10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Improve the efficiency, economy and effectiveness of government and its agencies by evaluating programmes and performance.
- Detect and prevent poor administration, waste, illegal and unconstitutional conduct.
- Protect civil liberties and constitutional rights.
- Gather information to develop new legislative proposals.
- Ensure legislative intent is carried through into administration.
- A way for Congress to check on, and check, the executive.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) Evaluate the view that the legislative process makes it impossible to pass radical legislation quickly in the USA. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Ways in which legislation is prevented from being radical and quick, e.g. constitutional arrangements for proposing and disposing in the field of legislation, Congressional gridlock.
- Committees, the need to log-roll in Congress, potential for amendment/veto.
- Influence of interest groups, iron triangles.
- Influence of party and constituency in the voting patterns of Congressmen and Senators.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Ways in which the system can be speeded up and smoothed – the relations between Congress and the executive branch.
- Reaction to a perceived national need or emergency, e.g. Obama and healthcare, the war on terror, the increased power of the President since 9/11 – possibility of the President by-passing Congress.
- Examples of radical legislation, e.g. the BCRA 2002, conditions necessary to be able to pass radical changes.
- Candidates may allege that the Supreme Court de facto makes legislation by its judgements.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 it is difficult to control the federal bureaucracy. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Managerial problems of size and geographic spread.
- Problems of iron triangles and clientilism, especially amongst regulatory agencies and in some departments, e.g. Defense.
- Sense of the bureaucracy following its own agenda rather than that of elected politicians.
- Size of budgets, waste and inefficiencies.
- Record of recent Presidents in trying to control the bureaucracy.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) Analyse critically the argument that the presidency is more imperilled than imperial. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- Debates about the powers of the President and the constraints that operate on the office – constitutional and operational.
- Relative strength of other parts of the executive such as the federal bureaucracy and EXOP, how much can a President control these.
- Examples of Presidents being constrained by the other branches, e.g. Nixon/Clinton and impeachment, Clinton and Obama with healthcare legislation, relationships with Congress, lame-duck Presidents.

Counter-arguments might include:

- Debates about the imperial presidency in the 1970s, the Reagan era and the post-9/11 presidency.
- Presidential strengths including foreign policy.
- The importance of personality and circumstance.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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 how the Supreme Court ensures the protection of rights in the USA. [10]

Credit could be given for explaining the following:

- Separation of powers, three branches of government all checking each other.
- The Supreme Court and its power of judicial review – Marbury vs Madison and McCullough vs Maryland.
- The Bill of Rights and Supreme Court power regarding enumerated and un-enumerated rights, Due Process.
- Rights of individuals and of the states, importance of federalism.
- Landmark judgements.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2	
4-6	Knowledge and understanding are 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 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.

- (b) 'The US Supreme Court is not an impartial guardian of the Constitution.' Discuss. [30]

Credit could be given for analysing/evaluating the following:

Arguments might include:

- The political nature of the Supreme Court – the appointments process, controversies and debates.
- Lifetime tenure.
- Periods of judicial activism with examples, the impact of loose constructionists, the ideological disposition of justices, cases that are decided politically.
- Duty of the Supreme Court to interpret the constitution in a modern setting, e.g. right to privacy and other rights that did not exist when the constitution was drawn up.
- The role of the Supreme Court in changing America's moral values through landmark judgements, e.g. Brown vs Board of Education, Roe vs Wade, the importance of dissents.

Counter-arguments might include:

- The legal role of the Supreme Court.
- Restrictions on its power.
- Judicial restraint and strict construction with examples.
- The acceptance of Supreme Court judgements even in the most contentious circumstances, e.g. 2000 Presidential election.
- Tendency of some Supreme Courts to follow, rather than lead, public opinion.
- Any other relevant material.

AO1		AO2		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 is 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 is 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