



---

# **GCE MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2016**

**GOVERNMENT & POLITICS – GP3a  
1403/01**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2016 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was 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 conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was 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' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

**GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS - GP3a**

**MARK SCHEME SUMMER 2016**

**Q.1 (a) Explain the importance of state level initiatives. [10]**

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

- A form of direct democracy that gives US citizens a frequent opportunity to add to legislation, or to repeal it.
- A way of safeguarding federalism as citizens of each state can vote on issues affecting that state, with different outcomes in different states, e.g. same-sex marriage.
- A way that US citizens can undermine federal law, e.g. with marijuana use regulations.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>AO1</b>		<b>AO2</b>	
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 criticism of presidential campaigns in the USA is the length of them.'** Discuss. [10]

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

- Criticisms of the length of campaigns might include: the money needed to fund a long campaign and the problems with this such as super PACs; the significance of the invisible primary; criticisms of the primary and caucus systems, the influence that a long campaign gives to the media; the divisive impact on parties of the primaries.
- Counter-arguments might include: a long campaign allows time for the electorate to become well-informed about the candidate and issues; a long campaign ensures that all 50 states take part; a long campaign allows the public to see which candidates have the stamina to become the president; other criticisms of presidential campaigning may be considered more important and may form the counter-argument, e.g. the importance of money or the media.
- 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 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 are displayed.	5-8	Differing viewpoints are reasonably thorough and coherent. Depth or range of analysis are 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 ideology for parties in the USA. [10]**

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

- The differing ideologies of the two main parties.
- The extent to which their ideologies are different, or they have ideologies.
- The extent to which ideology matters to US voters, compared to candidates and issues.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>AO1</b>		<b>AO2</b>	
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 whether the main parties in the USA are more factionalised than they are united. [30]**

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

- Arguments that they are factionalised/divided might include: examples of factions and groups within the two main parties; the impact of the need to allow candidates to be responsive to local priorities; politics is more regional than national; the variety of ideas that flourish in both parties even on the same issue; lack of ideology; the impact of federalism on the homogeneity of parties; bipartisanship and the necessity of politicians of different parties working together to achieve aims (necessary in legislatures), log-rolling; the ability of parties to block the executive's programme at state and federal level even when of the same party.
- Arguments that they are more united might include: the basic, fundamental principles that distinguish Democrats from Republicans; the extent of partisanship in state and national legislatures; the use and importance of party labels at election time to allow the electorate to distinguish between candidates; unity around candidates and programmes at election times.
- 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 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 significance of socio-economic status in voting behaviour in the USA. [10]**

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

- The general voting habits of richer and poorer voters.
- The significance of education.
- Connections with region.
- Arguments about 'social class' in US voting behaviour.
- The extent to which candidates in recent elections have been able to swing the votes of previous aligned socio-economic groupings.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>AO1</b>		<b>AO2</b>	
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) 'Voting behaviour is volatile and unpredictable in US elections.'** [10]  
**Discuss.**

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

- Arguments that it is might include: the decline of party identification and the rise of independent voters; the importance and incidence of swing voters; the volatility of certain voting groups in US politics such as Hispanics; the impact of recency factors on voting behaviour; split-ticket voting.
- Arguments that it is not might include: the strong identification of some US voters; the consistency of voting amongst some groups, e.g. the gender advantage for the Democrats amongst women, the loyalty of the black American vote for the Democrats; the core voting coalitions for the two main parties; the lack of impact of swing voters in most states, which are mainly consistently 'red' or 'blue'.
- 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 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 how PACs and super-PACs can exert pressure in US politics. [10]**

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

- Fund-raising for candidates' campaigns at election time.
- The nature of PACs and super-PACs and their connections with vested interests.
- The effect of the Citizens United ruling 2010 on the activities of PACs and super-PACs.
- Any other relevant material.

<b>AO1</b>		<b>AO2</b>	
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) **Analyse whether lobbying access points is more effective than other methods of pressure group action in the USA.** [30]

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

- Arguments that it is might include: Success of lobbying in changing policy and/or winning influence for pressure groups at state and/or federal level, e.g. corporations, pharmaceutical giants, the gun lobby; multiple access points and federalism; involvement of lobbying groups with candidates, election finance, voter influence; the weakness of parties compared to pressure groups in their relationships with elected representatives.
- Arguments that it is not might include: the difficulty of influencing legislation and the need for elected representatives to compromise; competing interests - the idea that group lobbying cancels each other out; examples of the effectiveness of direct action at state or federal level in achieving publicity and/or action, e.g. black civil rights, same-sex marriage, protests against capitalism and globalisation.
- 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 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.