



Pearson  
Edexcel

## Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In Politics (9PL0)

Paper 3A: Comparative Politics - USA

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Autumn 2020

Publications Code 9PLO\_3A\_2010\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

**Guidelines for Question 1(a)****AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)**

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

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

**Accept any other valid responses.**

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	<p><b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the ways in which the powers of the US Congress and the UK Parliament are limited in different ways:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bicameral structure exists in both countries, but the powers of the chambers in the US are more equal than in the UK- this suggests that the power of the Lords in the UK in particular are more limited</li> <li>• Separation of powers exists in the US whereas the UK has fusion of powers: this can lead to gridlock in the US but allows the executive to dominate in the UK</li> </ul>	<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of the ways in which the powers of the US Congress and the UK Parliament are limited in different ways:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lords is perceived to be less important in the legislative process in the UK as it is the unelected chamber, but the US House and Senate have their own exclusive constitutional powers, e.g. power of the purse and foreign affairs</li> <li>• This means that the Senate and the House play an equal role in passing legislation, but are limited by the potential for gridlock that can prevent effective legislation. In the UK, however, the Parliament Acts allow the House of Commons to effectively overrule the House of Lords on legislation, so preventing the Lords from checking government power effectively</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The US executive has explicit checks on the legislative branches through the presidential veto</li><li>• Fixed term elections exist in both countries, although the Lords are not elected in the UK, which means that members of the Commons and both chambers in the US have to consider the proximity of elections when scrutinising the executive and passing legislation</li><li>• Both legislatures are limited in how effective they can be by the party system</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• However, there is no equivalent in the UK, as the final legislative stage of the Royal Assent is a mere formality and so not an effective limitation on the power of parliament - whereas presidential vetoes can and do prevent legislation from passing - and can only be overturned by a 2/3 vote in both chambers of Congress</li><li>• This particularly affects members of the House of Representatives who have a very short election cycle and are often criticised for paying more attention to the 'folks back home' than the national interest</li><li>• Increasing partisanship in both countries leads to further gridlock, particularly in the case of divided government in the US or if there is not a strong majority in the UK House of Commons</li></ul>
--	---	---

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

**Guidelines for Question 1(b)****AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)**

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

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

**Accept any other valid responses.**



Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	<p><b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the ways in which the roles of the US President and the UK Prime Minister are different:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Separation of powers in the US means that the president is not the direct head of the government, whereas the UK has fusion of power</li> <li>• Both the US President and the UK Prime Minister make appointments to the Cabinet, but only the US president is required by the Constitution to seek approval of his appointments</li> <li>• The US President has the ability to sign and veto legislation, whereas the UK Prime Minister cannot veto legislation and the final signature on bills is the Royal Assent</li> </ul>	<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of the ways in which the roles of the US President and the UK Prime Minister are different:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This means that UK prime ministers usually have more direct influence over the legislature as the head of the dominant party in parliament</li> <li>• This allows the UK Prime Minister considerably more flexibility in choosing the Cabinet, however, s/he is also constrained by the requirement to choose cabinet members from within parliament, whereas the US President must choose from outside the legislative branch</li> <li>• UK prime ministers are therefore unable to completely block legislation they disagree with - however, as the UK Prime Minister controls the legislative agenda within Parliament, it is unlikely that a bill s/he does not wish to pass would reach the final stages of the legislative process</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The US President has more influence over the judiciary, as all federal and Supreme Court justices are nominated by the President</li> <li>US Presidents have the power of the pardon, which is widely used at key times, e.g. Obama pardoned 142 people in his last month in office</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>However, the power to appoint judges in the UK lies in the hands of the independent Judicial Appointments Commission rather than with the UK Prime Minister</li> <li>There is no equivalent power of pardon for UK prime ministers - this power is reserved to the monarch, and usually for moral issues e.g. pardoning Alan Turing, whereas the US President can use the pardon for any federal offence except impeachment</li> </ul>
--	---	---

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

## Section B

### Guidelines for Question 2

#### AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

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

Answers which focus exclusively on similarities (bipartisanship) or differences BETWEEN parties rather than WITHIN them are unlikely to exceed a low level 2 mark.

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

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

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
2	<p><b>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of how united the main political parties are in the USA and the UK:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UK parties tend to vote together on most issues because of stronger party discipline</li> <li>• US parties will unite more often around core ideological goals or fundamental policies such as abortion</li> </ul>	<p><b>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of how united the main political parties are in the USA and the UK:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are deep ideological divisions with UK parties over issues which also divide UK society, e.g. Brexit</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties in both countries are more likely to be united at conference/national party conventions</li> <li>• Parties in the US and the UK have organised leadership within Parliament/Congress to organise party business and facilitate support for/in opposition to prime ministerial/presidential agendas</li> <li>• Partisanship has grown in the US in recent years to more closely resemble the UK model in voting patterns in Congress</li> </ul> <p><b>Rational theory:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Factions appear and disappear in relation to changes in society</li> <li>• Unity can also depend on key individuals within the party</li> </ul> <p><b>Structural theory:</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US parties are also deeply divided over key issues - often social issues - such as abortion and gun control, which prevents a coordinated approach to policy</li> <li>• US parties are broad coalitions rather than formal organised structures like the UK model, which makes party discipline weaker and a coherent approach to policy weaker</li> <li>• US parties tend to only meet nationally at national party conventions - which are more about choosing presidential candidates than formulating policy</li> <li>• Within both the UK and the US individuals are becoming more outspoken and acting 'outside' the party line, particularly on divisive issues, e.g. Jacob Rees-Mogg in the UK</li> </ul> <p><b>Rational theory:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Factions can also affect parties' chances of formulating coordinated responses to key issues and policies, e.g. Momentum has deeply divided the modern Labour Party</li> <li>• This can also affect the role of individuals in parties if factions coalesce around key individuals who are divisive</li> </ul>
--	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Layout of Parliament and organisation of parliamentary business encourages party coordination and unity in the UK</li> </ul> <p><b>Cultural theory:</b> UK historically has focused on parties; parties coordinate more closely on manifestoes and campaigning than in the US</p>	<p><b>Structural theory:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US Constitution and system of federalism discourages/prevents effective party unity</li> </ul> <p><b>Cultural theory:</b> US society tends to focus on individuals rather than parties; lack national manifestoes and coordinated policy agendas</p>
--	--	--

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> </ul>
--	--	--

## Section C

<b>Guidelines for Marking Essay Question</b>
<p><b>AO1 (10 marks)</b></p> <p>Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3).</p>
<p><b>AO2 (10 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question.</p>
<p><b>AO3 (10 marks)</b></p> <p>Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgements and they should reach a reasoned conclusion.</p> <p>Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.</p> <p>The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.</p> <p>Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.</p>

Other valid responses are acceptable.

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(a)	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State of the Union address can be used by presidents to try to influence the political agenda of the party in control of Congress</li> <li>• Public, media and international focus on the president as head of state, and therefore his/her agenda</li> <li>• Because of the separation of powers, the party in control of Congress need to work with president to pass their own policy agenda (to prevent vetoes)</li> <li>• The nature of 'personality politics' in USA means that there is more focus on the individual than the party, during both legislative sessions and election time</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is because it can help sway public opinion and the media to the president's side</li> <li>• This focus can give the president the ability to launch national or international policy to gain direct support and bypass their party</li> <li>• This is particularly important in a time of divided government, when party leaders in Congress are reliant on their relationship with the president to pass legislation</li> <li>• This allows presidents to offer support for the personal agenda of individual party members or to party leaders in</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This puts additional pressure on party members to introduce/support passing the president's legislative proposals, particularly in an election year</li> <li>• This can give the president more leverage to influence policies and ideas when negotiating with party leaders in Congress as they can demonstrate support from media outlets and world leaders for their agenda</li> <li>• As presidents have no formal power over members of Congress, it is vital that s/he maintains good relationships with party leaders</li> <li>• Which can be seen as most effective in allowing the president to influence the policies and ideas of political parties when the president's party controls both houses</li> </ul>



	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parties can and do work together, independent of presidential influence, on creating national policy agendas</li> <li>Parties can also work together to oppose divisive or controversial policy, e.g. Bush and funding for the war in Iraq, Trump and healthcare reform</li> <li>Interest groups can have a more significant impact than the presidential power of persuasion on party policies, especially PACs and Super-PACs</li> <li>The influence of voters on the policies and ideas of individual members of a political</li> </ul>	<p>return for support for their legislative programme</p> <p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is particularly significant when a president of the opposing party is in office e.g. Contract with America, 6 for 06, Trump and the federal shutdown over funding for the Mexico border wall</li> <li>Weak party discipline allows this, as US parties tend to be broad-based coalitions rather than united around a national policy agenda</li> <li>Parties - and particularly individuals who are running for election - rely on interest group support and funding to run successful campaigns</li> <li>Party candidates must appeal directly to their constituents during elections, and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This can mean that presidents with divided government facing a united opposition will find it difficult to gain the support needed in Congress to pass their agenda as the opposition may be more focused on passing their policies instead</li> <li>This makes it harder for presidents to influence party policy as s/he is not seen as the head of the party and cannot control individual party members</li> <li>This has led to party members acting in opposition to the president - even if he is from the same party - in order to maintain support from interest groups who fund them</li> <li>This is especially important for members of the House of Representatives, who tend to be elected based on local rather than national issues, whereas presidents tend to be more focused on national</li> </ul>
--	--	--	--

	party can also be a more significant influence, particularly in an election year	cannot rely on the appeal of the president's platform to gain them votes	issues during elections that may not appeal to all states or districts
--	--	--	--

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

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul> |
|--|--|--|

### Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

#### AO1 (10 marks)

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

#### AO2 (10 marks)

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

#### AO3 (10 marks)

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

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

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

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

Other valid responses are acceptable.

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(b)	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liberals believe that there are too many checks and balances contained in the Constitution which hinder effective government</li> <li>• Conservatives believe that the system of checks and balances has been inadequate to prevent the expansion of the federal government</li> <li>• When the same party is in control of both the presidency and Congress, the checks and balances may cease to be effective</li> <li>• Checks and balances can also hamper effective government when there are divisions over controversial issues</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The consequence of this is that government can become gridlocked</li> <li>• The expansion of federal government has been at the expense of the states, and of the power of the Supreme Court</li> <li>• This can mean that presidents are more likely to be able to pass their policy agenda with limited checks by Congress, especially in an era of increasing partisanship</li> <li>• Conflicts between Supreme Court rulings and legislation Congress has passed on issues such as abortion have made the Supreme Court a quasi-judicial body</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This then makes important change impossible to enact, and change that does occur does so very slowly</li> <li>• This means the founding principles of the Constitution have been compromised and too much power concentrated in the hands of the federal government</li> <li>• This makes it more difficult for the opposition party to delay or check legislation as the presidential party will dominate the legislative process, e.g. through the committee system</li> <li>• This means that the founding principle on the separation of powers has been contravened</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The survival of the system of checks and balances shows that it has served its purpose of preventing one branch of government achieving disproportionate power</li> <li>• Checks and balances do not prevent effective government, but can help to ensure change is dependent on broad-based enduring support</li> <li>• The Constitution itself prevents populist legislation being passed simply to win electoral support on some issues that are seen as protected, e.g. gun rights</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is particularly true as there is still the ultimate check of judicial review by the Supreme Court after legislation has been passed by the executive and legislature</li> <li>• Both chambers of Congress must agree bills in the same format, and go through an elaborate system of checks through the committee system before the final bill is signed by the president</li> <li>• This has been demonstrated with presidents who have made a single issue a central plank of their presidency and then had to work with Congress to try to pass legislation, e.g. both Obama and Trump's healthcare reforms</li> <li>• Over 90% of bills 'die' in the committee stage due to the numerous powers committee chairman have over whether or not bills progress to the next stage</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This prevents effective dictatorship, particularly when one party dominates the presidency and both chambers of Congress</li> <li>• This means that compromise and an ability to work with opposition party members and politicians in different roles is essential to pass legislation effectively</li> <li>• This helps to ensure policy is well-designed and heavily scrutinised and so more likely to have input from a variety of sources rather than drafted by a single branch</li> <li>• This can significantly delay or even entirely prevent the passage of legislation that does not fit the agenda</li> </ul>
--	---	--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other barriers are more significant in preventing effective government, e.g. the committee system in Congress</li> </ul>		of committee chairmen, rather than following the will of the majority of Congress
--	---	--	---

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

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of political information, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li> <li>Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li> <li>Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li> </ul>

### Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

#### AO1 (10 marks)

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

#### AO2 (10 marks)

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

#### AO3 (10 marks)

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

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

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

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

Other valid responses are acceptable.



Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(c)	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The appointments system politicises the Supreme Court because they are often made on an ideological basis by president who seeks to influence the make-up of the SC</li> <li>Senate confirmation hearings are often influenced by which president is in office, meaning that the success or failure of an individual nominee can be a politicised process</li> <li>Media coverage/perception of SC justices enhances their increasing political role, e.g. Ruth Bader Ginsberg features heavily in profiles of the SC</li> <li>SC is often finely-balanced between liberal and conservative judges, so leading to 'swing justices' who may have disproportionate influence over key issues</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This can allow presidents to change the ideological makeup of the SC, particularly if the opportunity arises to appoint more than one justice</li> <li>This can give a president with his own party in charge of the Senate a higher chance of success in appointments</li> <li>This has been supported by the increasing number of social and/or controversial issues that the SC has chosen to hear cases on</li> <li>This means that when the opportunity to appoint a justice arises, presidents will seek to influence the ideological makeup of the SC by nominating a justice aligned with their liberal or conservative ideology</li> </ul>	<p><b>Agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Therefore because appointments are for life, presidential appointments can change the ideological outlook of the SC in the long-term</li> <li>This can also work in reverse - when a president faces opposition in the Senate - with the active prevention of confirmation hearings for political rather than judicial reasons, e.g. Garland</li> <li>Therefore the SC has been criticised for taking on a quasi-judicial role</li> <li>This suggests that appointments are more focused on ideology than judicial suitability</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Once in office SC justices are independent of presidential or congressional influence, so maintaining their judicial role</li> <li>• SC appointments are for life: only other justices can remove them through the impeachment process</li> <li>• SC justices do not have to follow the ideology expected of them by the president appointing them e.g. Warren was more liberal than expected</li> <li>• Justices are often reluctant to make overtly political decisions and can defer to the elected branches instead</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This means that there are few checks on the power of the SC thus allowing justices to make decisions as they see fit rather than as their appointees wish them to</li> <li>• This prevents the other branches from threatening to remove SC justices from power who do not support their views</li> <li>• This reinforces the separation of powers as presidents cannot influence decisions made once justices are appointed</li> <li>• The use of judicial restraint allows justices to avoid 'meddling' in political issues</li> </ul>	<p><b>Disagreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This prevents presidents or Congress from having undue influence over judicial decisions</li> <li>• Therefore SC justices can make decisions based on law rather than based on political influence</li> <li>• This limits the political effect of the appointments system because justices are independent of the executive and legislative branches</li> <li>• Therefore preserving the separation of powers and preventing potential conflict between the branches if the SC rules executive or legislative action is unconstitutional</li> </ul>
--	--	--	---

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

Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).</li><li>• Perceptive comparative analysis of political information, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within political information, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).</li><li>• Constructs fully relevant evaluation of political information, constructing fully effective arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).</li></ul>
---------	-------	--

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom