



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2004

GCE

Government and Politics

Unit GOV5

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING

Introduction

The AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, but the weightings are different at AS and A2. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

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

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

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

Using a levels of response mark scheme

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

Examiners should initially make a decision about which Level any given response should be placed in. Having determined the appropriate Level the examiners must then choose the precise mark to be given within that Level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the Level, where that Level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest whether the middle mark is unduly generous or severe.

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

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

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

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (a) (Total: 8 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Levels 3-4 (2 marks) The candidate demonstrates a good to excellent knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s). Where appropriate, the candidate produces accurate and/or relevant examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks) The candidate applies a good to excellent range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.</p>	<p>Levels 3-4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary. The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p>Levels 1-2 (1 mark) The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge and understanding of political data, concept(s) or term(s). The candidate produces few or inaccurate examples and/or limited evidence to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) The candidate applies a limited range of concepts and makes little or limited use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 (1 mark) The candidate communicates explanations or arguments with limited clarity and effectiveness using limited political vocabulary. The answer may lack either a clear focus on the question or a sense of direction. A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (b) (Total: 12 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (5-6 marks) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate fully addresses the requirements of the question and provides developed and effective to comprehensive interpretation. The answer also provides clear to accurate evidence and, where appropriate good to excellent examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks) The candidate applies a good to excellent range of developed concepts and uses appropriate political theory to construct a clear and cogent explanation or argument.</p>	<p>Levels 3-4 (2 marks) The candidate communicates clearly and effectively using appropriate political vocabulary. The answer has a clear sense of direction, is focused on the question and, where appropriate, has a conclusion which flows from the discussion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (3-4 marks) The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate clearly addresses the requirements of the question and provides sound interpretation and contextual awareness. The answer includes good examples to illustrate points made.</p>		

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) The candidate demonstrates slight to basic knowledge and understanding of political concepts, institutions and processes. The candidate makes a very limited to limited attempt to address the requirements of the question and provides little to partial and reasonably effective interpretation. Answers offer limited or little evidence and few or inaccurate examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) The candidate applies a limited range of concepts and makes little or limited use of political theory or ideas in developing an explanation or argument.</p>	<p>Levels 1-2 (1 mark) The candidate communicates explanations or arguments with limited clarity and effectiveness using limited political vocabulary. The answer may lack either a clear focus on the question or a sense of direction. A conclusion, where appropriate, may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion is modest or implicit.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Question 1 part (c) (Total: 20 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates excellent contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes excellent examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) The candidate displays excellent awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is an excellent focus on the specific question asked. There is a clear evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a sophisticated awareness of viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>Appropriate parallels and connections are clearly identified together with comparisons. A wide range of concepts is used.</p>	<p>Level 4 (4 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity. Excellent use is made of political vocabulary to construct cogent and coherent arguments. The answer has a clear sense of direction, culminating in a conclusion that flows from the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer clearly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates sound contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) The candidate displays sound awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is a clear focus on the question. There is a sound evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays good awareness of viewpoints and issues. There is good recognition of parallels and comparisons. Appropriate concepts are used.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions well. Good use is made of political vocabulary to construct clear arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate produces an answer with a conclusion linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them. The answer makes a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrates contextual awareness covering part of the question.</p> <p>The answer includes simple examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) The candidate displays limited awareness of the implications and demands of the question resulting in a restricted focus. There is a limited evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays partial awareness of viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>There is some recognition of basic parallels and comparisons with limited use of concepts.</p>	<p>Level 2 (2 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and conclusions adequately with limited use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion is offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) The candidate demonstrates a slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationships between them. There is little attempt to address the requirements of the question.</p> <p>The answer includes few, if any, examples which may be inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question and focus is lacking. Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial, with little awareness of viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>There is little, if any, recognition of parallels and comparisons. The use of concepts is superficial and naïve.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1 mark) The answer relies upon narrative, which is not fully coherent. There is little or no use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion, if present, is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

GENERIC MARK SCHEME for Questions 2, 3 and 4 (Maximum 40 marks)

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) The candidate demonstrates a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer fully addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates excellent contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes excellent examples to illustrate points made. The answer includes detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations as well as accurate evidence and relevant examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) The candidate displays excellent awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is an excellent and sustained focus on the specific question asked. There is clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues.</p> <p>Appropriate parallels and connections are clearly identified together with well-developed comparisons. A wide of concepts are used and developed.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity. Excellent use is made of political vocabulary to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. The answer has a clear sense of direction, culminating in a conclusion that flows from the preceding discussion.</p>
	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) The candidate demonstrates sound knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and the relationships between them. The answer clearly addresses the requirements of the question and demonstrates sound contextual awareness.</p> <p>The answer includes developed and effective interpretations or explanations and also clear evidence and good examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) The candidate displays sound awareness of the implications and demands of the question. There is a clear focus on the question. There is a sound evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays good awareness of differing viewpoints and recognition of issues. There is good recognition of parallels and comparisons. Appropriate concepts are used and developed.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) The candidate communicates arguments, explanations and conclusions well. Good use is made of political vocabulary to construct clear arguments and explanations.</p> <p>The candidate produces an answer with a conclusion linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding: Recall, Select & Deploy	Skills: Analysis & Evaluation	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) The candidate demonstrates outline knowledge and understanding of political concepts/theories/institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them. The answer makes a limited attempt at addressing the question and demonstrates contextual awareness covering part of the question.</p> <p>The answer includes a partial and reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some examples to illustrate points made.</p>	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question resulting in a restricted focus. There is a limited evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour which displays a partial awareness of differing viewpoints and issues.</p> <p>There is some recognition of basic parallels and comparisons. Arguments and explanations are undeveloped with limited use of concepts.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) The candidate communicates arguments and conclusions adequately with limited use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion is offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidate demonstrates a slight and incomplete knowledge and understanding of political institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationships between them. There is little attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness, if any, of the context of the question, with little interpretation and few, if any, examples often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) The candidate displays little awareness of the implications and demands of the question and focus is lacking. Evaluation of political institutions, processes and behaviour is superficial.</p> <p>Analysis shows little awareness of differing viewpoints and issues. There is little, if any, recognition of parallels and comparisons. Arguments, explanations and use of concepts is superficial and naïve.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) The answer relies upon narrative, which is not fully coherent. There is little or no use of political vocabulary.</p> <p>A conclusion, if present, is not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>

1**Total for this question: 40 marks**

- (a) Explain the term *swing voters* used in the extract. (8 marks)

Key VB term in the USA. Refers to de-aligned voters lacking party identification who are more likely to switch their votes at elections (and ticket split), and are therefore crucial to the winning of US elections, both presidential and congressional and, therefore, targeted by the parties in key swing states (those that are competitive) and districts.

These voters tend to be found in the centre ground of politics and are open therefore to persuasion by both the Democrats and Republicans on the basis of image, policies and campaigns designed to win their support. Key groups of “swing voters” in “swing states” are the Jewish vote in New York, the gay vote in California and the elderly vote in Florida, all of who are crucial to the success of presidential candidates in the Electoral College system.

- (b) Using the extract and your own knowledge, explain the high level of the black vote for the Democratic Party. (12 marks)

A key part of the democratic coalition of voters and the party’s most consistent and “solid” supporters. Extract gives statistical evidence of this support, which needs to be explained. The solid support has been there since the 1930s when the black vote re-aligned after FDR’s New Deal, which attracted black voters from the party of Lincoln. Very high levels of party identification, therefore, with the Democrats.

This can be related also to the specific ideology, policies and programmes associated with the Democrats, especially support for “big government programmes” (in the extract) which would need some examples and, also, the perception that the Republican party is the “more racist party” (extract), which would also need some evidence (more likely to oppose affirmative action programmes for example).

The Democratic Party support for “anti-poverty programmes”, such as FDR’s New Deal or Johnson’s Great Society and, also, civil rights (the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting rights Act) led to high black voter support which has remained until now. Other factors could include arguments that the Democratic Party provides more black role models, such as Jesse Jackson and other elected representatives, and the Democratic registration drives to mobilise the black vote. Candidates may also note however a recent move towards Republican voting by some black voters and also the fact that turnout is much lower amongst black voters.

- (c) Consider factors, other than race and ethnicity, that are significant in explaining voting behaviour in the USA. (20 marks)

Here candidates who have discussed the black vote in (b) should turn their attention to the OTHER VARIABLES involved in explaining VB in the USA to come to some conclusion as to the significance of these OTHER variables in explaining USVB. Candidates will be aware of the

diversity of the USA and the numerous long term socio-economic and demographic variables involved in their explanations as to why Americans vote the way they do.

The race and ethnicity factor, therefore, is only one amongst many, including important long term factors, such as party identifications and aligned voters, plus other socio-economic variables like gender (the gender gap in voting), socio-economic status (income and wealth), religions (the catholic, protestant, jewish votes) and region, which shows large variations in VB. Candidates should offer some explanation for the way in which these kind of groups distribute their support.

Alternatively, the question leaves open the opportunity to focus on short term factors and the increasing importance of policies (“issue voting”) such as abortion, gun control, health care and taxation in influencing voter choice of parties and candidates.

The increasing importance also of image (of both parties and candidates) leading to views of “personalised politics” and the importance of the media as an independent on VB.

The key to high marks is the use of specific evidence from recent elections and the ability to weigh factors in terms of explanation.

2

Total for this question: 40 marks

How far is it true that third parties and independent candidates in the USA have little political significance and are destined to fail? *(40 marks)*

Candidates may approach this question by identifying and discussing the reasons for the strength of the two party system in the USA, which would include arguments such as the strength of voter identification and the long standing duopoly of the Republicans and Democrats, their financial advantages, or the very broad and pragmatic nature of their appeal (“catch-all” “big tent” centrist parties) which leaves little ideological or issue space for third parties/candidates.

Alternatively, candidates may focus on the relative weaknesses of third parties themselves in breaking the mould of two party politics (all presidents, all members of congress bar one or two mavericks), such as the inability to campaign effectively on issues that are already covered by the two main parties. This relates to the candidacies of Perot in 92 and 96 (“Reform Party”), or Nader in 2000 (“Green Party”), both of whom failed to make a breakthrough (but in different ways and for different reasons). Third parties and their candidates often fail to gain name recognition, electoral finance (because of FECA rules) and they lack voter identification and media attention (this of course varies).

Candidates should make reference to the US electoral system, of First Past The Post with single member districts, and the existence of the Electoral College, which penalises third parties with a dispersed vote (Perot’s 19% of the vote in 92 got NO EC votes). However, with reference to the to the phrase “little political significance” it could be stated that with a concentrated vote like George Wallace’s in 68, it could be possible to deadlock the EC and therefore have great influence over the outcome. However, this has not happened yet.

Third parties also face problems getting ballot access and finance, and this affects their ability to campaign and therefore gain votes. However, candidates may view Perrot’s candidacy in 92 and 96 (Buchanon’s in 2000) and Nader’s 3% of the vote in 2000 as “success” in forcing new issues onto the political and electoral agenda, forcing the other two party candidates into taking these issues more seriously.

The overall success of the answer will depend on the evidence presented and the examples used to back up the arguments and analysis supporting either two party strength, third party weakness, or some combination of these views as to what constitutes “success” and “failure” in the party system of the USA. Raising issues and challenging the duopoly (from Teddy Roosevelt’s Bull Moose splinter party through to the candidacy of Ralph Nader) may well be regarded as both “relevant” and “successful” by many candidates.

3**Total for this question: 40 marks**

Examine the view that at state level political issues should be decided by elected representatives rather than by ordinary voters in the initiative and referendum processes. *(40 marks)*

A good answer to this question revolves around the relative merits and advantages of representative democracy compared with direct democracy. The candidates must be able to identify and explain these key concepts. The question invites debate around these forms of political decision making in democracies on issues which closely affect citizens lives in the states which have the initiative and referendum process. (There are no national referendums in the US.)

Candidates may defend the referendum and initiative process by pointing to the fact that they are highly democratic devices invoking the concept of popular sovereignty, and argue that citizens should be more directly involved in issues affecting their lives that the “blanket vote” at elections does not cover.

From this perspective elected representatives in state legislatures may be criticised as being beholden to special interests, their failure to make difficult decisions and their concern with short term electoral advantage.

On the other hand, candidates may choose to defend representative democracy as the best way of making public policy decisions whereby elected and, therefore, responsible politicians use their judgement (Burke) on behalf of the voters and thus take a more long term and community view after informed debate has taken place.

From this point of view the use of citizen-inspired initiatives and legislature-inspired referendums will be criticised using arguments such as their increasing dominance by powerful pressure groups and special interests and the “initiative industry”, low turn outs and the dominance of money and short termism.

The strength of the answer will be determined by the analytical and evaluative skills displayed, but also by the introduction of relevant evidence relating to the use of specific examples of the US direct democracy, such as proposition 13, Big Green, proposition 198 and 229 in California, or more recent examples of initiatives and propositions from the 2000 election and the 2002 mid terms.

4

Total for this question: 40 marks

Evaluate the claim that within the US political system pressure groups and their associated Political Action Committees (PACs) now have greater power and influence than parties. *(40 marks)*

The question refers to the debate in US politics that because of the weakness of US parties (which needs specific evidence to be included, such as their weakened role in the selection and financing of candidates, and the declining influence of ideology in the US), pressure groups with different functions and aims are now much more powerful and influential in the USA with respect to both the political and electoral processes.

The answer therefore needs evidence, analysis and evaluation relating to party weakness and pressure group/PAC strength. Candidates may approach from both angles when answering the question.

The weakness of parties is a consistent theme in US politics and candidates choosing this question will be familiar with the debate and the evidence to prove it. The strength of PACs and pressure groups can be addressed in several ways, for example, by pointing to the large number of access points in the US political system caused by the separation of powers and federalism. This enables groups to access decision makers and try to influence those decisions. The tactics used by pressure groups to gain influence over the legislative process (eg lobbying, use of expertise) and the electoral process (supporting candidates financially through direct contributions or spending “on behalf of” which is where the analysis of PACs comes into the answer).

Candidates should present evidence relating to the influence of PACs as the financial arm of many pressure groups (examples are needed) given the increasing importance of money in US politics, including ‘soft money’ – now being regulated – and ‘independent expenditures’ and ‘issue advocacy’.

Political candidates are now more likely to receive money from PACs than from the parties (although this does vary).

Evidence relating to PAC funding should be introduced as evidence, eg Enron and other corporate, trade union or single issue group contributions.

It may also be noted that many US pressure groups now work with the parties themselves to try and gain influence over the platforms and therefore policies, eg pro-choice and pro life groups, the gun lobby or the Christian coalition.

Evidence and examples of the relative influence and power of parties, pressure groups and PACs should be given and it will be up to the candidates to present a case for or against the view, with up to date evidence and examples. Strong candidates may be aware of the evidence which shows that parties in the US, far from weakening, are becoming stronger and more important at election times as a result of the increasing activities of the National Committees. It also would be possible for candidates to offer some critique of pressure groups’ power, such as their disproportionate influence and financial power and the existence of “Iron Triangles”.