

Mark Scheme (Standardisation)

June 2008

GCE

GCE Government and Politics (Unit 4)

Representation in the USA

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.

Question Number	Indicative content
1	<p>Candidates should demonstrate understanding of historical purpose of national party conventions, which take place in the year of a presidential election, and its current purpose.</p> <p>Historically, the convention served to following purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selecting a presidential candidate, often in deals between powerful party figures in “smoke-filled” rooms. • A forum for party factions to debate which issues should be included in the party’s platform (manifesto) • Announcing the vice-presidential candidate • Building cross-party links, as this is the only opportunity (occurring only once every four years) for activists across the country to come together <p>In recent decades, the convention has arguably become largely irrelevant as it does not fulfil many of its traditional roles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the growth of primaries, each party’s presidential candidate is usually known well before the conventions. The last time a convention was “brokered” was the Democratic Party’s convention of 1968. • Public debates at the convention create a sense of disunity and are largely discouraged. The last time a fierce debate was allowed at the 1996 Republican Party convention, when focus was on abortion • Vice-presidential candidates were also selected well in advance of the conventions at both of the last two conventions <p>However, in one key respect, the party plays an increasingly important role. For one week, in election year, virtually all political attention is on the party holding its convention and it is a prime opportunity to convey a positive impression of the candidate and the party. This may serve to provide a “bounce” in the polls and to establish a “narrative” for the election campaign. The 2004 party conventions illustrated their contemporary importance:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The convention provided an opportunity for John Kerry to address concerns about his campaigning style, which was seen as long-winded and dull. His speech to the convention put many of those doubts to rest, although it did not completely erase them and the accusation remained a problem for him for the remainder of the campaign. Also, the President ensured that there was no post-convention “bounce” however because attention shifted to a national security alert, with warnings issued by the government of a possible attack on prominent buildings in New York city. It later turned out that these warnings were based on three year old intelligence. • By contrast, the Republican National Convention produced a ten point lead in the opinion polls. It took place in New York in September, later than usual and one week before the third anniversary of the destruction of the World Trade Centre. Most of the prominent speakers were moderate Republicans with a record of attracting support from

	<p>independents and Democrats, such as Arnold Schwarzenegger and Rudy Guliani. All of them emphasised the President's steadfast leadership at a time of crisis and presented Senator Kerry as a "flip-flopper".</p> <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the traditional role of party conventions (AO1) • Evaluation of the whether they continue to play their traditional roles (AO2) • Evaluation of their impact on the most recent elections (AO2)
--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-6	<p>A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication. A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Limited analysis with some awareness of differing viewpoints and basic attempts at evaluation. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.</p>
Level 2	7-12	<p>A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.</p> <p>A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. Candidates at this level are likely to offer a two or three points suggesting the continued relevance or lack of importance of conventions. At the top of this level, the a limited range of points will be well-developed, with recent relevant examples. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.</p>
Level 3	13-20	<p>A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of vocabulary.</p> <p>A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Candidates at this level</p>

		<p>are likely to put party conventions in their historical context and offer a range of points suggesting the continued relevance or lack of importance of conventions. The very strongest students will recognise that the convention can be used to establish the presidential candidate's core messages in the mind of the voters. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.</p>
--	--	---

Question Number	Indicative content
2	<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the role of professional lobbyists is to influence policy-makers through direct contact by building a relationship which is seen to benefit to the constituents of elected representatives as well as the pressure group represented by the lobbyist.</p> <p>The methods used by professional lobbyists to influence members of Congress include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The “revolving door” syndrome, in which former legislators, bureaucrats, presidential advisors and assistants use their contacts to gain the kind of access to policy makers which ordinary citizens cannot. They can use this privileged position to act as the eyes and ears of their organisation on policy decisions being made and to convert policy-makers to their point of view • A useful source of information and expertise. For policy-makers to make their mark, the advice of an experienced former policy-maker and the resources of use their organisation can be invaluable. Alternatively, lobbyists are often used to testify, as experts, before congressional committees • Grass roots support. Lobbyists for organisations with a mass membership may use the promise of mobilising their members in support of an elected official in return for support on issues of importance to them • Financial support. Lobbyists for wealthy organisations may use the promise of financial support during election campaigns in return for support on issues of importance to them <p>The effectiveness of professional lobbyists is often measured by their number and pay. Candidates should recognise that the number of professional lobbyists in Washington DC has risen steadily in recent decades to over 15,000, and that their pay has also risen substantially. Insightful candidates will recognise that the importance of professional lobbyists depends not only on the extent of their contacts and their expertise but also on the resources the organisation they represent can mobilise. Where these two dimensions come together, the combination can be potent: immediately after retiring in the 2004 elections, former Congressman Billy Tauzin became president of Pharmaceutical and Research Manufacturers of America for \$2 million per year.</p> <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the role of professional lobbyists (AO1) • Evaluation of the methods used by lobbyists to influence members of Congress (AO2) • Evaluation of the effectiveness of the methods used by lobbyists to influence members of Congress (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication. A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Limited analysis with some awareness of differing viewpoints and basic attempts at evaluation. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Answers which outline the methods used by lobbyists but fail to evaluate their effectiveness cannot exceed this level. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication. A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.
Level 3	13-20	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of vocabulary. A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Responses at this level will include analysis of the success of professional lobbyists as well as explanation of the methods used. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.

Question Number	Indicative content
3	<p>Candidates should recognise that in Presidential elections, the outcome is determined by an electoral college in which the Presidential candidate who wins a majority of votes in each State wins all of the electoral college votes for that State (with the exception of Maine and Nebraska, which allocate their electors on a proportional basis).</p> <p>Some States are solidly Democrat (often referred to as “blue” States), others solidly Republican (referred to as “red” States). Voters in those States can be largely taken for granted and absorb only a minor proportion of campaign effort and resources.</p> <p>Instead, the main focus of presidential campaigns, particularly in a close election, is on the voters of States which are either fairly evenly split between the two main parties or have a high proportion of voters without a strong party affiliation. In 2004, there were ten of these States, known as “Swing States” or “Battleground States”, which are expected to be decisive in the outcome of the election. The Swing State with the most Electoral College votes was Florida but the most significant was Ohio, which President Bush won by 120,000 votes. However, had just 70,000 people switched their vote in Ohio, John Kerry would have won the Presidency despite losing the popular vote in the country as a whole by 3.5 million.</p> <p>More famously, in the 2000 presidential election, George W Bush only became President because he won Florida’s 25 electoral college votes with a plurality of just 535 votes out of the 22 million voters in that State.</p> <p>In addition to Florida and Ohio, likely swing states in 2008 include Pennsylvania, Nevada, Colorado, New Mexico and Virginia.</p> <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the role of the electoral college system (AO1) • Evaluation of the way in which the electoral college system marginalizes “safe” States, with example (AO2) • Evaluation of the disproportionate impact of “swing” States, with recent examples (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-6	<p>A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication. A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Limited analysis with some awareness of differing viewpoints and basic attempts at evaluation. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic</p>

		level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication. A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Candidates at this level may be able to assess the impact of key states in recent elections but fail to analyse how they affect campaign strategies. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.
Level 3	13-20	<p>A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of vocabulary.</p> <p>A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. Candidates at this level would be expected to analyse how swing states shape campaign strategies. Candidates at the top of this level may recognise that “swing” States provide an opportunity for minor parties to have a disproportionate impact on an election result, such as Ralph Nader in 2000 whose 97,000 votes in Florida would have gone mainly to the Democrats, had he not stood. Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.</p>

Question Number	Indicative content
4	<p>Candidates should recognise the following factors as inhibiting electoral success of minor parties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first past the post electoral system, which has a tendency to produce two dominant parties wherever it is used. This is particularly true of US Presidential elections where candidates have to win a majority of the votes cast in each State in order to win electoral college votes. It is so unlikely in most elections that minor parties will achieve this goal that they generally lack credibility. • Many States have restrictive regulations which make it difficult for candidates to be included on the ballot unless they have already demonstrated (by raising signatures) that they have significant levels of support. This often causes expensive distractions from campaigning by the candidates who may have the fewest resources. • Many states allow 'straight ticket' voting, which encourages voters to cast their votes for one of the main parties in all posts being contested. This penalises minor parties which may have not have candidates for all posts. Minor candidates receive, on average, twice as many votes in districts that do not allow straight ticket voting. • Federal funds are only available to parties which gained over 5% of the vote in the previous presidential election and full funding is only available to parties which gained over 25% • Campaigns are getting steadily more sophisticated and expensive and minor parties often have limited funds and expertise at their disposal. • If a minor party produces a policy that attracts support, it is likely to be adopted by either or both major parties, thereby nullifying its electoral benefit. <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding that there are a variety of factors inhibiting the electoral success of minor parties (AO1) • Evaluation of the ways in which these factors affect minor parties, with example (AO2) • Evaluation of the ways in which elections campaigns are becoming more sophisticated and expensive, to the disadvantage of minor parties, warrants more credit than the other factors (AO2)

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication. A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Limited analysis with some awareness of differing viewpoints and basic attempts at evaluation. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication. A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. At least two factors have to be considered for answers to be at this level. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.
Level 3	13-20	<p>A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of vocabulary.</p> <p>A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. Candidates who are able to evaluate the ways in which elections campaigns are becoming more sophisticated and expensive, to the disadvantage of minor parties, are likely to be providing answers at this level.</p> <p>Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.</p>

Question Number	Indicative content
5	<p>Candidates should be aware that there has been a tendency for criticisms of affirmative action programmes to be based on the principle that they are unfair to those who do not benefit from them. They should also recognise, however, that, more recently, the focus of criticism has shifted to the claim that it harms its intended beneficiaries.</p> <p>The arguments that Affirmative Action is unfair include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The central American values are fairness and equality for everyone. Policies which appear to favour one group over others are out of step with American values • <i>It uses one form of discrimination to compensate for another. All discrimination causes fear and anxiety. African Americans continue to experience the fear of discrimination, now Affirmative Action has extended that fear to white Americans making the overall situation worse rather than better</i> • Affirmative Action is a form of compensation by whites for slavery and <i>Jim Crow</i>. But why should today's white Americans pay for the sins of their forefathers, especially as their forefathers may have nothing to do with slavery and <i>Jim Crow</i>? And what about the role of African Americans themselves in slavery? Some free blacks were themselves slaveowners so why can their descendents benefit from Affirmative Action? <p>The main alternative proposal from this group of critics (a logical extension of their argument that any government support for struggling Americans should benefit all groups, not only specific races) is that income-based programmes, to help all in poverty, should replace race-conscious programmes. Supporters of existing affirmative action programmes counter that racial groups which suffer specific patterns of disadvantage as a direct result of racial discrimination need programmes specifically tailored to their circumstances. Further, they argue that opponents of race-conscious affirmative action are seeking to erode public awareness of the continuing damaging effects of decades of racial discrimination.</p> <p><i>s that Affirmative action is counter-productive, harming its intended beneficiaries, has dominated the debate in recent years. They include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affirmative Action encourages its beneficiaries to have unrealistic expectations of their prospects. Students who gain entry to elite colleges because of Affirmative Action despite weak grades, may be ill-equipped to cope with the academic demands • Affirmative Action encourages its beneficiaries to be lazy. Why work hard if Affirmative Action programs virtually guarantee progress? • Because Affirmative Action programs have been in place for decades and have the appearance of becoming

permanent, they send the message to its main beneficiaries, African Americans, that they cannot, and never will be able to, compete with other races on equal terms which is bad for their self-esteem and self-confidence

- Equally damaging is the message they send to other races that African American success is not really due to ability, determination and hard-work but due to “preferential treatment”

Three main alternatives are offered by opponents of Affirmative Action:

1. Abolition: in several states, including California and Michigan, propositions have been passed that have banned affirmative action, particularly in higher education. Critics of these measures point out that enrolment of African Americans and Hispanics has fallen sharply following these measures (especially in the elite institutions) reversing the previous tendency for racial disparities in higher education to diminish. Supporters of these measures point out that graduation rates among minorities has increased as a result of all students entering University on a similar level.
2. Class-based Affirmative Action: pioneered in Texas in 1998, race-based Affirmative Action in education was replaced a model that provided a route to higher education from all communities. The top 10% of all students qualified for the University of their choice, thus ensuring that they do not have to directly compete with students from better-resourced schools or education districts. Supporters of this approach argue that it enjoys greater public confidence than race-based Affirmative Action, while providing opportunities for all racial groups in a state where there is still a high level of segregation between communities. Opponents point out that enrolment of minorities has fallen since the plan was adopted and that it would be even less effective in states where there was less racial polarisation.
3. Cultural reform: struggling minority groups encouraged examine the causes of their inability to effectively compete. They should then make the necessary adjustments to conform more closely with American “mainstream cultural norms” which are the basis of economic and social progress. In support of their argument they point to the contrast, in schools, between African American children being much more likely to be disruptive in class compared to Asian students from China and India who tend to obey their teachers and do their schoolwork and outperform students of other races. Supporters of affirmative action counter that these arguments have the effect of shifting responsibility for disadvantage arising from racial discrimination from the political authorities, which sanctioned the exclusion of racial minorities from the mainstream of US society, to the victims of discrimination. Further, they argue that

	<p>the claims that African Americans are lazier and less disciplined than other racial groups echoes that prejudices which allowed slavery and segregation to flourish for generations.</p> <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of Affirmative Action programmes and their purpose. • Evaluation of the arguments that Affirmative Action is unfair, particularly to white Americans, and should be replaced by income based support (AO2) • Evaluation of the arguments that Affirmative Action is counter-productive and should be abolished (AO2)
--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-6	A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication. A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Answers which concentrate exclusively on the effect of increasing wealth are unlikely to rise above this level. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Limited analysis with some awareness of differing viewpoints and basic attempts at evaluation. Polemics on Affirmative Action, reflecting the views of the candidate rather than the debate in US political circles, cannot rise above this level. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.
Level 2	7-12	A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication. Answers which outline criticisms of Affirmative Action and proposed alternatives but fail to analyse them are unlikely to rise above this level. Similarly, an effective evaluation of <i>either</i> the criticisms <i>or</i> the alternatives, but not both, are unlikely to rise above this level. A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.
Level 3	13-20	A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of vocabulary.

		<p>A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. To reach this level, candidates must analyse both the criticisms of affirmative action and proposed alternatives. Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.</p>
--	--	--

Question Number	Indicative content
6	<p>Candidates should be able to evaluate both the view that Pressure groups are too powerful and the view that they provide a healthy “free market” of opinion influences on political leaders.</p> <p>On one side, it is argued that US society is dominated by a power elite. It is argued that efforts to ensure a balance of political power between all sections of society has been no more effective than efforts to ensure that major companies do not dominate the marketplace. Just as Microsoft dominates the software market, without being a monopoly, so a powerful, wealthy elite dominates political access without monopolising it.</p> <p>According to this view, the wide range of opportunities to influence people in power can only be effectively exploited by pressure groups which have large memberships, effective lobbyists, effective lawyers and considerable wealth. Those most able to achieve all of these goals tend to be those who already dominate society in terms of group numbers or wealth. The less wealthy and minorities, by contrast, tend to lack the organisation, political connections and lack the voting power to make themselves heard in the corridors of power. Consequently, the US political landscape, designed to promote maximum accountability of politicians, has the opposite effect and provides a system which can be used by the already wealthy and powerful to entrench their privileges.</p> <p>On the other side of the argument it is claimed, that even if it appears that one section of society is dominant, US society is so open with multiple opportunities for everyone to be heard that all groups may make a contribution to shaping their society.</p> <p>According to this view, some of the most significant changes in recent times have been to the benefit of the kind of minority groups which the elitist theorist argue are largely excluded from the corridors of power. For example, <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> transformed the South, <i>Roe v. Wade</i> meant that vulnerable women no longer had to resort to back-street abortions; <i>Lawrence v. Texas</i> meant that laws which discriminated against gays were declared unconstitutional and, in 2004, gay marriage was permitted in Massachusetts. Political scientists who believe that the USA provides a healthy pluralist political system argue that none of these advances would have been possible if a small, wealthy, white, conservative elite controlled all meaningful power.</p> <p>Furthermore, they claim, if the country goes through a period in which barriers develop to full participation, history demonstrates that these will be addressed through regulation. Hence the passage of the Federal Election Campaigns Acts (FECA) in the 1970’s, when questionable relationships between the President and his donors was revealed by the Watergate scandal and the passage of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act in 2002 when it was clear that FECA was proving ineffective. Similarly, when the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act (1946) proved ineffective, it was replaced with the Lobbying Disclosure Act in 1995. Pressure groups, therefore, far from shaping the political landscape are</p>

	<p>forced to respond to it.</p> <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of argument that pressure groups in US society provide a mechanism for the domination of a power elite. (AO2) • Evaluation of argument that pressure groups in US society provide a mechanism for holding those in power to account and a forum for a free market in ideas. (AO2) • Relevant examples and illustrations should be credited (AO1)
--	---

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-20	<p>A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.</p> <p>A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.</p>
Level 2	21-38	<p>A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.</p> <p>A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. Effective analysis of only one side of the argument on the impact of pressure groups are unlikely to exceed this level. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.</p>
Level 3	39-60	<p>A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary and an excellent standard of vocabulary.</p> <p>A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. At this level, candidates will be able to analyse both sides of the argument on the impact of pressure groups on US democracy. Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints</p>

		and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.
--	--	--

Question Number	Indicative content
7	<p>Candidates should demonstrate an understanding that there are three main factions within the Democratic Party, only one of which is clearly “liberal”. While the influence to the liberal faction has grown in recent years, it is less easy to characterise the party as a whole as “liberal” than it is to characterise the Republicans as “conservatives”.</p> <p>The main factions of the party are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Dog Democrats: this faction argues that Americans have become increasingly conservative and that Democrats have to respond to this trend by presenting an agenda which protects the interests of the vulnerable while respecting traditional Christian values and keeping taxes low. This agenda enables them to work with Republican moderates and they are the least likely to vote on party lines of any identifiable group in Congress. Criticised by other members of their own party as “Republican lite”, the group had 44 members in the 110th Congress, following the 2006 mid-term election, an increase of seven compared to the previous election. • Democratic Leadership Council: this faction, founded in 1985, also seeks to establish a political agenda for the Democratic Party which appeals to the conservative heartland of the USA. The group is often identified with Bill Clinton who became its leader in 1990 and, of course, went on to become President two years later. He argued that the Democrats had not been trusted by middle-class voters to “defend our national interests abroad, to put their values into social policies at home, or to take their taxes and spend it with discipline”. • The left: a loose coalition of party activists and internet-based organisations on the fringes of the party, such as MoveOn.org (that helped raise £40 million to promote a liberal agenda in the 2004 presidential election) they adopt a stance that there can be no compromise with conservatives and that the way for the Democratic Party to win power is by fighting every conservative policy which threatens hard-won rights such as abortion, civil rights for racial minorities, gay rights etc. The growing influence of this movement was demonstrated by the defeat of Senator Lieberman in the Democratic primary ahead of the 2006 midterm elections. Activists, using the internet to spread their message, generated a wave of support behind a little-known challenger, Ned Lamont, because of Lieberman’s support for President Bush’s foreign policy. Furthermore, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and several chairmen of the most important committees (such as John Conyers, who chairs the House Judiciary committee) are to the left of the party <p>Both the left and the Blue Dogs have had success in recent elections. Candidates may, therefore, make legitimate arguments either that the party has moved to the left or that it is gravitating</p>

	<p>towards the centre, provided their conclusions are supported by recent evidence.</p> <p>In making judgements, consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of the policies of Blue Dog Democrats (AO1) • Evaluation of their influence within the Democratic Party (AO2) • Understanding of the policies of the DLC (AO1) • Evaluation of their influence within the Democratic Party (AO2) • Understanding of the policies of the “internet left” (AO1) • Evaluation of their influence within the Democratic Party (AO2)
--	--

Level	Mark	Descriptors
Level 1	1-20	<p>A limited level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a less structured manner, making occasional use of political vocabulary and a basic level of written communication.</p> <p>A limited demonstration of knowledge of political institutions and processes and some of the relationships between them. Superficial contextual awareness of part of the question may be evident, with limited examples. Candidates who use dated examples or generalisations to argue that the Democratic Party is still a broad churches, with little internal cohesion, are unlikely to rise above this level. Conclusions may have limited relevance to the preceding discussion. A basic level of written communication with occasional use of political vocabulary.</p>
Level 2	21-38	<p>A sound ability demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation; arguments and explanations expressed in a structured manner. Use should be made of political vocabulary and a reasonable level of written communication.</p> <p>A good demonstration of knowledge of political processes and some of the relationships between them. Sound comprehension of the context of the question, with some good examples. Analysis displays an awareness of differing viewpoints and good attempts at evaluation. Candidates who are able to outline liberal policies associated with the Democratic Party (pro-choice etc) but fail to analyse the level of support for those policies are unlikely to rise above this level. Similarly, candidates who outline which groups support the Democratic Party and attempt to infer how liberal it is on this basis are unlikely to exceed this level. A reasonable level of written communication with some use of political vocabulary.</p>
Level 3	39-60	<p>A high level of skill demonstrated in analysis, interpretation and evaluation. Arguments and explanations expressed in a clearly structured manner, making appropriate use of political vocabulary</p>

		and an excellent standard of vocabulary.
--	--	--

		<p>A comprehensive demonstration of knowledge and excellent contextual awareness with detailed evidence and examples. Candidates must be able to outline the policies of at least two factions within the Democratic Party and be able to evaluate their influence to reach this level. The very strongest candidates will be able to analyse the impact of all three factions. Analysis displays a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and clear and full evaluation of the issues. Some use of political vocabulary with an excellent standard of written communication.</p>
--	--	--