

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2013

GCE Government and Politics (6GP04)
Paper 4C Governing the USA

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. 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 or www.btec.co.uk for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: www.edexcel.com/teachingservices.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at www.edexcel.com/ask. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

January 2013

Publications Code UA034599

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

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.

Placing a mark within a level mark band

- The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. Follow these unless there is an instruction given within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, **always** follow that guidance.
- **2 mark bands**
Start with the presumption that the mark will be the higher of the two.
An answer which is poorly supported gets the lower mark.
- **3 mark bands**
Start with a presumption that the mark will be the middle of the three.
An answer which is poorly supported gets the lower mark.
An answer which is well supported gets the higher mark.
- **4 mark bands**
Start with a presumption that the mark will be the upper middle mark of the four.
An answer which is poorly supported gets a lower mark.
An answer which is well supported and shows depth or breadth of coverage gets the higher mark.

- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:
 - i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear*
 - ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter*
 - iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.*

| Question Number | Question |
|---|--|
| 1. | How much power do the party leaders exert in Congress? |
| Indicative content | |
| <p>Since the 1980s, the party leaders in Congress have been gaining influence, the process being particularly marked after the 'Republican Revolution' of 1994. 'Party votes' have become more frequent, exemplified by unanimous Republican opposition to the stimulus bill and health care reform in President Obama's first term.</p> <p>This influence has been exerted by a variety of means, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ignoring seniority in assigning committee chairmanships • monitoring of progress of favoured legislation through its various stages, and the imposition of timetables on committees for its completion • working with majority members of the House Rules Committee to design rules likely to produce a bill which most closely meets majority party views, e.g. prohibiting amendments hostile to its preferences • promises to members of committee assignments, leadership PAC campaign donations and 'earmarks', or threats of a primary challenge <p>however, members are still subject to pressures from the administration, constituents, donors and pressure groups (such as Grover Norquist's 'Americans for Tax Reform'); earmarks are no longer available; and the limits of party control have been evident in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Democratic representatives (over 30) who voted against 'Obamacare' in 2010 • divisions within the House Republicans over Speaker Boehner's 'Plan B' and the 'fiscal cliff' legislation <p>and party control is anyway traditionally weaker in the Senate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • senators represent a whole state, and consequently are often more moderate than House representatives from gerrymandered districts • of their length of tenure • there is no equivalent to the House Speaker • much smaller numbers mean there is less need for rules of procedure, and members are more amenable to informal negotiation and compromise <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline awareness of the recent ascendancy of the party leadership in Congress • Limited knowledge of the factors which affect votes in Congress <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the recent ascendancy of the party leadership • Clear explanation of at least one means by which their influence is exerted, and clear recognition of the limits of their influence | |

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|--|---|
| <p>Level 3 (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p>Level 2 (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p>Level 1 (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| Question Number | Question |
|--|---|
| 2. | What is judicial restraint, and on what grounds has it been criticised? |
| Indicative content | |
| <p>Judicial restraint is a judicial approach which stresses respect for precedent, and deference to the elected branches of government.</p> <p>Its proponents argue that, as the constitution is unclear in many places, no one can claim a definitive knowledge of it; consequently, as an unelected body, the Supreme Court should only overrule either its own precedents or the other branches of government in the most egregious cases of faulty judgment or constitutional violation.</p> <p>It is often associated with, although it is not the same as, strict constructionist or originalist judicial philosophies; the court's decision in <i>National Federation v Sebelius</i> to endorse 'Obamacare' is an example of judicial restraint, although it was opposed by originalists like Justice Scalia.</p> <p>It should also be distinguished from judicial <i>review</i>, which is the process of case consideration, and gives the power to the court of ruling the other branches to be in breach of the constitution.</p> <p>Criticisms of judicial restraint include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • conservative critics of judicial restraint would argue that deference to the elected branches may mean that serious breaches of the constitution, such as 'Obamacare', are sanctioned, significantly altering its character • liberal critics would argue that the electoral incentive for politicians to avoid alienating significant sections of the electorate means that archaic and repressive legislation is unlikely to be repealed, especially by state legislators; consequently if the court is willing to overturn only the most flagrant breaches of the constitution, cases such as <i>Plessy v Ferguson</i> show that access to basic rights can be denied, potentially indefinitely <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline awareness of the nature of judicial restraint • Limited knowledge of at least one ground on which it has been criticised <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the nature of judicial restraint • Clear explanation of at least one ground on which it has been criticised | |

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Question Number | Question |
| 3. | How difficult is it to amend the US constitution? |

Indicative content

There are two stages to the formal procedure of amending the constitution: amendments can be proposed either by a 2/3 majority vote in both houses of Congress or by a constitutional convention applied for by 2/3 of the state legislatures; once proposed, they then need to be ratified, either by 3/4 of the state legislatures or by 3/4 of specially convened state constitutional conventions.

The requirement at both stages for a 'super-majority' has meant that only 27 have ever been approved, out of thousands that have been put forward.

However, the constitution can be effectively amended by other means, either through Supreme Court decisions, such as *Roe v Wade*, or administrative practice, such as the shift of power from the states to the federal government that has occurred since 1787.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited knowledge of the formal procedure for amending the constitution
- Outline awareness of the difficulty of amending the constitution

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the formal procedure for amending the constitution
- Clear explanation of the relative difficulty of formal methods and other means of amending the constitution.

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|--|---|
| Level 3 (11-15 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 2 (6-10 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 1 (0-5 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| Question Number | Question |
|-----------------|---|
| 4. | Assess the significance of the Cabinet in the executive branch. |

Indicative content

Factors which give the cabinet significance include:

- the cabinet symbolises the unity of the executive and its representation of all parts of American society
- the president can present policy to the cabinet which affects all its members, such as the annual budget
- some presidents have used cabinet meetings to discuss policy
- some individual members, such as the secretary of state, are almost always 'heavyweights' with significant influence on important areas of policy

Factors which suggest the cabinet lacks significance include:

- there is no tradition of collective decision-making
- it is likely to be a disparate collection of individuals appointed for a variety of reasons with little to bind them together
- presidents are aware that cabinet members' loyalties are divided between the administration and Congress
- cabinet members may become preoccupied with running their own departments and consequently have little to contribute to overall administration strategy
- they are likely to be in competition for influence with their departmental equivalent in the EOP

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Outline awareness of the significance of the Cabinet
- Limited knowledge of its role in the executive branch

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the significance of the Cabinet
- Clear explanation of its role in the executive branch

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|--|---|
| Level 3 (11-15 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| Level 2 (6-10 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Level 1 (0-5 marks) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.• Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.• Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |
|--------------------------------------|---|

| Question Number | Question |
|--|---|
| 5. | Does the House of Representatives carry out its representative role more effectively than the Senate? |
| Indicative content | |
| <p>Because of the separation of powers, members of both houses of Congress do not run for office as prospective members of a government but primarily to represent the interests of their district or state in the federal government. Their votes on legislation will often be based more on what they perceive to be their constituents' views than their parties', and they will work tirelessly to direct federal money in whatever form back home.</p> <p>A further element of the representative role is the mirroring of the composition of the population, especially in relation to gender and race; women and non-whites may feel that Congress does not represent them if their representation is significantly below their proportions in the population.</p> <p>Finally, even though the main loyalty of members may be local, Congress has a role in representing the national interest.</p> <p>Factors which suggest the House of Representatives carry out its representative role more effectively than the Senate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • elections every two years, compared to the six year tenure of the Senate, give House representatives a strong incentive to be attentive to constituents • in most states senators represent more voters than representatives • rates of incumbency are typically higher in the House than the Senate • the exclusive powers of the Senate, particularly nomination confirmation and treaty ratification, may mean that senators are more concerned with national than state interests • 'majority-minority' districts have meant that more black voters are represented by black representatives, and there has been an increase in the number of black representatives (currently 43, 10%), which is now roughly proportional to the black population in the population as a whole (13.1%); there are currently only two black senators (Tim Scott and Mo Cowan), both of whom were appointed by their state governors, and since 1900 there have only been three elected black senators <p>Factors which suggest that it does not include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gerrymandered districts means that many House representatives face no serious challenge in the general election, and the only threat to their security is through a primary challenge; consequently the only constituency they have an incentive to represent is primary voters • because of their six year terms and relative insulation from electoral pressure, senators can arguably represent the national interest more effectively • proportionally there are more women in the Senate (at the start of the 113th Congress, there were 78 women in the House (18%), 20 in the Senate (20%). • the high cost of elections for both senators and representatives means there is an incentive to represent donors more than voters • lack of term limits creates an unrepresentative elite in both houses • some states have one House representative and two senators <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline awareness of the representative role of the House of Representatives • Limited knowledge of at least one way in which it either does or does not carry out this role more effectively than the Senate | |

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the representative role of the House of Representatives
- Clear explanation of at least two ways in which it does carry out this role more effectively than the Senate.

| LEVELS | DESCRIPTORS |
|---|---|
| <p><i>Level 3</i> (11-15 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Good to excellent ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 2</i> (6-10 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Limited to sound ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary. |
| <p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • Very poor to weak ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary. |

| Question Number | Question |
|-----------------|--|
| 6. | 'The US constitution is no longer fit for purpose.' Discuss. |

Indicative content

Arguments that the constitution is no longer fit for purpose include:

- there are too many checks and balances, with the consequence that the system can become gridlocked
- the difficulty of amending it and the survival of (arguably) archaic elements such as the second amendment
- the power of judicial review has created an 'imperial judiciary'
- the unrepresentative nature of the Senate
- the archaic mechanism of the Electoral College can mean that winner of the popular vote is denied the presidency
- House elections are too frequent, meaning that representatives are constantly campaigning
- lack of term limits in Congress creates an unrepresentative elite

Arguments that the constitution is functioning satisfactorily include:

- a degree of 'gridlock' ensures that ill-thought out policy cannot be rushed through
- the constitution is sufficiently vague to allow necessary changes to occur, e.g. power has moved from Congress to the executive and the states to the federal government to meet societal needs
- the constitution has been amended to reflect changes in values, e.g the Senate is now elected by popular vote
- both the Senate and the Electoral College are an important element of the federal identity of the constitution
- it has survived for 200+ years

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Outline awareness of the system of government created by the constitution
- Limited knowledge of at least one way in which it might or might not be considered fit for purpose

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the system of government created by the constitution
- Clear explanation of at least one way in which it might and one way in which it might not be considered fit for purpose

| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| AO2 | Intellectual skills |
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| A02 | Synoptic Skills |
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Level 3 (7-9 marks) | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 2 (4-6marks) | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 1 (0-3 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary |

| Question Number | Question |
|-----------------|---|
| 7. | Has the Supreme Court become an 'imperial judiciary'? |

Indicative content

Factors which suggest that the Supreme Court has become an imperial judiciary include:

- judicial review means that the constitution means what the court says it means
- almost no area of public policy is immune to constitutional challenge
- the increased willingness of justices to strike down state and federal legislation means that they have become arbiters over a wide range of policy, most famously desegregation and abortion
- many conservatives would argue that some of the rights which the court has established in recent years have only a tenuous basis in the constitution
- once appointed justices have security of tenure and may vote on the court in ways at odds with the impression they created during their confirmation hearings

Factors which suggest that it has not include:

- its lack of enforcement power
- the court's decisions may be reversed by constitutional amendment
- it has no power of initiation and must wait for cases to be brought to it
- the reluctance of the court to become involved in some areas, such as foreign policy
- the need for justices to give at least some regard to public opinion and the political context if the legitimacy of the court is to be maintained – perhaps such considerations influenced Justice Roberts in the *Sebelius* decision.
- many liberals would argue that the court must intervene to strike down legislation sometimes if basic rights are to be maintained
- Congress has the power to impeach justices and vary the size of the court – the threat of the latter was sufficient to prompt the court to change course in 1937

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Outline awareness of the meaning of the term 'imperial judiciary'
- Limited knowledge of at least one way in which it might or might not apply to the Supreme Court

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the meaning of the term 'imperial judiciary'
- Clear explanation of at least one way in which it might and one way in which it might not apply to the Supreme Court.

| A01 | Knowledge and understanding |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| A02 | Intellectual skills |
| Level 3 | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| (9-12 marks) | arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| A02 | Synoptic Skills |
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| A03 | Communication and coherence |
| Level 3 (7-9 marks) | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 2 (4-6 marks) | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 1 (0-3 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary |

| Question Number | Question |
|--|---|
| 8 | 'Weak at home, strong abroad.' Discuss this view of the power of the president. |
| Indicative content | |
| <p>Evidence that the president is weak at home and strong abroad includes:</p> <p>domestically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the president is dependent on congress for all legislation and money • even a Congress of his own party will sometimes defeat or ignore presidential initiatives, and a Congress controlled by the opposing party will mean at least substantial compromise, if not complete obstruction • the president is dependent on the Senate for confirmation of all nominations and treaties • the president has to rely for implementation of policy on the federal bureaucracy, which will have its own agenda, and has divided loyalties • the growth of partisanship means that it is increasingly difficult to get his programme through Congress <p>abroad</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Cold War confirmed the power of the president to set the tone and direction of foreign policy • although only Congress has the right to authorise the use of the armed forces, if the president acts there is little Congress can do to restrain him • 'politics stops at the water's edge' – by convention, the president can rely on bipartisan support for at least the broad aims of foreign policy <p>Evidence that the president is strong at home and weak abroad includes:</p> <p>domestically</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the president sets the domestic agenda and is the only politician with a national mandate • the extensive bureaucratic support of the president gives him a significant advantage over Congress • the power of veto gives the president significant leverage • executive orders and recess appointments give the president a route around congressional obstruction • signing statements enable the president to put an expansive interpretation on congressional legislation <p>abroad</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • especially when there is no immediate threat to national security, politics often extends beyond the water's edge • multiple agencies in the federal bureaucracy have a stake in foreign policy, and may pull in different directions • pressure groups, e.g. AIPAC, can exert significant influence on policy • post-Vietnam, presidents are highly sensitive to public opinion • it is in the gift of Congress to grant 'fast-track' trade authority and has not granted it to President Obama • the Senate may decline to ratify the president's treaties <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outline awareness of the powers of the president at home and abroad • Limited knowledge of at least one way in which one could be argued to be stronger than | |

the other

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the powers of the president at home and abroad
- Clear explanation of at least one way in which 'abroad' powers could be argued to be stronger and one way in which it could be argued that they are not

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| AO1 | Knowledge and understanding |
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates |
| AO2 | Intellectual skills |
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations, and identify parallels, connections, similarities and differences |
| AO2 | Synoptic Skills |
| Level 3 (9-12 marks) | Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| Level 2 (5-8 marks) | Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| Level 1 (0-4 marks) | Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions |
| AO3 | Communication and coherence |
| Level 3 (7-9 marks) | Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary |
| Level 2 (4-6 marks) | Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary |

**Level 1
(0-3 marks)**

Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

These grids should be used in conjunction with the fuller Level descriptors.

PART A - SHORT QUESTIONS (15 marks)

| | | |
|----------------|-----------|-------|
| Level 3 | Excellent | 15 |
| | Very good | 13-14 |
| | Good | 11-12 |
| Level 2 | Sound | 10 |
| | Basic | 8-9 |
| | Limited | 6-7 |
| Level 1 | Weak | 4-5 |
| | Poor | 2-3 |
| | Very poor | 0-1 |

PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

| A01 / A02 / Synopticity | |
|------------------------------------|------|
| Level 3 (Good to excellent) | 9-12 |
| Level 2 (Limited to sound) | 5-8 |
| Level 1 (Very poor to weak) | 0-4 |

| A03 | |
|------------------------------------|-----|
| Level 3 (good to excellent) | 7-9 |
| Level 2 (Limited to sound) | 4-6 |
| Level 1 (Very poor to weak) | 0-3 |

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA034599 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

