

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2012

GCE Government & Politics
Processes in The USA
6GP03 3C

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, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

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

Summer 2012

Publications Code UA032359

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

Question Number	Question
1.	Why have the activities of US pressure groups been criticised?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Activities of US groups which have been criticised include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • campaign donation – creates the appearance of corruption and puts pressure on congressmen to please donors, which may lead to constituents’ interests and/or the national interest being neglected • lobbying – knowledge and contacts of lobbyists gives benefit to wealthy groups who can afford to hire them • iron triangles – will protect policies and programmes which benefit only a wealthy minority • infiltration of the federal bureaucracy - usually by corporate interests, skews policy implementation in their favour • direct action – subverts democracy and in some cases, e.g. attacks on abortion clinics and doctors, illegal <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of at least two activities of US pressure groups • Limited knowledge of the criticisms of them <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the activities of US pressure groups • Clear explanation of the criticisms of them 	

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

Question Number	Question
2.	Which groups of voters support the Democratic Party, and why?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Groups which support the Democratic Party are typically attracted by a mixture of 'pull' (towards the Democratic Party) and 'push' (away from the Republican Party) factors. The groups which support the Democratic Party include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • women – voted Democratic 52-48% in 2010; typically women are attracted to Democratic values around activist government, e.g. in promoting health and education provision, and around the use of force, e.g. concerning gun control at home and diplomatic rather than military solutions abroad • racial and sexual minority voters – attracted by Democratic history and policies on civil rights, affirmative action and immigration, and alienated by the identity of the GOP as the party of the South and the WASP • union members – voted Democratic 61-37% in 2010; unions have been traditional supporters since the New Deal • the poor – voters earning under \$30,000 voted Democratic 57-40% in 2010, attracted by Democratic policies on welfare and tax • the young – voters under 30 voted Democratic 55-42% Democratic in 2010, still attracted by the optimism and energy of the Obama campaign in 2008 • elements of the very rich, typically those in Hollywood/media • urban/secular voters <p>(figures from <i>Pendulum Swing</i>, Sabato)</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of at least two groups who typically support the Democratic Party • Limited knowledge of the reasons for their support <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of at least three groups who typically support the Democratic Party • Clear explanation of the reasons for their support 	

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

Question Number	Question
3.	Why have attempts at immigration reform since 2000 been criticised?

Indicative content (*this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points*)

Significant attempts at immigration reform since 2000 include:

1. the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Acts of 2006 and 2007, both of which would have:

- tightened border controls and punished the employers of illegal immigrants
- granted legal status ('legalisation ') to the estimated 12 million illegal immigrants already in the country, with an eventual path to citizenship
- established a guest worker program to give would-be illegal immigrants a legitimate route into the country

criticisms of legalisation included:

- the 1986 legalisation saw a significant level of fraud
- would reward law-breakers
- would send a message that future law-breakers would eventually be legalised

criticisms of a guest worker scheme included:

- would create a permanent underclass
- would make workers dependent on their employers
- would depress other workers' wages

2. the 'DREAM' Act, which would give a path to citizenship for some young illegal immigrants, was filibustered in the Senate in 2010. Criticisms included:

- a poor substitute for comprehensive reform which President Obama had promised as a candidate, and addressed the situation of only a small fraction of those present in the country illegally
- its requirements were excessively demanding and could be seen as a means of military recruitment
- it would reward parents who brought their children illegally into the US, and they might ultimately be eligible for citizenship through this route

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

- Awareness of attempts at immigration reform since 2000
- Limited knowledge of criticisms of them

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

- Clear understanding of attempts at immigration reform since 2000
- Clear explanation of criticisms of them

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

Question Number	Question
4.	Explain the factors which give pressure groups such a significant role in US politics.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Factors which give pressure groups a significant role of in US politics include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ fragmented political system and multiplicity of access points ▪ weak parties ▪ primaries and the cost of election campaigns mean limited party finance and support are available so candidates are dependent on pressure groups ▪ initiatives, enable groups to bypass politicians altogether • diverse population • tradition of civic engagement • openness, freedom of information and accessibility of politicians <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of the role that pressure groups play in the USA • Limited knowledge of factors which explain the significance of pressure groups <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the role that pressure groups play in the USA • Clear explanation of factors which explain the significance of pressure groups 	

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

Question Number	Question
5.	Why has campaign finance reform proved difficult to achieve?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Campaign finance reform has proved elusive because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • candidates want to spend as much as possible to gain an advantage over their opposition, and this has led to the collapse of the presidential election financing system in both the primaries and general election • donors want to donate; there is apparently a widespread belief that donations buy influence, and the bigger the donation, the bigger the influence • of the role of the Supreme Court and the strength of constitutional rights to free speech, which means e.g. that TV advertising is impossible to ban; <i>Buckley</i> made all limits on candidate expenditure (except where federally subsidised) unconstitutional and <i>Citizens United</i> made the electoral activities of independent groups exempt from regulation • of the apparent difficulty of framing legislation without loopholes, e.g. the growth of soft money in the 1990s, the role of 527s in 2004 • of the gridlocked and ineffectual state of the FEC <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Awareness of campaign finance regulation • Limited knowledge of attempts to reform it and of factors which have made it difficult to achieve <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of campaign finance regulation • Clear knowledge of attempts to reform it • Clear explanation of factors which have made it difficult to achieve 	

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

Question Number	Question
6	'Affirmative action has failed primarily because of a lack of political will.' Discuss.

Indicative content (*this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points*)

Evidence that there has been a lack of political will to promote affirmative action:

- after President Nixon promoted affirmative action in the federal government, since the 1970s the Republican Party has been hostile to affirmative action and the Reagan administration in particular actively sought to undermine it
- since the Johnson presidency, the Democratic Party has been sympathetic to affirmative action but its support has waned in recent years; the most recent significant pronouncement was President Clinton's defensive 'mend it, don't end it' speech in 1995; President Obama has been notably guarded in his statements
- in recent years affirmative action has largely disappeared from political campaigns (though may return with *Fisher v Texas*), as candidates of both parties have become wary of alienating key constituencies through either its endorsement or denigration

Other possible causes of the failure of affirmative action include:

- in a succession of cases, the Supreme Court has narrowed the scope of affirmative action schemes
- the nature of black culture means that inequality is likely to resist any attempts to ameliorate it through government action
- given the scale of the problem, affirmative action is too tentative a measure and more drastic action is needed

Candidates may rewardably take issue with the premise that affirmative action has failed.

Arguments that affirmative action has succeeded includes:

- there is a black president
- more blacks are in middle class white collar jobs than when affirmative action first began
- precise equality of outcome was never the goal of affirmative action, but rather making equality of opportunity more of a reality for minorities

Arguments that affirmative action has failed include:

- on every relevant measure, the black population continues to suffer disproportionate deprivation
- affirmative action has entrenched racial divisions rather than erase them
- 50 years is a more than adequate time span for any social policy to be seen to be succeeding

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

- limited knowledge of successes and failures of affirmative action
- limited knowledge of reasons for failure of affirmative action, with some reference to political will
- awareness of nature of affirmative action

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

- clear explanation of successes and failures of affirmative action

- clear assessment of reasons for failure of affirmative action, considering the importance of political will
- clear understanding of nature of affirmative action

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 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
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
<i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<i>Level 1</i> (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	Which of the two major parties is more ideologically divided?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>The Democratic Party has become a broadly liberal party, on both economic issues, advocating a role for 'big government', and social issues, in favour of e.g. abortion rights, gun control and same-sex marriage, at home, and favouring diplomatic rather than military solutions abroad.</p> <p>Different ideological elements within the party include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • liberal activists - presence in the party dates from civil rights movement and Vietnam war protests, expanded to take in anti-nuclear movement, gun control, 'pro-choice'/ feminism, environmentalism, gay rights, especially same-sex marriage; evident e.g. in Clinton ban on assault weapons and veto of partial birth abortion ban, and Obama reversal of Mexico City policy, repeal of 'don't ask don't tell' and support for same-sex marriage; tradition of 'big government' activism date from New Deal, reinforced by Great Society program, exemplified by 2009 stimulus package and 2010 health care reform • centrists - tension with liberal base evident e.g. in Clinton presidency, Clinton explicitly rejected liberal economic tradition, 'era of big government is over', 'welfare a second chance not a way of life', and endorsed some socially conservative policies, e.g. extension of federal death penalty and Defense of Marriage act; ; liberals disappointed with several elements of Obama presidency, e.g. Afghanistan 'surge', lack of 'public option' in health care and extension of Bush tax cuts for the well-off; centrists more pro-business, e.g. criticism by some in 2012, e.g. Cory Booker, of Obama campaign attacks on Romney's record at Bain Capital • white working class union tradition potentially in conflict with other elements: with feminists, gun control advocates and gay rights campaigners over abortion/birth control (especially Catholics, e.g. Stupak Amendment), guns, and same sex marriage; with environmentalists, e.g. unions support Keystone pipeline; with minorities, party's perceived preoccupation with promotion of minority rights and affirmative action meant white working class 80s onwards came to see party elites as not promoting their interests; with pro-business elements of Clinton and Obama administrations, e.g. critical of free-trade agenda • fiscal conservatives – e.g. Blue Dog Democrats, now declining element of the House Democrats, successfully opposed 'public option' of health bill and Cap and Trade energy bill stall in Democrat-controlled senate after passing HoR • racial minorities - black voters at odds with elements of Democratic liberal tradition, especially homosexuality and same sex marriage, and support school vouchers, opposed by teachers unions; indifferent to calls for immigration reform and history of antagonism with Jewish voters; many Latinos also not pro-choice <p>The Republican Party has become a broadly conservative party, on both economic issues, advocating 'small government', and social issues, in favour of e.g. strict limits or a ban on abortion, gun rights and marriage limited to heterosexuals, at home, and often favouring military rather than diplomatic solutions abroad.</p> <p>Different groups within the Republican Party include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Washington/corporate/financial establishment, 'country club' conservatives 	

(most closely represented by Romney in the 2012 primary): pro-business, e.g. support for TARP, free trade and guest worker program; only moderately socially conservative, disdainful of e.g. Schiavo legislation; impatient with excesses of populist conservatism, e.g. 'birther' movement; generally hawkish abroad, promotion of American interests; nearest to being the pragmatic centre

- Populist conservatives, represented by Pat Buchanan 90s, modern version Tea Party 'pitchfork populism' (represented by elements of Cain, Bachmann, Perry and Gingrich 2012 primary): keenest on tax cuts (e.g. Cain '9-9-9' plan) and most virulent in antipathy to 'Washington', hostile TARP; pro-states rights, anti-politician and pro-term limits (Perry called for part-time 'citizen's Congress'); anti media and cultural 'elites'; anti-big business, Perry referred to Bain Capital as 'vulture capitalism'; mixture of foreign policy approaches, some (e.g. Palin) hawkish, others (e.g. Buchanan) isolationist, hostile international organisations e.g. UN & NATO, anti-free trade; nativist elements, most opposed to legalisation of illegal immigrants; more working-class, rural, keenest on gun rights, most pro-capital punishment
- 'Compassionate' 'big government' conservatism of George W. Bush (represented by Santorum 2012 primary): least emphasis on shrinking the state, e.g. expansion of role of government under Bush (e.g. in education, No Child Left Behind, and health, Medicare prescription drug benefit); most religious (e.g. 'faith-based initiative') and most pro-life; hawkish abroad, promotion of American values ('neo-conservatism')
- Libertarianism (represented by Paul 2012 primary): similar emphasis to populist conservatives on dismantling the federal government (though more philosophical than emotional), giving almost all its functions to the states, would phase out social security, Medicare and Medicaid; abolish the Federal Reserve; not traditional social conservative, e.g. would abandon the 'war on drugs'; non-interventionist foreign policy

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

- limited knowledge of ideological divisions within the Democratic Party
- limited knowledge of ideological divisions within the Republican Party

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

- clear explanation of ideological divisions within the Democratic Party
- clear explanation of ideological divisions within the Republican Party
- some ability to compare and contrast the two parties

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 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

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	'The Electoral College should be replaced by a national popular vote' Discuss.

Indicative content (*this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points*)

Arguments that the Electoral College should be replaced by a national popular vote include:

- all of the original rationale for the Electoral College has disappeared and it is now a constitutional anachronism
- the winner is not guaranteed a majority of the popular vote (or may even lose the popular vote), and consequently may lack legitimacy
- the Electoral College gives some voters more clout than others; extra weight is given to voters in smaller rural states (alternatively- smaller states tend to be safe for one party or the other and are consequently ignored by candidates) and the campaign is concentrated in 'swing states'
- the long history of 'faithless electors'
- third parties are penalised
- the exaggeration of the winning margin of ECVs compared to the percentage of the popular vote gives the winner an artificially strong mandate
- a constitutional amendment is not necessary to introduce a national popular vote; some reformers are campaigning for an interstate compact, which would retain the Electoral College but impose a national vote on it (see for example <http://www.nationalpopularvote.com/>)

Arguments that the Electoral College should not be replaced by a national vote include:

- the Electoral College is an important element of the federal identity of the constitution
- the Electoral College requires candidates to campaign across all regions of the US, when a national vote might enable them to concentrate on the major cities or regions of strength, or create an incentive to campaign in major media markets
- since the pursuit of ECVs determines the nature and course of the campaign, it is invalid to criticise the Electoral College for failing to reflect the popular vote

- since only *one* president is being elected, disadvantaging third parties is arguably not as significant as in an election for a legislature, and they would fare no better under a national vote
- administration is simplified by being the responsibility of the states and problems such as recounts are confined within one state; a nationwide recount would be burdensome and potentially controversial
- 'faithless electors' have never affected the result
- the concept of a mandate is of limited relevance in a separated system; however 'strong' a president's mandate, congressmen and senators will regard themselves as having their own mandate and will not feel any duty to support the president's agenda
- a national vote could lead to a proliferation of third party candidates and lead to the winner having possibly only 20% (or less) of the vote

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

- awareness of the nature of the Electoral College and the national popular vote
- limited knowledge of arguments in favour of the Electoral College
- limited knowledge of arguments against the Electoral College

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

- clear knowledge of the nature of the Electoral College and the national popular vote
- clear explanation of arguments in Favour of the Electoral College
- clear explanation of arguments against the Electoral College

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 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
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

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)

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

<i>A03</i>	
...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 UA032359 Summer 2012

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

