

Mark Scheme for 9PL0/3A

Comparative Politics - USA

EAMS

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

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

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

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(a)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining differences between the House of Representatives and the House of Commons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the USA has strict separation of powers between Congress, President and Supreme Court- this includes powers that are specific to the House of Representatives rather than the Senate and vice versa, whereas the UK has fusion of powers between each branch of government and so both are expected to have similar powers with no specific exclusions for the House of Commons the US Constitution has specifically defined roles for the House of Representatives that govern its operation and the relationship between the two legislative chambers, whereas the UK Constitution is unentrenched and so the role of the House of Commons has evolved over time the nominal head of the House of Representatives is the 	<p>Candidates are may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the similarities between the two Houses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separation of powers means that there are areas of policy where the House of Representatives can act independently such as initiating revenue bills, but is constitutionally prevented from acting on Senate exclusive powers such as ratifying treaties, whereas there is no such limit on the House of Commons, as it is considered the dominant chamber in Parliament due to the unelected nature of the House of Lords the House of Representatives is more closely tied to its defined role than the House of Commons, which can be adapted to fit the political circumstances e.g. investigation of MPs' expenses, setting up the Liaison Committee to scrutinise the prime minister the House of Representatives is more able to introduce legislation on an individual rather than a party basis, whereas

<p>1 (a) (cont'd)</p>	<p>Speaker, while the head of the House of Commons is also the head of the executive, the Prime Minister</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the House of Representatives is elected more frequently- every two years- with a broad base of electors, whereas the House of Commons is elected every five years with a much narrower base of electors the House of Representatives has a much weaker party discipline system than the House of Commons, where voting is largely along party lines due to the whip system <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<p>the House of Commons tends to be dominated by the governing party's agenda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the business of the House of Representatives tends to be more focused on local rather than national issues, as re-election is foremost in Congressmen's minds, whereas the House of Commons has longer terms of office which allow MPs more time to examine issues that arise the House of Representatives is theoretically more able to work on collegiate lines, with individual Congressmen or caucuses campaigning to pass legislation rather than following a dominant party manifesto, which can lead to gridlock, unlike the House of Commons which generally works and votes along party lines and is more likely to pass government policies if the governing party has a majority <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>
----------------------------------	--	--

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

		similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

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

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

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

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
1(b)	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining the ways in which US presidents and UK prime ministers may seek to influence legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US president also announces the year’s legislative programme in the State of the Union address. UK prime ministers are responsible for drafting the Queens’ Speech at the start of each new Parliament, where the legislative programme is set out for the year. • The US president has no direct influence over the introduction of legislation in Congress, whereas the UK prime minister can directly introduce legislation at any 	<p>Candidates are may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining the ways in which US presidents and UK prime ministers may seek to influence legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UK Queen’s Speech forms the basis of the government’s legislative programme, and take priority in determining the business of the day in the UK Parliament, whereas the State of the Union address sets out the president’s preferred legislative priorities- he is reliant on Congress to actually introduce his suggested ideas as legislation • The separation of powers in the US gives Congress priority over legislation rather than the president, with the president

<p style="text-align: center;">1 (b) (cont'd)</p>	<p>time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The role of the UK prime minister as leader of the majority party governing the House of Commons gives him/her more access to bargaining tools with MPs over proposed legislation, whereas the separation of powers in the US limits this power • The UK prime minister can also reward MPs who are seen to be cooperating with his/her ideology and legislative programme, whereas the US president is prevented from doing so by the Constitution • The US president has access to a large executive body of organisations that can help draft legislation and negotiate with Congressmen over legislation, whereas the UK prime minister is more reliant on Parliament to carry out this role <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<p>given a veto over legislation instead, whereas the fusion of powers in the UK means that the UK prime minister takes the lead on legislation and has no veto</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The UK prime minister can use the whip system to discipline MPs who refuse to follow party lines, whereas the whip system in the US is weaker and used by party leaders in the two Houses rather than by the US president, who must rely on his power of persuasion instead • The UK prime minister can use patronage to offer his party MPs potential promotion in the Cabinet if they cooperate on legislation, whereas the US president is forbidden to appoint elected representatives to his Cabinet so cannot use this as an incentive to support his legislation • The US president's Executive Office gives him access to more expertise and more individual specialists whose role is to help draft and negotiate legislation, which can be more influential than the UK prime minister- while the UK prime minister does have an increasing number of advisers, he is more reliant on the cooperation of MPs and Lords in Parliament to draft, amend and agree legislation s/he proposed <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>
--	--	--

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

Section B

Guidelines for Question 2

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

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

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

Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3.

Question number	AO1 (6 Marks)	AO2 (6 Marks)
2	<p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) when examining Supreme Court independence in the US and the UK (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • in both countries, there is a separation of powers between the Supreme Court and the legislative and executive branches- this is explicitly defined in the US Constitution and enshrined in legislation in the UK in the 2005 Constitutional Reform Act • the US Constitution clearly outlines the checks and balances on the Supreme Court, but in the UK this is not formally entrenched • Neither country's Supreme Court can be directly 	<p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when examining Supreme Court independence in the US and UK (but accept any other valid responses):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this allows the courts in both countries to operate without fear of interference by the other branches, although the appointments process in both countries does allow the potential for the executive to try to influence the conservative/liberal stance of the court- in the US in particular, e.g. Garland's nomination by Obama, Gorsuch's nomination by Trump • the US Constitution, in theory, prevents the US Supreme Court from being dominated by legislative or executive influence, and also from being over-powerful e.g. appointments process can influence makeup of court; the UK Supreme Court, however, is theoretically more subject to influence as the appointments process is less well scrutinised, and can be altered without a

<p style="text-align: center;">2 (cont'd)</p>	<p>overruled or have decisions overturned by lower courts or the legislature or executive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the US Supreme Court is the highest court in the land and cannot be overruled by any other court, but the UK's membership of the EU allows UK Supreme Court rulings to be challenged in the EU Court of Justice and in the European Court of Human Rights (on ECHR cases only) <p>Candidates may refer to the following when considering structural theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA - the Constitution provides a much more formalised system of government UK – has a more informal constitution Both- a system of checks and balances exists in each country to limit the powers of the Supreme Court <p>Candidates may refer to the following when considering cultural theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA – the Supreme Court can choose which cases to hear UK – there is less fear of initiating a constitutional crisis 	<p>formal constitutional amendment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this allows both Supreme Courts to make rulings based on their interpretation of the law and precedence rather than considering potential appeals; however, rulings in both countries can be overcome by new legislation or executive orders and constitutional amendments (US only). this makes the US Supreme Court more sovereign than the UK, as it cannot be overruled except by decisions made by later courts e.g. <i>Citizens United vs Federal Electoral Commission in 2010</i> partially overruled <i>McConnell vs FEC 2003</i> whereas the UK can and is overruled more often by appeals to European courts e.g. over the issue of allowing prisoners to vote in 2004 (<i>Hirst vs United Kingdom</i> in the European Court of Human Rights) <p>Candidates may refer to the following when analysing structural theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means that the structure of the US system of government determines the powers and checks on the Supreme Court and its appointments and rulings This allows the UK more flexibility in the judicial system overall This means that each country's Supreme Court's rulings can ultimately be overcome with the passage of new legislation or an executive order (US only) that addresses the point of law featured in the ruling <p>Candidates may refer to the following when analysing cultural theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The US Supreme Court has, therefore, been accused of only hearing cases that are clear on points of law to avoid constitutional clashes, and often avoids controversial issues-referring them back to lower courts as state-based issues. This
---	--	--

2 (cont'd)	<p>and so the Supreme Court is more likely to hear cases from a wide range of social and political issues</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>	<p>does vary over time, however e.g. <i>Texas V Johnson</i> (flag-burning)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This means the UK Supreme Court is more likely to consider ruling against the government or making a declaration of incompatibility if legislation in cases brought forward is incompatible with the ECHR e.g. in January 2017 the Supreme Court ruled that Parliament must be given a vote before Article 50 was triggered <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>
-----------------------	---	--

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

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Question

AO1 (10 marks)

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

AO2 (10 marks)

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

AO3 (10 marks)

Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis.

They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.

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

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

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

Other valid responses are acceptable

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(a)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of rights are explicitly provided for in the original constitution e.g. habeus corpus • Congress added the Bill of Rights to the Constitution in the first 10 amendments, which the Supreme Court refers to in its rulings • Subsequent amendments to protect civil rights e.g. Thirteenth Amendment have added to the Supreme Court's remit • The Supreme Court's constitutional role is to adjudicate on issues arising from the Constitution and the lower courts- including civil rights cases 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rights enshrined in the original Constitution are therefore considered inviolate and cannot be altered without going through the formal amendment process or a ruling by the Supreme Court on points of interpretation • The addition of the Bill of Rights ensures that a list of specific rights are emphasised in importance and protected in the same way as the rights in the original Constitution • The amendments process for the Constitution allows Congress to pass additional amendments to protect rights that may not have been considered previously or require additional entrenchment which has in the past been influenced by Supreme Court rulings • The Supreme Court is widely considered to be the guardian of the Constitution and so as part of its remit becomes the guardian of the rights contained within it, including the Bill of Rights 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore the Constitution itself can be referred to on points of law in court cases related to civil rights • This allows the Supreme Court to rule on constitutionality in cases related to the Bill of Rights as well as on legislation related to civil rights • This can then supercede legislation passed and then enshrine those rights more deeply in both American society and points of law • Therefore the Supreme Court then helps to ensure that rights enshrined within the Constitution are protected, and can also hear cases related to the constitutionality of legislation in relation to civil rights

<p>3 (a) (cont'd)</p>	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Constitution is a relatively short document that does not cover all areas related to civil rights • The Supreme Court cannot initiate cases related to civil rights • The Supreme Court does not have to hear all cases related to civil rights • The Supreme Court has no power of enforcement 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Constitution was not intended to focus solely on civil rights, which were not a major consideration at the time- as suggested by the late inclusion of the Bill of Rights- so does not and cannot specify all areas of civil rights • The powers of the Supreme Court are limited to selecting cases that have been referred to them as the highest court of appeal, rather than choosing to discuss issues related to civil rights • Many cases related to civil rights may be considered to be controversial, or not directly related to issues of constitutionality as they may be related to congressional or state law • The Supreme Court cannot act to enforce its rulings and so is reliant on Congress and the states to take action 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This then means that many areas of civil rights are subject to the interpretation of the courts in how they relate to the Constitution, or must be related to legislation rather than the Constitution • This means that the Supreme Court must wait until a point of law has been raised on constitutionality or that all other possible appeals have been exhausted before cases are referred to them • This means that the Supreme Court may choose to practice legislative deference and uphold laws that attack or limit civil rights e.g. <i>Plessy vs Ferguson</i> or <i>Buck vs Bell</i> • This makes it difficult to ensure rulings take effect immediately, as some rulings may require amendments to, or new legislation to be passed- which is a time-consuming process
----------------------------------	---	---	---

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

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(b)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The scale of US elections means that Congressmen begin fundraising again as soon as they are elected • The majority of candidates elected are incumbents with sizeable campaign 'war chests' • There has been a marked increase in the number and fundraising activities of PACs in recent years • Legislation to limit the impact of campaign finance has included loopholes 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terms of office, particularly in the House of Representatives and the cost of elections means that campaign finance is a priority for many congressmen, as they must consider re-election costs as well as issues once elected • Incumbents overwhelmingly dominate both house of Congress and are more likely to receive large donations that can be used for campaigning • The increase in number and fundraising activities by PACs and the emergence of Super-PACs suggests that campaign finance is becoming increasingly important • Campaign finance legislation has not eliminated/dealt with all the criticism of the impact of money on electoral outcomes as many lawmakers rely on campaign finance from corporations and unions 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore actions in Congress can be influenced by contributions received in the previous election by various organisations or by pledges of donations for future elections • So incumbents are more likely to be seen as a 'safe bet' by organisations and individuals who wish to contribute • This also contributes towards incumbency as funding is more likely to be given to incumbents than new candidates or freshmen congressmen • This suggests that loopholes have been left to ensure that congressmen can still access the funding they need

<p>3 (b) (cont'd)</p>	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The congressional record of candidates is also a major feature in electoral campaigns • The 'coat-tails' effect in presidential elections is a factor • Political context such as the state of the economy or the party's reputation can also affect outcomes • 'Name recognition' can affect the degree of media coverage candidates receive 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congressmen also focus considerable efforts on creating a record of action in Congress that will appeal to their electorate ('bringing the bacon home') • Popular presidents can 'bring congressmen with them', as associating candidates with the president of the same party can lead to balanced ticket voting across all elections- the 'coat-tails' effect • Congressional elections can be affected by the political climate of the country, such as a major crisis or economic recession where the ruling party is blamed for problems and punished at the ballot box • Individual congressmen can become celebrity-like in their status in their home district or also in the media, especially if they are perceived as a potential future president candidate 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Therefore campaign finance, while still important, cannot compensate for a proven track record of earmarking projects for congressional districts that demonstrate why an incumbent should be re-elected • This is a particular feature for newly elected presidents or during the honeymoon period of the first mid-term elections for a presidential candidate where gains can be made by the ruling party • Therefore the perception of Congress can be skewed by the political situation or also the reputation of the president • Therefore such candidates may find their elections more widely covered in the media to the exclusion of their opponent, particularly if they are a long-standing incumbent or have a significant position within Congress or on a committee
----------------------------------	---	---	--

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

Question number	AO1 10 Marks	AO2 10 Marks	AO3 10 Marks
3(c)	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure groups exist to influence change rather than seek election so can focus their efforts on influencing legislation e.g. by lobbying • Pressure groups are influential in mobilising support for campaigns, especially in the digital age and so can directly influence individual congressmen • Political parties or individuals within Congress can be reliant on pressure groups for funding and support • Pressure groups can also make connections with executive departments or agencies who can influence the formation of legislation 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The very nature of pressure groups means that they are more able to focus their campaign efforts on one issue or piece of legislation • Pressure groups are becoming increasingly effective at mobilising mass support through other methods such as bringing cases to court or the use of social media to encourage constituents to bombard congressmen if Congress proves unresponsive/unwilling to legislate • The cost and frequency of elections- especially in the House- means that many individuals within political parties are more reliant on pressure groups or Super PACs for donations than their own party • Pressure groups also seek to form direct connections with executive departments or agencies to give them direct access to those who are involved in writing and reviewing legislation 	<p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whereas political parties- especially in the House of Representatives- have to consider the proximity of elections and their constituents' wishes • This can then lead to additional pressure on Congress to legislate on issues that have not been fully addressed by current legislation to avoid being seen to be overruled by the courts or face re-election issues • This can give pressure groups direct access to congressmen or committee members and affect how they amend or vote on legislation • The sharing of expertise and advice to these departments agencies can lead to direct access to the president and to more direct involvement in drafting legislation or amendments

<p>3 (c) (cont'd)</p>	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure groups are still reliant on political parties within Congress to support and act on the issues they campaign on • The effectiveness of pressure groups to affect any legislation is limited by the party in power in Congress and the power of opposition to filibuster legislation • Legislation has been passed to limit the power and influence of pressure groups in legislation • Political parties are becoming more polarised and so more likely to organise around party votes 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While pressure groups in the USA do have a wide number of access points available to them in Congress, they must still wait for a political party sympathetic to their cause/to be pressured by the political climate or media coverage to be in power • The ideology of the ruling party can limit the effectiveness of pressure groups because of the political context of the time or the issue the pressure group represents • Pressure groups may find it harder to make direct links with congressmen after legislation passed to limit the impact of lobbying • Political parties are becoming more unified around ideology and policy programmes and so more likely to vote in a partisan manner in Congress which leaves fewer opportunities for pressure groups to influence legislation 	<p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This makes it very difficult for minority parties to push through legislation without the ruling party or president's approval • So political will is essential for bringing issues to the legislative table in a Congress with an ever-increasing legislative workload • This means they are more reliant on the goodwill or ideology of individual congressmen or the political will of party leaders to take up their issue in Congress • Increased polarisation limits the ability of pressure groups to influence individual congressmen and legislation through the usual channels
----------------------------------	---	--	--

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