



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2019**

**A LEVEL (NEW)  
GOVERNMENT & POLITICS - UNIT 4  
1160U40-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2019 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

**GCE A LEVEL (NEW)  
GOVERNMENT & POLITICS**

**SUMMER 2019 MARK SCHEME**

**UNIT 4: Government and politics of the USA**

**Marking guidance for examiners**

**Summary of assessment objectives for Unit 4**

The questions in Section A assess both AO1 and AO2. The questions in Section B assess both AO1 and AO3. The question in Section C assesses all three assessment objectives. The assessment objectives focus on the ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories and issues (AO1); the ability to interpret and apply political information to identify and explain relevant similarities, differences, and connections (AO2), and the ability to analyse and evaluate the areas of government and politics studied to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions (AO3).

**The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for each question has two parts:

- Advice outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by the candidates.
- An assessment grid advising bands and associated marks that should be allocated to responses which demonstrate the characteristics needed in AO1, AO2 and AO3.

**Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

- The first stage for an examiner is to use both the indicative content and the assessment grid to decide the overall band.
- The second stage is to decide how firmly the characteristics expected for that band are displayed.
- Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

**Organisation and communication**

This issue should have bearing if the standard of organisation and communication is inconsistent with the descriptor for the band in which the answer falls. In this situation, examiners may decide not to award the highest mark in the band.

**Level Descriptors**

Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of level descriptors best describes the overall quality of the answer. The following grid should inform your decision as to which band the answer belongs:

	<b>AO1</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>Thorough</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aware of a wide range of detailed and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates fully developed understanding that shows relevance to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are well chosen.</li> <li>• Precision in the use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is consistently applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a clear, developed and convincing interpretation of evidence that is fully accurate.</li> <li>• Is able to fully identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used in a consistently appropriate and effective way.</li> <li>• An effective and balanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Detailed and substantiated evaluation that offers secure judgements leading to rational conclusions.</li> </ul>
<b>Reasonable</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a range of detailed and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates well developed understanding that is relevant to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are appropriate.</li> <li>• Generally precise in the use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is mainly applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a clear and developed interpretation of evidence that is mostly accurate.</li> <li>• Is partially able to identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are mostly used in a suitable way and with a good level of competence and precision.</li> <li>• An accurate and balanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Detailed evaluation that offers generally secure judgements, with some link between rational conclusions and evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows some accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates partial understanding that is relevant to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is partially applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a sound interpretation of evidence that shows some accuracy.</li> <li>• Makes some attempt to identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used in a suitable way with a sound level of competence but may lack precision.</li> <li>• An imbalanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Sound evaluation that offers generalised judgements and conclusions, with limited use of evidence.</li> </ul>
<b>Limited</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge with some relevance to the topic or question.</li> <li>• Little or no development seen.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little or no use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding is applied in a weak manner to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Can only form a simple interpretation of evidence, if at all, with very limited accuracy.</li> <li>• Makes weak attempt to identify and explain similarities, differences and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used with limited competence.</li> <li>• Unsupported evaluation that offers simple or no conclusions.</li> </ul>

## Section A

### Question 1

**Assess how the content of the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.**

**[16]**

#### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In applying their knowledge, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to show how an emphasis on the rights of individual states influenced the content of the US Constitution. In demonstrating this candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on how the Constitution protects and ensures the rights of states. The response might consider issues such as:

- Federalism as a key principle in the US Constitution – political power shared between a national government and state governments.
- The framers of the Constitution were representatives of the states and placed an emphasis on limiting the central government; the rights of states almost a further check and balance on the federal government.
- Enumerated powers of the three branches of the federal government as a means of defining their precise remit and consequently protecting the states.
- Concurrent powers given by the Constitution to both the states and the federal government, e.g. taxes.
- Tenth Amendment – reserving all remaining powers ‘to the states and the people.’
- Role of the states as regards Constitutional amendments; ratification or initiation of amendments. Equal representation of all states in the Senate.
- Possible to discuss federalism as an ever changing and flexible concept; periods of Dual, Co-Operative and New Federalism and how the rights of states have fared during these periods.
- Often difficult to see where federalism begins and ends and the development of the term ‘states’ rights’ to express dissatisfaction at the enlarged nature of the federal government, use of elastic clause, commerce clause.
- Supremacy Clause (Article VI, Paragraph 2) – federal law superior to state law in an area of conflict.
- Any other relevant information.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>10-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough application of political knowledge of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Thorough interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Thorough explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>7-9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable application of political knowledge of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Reasonable interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Reasonable explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>4-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate application of political knowledge of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Adequate interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Adequate explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited application of political knowledge of how the US Constitution is influenced by the principle of federalism.</li> <li>• Limited interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Question 2

Explain and illustrate the influence of money in US elections.

[16]

### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In applying their knowledge candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to explain the influence of money on US elections. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on explaining a range of factors and illustrating how money impacts upon US election. The response might consider issues such as:

- The necessity of raising large sums of money in order to run for public office; the protracted electoral process for the Presidency and its financial consequences, the soaring cost of running for Congress.
- The failure of legislation to regulate and control spending at election time.
- The decline in the role of public spending ('matching funds') in presidential elections and the development of alternative sources of finance.
- The developing role of Super PAC's and PAC's in the process of spending at election time.
- Relationship between money and the media during campaign time.
- The polarizing nature of many of the larger donations and the difficulty in obtaining full disclosure on the source of the donations. This leads to concern and criticism regarding the undemocratic nature of money's impact on US elections.
- Any other relevant information.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>10-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough application of political knowledge of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Thorough interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Thorough explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>7-9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable application of political knowledge of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Reasonable interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Reasonable explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>4-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate application of political knowledge of impact of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Adequate interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Adequate explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited application of political knowledge of impact of the influence of money in US elections.</li> <li>• Limited interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		



## Section B

### Question 3

Region is now the key influence on voting behaviour in US Elections.’ Discuss this view. [24]

#### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In discussing key influences on voting behaviour candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse the relative importance of regional factors on voting behavior in US elections. Candidates will construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on what factors have the greatest weight in determining the voting behavior of citizens in the United States across a range of elections. The response might consider issues such as:

#### Arguments for:

- Party identification and partisanship that exists in regional terms. ‘Red/Blue America.’
- Regional patterns in voting behavior; Republican Party and the ‘solid south,’ Democratic Party and the ‘liberal North-East.’ Extent to which these areas are consistent or dynamic in their support for the political parties across a range of elections.
- Correlation between population density and voting behavior; urban, rural, suburban areas and their differing patterns of voting. Suburban vote no longer a key factor?
- 2016 presidential election and the importance of the ‘Rust-belt.’ States like Pennsylvania, Ohio and the interaction that exists between region and socio-economic factors, the collapse of the Democratic Blue Wall.
- Region and polarization; the increasing polarization in US politics causing candidates to maximize and fully exploit their core support rather than attempting to reach out to moderate voters from the opposing party.
- The relationship between regions and other long-term factors; race, socio-economic status, growing importance of Hispanic vote in certain swing states. These factors enable us to contextualize regional voting patterns in a more meaningful way.
- Any other relevant information.

#### Arguments against

- Influence of short-term factors and the manner in which they are able to impact and challenge longer term trends e.g. candidates and their appeal to particular voting blocs, ‘Reagan Democrats,’ Trump’s appeal to the white working classes, Obama to the young.
- Economic factors; ‘It’s the economy, stupid’ – Clinton 1992.
- Issue voting.
- ‘October Surprise.’
- The extent of party identification and the importance of independent/swing voters.
- Any other relevant information.

Band	Marks	AO1	Marks	AO3
4	7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of regional factors and voting behavior.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of how key an influence region is on voting behavior in the US.</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3	5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of regional factors and voting behavior.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of how key an influence region is on voting behavior in the US.</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
2	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of regional factors and voting behavior.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of how key an influence region is on voting behavior in the US.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is adequate.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An adequate conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of regional factors and voting behavior.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited analysis and evaluation of how key an influence region is on voting behavior in the US.</li> <li>• Limited discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	0	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

#### Question 4

Evaluate the view that the Republican Party is totally divided and lacking in any unifying ideology. [24]

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In discussing the extent of ideological disunity or unity within the Republican Party, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the state of the Republican Party in the USA in recent times and whether there are ideas that have the potential to unify their ranks. Candidates will construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on any unifying ideology that may or may not exist within the Party. The response might consider issues such as:

##### Arguments for

- The divisions exposed within the Republican Party by the candidacy of Donald Trump and his subsequent election as President. He was attacked by leading Republicans throughout the campaign yet won the nomination and subsequent election.
- Trump at odds with conservative/Tea Party ideas of fiscal conservatism as he proposes massive government spending projects. A return to 'big-spending conservatism?'
- Also rallies against free trade (NAFTA) – a sacrosanct principle amongst right wing small-state conservatives.
- Electoral convenience of Trump's success has caused the Republican Party to abandon its core ideology in order to achieve short-term targets, i.e. Supreme Court nomination, control of executive.
- Historical perspective of divisions within the Republican Party; Goldwater/Rockefeller 1964.
- Any other relevant information.

##### Arguments against

- The relationship between the traditional conservatism within the Republican Party and Trump's 'America First,' economic nationalism. Trump as an anomaly or will he be a long-term transformative and unifying force upon the GOP?
- Factions within the Republican Party (Tea Party, Religious Right) and the extent to which the conservative wing has prevailed over the moderates in Congress and across the country and consequently unified the party.
- The traditional unifying ideas of the Republican Party, lower taxes, limited government and how these have the potential to unite the party. Historical context of Gingrich's Contract with America in 1994, Reagan.
- Polarisation in Congress and the voting discipline of the Republican Party. The potential of attacking Obama's legacy to serve as a unifying force for the Republican Party.
- Any other relevant information.

<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>7-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>13-16</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>5-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>9-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>3-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>5-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is adequate.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An adequate conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited analysis and evaluation of the extent of unity and division within the Republican Party in terms of ideology</li> <li>• Limited discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Question 5

'The process of presidential elections is deeply flawed.' Analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the process of presidential elections.

[24]

### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In discussing the presidential election process, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate whether the process is fit for purpose and possible to justify. Candidates will construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions. In demonstrating this candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the flaws of the system in relation and the extent to which they undermine the process making it possible or impossible to justify. The response might consider issues such as:

#### Arguments for

- Length and structure of process (Invisible Primary, front-loading) and the implications this has on financial requirements for candidates
- Undemocratic nature of caucuses and undue influence given to early states in the nomination process.
- Low and unrepresentative nature of primary/caucus turnout and too much control given to the parties.
- Does the process test what is required to be an effective President or does it emphasise and prioritise other skills not necessarily required for the role? Is it fit for purpose?
- Role of money and Super PAC's. Trump's candidacy as a challenge to the domination of money and a lesson in the emerging power of social media.
- Strengths and weaknesses of the Electoral College.
- Any other relevant information.

#### Arguments against

- System offers a challenge to party control (Trump 2016, Obama 2008, Sanders 2016) and is an exercise in democratic engagement far removed from the 'smoke filled rooms of the early 60's.'
- A genuine test of candidate stamina and resilience.
- The lack of a popular alternative to the process or massive calls for its reform.
- Any other relevant information.

Band	Marks	AO1	Marks	AO3
4	7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of the process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	13-16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of the process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3	5-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	9-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of the process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
2	3-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	5-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of the process of presidential elections. Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>OR</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is adequate.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An adequate conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>
1	1-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	1-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited analysis and evaluation of the process of presidential elections.</li> <li>• Limited discussion.</li> <li>• Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	0	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.		

## Section C

### Question 6

'The principle of limited government is largely ignored by all three branches of the federal government today.' Discuss. [40]

#### Indicative content

*NOTE: The content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material mentioned below. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid and the indicative content. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.*

In evaluating this viewpoint in this extended piece of writing, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the idea of limited government and the debate regarding the proper scope of the federal government within American society, and whether this idea is largely ignored by all branches of the federal government, in order to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and to draw conclusions. In demonstrating this candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on interpretations around limited government, the debates regarding its definition across party lines and whether the three branches of the federal government, individually and collectively, largely ignore the principle so heavily emphasised by the Founding Fathers.

The response might consider issues such as:

- The Founding Father's conception of limited government; political power to emanate from the people, government has clearly enumerated powers and constraints. 'I am not a friend to a very energetic government. It is always oppressive.' Jefferson 1787.
- The principle of limited government as manifested in the Constitution; separation of powers, checks and balances, Bill of Rights, federalism, frequent elections; all intended as a bulwark from big government.
- The gradual extension of the federal government from the 1930's onwards and the public expectation of certain rights, Medicare, Social Security, whilst maintaining an antipathy to the general notion of the federal government.
- Limited government in a variety of differing contexts; social policy, defense, foreign affairs.
- Political parties and their evolving relationship with the term limited government. How valid is the claim that Republicans are party of limited government whilst Democrats are the believers in big government?
- Limited government has been an animating force to many on the right of American politics in recent times as they question the effectiveness of constitutional arrangements to ensure limited government; the extent to which checks and balances, federalism, Bill of Rights have all failed to protect the ideal of limited government?
- Individual branches of federal government and their propensity to transgress the idea of limited government; e.g. Congress – elastic clause, a judicially active Supreme Court has reshaped America during periods like the Warren Court, the development of presidential power with the growing Executive Office of President.
- The affinity of Americans to the term 'limited government' as a rallying cry to their entrenched philosophy of a limited state.
- Any other relevant information.

Band	Marks	AO1	Marks	AO2	Marks	AO3
4	10-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of the principles of limited government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are well chosen.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used.</li> <li>• Effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>	11-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough application of political knowledge of limited government.</li> <li>• Thorough interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Thorough explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections between the political theories.</li> </ul>	11-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough analysis and evaluation of how the principle of limited government is largely ignored by all three branches of the federal government today. .</li> <li>• Thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An appropriate conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
3	7-9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable knowledge and understanding of the principles of limited government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are appropriate.</li> <li>• Depth and range to material used, but not in equal measure.</li> <li>• Good use of terminology.</li> </ul>	7-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable application of political knowledge of limited government.</li> <li>• Reasonable interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Reasonable explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>	7-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable analysis and evaluation of how the principle of limited government is largely ignored by all three branches of the federal government today.</li> <li>• Reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> <li>• Structure is mostly logical.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates reasonably accurate grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• A reasonable conclusion is reached based on evidence presented.</li> </ul>
2	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate knowledge and understanding of the principles of limited government.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples used are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Depth or range to material used.</li> <li>• Some appropriate use of terminology.</li> </ul>	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate application of political knowledge of limited government.</li> <li>• Adequate interpretation of political information.</li> <li>• Adequate explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>	4-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate analysis and evaluation of how the principle of limited government is largely ignored by all three branches of the federal government today.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>• Structure is adequate.</li> <li>• Writing demonstrates some errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>• An adequate conclusion is reached.</li> </ul>



<b>Band</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO1</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO2</b>	<b>Marks</b>	<b>AO3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of the principles of limited government.</li> <li>Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited application of political knowledge of limited government.</li> <li>Limited interpretation of political information.</li> <li>Limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>	<b>1-3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited analysis and evaluation of how all branches of the federal government interact with the principle of federal government.</li> <li>Limited discussion.</li> <li>Answer lacks structure.</li> <li>Writing demonstrates many errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.</li> <li>No conclusion.</li> </ul>
	<b>0</b>	Response not creditworthy or not attempted.				