

Mark Scheme (Results)  
Summer 2013

GCE Government and Politics 6GP03 3C  
Processes in the USA

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

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

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

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2013

Publications Code UA036091

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

<b>No. 1</b>	Explain the main values and policies of the Democratic Party.
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The main values and policies which have become associated with the Democratic Party since the 1960s include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘big government’ – an extensive federal role in management and regulation of the economy, such as the auto industry ‘bailouts’ of 2009, the Recovery Act 2009, the Dodd-Frank Act 2010, higher fuel emission standards (including the first ever standards for commercial vehicles) 2011, attempt to pass the Clean Energy bill in 2009-10, including a ‘cap and trade’ provision; progressive taxation, such as the ending of the Bush tax cuts for joint incomes over \$450,000 in 2013; federal supervision and/or provision of health and education services, such as the ‘Race to the Top’ education program, and the Children’s Health Insurance Authorization Act 2009, expanding CHIP, and the Affordable Care Act 2010; welfare and pensions; the raising of living standards through, for example, minimum wage or equal pay legislation such as the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act 2009</li> <li>• social liberalism – promotion of issues such as: gun control, such as the package of measure proposed by President Obama in 2013 after the Newtown shootings; ‘pro -choice’ on abortion, such as the reversal of the ‘Mexico City’ policy 2009; feminism; gay rights, such as the repeal of ‘Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell’ 2010 and the support expressed by the president and vice-president for gay marriage in 2012; minority rights, such as the Claims Resolution Act 2010 compensating black farmers, the Hate Crimes Prevention Act 2009 expanding the type of groups covered by hate crime legislation, the Fair Sentencing Act 2010 reducing the sentencing disparity between crack and powder cocaine possession, and attempts to pass the Dream Act in 2010 and the subsequent enforcement of some of its measures through executive action</li> <li>• foreign policy – typically more ‘dovish’ than ‘hawkish’, less assertive exertion of US power, less emphasis on unique US role in the world and a preference for diplomacy over the use of military force, e.g. Obama commitment 2009 to talks ‘without preconditions’ with Iran, ‘reset’ in relationship with Russia, ‘leading from behind’ in action in Libya, withdrawal of troops from Iraq and 2014 deadline for withdrawal from Afghanistan.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited awareness of at least two values and / or policies of the Democratic Party.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of at least three values and / or policies of the Democratic Party.</li> </ul>	

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

<b>No. 2</b>	How significant are presidential debates for election campaigns and outcomes?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Presidential debates offer the candidates a national platform, and the audience an opportunity to see how they perform under pressure. The dynamic of the debates will depend to some extent on whether an incumbent is running; the incumbent's record will be the focus of a lot of the debate if he is.</p> <p>Significant moments which arguably have had an impact on the election campaign and outcome include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1960 - the first Nixon-Kennedy debate</li> <li>• 1976 - Ford's claim that 'There is no Soviet domination of Eastern Europe'</li> <li>• 1980 - Reagan comment 'There you go again'</li> <li>• 2000 – Gore's attempt to crowd Bush</li> </ul> <p>Even when there is no defining moment, as in 2008, the debates help establish the personas of the candidates.</p> <p>however:</p> <p>these effects are difficult to quantify and, even when the margin of victory is very small, the role of the debate is itself a matter of debate; Romney's 'victory' in the first 2012 debate was thought at the time to have been very significant, and certainly had the effect of raising GOP morale, but seems to have had little impact on the final result.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited awareness of at least two ways in which presidential debates are significant.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of at least three ways in which presidential debates are significant.</li> </ul>	
<b>LEVELS</b>	<b>DESCRIPTORS</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

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

<b>No. 3</b>	To what extent are Latinos a significant voting group?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>The reasons the Latino vote can be considered significant include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Latinos are the fastest growing section of the US population - under 5% of the population in 1970, over 15% by 2010 and projected to grow to nearly 25% by 2050.</li> <li>• there are large Latino populations in potential swing states such as Florida, New Mexico and Nevada</li> <li>• Latinos are not a homogenous group and different groups have traditional loyalties to the Democratic Party (Mexicans) and the Republican Party (Cubans) - consequently the Latino vote is 'in play' to an extent that is not true, for example, of the black vote; although on balance Latinos favour Democratic candidates, support for GOP House candidates was higher in 2010 than either 2006 or 2008, and a number of high profile Latino Republicans were elected, e.g. Marco Rubio as Senator for Florida</li> <li>• evidence for their significance includes: presidents of both parties have made efforts to court the Latino vote, e.g. President Bush made Mexico his first foreign visit in 2001, and President Obama nominated Sonia Sotomayor to the Supreme Court in 2009.</li> </ul> <p>evidence for their relative insignificance could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• in many states the Latino proportion of the population is still relatively small</li> <li>• poorer and minority voters are typically less likely both to register to vote and vote</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited awareness of at least two ways in which Latinos are / aren't a significant voting group.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of at least three ways in which Latinos are / aren't a significant voting group.</li> </ul>	
<b>LEVELS</b>	<b>DESCRIPTORS</b>
<b>Level 3</b> <b>(11-15 marks)</b>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

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

<b>No. 4</b>	Assess the role of pressure groups in election campaigns.
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Pressure groups traditionally have a significant role in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• campaign donation - US elections are extremely costly and PACs donate a significant proportion of candidates' campaign finance, although their influence may be limited because donations are limited to \$5,000 per candidate</li> <li>• running independent campaigns - the <i>Swift Boat Veterans for Truth</i> played a significant role in the 2004 presidential campaign, denigrating John Kerry's war record, and the ability of groups to run independent campaigns was greatly increased by the decision in <i>Citizens United</i>, leading to the proliferation of 'Super PACs' in 2012</li> <li>• registering voters and 'getting the vote out' - 'Rock the Vote' claims to have registered 5,000,000 young voters over 20 years</li> <li>• publishing voter guides and endorsing candidates, encouraging their members to vote for them, or highlighting the voting record of opponents, such as the 'dirty dozen' list of the League of Conservation Voters</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited awareness of at least two roles of pressure groups in election campaigns.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features: Clear understanding of at least three roles (with some assessment in at least one) of pressure groups in election campaigns.</p>	
<b>LEVELS</b>	<b>DESCRIPTORS</b>
<p><b>Level 3</b></p> <p><b>(11-15 marks)</b></p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.</li> <li>• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.</li> <li>• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.</li> </ul>

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

<b>No. 5</b>	Explain the main reasons why affirmative action has failed to end racial inequality.
--------------	--

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

The reasons affirmative action has failed to end racial inequality include:

- it was never intended to – it was only intended to provide equality of opportunity, not outcome
- there is evidence of continuing racism in the majority population which has undermined it
- there has been a lack of political will to support and expand it
- the Supreme Court has limited its application in cases such as *Bakke*, *Croson*, *Adarand* etc
- the nature of black culture (the ‘No Excuses’ argument) means that black inequality is resistant to it
- the roots of black inequality go back centuries and affirmative action has not been operating long enough to eradicate them entirely
- it may encourage black students and workers to become lazy and rely on preferential treatment, creating a permanent class of state dependants
- it discriminates against the majority population, creating a new inequality
- it places black students on courses they are not equipped for, and they end up dropping out
- successful blacks are viewed as not having achieved through their own efforts but as the beneficiaries of affirmative action, and are not consequently not seen as the equals of their white peers

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

- Limited awareness of at least two reasons why affirmative action has failed to end racial inequality.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:  
Clear understanding of at least three reasons why affirmative action has failed to end racial inequality.

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

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

**No. 6**

'Membership size is the crucial factor in determining pressure group success.' Discuss.

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

Evidence that membership size is crucial to pressure group success include:

- the success of large groups such as the NRA, e.g. in derailing President Obama's gun control proposals, and AARP, e.g. in resisting the attempts of President Bush to reform social security
- the access to lobbyists, ability to advertise and make campaign donations that a large membership and money brings

Some groups such as AIPAC may be seen to be successful despite lack of numbers, and other factors which may explain the success of pressure groups include:

- money (may not be dependent on a large membership)
- depth of support - a committed minority may be able to overcome an apathetic majority; support for gun control is broad but shallow, so that the passion of gun rights activists, who are often prepared to vote on this issue alone, frequently wins out
- divided opposition - there are a number of groups advocating gun control, whereas the NRA has a dominant position on the other side.
- 'insider' contacts within both parties
- favourable Supreme Court decisions - the Supreme Court is an access point for groups who lack a large membership, e.g. the cause of gay rights was advanced by the decision in *Lawrence v Texas*
- public opinion - a majority of the American public is consistently pro-Israel, so it may well be in a politician's self-interest to support groups campaigning for Israel's interests
- close relationship with a government department, leading in some instances to 'regulatory capture'.

**AO1** threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

Limited awareness of at least two factors including membership size in determining pressure group success.

**AO1** threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

Clear and detailed understanding of the significance of membership size relative to other factors in determining pressure group success.

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

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

<b>No. 7</b>	To what extent do fiscal conservatives now dominate the Republican Party?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Social and fiscal conservatism have been core Republican values at least since the presidency of Ronald Reagan. During the 1980s and 90s, social conservatives came increasingly to dominate the party and this domination was particularly marked in the early years of the presidency of George W. Bush. At the same time, concern with fiscal prudence lessened, and the consequence of programs such as the Medicare prescription benefit, measure to combat the financial crisis and the military actions in Iraq and Afghanistan was that the Bush presidency ended with a substantial federal deficit. Reaction to this and the first year of the Obama presidency generated the Tea Party movement which, for a while at least, became the dominant voice of the right.</p> <p>'Fiscal conservatives' is a broad term and can be taken to include both the Tea Party movement on the populist right, and the traditional business-based establishment of the Republican Party. Nearly all Republicans will be socially and fiscally conservative in some degree, and the question is asking which agenda is being promoted more forcefully within the party.</p> <p>Evidence that fiscal conservatives now dominate the Republican Party includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the disowning of the 'big government/compassionate conservative' legacy of President G W Bush</li> <li>• the prominence of Tea Party candidates and ideas, e.g. in successive 'Ryan budgets', and the Cain '999' plan</li> <li>• the high profile of Tea Party sympathisers such as Rand Paul and Ted Cruz in the Senate</li> <li>• the influence of groups such as the Club for Growth and FreedomWorks in Republican primaries</li> <li>• the influence of Grover Norquist and the anti-tax pledge</li> <li>• Congressional Republicans have acquiesced in the defense cuts brought about by sequestration, when previously Republicans regarded the defense budget as sacrosanct</li> <li>• several social conservative issues, e.g. constitutional amendments on school prayer and same sex marriage, have faded from prominence and a number of prominent Republicans e.g. Senators Rob Portman and Mark Kirk have endorsed same-sex marriage</li> </ul> <p>Evidence that fiscal conservatives do not dominate the Republican Party includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the ultimate failure of the Tea Party-backed presidential candidates in 2012, e.g. Herman Cain and Michele Bachmann</li> <li>• the declining prominence of Sarah Palin</li> <li>• the nomination of John McCain and Mitt Romney as presidential candidates, both centrists</li> <li>• following the Republican takeover in many states in 2010, social conservative measures have been vigorously pursued, particularly abortion restrictions</li> <li>• the willingness of some Republican governors to accept federal money to expand Medicaid through the Affordable Care Act</li> </ul>	

- the formation of groups such as the Conservative Victory Project to elect more moderate candidates in Republican primaries
- the tax increases approved by the Republican-controlled House in 2013 as part of the deal to resolve the 'fiscal cliff'

Some issues such as immigration reform divide fiscal conservatives - the Tea Party wing are resistant to any measures which could be seen as an 'amnesty' whereas business interests favour measures which secure or increase the supply of cheap labour.

**AO1** threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:  
Limited awareness of at least two ways in which fiscal conservatives do or do not dominate the Republican Party

**AO1** threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:  
Clear and detailed understanding of the significance relative to other groups of fiscal conservatives in the Republican Party

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

<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i> (9-12 marks)</b>	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
<b><i>Level 2</i> (5-8 marks)</b>	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
<b><i>Level 1</i> (0-4 marks)</b>	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
<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i> (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

**No. 8**

'The system for nominating presidential candidates is in need of reform.'  
Discuss.

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

criticisms of the presidential candidate nominating system include:

- length of the campaign, compounded by 'front-loading'
- expense of the campaign and breakdown of matching funds system give an advantage to well funded candidates
- disproportionate influence of Iowa and New Hampshire
- lack of peer review
- the role of unelected delegates, e.g. 'super delegates' is undemocratic
- caucuses and closed primaries restrict participation to the party extremes
- low turnout
- the result may be decided before the later states vote
- role of media in creating narrative and manipulating expectations
- deprives the national party conventions of their major function
- tests campaigning skills rather than governing skills
- there are better systems available

Evidence that these criticisms are not valid includes:

- the length of the campaign is inevitable in a country as large as the US when candidates are not well known to most voters and the trend to front-loading reversed in 2012
- money is no guarantee of success e.g. Forbes' unsuccessful campaigns in 1996 and 2000, and Huckabee's near-success in 2008, despite very limited funds
- Iowa and New Hampshire are not necessarily decisive – Clinton lost both in 1992, and Bush in 2000 and Obama in 2008 both lost New Hampshire after winning Iowa
- it is impossible to know whether 'peer-reviewed' candidates would have been any more successful
- 'super delegates' have never reversed the popular result
- extreme candidates are rarely nominated and open primaries have their own problems
- national party conventions have acquired other significance
- campaigning skills are highly relevant in a media age
- there may be no alternative system which provides a solution to the problems of the existing system

**AO1** threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

Limited awareness of at least two advantages or disadvantages of the system for nominating presidential candidates

**AO1** threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

Clear and detailed understanding of arguments for and against reforming the system for nominating presidential candidates.

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

<b>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	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)

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

### PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

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

<b><i>A03</i></b>	
<b>...Level 3</b> (good to excellent)	7-9
<b>...Level 2</b> (Limited to sound)	4-6
<b>...Level 1</b> (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](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA036091 Summer 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website  
[www.edexcel.com](http://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

