



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel GCE In Politics
Paper 3: Comparative Politics – USA
(9PL0/3A)

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2023

Question Paper P72624A

Publications Code 9PL0_3A_2023_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

Paper 3A: Comparative Politics: USA mark scheme 2023

Section A

Guidelines for Questions 1a and 1b
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.

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 and evaluation (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 and evaluation (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 and evaluation (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 and evaluation (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).

Question number	Indicative content
<p>1(a) Examine the differences between the US Senate and the UK House of Lords.</p>	<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences between the US Senate and the House of Lords:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate is elected so has a state-wide mandate; House of Lords is appointed so no direct mandate • Senate has its own explicit Constitutional powers e.g. to confirm judicial appointments; Lords has no equivalent powers but is often used a revising chamber • Senate has a representative function due to its elected nature; Lords is not expected to represent a particular constituency/area/region • Senate cannot be overruled by the other chamber, as bills must come to an agreed state before passing to the executive; the Lords can be overruled by the Commons using the Parliament Acts • Separation of powers means the other legislative chamber and the executive have specific oversight of the Senate e.g. Vice President casts tie-breaking vote in Senate; there are fewer formal political checks by the Commons or the prime minister on the Lords, allowing more independence <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of the differences between the US Senate and the House of Lords:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The differing mandates means the Senate is more likely to be responsive to public opinion, whereas the Lords may be more independent in their decision-making • Explicit and implied powers mean the Senate have more power to directly affect the political process, whereas the Lords is more limited- but conversely, may have more time for scrutiny of the executive • The representative nature of the Senate must therefore consider the needs of their constituents and may be held accountable at election time; the Lords can act without fear of affecting their electoral chances and therefore may make decisions based on national rather than regional issues • The Constitution gives the Senate equal legislative power to the House of Representatives, whereas the Lords is perceived as less powerful and more of a revising chamber- although the Lords does also have the power to introduce Bills, so is not wholly subservient to the Commons • The Lords can and does act more independently of executive and party-political influence to introduce, revise and amend legislation; the Senate, however, may become more bogged down in political gridlock due to the Constitutional checks and balances in place <p>Candidates who refer to only one country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>

Question number	Indicative content
<p>1(b) Examine the similarities between the policies of one main US political party and one main political party in the UK.</p>	<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the similarities between the policies of one main US political party and one main political party in the UK:</p> <p>Candidates may compare similarities in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Broad ideological similarities (need to link to specific policy) • Specific economic policies • Specific welfare policies • Specific policies on law and order • Specific policies on environmental policies <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of between the policies of one main US political party and one main political party in the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • e.g. left-wing, tendency to be more liberal, pro-choice etc Labour and Democrat; more right-wing, less liberal, prefer limits on abortion/immigration etc Republican/Conservative • e.g. low taxation, pro-business etc for Republican/Conservative. May draw parallels with Republicans and Labour’s more pro-business stance since New Labour • e.g. Democrats and Obamacare and Labour commitment to high levels of spending on welfare and maintaining NHS standards • e.g. Republicans and Conservatives tend to focus on strong law and order policies such as longer sentences/use of prisons; parallels between Democrats and Labour on restorative justice • e.g. Conservatives more focused on environmental issues/ the ‘green’ agenda in recent years, similar to Democrats e.g. opposition to Keystone pipeline, calls by individual Democrats for a ‘Green New Deal’ <p>Examples include references to other parties such as the SNP (the main party in the Scottish Parliament), the Green Party (may be arguably considered a main party due to the wide field of candidates nationally and local council success rate), the Liberal Democrats.</p> <p>Candidates who refer to only one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.</p>

Section B

Guidelines for Question 2
<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates who refer to only one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.</p> <p>Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3.</p> <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 and evaluation. Makes limited comparative theory points (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 and evaluation. Makes some relevant comparative theory points (AO1). • Some 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 and evaluation. Makes relevant comparative theory points (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 and evaluation. Makes cohesive comparative theory points (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Question number	Indicative content
<p>2 Analyse how the role and powers of the US President and the UK Prime Minister are similar.</p>	<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks) Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of how the role and powers of the US President and the UK Prime Minister are similar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both act as Head of government • Both are a 'leader' of a main political party • Both have significant powers of appointment • Both act as a national figurehead in times of crisis e.g. wartime • Both are Chief diplomat for international negotiations <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when analysing of how the role and powers of the US President and the UK Prime Minister are similar:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may be a significant power for UK prime ministers with a slim majority or in a coalition government because of the fusion of powers, while separation of powers means that it is also a significant power for a US president as they often rely on the powers of persuasion to lead national policy • This may be a significant power for both presidents and prime ministers as they work to persuade their members to support their legislative agenda- this is a position in name only for the president who may be considered a figurehead, while the UK prime minister is elected to be party leader by party members • This may be a significant power for both presidents and prime ministers as both can appoint a significant number of cabinet members and advisers • This may be a significant power because it applies to domestic and international crises, such as the use of executive orders in the US and delegated legislation in the UK to deal with crises such as natural disasters or international conflict • This may be a significant power as they will represent the country at international conferences and initiate or participate in negotiations, or delegate representatives to attend meetings in their place <p>Candidates may refer to the following when analysing structural theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USA- Constitution grants explicit powers to the president e.g. appoint Supreme Court • UK- Constitution is uncodified, but these powers have passed to the prime minister over time e.g. Royal Prerogative <p>Candidates may refer to the following when analysing cultural theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USA – president is a figurehead for one of the main parties, but they are considered to be leader in name only rather than have the ability to unite their party around their agenda, and have no guarantee of their party being the largest in either chamber of Congress • UK- prime ministers are the elected leaders of their party, which is usually the largest party in the House of Commons- their MPs are expected to largely follow the party line, making this a more significant role of the prime minister <p>Candidates may refer to the following when analysing rational theory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USA – US presidents are able to use their position to make treaties/agreements in line with personal rather than party policy, which is a significant power (this also links to structural theory- Constitutional powers) • UK – prime ministers are expected to negotiate/participate in treaties/agreements in line with government/party policy rather than their individual agenda <p>Candidates who refer to one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1. Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3. Accept any other valid responses.</p>

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Questions 3a-3c
<p>AO1 (10 marks) Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3).</p>
<p>AO2 (10 marks) Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question.</p>
<p>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.</p>
<p>Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way.</p> <p>The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion.</p> <p>Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2.</p> <p>Other valid responses are acceptable.</p>

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 analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many 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 analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (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 analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, 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 analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, 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 analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	Indicative content
<p>3(a) Evaluate the view that Congress is unrepresentative.</p>	<p>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that Congress is unrepresentative:</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both chambers of Congress lack diversity • Congress is dominated by incumbency • Congress is often gridlocked within and between the chambers because of the tendency to focus on local issues • Congress is dominated by two main parties • The unequal nature of the size of the chambers is unrepresentative <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As both chambers are elected, there is accountability to their constituents • The House of Representatives in particular must be seen to be acting in their constituents' interests • Individual members of Congress may use pork barrel politics to represent the needs of their individual states/districts • With longer terms of office, the Senate can be more representative of national interests as well as state • Congress has become more representative over time <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statistically Congress lacks diversity on race, gender, sexuality, disability and also the party system (AO2) Although this has improved in recent years, it has been a slow process, and has not benefited from affirmative action programmes, meaning Congress is still quite unrepresentative (AO3) • This makes it harder for serving members of Congress to be successfully challenged in elections as they have the organisation, resources and political record to campaign with (AO2) Therefore Congress is less democratic as its representative function is limited by the dominance of incumbency, meaning Congress is still quite unrepresentative (AO3) • This means that Congress does not always focus on the national picture when considering key issues and often divides along regional lines (AO2) Therefore Congress is less representative of national needs and priorities, although it can be said to be representative on an individual district or state basis, but is still quite unrepresentative on a national level (AO3) • This means that the legislative agenda is dominated by the ideology of the two main parties, with little third party success- 'crossing the floor' to become independent rare (AO2) Therefore there is a perception that voting for a third party is a 'wasted' vote, as these views will not be represented in the legislative agenda, which adds to unrepresentative nature of Congress as it continues to be dominated by just two parties (AO3) • The Senate has equal numbers with 2 representatives per state (AO2) arguably this means Congress is unrepresentative as smaller states have equal power to larger states (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

Disagreement

- If members of Congress are seen to not be adequately representing their constituents, this may lead to loss in the next election/reduction in financial support (AO2) Therefore members of Congress must always pay some heed to their constituents' needs and priorities, even as incumbents, to demonstrate why they should be re-elected, and so Congress does still play an important representative role (AO3)
- The two-year election cycle for the House means members of Congress always have one eye on re-election, and so must pursue policy/legislation/funding for projects that appeal to their constituents (AO2) meaning that the representative role of Congress is still vital (AO3)
- This demonstrates that members of Congress are responsive to local needs (AO2) Therefore members of Congress still fulfil a representative role, as much of their time is invested in adding pork barrel amendments to Bills and making deals to ensure support for them (AO3)
- Six-year terms and the broader electoral support by state rather than electoral district (as the House requires) means the Senate are more able to focus on long-term issues that affect national interests rather than focusing on simply representing local or state-wide issues (AO2) which allows them to play a more representative role than the House, with their shorter terms of office (AO3)
- Increases in representation of minority groups and the fact that there are now several high-profile members of Congress from minority groups (AO2) suggest that Congress is making progress towards becoming more representative (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	Indicative content
<p>3(b) Evaluate the view that the checks and balances in the US Constitution are effective.</p>	<p>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that the checks and balances in the US Constitution are effective.</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has largely prevented one branch becoming too powerful over legislation • Allows for change that is based on broad support • Judicial review can prevent states/federal government going beyond their powers • Presidential appointments must be approved • Checks and balances ensure branches work together <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many checks and balances • Does not prevent states becoming too powerful • Checks and balances ineffective with united government • Can also be ineffective with a narrowly divided House/Senate • SC ideology can be influenced by presidential appointments <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system of checks and balances means that compromise and consensus between the Congressional chambers needs to be reached to pass legislation (AO2) and so the checks and balances can be effective in preventing one branch becoming too powerful over legislation (AO3) • This is especially true in times of divided government, as broad support is needed in both chambers of Congress as well as the president for legislative change, and a super-majority for constitutional amendments (AO2) and so the checks and balances can be effective in preventing a narrow minority dominating (AO3) • The Supreme Court can review decisions at state and federal level to ensure that legislation/programmes/executive orders are constitutional (AO2) so demonstrating that the system of checks and balances is effective in ensuring the other branches do not go beyond their powers (AO3) • This can prevent an over-powerful (imperial) executive, as the president is not always guaranteed support of Congress, even if their own party dominates, when making appointments (AO2) showing that the checks and balances are effective in limiting the power of the executive (AO3) • It is difficult to pass legislation without Congress and the president working together, as both must agree bills before they become law- and the Supreme Court has the ultimate ability to declare laws/executive orders unconstitutional (AO2) and so the checks and balances are effective in ensuring the branches work together rather than one dominating the others (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- The complexity of the system of checks and balances can result in gridlock where little is achieved because consensus cannot be reached (AO2) which suggests the system is ineffective because it may prevent effective government if legislation cannot be passed due to gridlock (AO3)
- The checks and balances are largely within the federal government- states are able to exercise their reserved powers with only limited checks such as judicial review (AO2) which can be ineffective, especially with a Supreme Court that is more ideologically aligned with states' rights (AO3)
- When one party dominates both chambers of Congress and the presidency, it is often easier to pass legislation/achieve compromise and consensus (AO2) which suggests the checks and balances may be ineffective if the minority party is unable to gain enough support to act (AO3)
- Similarly, with a narrowly divided House/Senate a powerful minority can block a wider consensus (AO2) so making the system of checks and balances ineffective as legislation may be blocked (AO3)
- For example, presidents who are able to make multiple appointments can change the ideology of the Supreme Court from liberal to conservative or vice versa, which can influence decisions made for years even after a president has left office (AO2) which means the checks and balances may be ineffective as the Supreme Court may not always be as impartial as intended (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	Indicative content
<p>3(c) Evaluate the view that the most significant problem with the US electoral system is the failure to reform campaign finance.</p>	<p>AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that the most significant problem with the US electoral system is the failure to reform campaign finance.</p> <p>Agreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financing of elections means that large sums of money are needed • Attempts to reform campaign finance rules have failed because of Supreme Court rulings • Loopholes in campaign finance rules have allowed Super PACs to flourish • Campaigning is also carried out by interest groups and lobbyists- as long as they campaign indirectly, they are less regulated by campaign finance rules • The need for extensive finance for elections means that members of Congress may focus on fund-raising more than the needs of their constituents <p>Disagreement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incumbency is also a significant problem • Two-party system is also a major problem that limits democracy within the electoral system • Electoral College is also a major problem as it means the executive is not directly elected • Campaign finance reform has succeeded within the confines of the Constitution, and so allows the necessary finance to allow elections to operate • The electoral system of First-Past-the-Post itself produces unrepresentative results <p>This is a very broad question, with a wide range of possible areas to focus on for 'disagreement'. Other valid points should be credited accordingly e.g. voter registration, gerrymandering etc.</p> <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This means there is a lack of will to carry out serious campaign finance reform, and so this is unlikely to become a political priority (AO2) Therefore elections at all levels will continue to become more expensive, so excluding many people and smaller parties from being able to participate/succeed, which is a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3) • Legislation has been introduced to attempt to limit how much money is spent/raised and how this is done, but judicial challenges have overturned - some rules on the basis of protecting the First Amendment (AO2) This has made further attempts to reform campaign finance rules unlikely, as it appears that the right to raise money/campaign for individuals/parties is constitutionally protected, and politicians may be reluctant to enter into potential conflict with the Supreme Court, which is a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)

- This means that problems with campaign finance that appeared to have been tackled have continued, and in fact worsened with the growth of, and candidate reliance on Super PACs (AO2) Therefore this has allowed wealthy individuals and corporations/groups to continue to dominate the US electoral system despite attempts to limit this, which is a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)
- Arguably, campaigning is dominated by such groups who have access to more funding and organisational resources than individuals that allow them to campaign for individual candidates/parties (AO2) Therefore the rules have failed to tackle the problems of increasingly expensive elections and domination by wealth, which is a problem with the electoral system (AO3)
- This is particularly true of the House of Representatives, where short terms of office mean they have only 2 years to fund and run the next election campaign (AO2) which may give campaign finance more importance in determining their political priorities, a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)

Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when disagreeing with the view:

- This is particularly true in Congressional elections, where states cannot have term limits in place for members of Congress, and so some members of Congress are re-elected because of name familiarity and their electoral record (AO2) Therefore the ability of new candidates to succeed is limited in states where there is an incumbent, consequently restricting the democratic nature of the US system, which is a more significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)
- This is because FPTP encourages the domination of the two major parties at all levels of local, state and national government (AO2) Therefore third parties find it much more difficult to get elected at all levels of government, which is a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)
- The indirect nature of this system means that presidential candidates must campaign on an individual state basis rather than a national level, so may focus on winning certain key states to the detriment of other, smaller states (AO2) Therefore this system gives disproportionate influence to certain states, and can under certain circumstances give undue power and influence to the electoral college delegates, which is a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)
- Without the ability to raise large sums of money from individual or organisations, candidates would find it impossible to campaign effectively in modern elections (AO2) Therefore having limited campaign finance rules is a necessary evil in a modern society, which is a significant problem with the electoral system (AO3)
- FPTP encourages the two-party system, and makes it much harder for minority parties or independents to achieve electoral success, especially on a federal level (AO2) which makes it a more significant problem than campaign finance because it limits potential representation so much (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.