



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2023**

**A LEVEL  
GOVERNMENT & POLITICS – UNIT 4  
1160U40-1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2023 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 GOVERNMENT & POLITICS**  
**UNIT 4 - GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE USA**  
**SUMMER 2023 MARK SCHEME**

**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

Explain the importance of national nominating conventions in US presidential 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 assess the influence of national nominating conventions on US presidential elections. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the influence of national nominating conventions on the election of the President.

The response might consider issues such as:

- Promoting party unity to the general public after a potentially divisive primary election campaign, e.g. Sanders supporting Clinton in 2016.
- Conventions can be a way of revealing and exposing disunity within a party, e.g. Cruz's speech at Republican Convention where he did not directly endorse Trump. Divided parties often struggle in elections.
- Enthusing ordinary voters to support a candidacy.
- The nominees' acceptance speeches on the final night of the convention are an opportunity for each candidate to communicate directly with voters, set the tone of the forthcoming campaign and offer their visions of America.
- Enthusing the party faithful in order to ensure a motivated, enthusiastic and committed support network for the candidates during the election campaign, e.g. Bill Clinton's speech in 2012 supporting Obama, Michelle Obama's in 2016 supporting Hillary Clinton.
- Discussion around the 'post-convention bounce' as a means of assessing the impact of the conventions. The 'bounce' registers the increased performance of a candidate in opinion polls as a consequence of the convention.
- Convention can act as a 'kickstart' to the campaign and offer some momentum to a candidate.
- Conventions as having potentially less impact in recent times due to reduced television scheduling.
- Primaries and caucuses have already determined the nominee.
- 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 impact of national conventions on US 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>	<b>10-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough application of political knowledge of the impact of national conventions on US presidential 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 impact of national conventions on US 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>	<b>7-9</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reasonable application of political knowledge of the impact of national conventions on US presidential 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 impact of national conventions on US 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>	<b>4-6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate application of political knowledge of the impact of national conventions on US presidential 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 impact of national conventions on US presidential 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 the impact of national conventions on US presidential 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.		

## Question 2

Illustrate with examples how the principles found within the Declaration of Independence are expressed in the US Constitution. [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 assess the influence of the principles of the Declaration of Independence on the US Constitution. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on how the principles underpinning the Declaration of Independence are to be found in the US Constitution.

The response might consider issues such as:

- Rights of citizens – Declaration of Independence speaks of ‘unalienable rights’. The Bill of Rights attempts to reinforce this idea of citizens’ rights within the Constitution.
- Sovereignty of the people – governments derive their authority from the people and the people can remove governments they deem to be unjust, ‘the consent of the governed’. This principle is reflected partially in Article 1, Section 3 of the Constitution which outlines the impeachment process.
- Sovereignty of the states is a key principle of Declaration of Independence, ‘free and independent states’, and the principle of federalism is found in many parts of the Constitution; enumerated powers of Congress and Executive, 10<sup>th</sup> Amendment, electoral college.
- Limited government is linked to federalism and the US Constitution ensures this through checks and balances, separation of powers.
- ‘Government instituted amongst men’, ‘all men are created equal’. These ideas of democracy and Republicanism expressed in the Declaration of Independence are reflected in the US Constitution’s establishment of a Republican form of government, (Article 4, Section 4) and in the first 52 words that commence ‘We, the people.’
- 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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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 principles of DOI influenced the US Constitution.</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

Evaluate the significance of third parties and independent candidates in US politics. [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 independent candidates and third parties candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse their significance on US politics. 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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.

The response might consider issues such as:

#### Arguments for:

- Third party candidates have played a significant role in the result of US presidential election; Perot 1992 won 19% of the vote, Nader in 2000 contributed to Gore's defeat.
- Third parties have the potential to influence the political debate; Perot's focus on the federal budget deficit was adopted by President Clinton and congressional Republicans.
- The experience of 2016 with national candidates such as Gary Johnson (Libertarian Party) appearing on the ballot in all 50 states, Jill Stein (Green Party) appearing on the ballot in 44 for permanent third parties.
- Some third parties are ideological and issue based and have aims beyond electoral success; Socialist Party, Libertarian Party, Green Party, Prohibition Party.
- Third parties on an individual state level have a greater influence than on a national level. Individual candidates such as Evan McMullin (Utah) 2016 – 21% of the vote.
- Any other relevant information.

#### Arguments against:

- America has a two-party system that is well-established and historically undeniable. The two major parties dominate Presidential, Congressional and state elections leaving little scope for third parties and independent candidates.
- Combined popular vote of Third Parties in 2012 was less than 2%. In 2016 it was 6%.
- Third parties face many challenges around the voting system, media coverage, lack of resources, ballot-access laws, co-optation that hinder their potential significance.
- Increased polarisation in US politics is an opportunity for third party and independent candidates that has not been taken, e.g. Bloomberg's touted run in 2016 had both Trump and Sanders won their parties' nominations.
- 2016 – Trump/Sanders – chose to run for major party endorsement despite being from outside that parties' traditions.
- Any other relevant information.

Band	Marks	AO1	Marks	AO3
4	7-8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thorough knowledge and understanding of significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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 significance of third parties and independent candidates.</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

'The US Supreme Court is becoming an increasingly political institution.' Discuss. [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 US Supreme Court, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the extent the US Supreme Court has become politicised through its quasi-legislative powers. 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 extent the Supreme Court has become politicised due to its perceived legislative powers. The response might consider issues such as:

#### **Arguments for:**

- Quasi-legislative effect of its decisions.
- Supreme Court makes landmark decisions on policy areas that divide the two main parties, e.g. abortion, election finance, gun control, and is therefore inevitably political.
- Appointments process – highly politicised from the nomination by the President to the confirmation (or not) by the Senate. Recent experiences of Garland and Kavanaugh herald the hyper-partisanship connected to the appointments process and how this influences the perception of the Court.
- Senate confirmation votes are increasingly influenced by party politics.
- Judicial activism and loose constructionalism.
- Supreme Court's willingness to use the power of Judicial Review in its relationship with the other branches of the federal government.
- An assessment of the number of 5-4 votes within the Supreme Court that demonstrate the ideological voting pattern of the institution on certain issues.
- Any other relevant information.

#### **Arguments against:**

- Supreme Court as a legal institution first and foremost.
- The independence of the Supreme Court and the measures in place to ensure that independence; life tenure, independent salaries.
- Supreme Court decision that show its members deciding against the President who nominated them e.g. NLRB v Noel Canning when Sotomayor and Kagan (Obama nominees) both decided that Obama had exceeded his powers in making recess appointments. Ginsburg and Breyer (Clinton nominees) voted against the President in Clinton v Jones 1997.
- Judicial restraint and an emphasis on stare decisis.
- Strict constructionalism and the importance of the actual text of the US Constitution.
- An assessment of the Court's ability to offer unanimous decisions and thus indicate its legal uniformity.
- 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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></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 the extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 extent to which the SC has been politicised.</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 5

Discuss the view that the Executive Office of the President has greater power and influence over the US President than the Cabinet. [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 US Presidency, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the comparative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the US President. 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 extent of the influence that both institutions exert over the Presidency. The response might consider issues such as:

#### Arguments for:

- Proximity is power – members of EXOP have greater access to the President on a daily basis and have no divided loyalties as members of the Cabinet may potentially have (Congress, pressure groups), e.g. within the Trump White House some advisers and members of EXOP have daily and unfettered access to the President.
- Cabinet meetings are relatively rare and, according to the US Constitution, all executive power is granted to the President.
- Role of White House Chief of Staff and its influence over the President and the Cabinet, e.g. Rahm Emanuel insisting that every Cabinet member send him weekly reports on their departments, attempt of John Kelly to bring order to Trump's White House.
- Central role of some departments within EXOP, e.g. the Office of Management and Budget in formulating the budget, the National Security Council in foreign, security and defense policy.
- Obama's use of policy czars to develop policies and thus diluting the authority of Cabinet officials.
- Any other relevant information.

#### Arguments against:

- Cabinet maintains important functions for the President; exchanging information, some policy debate, developing team spirit, discussing 'big-picture issues.'
- Cabinet provides something of a protection for the US President.
- All Cabinet members are the heads of executive departments with large budgets.
- Individual Cabinet members have proven to have great importance in recent times to various Presidents; Obama - Clinton (Secretary of State), Timothy Geithner (Treasury), Trump - Mike Pompeo (State).
- Members of Cabinet are often policy specialists and in 2017 Trump persuaded some incumbent members of Congress to join his Cabinet, e.g. Jeff Sessions.
- 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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</li> <li>• Adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments.</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></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 the relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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 relative influence of EXOP and the Cabinet over the President.</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

Discuss where power lies within twenty-first century American politics.

[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 discussing this viewpoint in this extended piece of writing, candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate where power lies in twenty first century America 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 the concept of power and to assess contemporary American political life in order to determine where power lies. The response might consider issues such as:

- The principle of popular sovereignty gives power to American citizens enabling them, through a vast range of elections, to choose their elected representatives.
- American citizens also retain power through having their rights well-protected in the Bill of Rights.
- The status of the US Constitution as fundamental law enables an argument that it is the decisive and most powerful force in America political life.
- The principle of federalism allows an argument regarding the power retained and exercised by the 50 states.
- The propensity of the three branches of the federal government to exercise and retain political power, e.g. President in foreign affairs, Congressional ability to act beyond constitutional restraint, Supreme Court and its power of judicial review.
- The propensity of the three branches of the federal government to nullify the power of the other branches of government; checks and balances, gridlock, separation of powers.
- The increasing role and power of money in US political life.
- The power exercised by the developing US media.
- The power of the two main political parties and the dominance of the two-party system in American political life.
- 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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</li> <li>Thorough interpretation of political information.</li> <li>Thorough explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>	11-14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thorough analysis and evaluation of where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 where power lies in twenty first century America.</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 the power of where power lies in twenty first century America.</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	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge and understanding of where power lies in twenty first century America.</li> <li>Evidence/examples used are not made relevant.</li> <li>Very little use of terminology.</li> </ul>	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited application of where power lies in twenty first century America.</li> <li>Limited interpretation of political information.</li> <li>Limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul>	1-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited analysis and evaluation of the power of where power lies in twenty first century America.</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.				