



ASSESSMENT and
QUALIFICATIONS
ALLIANCE

Mark scheme January 2003

GCE

Government and Politics

Unit GOV5

Copyright © 2003 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334
Registered address: Addleshaw Booth & Co., Sovereign House, PO Box 8, Sovereign Street, Leeds LS1 1HQ
Kathleen Tattersall: *Director General*

www.theallpapers.com

Unit 5: The Politics of the USA

Criteria for marking

Introduction

The AQA's revised Government and Politics specification has been designed to be objectives-led in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the specification. The assessment objectives for A Level and AS are the same, the weightings are different. Details of the weightings are given in paragraphs 7.2 and 8.4 of the specification.

The schemes of marking reflect these objectives. The mark scheme which follows is of the *levels of response* type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of the skills required in the context of their knowledge and understanding of Government and Politics. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for examiners but they cannot cover all eventualities. Candidates should be given credit for partially complete answers. Where appropriate, candidates should be given credit for referring to recent and contemporary developments in Government and Politics.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other options.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the general principals of the mark scheme as contained in the Assessment Matrix.

Using a levels of response mark scheme

Good examining is about the **consistent** application of judgement. Mark schemes provide a framework within which examiners exercise their judgement. This is especially so in subjects like Government and Politics which in part rely upon analysis, evaluation, argument and explanation. With this in mind, examiners should use the Assessment Matrix alongside the detailed mark scheme for each question. The Assessment Matrix provides a framework ensuring a consistent, generic, source from which the detailed mark schemes are derived. This supporting framework ensures a consistent approach within which candidates' responses are marked according to the level of demand and context of each question.

One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is what precise mark should be given within a level. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think first of the mid-range within the level, where that level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates' responses to the same question might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making decisions away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves questions relating to candidate attainment, including the quality of language. The more positive the answers, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid "bunching" of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided. A candidate's script should be considered by asking "Is it:-

precise in its use of factual information?

appropriately detailed?

factually accurate?

appropriately balanced or markedly better in some areas than others?

generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded)?

well presented as to general quality of language?"

The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do.

Assessment matrix

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 4	Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationship between them, producing answers which fully address the requirements of the question and demonstrate excellent contextual awareness. They produce answers which include detailed and comprehensive interpretations or explanations, and provide accurate evidence and up-to-date examples to substantiate and illustrate points made.	Candidates confidently apply a wide range of well developed concepts and theories, using appropriate political vocabulary, to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct cogent and coherent arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display a sophisticated awareness of differing viewpoints and a clear recognition of issues. Parallels and connections are identified together with well developed comparisons. There is a clear and full evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion which flows from the discussion.
Level 3	Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of political institutions and processes and the relationships between them producing answers with a clear attempt at addressing the requirements of the question and demonstrating sound contextual awareness. They produce answers which include developed and effective interpretations or explanations and provide clear evidence backed up by good examples to illustrate points made.	Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories, using political vocabulary to analyse and synthesise political information and to construct clear arguments and explanations. Candidates provide analyses which display an awareness of differing viewpoints and a recognition of issues. There is a clear recognition of parallels and connections together with some comparisons. There is good evaluation of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments and explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Level 2	Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of political institutions and processes and some awareness of the relationships between them producing answers with a limited attempt at addressing the requirements of the question. They may demonstrate contextual awareness covering part of the question. They produce answers which include a partial but reasonably effective attempt at interpretation or explanation with some not very detailed examples to illustrate points.	Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider political information and begin to construct arguments and explanations. Candidates offer limited analysis which shows some awareness of differing viewpoints. There is a recognition of basic parallels and connections together with limited comparisons. There is a simple attempt to evaluate political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations.	Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straight-forward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
Level 1	Candidates demonstrate a slight and incomplete knowledge of political institutions and processes and limited awareness of the relationships between them, with very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. Only superficial awareness of the content of the question with little interpretation and few examples often inaccurately reported or inappropriately used.	Discussions are supported by few if any concepts and theories. Arguments and explanations will be sparse and incomplete. Analyses will show little awareness of differing view points and very few parallels and connections will be used to establish comparisons. Evaluations of political institutions, processes, behaviour, arguments or explanations will be superficial and naive.	Answers rely upon narrative which is not fully coherent, conclusions will frequently not be adequately related to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(a) 8 marks	Levels 3-4 (2 marks) Candidates demonstrate a clear understanding of the difference between referendums and initiatives as used in several American states. They will demonstrate this in terms of differences in the initiation of the question put to the electorate and the source of the question.	Levels 3-4 (3-4 marks) Candidates apply an appropriate range of concepts and or theories to analyse the differences between initiatives and referendums although both are examples of direct democracy in action with one being a bottom-up process and the other top-down. The origin of initiatives through petitions will be outlined and the role of the state legislatures will be indicated in referendums. The processes involved will vary with the states because of the federal system.	Levels 3-4 (2 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions with a clear sense of direction ending with a conclusion, which flows from or is linked to the discussion.
	Levels 1-2 (1 mark) Candidates demonstrate only an outline understanding of the terms and may not make clear the difference between them.	Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) Candidates apply a limited range of concepts to explain the terms with the answer being largely descriptive of the processes with perhaps a stronger focus on one term to the exclusion of the other. There is likely to be no reference to the concept of direct democracy and/or no reference to the importance of constitutionally recognised petitions.	Levels 1-2 (1 mark) Candidates communicate arguments adequately, with a straightforward explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its link with the discussion may be only modest or implicit.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(b) 12 marks	Level 4 (5-6 marks) Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the growth of the use of initiatives and referendums, some of which are contained in the extract. These include the growth of divisive issues, the weaknesses of state legislatures and the growth of technology enabling them to be more easily held. At this level candidates must be able to focus clearly on the reasons for growth and the answer should not stray into arguments more relevant to section c. The answer will be backed up by evidence and examples from recent US elections.	Level 4 (4 marks) Candidates apply concepts and theories to analyse the reasons for the growth of initiatives and referendums in certain states of the USA using the extract and their own knowledge of direct democracy. Reference may be made to arguments concerning popular sovereignty, distrust of government, the gridlock of state legislatures, populism or the increasing involvement of pressure groups in the process. The answer is likely to be backed by evidence and examples from the USA.	Levels 3-4 (2 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions with a clear sense of direction ending with a conclusion, which flows from or is linked to the discussion.
	Level 3 (3-4 marks) Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of some of the reasons for growth but their answer will not contain the depth of knowledge or the insights of a level 4 answer. The answer may not go beyond the evidence in the extract and may lack the precise focus of a level 4 answer.	Level 3 (3 marks) Candidates apply a range of concepts and theories to analyse the growth of direct democracy with a good use of the evidence from the extract. There will be less use of examples and evidence to back up the analysis and some evidence may be ignored from the extract or undeveloped.	See level above.
	Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) Candidates demonstrate a limited knowledge of the reasons for growth and their answer may not even utilise the evidence given in the extract. The answer lacks any focus.	Levels 1-2 (1-2 marks) Candidates apply limited concepts and theories with little or no focus on the reasons for the growth of referendums and initiatives. They do not fully utilise the evidence presented in the extract or perhaps ignore it altogether.	Levels 1-2 (1 mark) Candidates communicate arguments adequately, with a straightforward explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its link with the discussion may be only modest or implicit.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) 20 marks	Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate very high levels of knowledge and understanding of the debate surrounding the value of direct as opposed to indirect or representative democracy. In evaluating the case FOR the use of referendums and initiatives they will point to the arguments put by those who see the advantages of decision making by the people on issues which directly concern them. They may also refer to some of the disadvantages of decision making by elected representatives in state legislatures. In evaluating the case AGAINST referendums they are likely to identify the opposite arguments by criticising the closer involvement of the people in decisions where short term interests may prevail, and defending decision-making by elected representatives, after informed debate and using their judgement (Burkeian representation). The arguments are wide but at this level the arguments on both sides are addressed and evaluated using a wide range of evidence and examples.	Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates confidently apply a wide and comprehensive range of theories and concepts to analyse the case both FOR and AGAINST the use of direct democracy in the USA. They are aware of the arguments in support of direct democracy relating to popular sovereignty and populism, which in turn relate to the shortcoming of representative democracy. They are likely to refer to such things as crude majority rule, low voter turnout, legislative gridlock and recognise that there are very strong arguments to be identified on both sides of the argument. Examples will be given of both advantages and disadvantages by reference to specific referendums and initiatives that have caused controversy such as proposition 9 in California in 1978 or Big Green in 1992. There is likely to be reference to the role of powerful pressure groups in the initiative process which may be part of the critique, as would the unequal resources of the competing sides in the process. Reference may also be made to the importance of long term versus short term interests, and the personal interests of the voters compared to the interests of the wider community. There will be a clear focus to the answer and both sides of the argument will be addressed.	Level 4 (4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) (cont)	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates display sound knowledge and understanding of the debate surrounding decision-making in the USA and whether it should be done by elected representatives or by the people themselves. Their answer will lack some of the insights and evidence of a level 4 answer and the answer may be more focussed on one set of arguments to the exclusion of the other side. However, strong arguments will be presented backed up by relevant evidence and examples from US states.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates are able to apply a wide range of theories and concepts to analyse and evaluate the arguments both for and against the use of direct democracy in certain states of the USA. Their answer may not contain the breadth and depth of argument contained in a level 4 answer, but will cover many arguments that will support their use or deny that they are important or useful. Level 3 answer will be more unbalanced than a level 4 answer, with perhaps more attention being paid to one side of the argument to the exclusion of the other. Evidence and examples may be less widespread, and arguments may not always be backed up by reference to specific results of specific referendums or initiatives.</p>	<p>Level 3 (3 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 1(c) (cont)	Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates display an outline knowledge and understanding of the debate surrounding the use of referendums and initiatives in the USA, but only produce a limited understanding of the arguments, and at the same time the arguments may be more one-sided and ignore either the case for or the case against. There is a more limited awareness of the use of referendums in practice and there are few examples and specific evidence is not provided.	Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates use a more limited range of concepts and theories to analyse and evaluate the use of referendums and initiatives in the USA. The answer may be more descriptive of the referendum and initiative process, and fail to achieve focus on the demands of the question. One side of the argument may be more neglected and there is little attempt at evaluation of their use. Examples and evidence may be lacking and the arguments are not supported by their use.	Level 2 (2 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
	Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates display only slight knowledge of the debate on the use of referendums and initiatives with only a very limited attempt to address the requirements of the question. There is only a very superficial response and few if any examples are given.	Level 1 (1-2 marks) Candidates analysis of the use of referendums and initiatives is simple and superficial with little or no attempt to address the requirements of the question. The response is merely descriptive with no examples or evidence introduced.	Level 1 (1 mark) Answers rely on narrative which is not wholly coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 40 marks	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates demonstrate a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the dominance of the two parties in the USA and the reasons for the difficulties faced by third parties in making an electoral breakthrough. There are several ways of approaching the question and it is possible that some candidates may wish to challenge the main thrust of the question perhaps by arguing that some third parties such as Perot's Reform Party or Nader's Green Party did in fact achieve some break through in elections. Candidates may display understanding through a discussion of the strength of the two parties such as in finance, ideology, or the party identification of voters or through an identification of the weakness of third parties such as the lack of issue space or the workings of the electoral college. The broad nature of the question means that candidates may achieve high marks through different routes.</p> <p>At this level the answers will contain strong evidence and examples to back up the arguments regarding the dominance within the political system of the Republican and Democratic parties.</p>	<p>Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates confidently apply a range of political concepts and theories relating to the reasons for the dominance of the political system in the USA by only two political parties despite the diversity of the country. Their analysis and evaluation may be based on several areas of explanation which will be wide-ranging and involve the electoral system, voting behaviour, party alignment, electoral finance plus many other factors which may be used to explain the paradox. At this level candidates may challenge the note of "electoral breakthrough" and suggest that the 3% of the vote gained by Nader in 2000 did in fact constitute this. Level 4 answers would be likely to analyse and evaluate the reasons for the weakness of third parties for example in trying to locate issue areas not already covered by the highly pragmatic and centrist democrats and republicans in order to gain votes.</p> <p>At this level there is clear and full evaluation of the quotation, and the answer to the question is precisely focussed.</p>	<p>Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 (cont)	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates demonstrate a sound K and U of the reasons for the dominance of the Democrat and Republican parties in the USA, and the weaknesses of and difficulties faced by third parties in the USA, and the weakness of and difficulties faced by third parties. They are likely to lack the insights of a level 4 answer and the answer may be more unbalanced perhaps concentrating on the factors that have led to the strength of the two main parties with little reference to third parties or vice-versa. There is a clear attempt to address the requirements of the question, but there will be less focus than that found in level 4 and there will be less examples and precise evidence used to back up the arguments made.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates apply a wide range of concepts and theories to analyse and evaluate the arguments used to explain the reasons for the dominance of the two major parties in the highly diverse USA. They are able to evaluate several explanations for dominance but the answer will lack the precise focus of a level 4 answer, and may be stronger on the two major parties and less evaluative of the weakness of third parties. The answer may also lack the range of evidence and examples presented for a level 4 response.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 2 (cont)	Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of some of the reasons for the dominance of the two main parties in the USA and the difficulties faced by third parties in making electoral breakthroughs. Their answer may be more descriptive of the parties and there will be less focus on the precise demands of the question. Evidence of domination may be lacking, and there will be little attempt to challenge the thrust of the quotation, with few examples introduced into the answer.	Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to analyse and evaluate the reasons for two party dominance and the difficulties faced by third parties in making an electoral breakthrough in the USA. The answer will be more descriptive of the parties rather than an analysis of the dominance and weakness. There will be no challenge to the thrust of the quotation. The answer will be more unbalanced and the evidence and examples will be much more limited.	Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
	Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates show little knowledge and understanding of the reasons for two party dominance in the USA and their answer makes little attempt to address the requirements of the question. The answer is likely to be descriptive of two party dominance rather than explanatory, and there is only superficial and simple evidence presented.	Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates answer is not supported by concepts or theories and makes little attempt to address the requirements of the question. There are no explanations given and few if any examples or evidence will be presented. Any evaluation will be superficial and simple.	Level 1 (1-2 marks) Answers rely on narrative which is not wholly coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 40 marks	Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates demonstrate very high levels of knowledge and understanding of the factors that contribute to the success of pressure groups in the US political system. Level 4 answers will focus clearly on the methods and tactics used by pressure groups in their varying activities and the reasons why some groups may be successful and others not. They will be aware of different types of pressure group (single issue, corporate, professional, cause) and the ways in which some of these groups will be powerful and influential and gain access to the political system, whereas some will not. This will involve knowledge of the access points of the system, particularly the federal government in Washington. Evidence and examples will be given to illustrate the varying levels of success such as membership, finance through political action committees, insider or outsider status. It will be recognised that some groups have little difficulty in gaining access to Congress (indicating the reasons why) or the Courts, whilst other groups do not gain access. Candidates may approach this question from different angles, but at this level will be aware of many of the key variables in explaining success or the	Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates apply a comprehensive range of developed political concepts and theories related to the nature of pressure group influence and power. They are able to analyse and evaluate the factors that will lead to success or the lack of it within the political system, and will select evidence and examples to back up their analysis. They will refer to the importance of level of success and recognise that this will depend on numerous factors which will be identified. Examples will be identified which will identify successful groups in various policy areas such as the NRA and gun reform, or the various corporate lobbies and use them to illustrate their answer. Groups which represent other interests are less likely to achieve success and these will also be identified. Analysis and evaluation is thorough and backed up by strong evidence.	Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 (cont)	Level 4 (cont) lack of it. Answers will be fully illustrated with evidence and examples to back up arguments.		
	Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates display sound knowledge and understanding of the variable nature of pressure group success in the US political system and offer explanations for the differences, and the reasons why some groups are more successful than other in influencing those in power. Their answer will be supported by evidence of pressure group success (or failure) but will lack the insights and the precise focus of a level 4 answer. There may be more general discussion of pressure group power rather than an assessment of factors influencing success. There may be fewer examples and evidence given and these may not be fully focussed on the demands of the question.	Level 3 (9-12 marks) Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories from pressure group studies to analyse and evaluate pressure groups success or lack of it. Clear arguments will be constructed around the variable factors and although the analysis will not be as clear as that of a level 4 answer and will contain less evidence and examples there is still a focus on the question and its demands. The answer may lack the insights of a level 4 answer and be weaker on the evaluation of the various factors involved.	Level 3 (5-6 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 3 (cont)	Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of the factors influencing pressure group success (or the lack of it), but will be much less focused and perhaps present more general debate on pressure groups rather than why some are more successful than others. There is only a limited awareness of the reasons for the power of some groups and the weakness of others, and few examples are offered to support the arguments.	Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates use a limited range of concepts and theories to consider the variable factors involved in pressure group success in the American political system, but the focus of the answer may be more descriptive of pressure groups generally without a strong focus on the precise demands of the question. Candidates at this level may not go beyond describing what pressure groups do and be unable to give the examples and evidence needed for the analysis of the factors which lead to success, and what is meant by success.	Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.
	Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates display a slight and very general knowledge of American pressure groups and fail to address the requirements of the question. There is only superficial awareness of methods and tactics and no examples or evidence are presented in the answer.	Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates' discussion of pressure groups is not supported by any concepts or theories and fails to address the precise requirements of the question. The response is at a simple descriptive level and is superficial and fails to analyse or evaluate factors involved in pressure group success.	Level 1 (1-2 marks) Answers rely on narrative which is not wholly coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 40 marks	Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates demonstrate comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the reasons for the very low levels of political participation in the American electoral system. They recognise the implications of the term “electoral process” and see that this can refer to many kinds of elections in the USA from primaries through to the presidential elections. The key question is why and at this level candidates will be able to offer a variety of explanations ranging from the electoral system itself through to the nature of the parties and the choices on offer. They will be able to present information from numerous election studies that offer explanations for the very low level of voter turnout and the varied nature of these explanations through from satisfaction with the system to alienation from the system. Candidates should also be aware of the greater difficulties of registration in the USA and the federal system, but also the paradox that US political culture tends towards the participatory compared to the UK for example. At this level there will be much evidence relating to turnout and participation and examples from recent elections.	Level 4 (13-16 marks) Candidates confidently apply a range of concepts and theories from well established studies which analyse and evaluate the reasons for the low turnout in the USA in a number of different electoral contests (where the turnout fluctuates). They are aware of the paradox of the world’s oldest democracy having almost the lowest turnout at election. They refer to concepts such as “voter fatigue”, “democratic overload” the impact of bland middle ground parties, decline in levels of party identification and such things as the “electoral college effect” at presidential elections. They may also refer to the negative and spin doctored American election campaigns and refer to the effects of “different abstention”. Level 4 answers show awareness of a number of different variables at work and there is a clear and full evaluation of them backed up by appropriate examples and evidence.	Level 4 (7-8 marks) Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions with clarity and produce answers with a clear sense of direction culminating in a conclusion, which flows from the discussion.

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 (cont)	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</p> <p>Candidates demonstrate sound knowledge of the extent to which turnout for various elections are low in the USA and can offer several explanations for this fact. The arguments and evidence is likely to be less extensive and wide-ranging and may concentrate on one or two explanations rather than several. The explanations may also lack the depth of level 4 answers and also many of the insights of a level 4 answer. The answer may concentrate only on presidential elections ignoring the primary contests and the mid-terms when other factors come into play. Examples will be fewer and evidence less impressive.</p>	<p>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</p> <p>Candidates apply a range of developed concepts and theories to analyse and evaluate the causes for the greater levels of abstention in American elections. Their answer may only identify a few variables but discuss these in depth, or there may be a range of factors identified without much discussion of these. At this level candidates may not have the range of knowledge of level 4 answers, and may fail to identify the differential turnout in different kinds of elections. Evidence may be less wide-ranging and some of the more analytical explanations may not be covered.</p>	<p>Level 3 (5-6 marks)</p> <p>Candidates communicate arguments, explanations and conclusions well and produce answers with a conclusion clearly linked to the preceding discussion.</p>

	Knowledge and Understanding	Skills	Communication
	AO1	AO2	AO3
Question 4 (cont)	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates demonstrate an outline knowledge of the variable factors involved in explaining low turnout in the USA, and will present limited evidence and explanations for its causes. Explanations will not reach the depth of level 3 or 4 answers and may be rather generalised rather than focused on research studies and the evidence found in them. There is a partial attempt to answer the question, and some attempt at explanation but the evidence is limited and there is little evidence used or examples to back up the arguments.</p>	<p>Level 2 (5-8 marks) Candidates use a limited range of theories and concepts to analyse and evaluate the explanations for low turnout in the USA. There is some attempt to offer some analysis but this will not be wide-ranging and will tend to stick to the more obvious explanations such as political disillusionment, or difficulties of registration. There will be little attempt to analyse and the party or electoral systems themselves or pursue the explanations for the lower turnout in lower socio-economic groups for example. Examples and evidence will be lacking to back up the analysis and evaluation.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3-4 marks) Candidates communicate arguments and conclusions adequately with straightforward narrative and/or explanation. A conclusion may be offered but its relationship to the preceding discussion may be modest or implicit.</p>
	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates knowledge of the factors involved in explaining low turnout in the USA is superficial and limited to a few highly generalised factors. No evidence is presented and no examples are incorporated into the answer.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-4 marks) Candidates discussion of the reasons for abstention are not supported by any theories or concepts and the answer contains little, if any, analysis and evaluation. The answer tends to the descriptive and superficial and there are few examples and no evidence presented.</p>	<p>Level 1 (1-2 marks) Answers rely on narrative which is not wholly coherent. Conclusions are frequently not adequately related to the preceding discussion.</p>