

**A-level**  
**POLITICS**  
**7152/2**

Paper 2 Government and politics of the USA and comparative politics

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2024

---

Version: 1.0 Final



Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

## Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

### Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

### Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

## Section A

### Levels of response mark scheme for 9-mark questions

- 0 1** Explain and analyse three factors that can influence the outcome of a presidential election. **[9 marks]**
- 0 2** Explain and analyse three functions of the US Congress. **[9 marks]**
- 0 3** Explain and analyse three ways that structural theory could be used to study how civil liberties and rights are protected in the US and UK. **[9 marks]**

### Target AO1: 6 marks, AO2: 3 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed knowledge of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes is demonstrated and appropriate political vocabulary is used (AO1).</li> <li>Thorough explanations and appropriate selection of accurate supporting examples demonstrate detailed understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis of three clear points is structured, clearly focused on the question and confidently developed into a coherent answer (AO2).</li> </ul>
2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally sound knowledge of political concepts, institutions and processes is demonstrated and generally appropriate political vocabulary is used (AO1).</li> <li>Some development of explanations and generally appropriate selection of supporting examples demonstrate generally accurate understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, though further detail may be required in places and some inaccuracies may be present (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis is developed in most places, though some points may be descriptive or in need of further development. Answers, for the most part, are clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material (AO2).</li> </ul> <p>Students who only make two relevant points will be limited to this level.</p>
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Limited knowledge of political concepts, institutions and processes is demonstrated and little or no appropriate political vocabulary is used (AO1).</li> <li>Limited development of explanations and selection of supporting examples demonstrate limited understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with further detail required and inaccuracies present throughout (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis takes the form of description for the most part. Coherence and structure are limited (AO2).</li> </ul> <p>Students who only make one relevant point will be limited to this level.</p>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nothing worthy of credit.</li> </ul>

0	1
---	---

Explain and analyse three factors that can influence the outcome of a presidential election.

[9 marks]

### Indicative content

In their explanations and analysis, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- explanation and analysis of the importance of raising money. Presidential candidates need to raise large sums of money to fund advertising and airtime as well as being able to campaign in key swing states. Students are likely to argue that while money cannot buy outcomes (eg Clinton in 2016), it helps a candidate make a strong attempt to win
- explanation and analysis of the impact that third party and independent candidates can have on the overall result of a presidential election, students may refer to elections such as 1968, 1992 or 2000
- explanation and analysis of the role of the media and the importance of the televised debates. The media and campaign ads are an important part of presidential elections when trying to project a positive image of a candidate. Students may refer to a number of 'attack ads' from previous elections such as LBJ's 'Daisy girl' ad from 1964. Students may refer to the fact that televised debates between candidates are long established and performing well or competently can help a candidate. Some responses may argue that social media has become more important than the traditional debates, citing the fact that Trump in 2020 had 42 million Twitter followers
- explanation and analysis of issues and policies such as the economy. Responses may refer to James Carville, Bill Clinton's campaign strategist in 1992, who noted "It's the economy, stupid". Students may also refer to the so-called 'October surprise' such as the two from 2016 involving Trump and the 'Access Hollywood' tape and Clinton's FBI inquiry. Students may refer to retrospective voting and how voters respond to changing candidates and issues, examples could include 9/11 and the war on terror in 2004, and/or wedge issues such as abortion and same sex marriage
- explanation and analysis of image, leadership qualities of candidates and incumbency. Since 1945 one-term presidents have been rare (eg Carter, George H.W. Bush and Trump). The nature of the presidential office and the election of a single person encourages a focus on the individual and their own qualities, experience, policies (eg Obama and 'Hope and Change' or Trump's 'Make America Great Again') and campaigns which focused on their personalities and leadership credentials.

Students are required to consider only three factors that can influence the outcome of a presidential election. If a student exceeds this number reward only the best three. However, some may include relevant points not listed above and these should be credited. If a student gives only one or two examples, they will receive a maximum of three and six marks respectively.

0	2
---	---

Explain and analyse three functions of the US Congress.

**[9 marks]****Indicative content**

In their explanations and analysis, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- explanation and analysis of the representative function of Congress. Students may refer to the delegate and trustee models of representation and the different terms of members of the House and Senate. The representational function can be illustrated by the work of members of Congress: being members of relevant standing committees, which often represent the interests or concerns of their states or districts, lobbying on behalf of their constituents, pork barrel politics and ideas that “all politics is local”
- explanation and analysis of the legislative function of Congress. Students may refer to Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution which grants the Congress legislative powers which means Congress can initiate, debate, amend and pass legislation such as the Civil Rights Act 1964, the Voting Rights Act 1965, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act 2010, and the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act 2016. Responses are likely to focus on the work of standing committees (found in both chambers), stressing that these committees are organised along policy-specific lines
- explanation and analysis of the oversight function of Congress. Congress performs oversight of the executive branch (government departments, federal agencies as well as the actions of the president) and students are likely to focus on the fact that congressional oversight is performed via committees, such as the Senate Foreign Relations and the House select committee investigating the January 6 attack on the Capitol building
- explanation and analysis of impeachment. Students are likely to make links between impeachment and constitutional checks and balances and the fact that Congress can impeach members of the other branches of government (eg Clinton and Trump)
- explanation and analysis of the Senate’s exclusive power of advice and consent (eg the ratification of treaties and the confirmation of executive appointments) as an example of one of the constitutional check and balance functions performed by Congress
- explanation and analysis of the power of the purse, and that congressional consent is required for executive budgets and for rises or cuts in federal taxation.

Students are required to consider only three functions of Congress. If a student exceeds this number reward only the best three. However, some may include relevant points not listed above and these should be credited. If a student gives only one or two examples, they will receive a maximum of three and six marks respectively.

**0 3**

Explain and analyse three ways that structural theory could be used to study how civil liberties and rights are protected in the US and UK.

**[9 marks]****Indicative content**

In their explanations and analysis, students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- explanation and analysis of structural theory and how it can be applied to understanding how civil liberties and rights are protected in the US and UK. This approach focuses on the institutions in a political system and the processes within them. It views institutions as structures and places significance on the functions of institutions and the environment in which the structures exist. A structural approach suggests that political outcomes are largely determined by the formal processes laid out within a political system. It also provides a means of recognising differences in constitutional and governmental frameworks of power
- explanation and analysis of what civil rights and liberties are and the fact that in both countries they are expansive and designed to protect individuals from unfair treatment or discrimination. In the UK, there is a focus on common and statute law such as the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 or the Human Rights Act 1998 due to having an uncodified constitution, whereas in the US the focus is on the codified constitution, including the Bill of Rights and amendments. Students are likely to argue that rights and liberties are better protected in the US while in the UK there is a negative rights culture due to the absence of a codified constitution and an absence of entrenched rights
- explanation and analysis of judiciaries in the US and UK in relation to civil rights and liberties. In the US the Supreme Court is co-equal with the other two branches of government. Students are likely to refer to the Court's power of judicial review and the positive rights culture in the US due to entrenched rights, such as the Fourteenth Amendment. Students may refer to landmark Supreme Court cases which have secured the legal rights of, for eg, African Americans and LGBTQ+ Americans. In comparison, structurally in the UK, students may refer to the impact of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005, and the creation of the UK Supreme Court. Students may in addition refer to the sovereignty of Parliament in the UK and the argument that Parliament ultimately decides what civil rights UK citizens have. In terms of UK statutes there is a wide range of examples students may refer to which have sought to protect and extend rights (eg the Sex Discrimination Act 1975 or the Human Rights Act 1998)
- explanation and analysis of the role played by pressure groups in the US and UK in the promotion and protection of rights. Due to the US Constitution a range of access points have been created such as Congress, Supreme Court, and the states themselves. Such access points allow pressure groups to operate at all levels of government and across a range of policy areas eg abortion, gun rights, race, gender and freedom of speech. Students may also refer to the First Amendment of the Constitution regarding interest group activity. In terms of the UK there are fewer access points for groups to use to either defend or promote rights in the UK.

Students are required to consider only three ways that structural theory could be used to study how civil liberties and rights are protected in the US and UK. If a student exceeds this number reward only the best three. However, some may include relevant points not listed above and these should be credited. If a student gives only one or two examples, they will receive a maximum of three and six marks respectively.

## Section B

### Levels of response mark scheme for 25-mark extract-based essay

**0 | 4** Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments in the above extracts for and against the view that initiatives enhance US democracy.

**[25 marks]**

**Target AO1: 5 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 10 marks**

Level	Marks	Descriptors
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis of the extract is balanced and confidently developed (AO2).</li> <li>Comparisons are well explained, are focused on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation of the above leads to well substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives and/or the status of the extract are successfully evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is well organised, coherent and has a sustained analytical focus on the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
4	16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion, though further detail may be required in places (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis of the extract is balanced and developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further (AO2).</li> <li>Comparisons are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation leads to conclusions that show some substantiation and are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives and/or the status of the extract are evaluated in constructing arguments, although in some places there could be further development (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set (AO2).</li> </ul>
3	11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1).</li> <li>Analytical points relating to the extract are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical (AO2).</li> <li>Comparisons are made and may be supported by examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion, but that lack substantiation (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives and/or the status of the extract are commented on in constructing arguments, though evaluation is lacking depth (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set (AO2).</li> </ul>

2	6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though these contain inaccuracies and irrelevant material (AO1).</li> <li>• Analysis of the extract takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are unsupported assertions (AO2).</li> <li>• Comparisons tend to be limited and unsupported by examples (AO2).</li> <li>• Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>• Relevant perspectives are identified and some awareness of the status of the extract is shown in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation will be superficial (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Analysis of the extract takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2).</li> <li>• Comparisons tend to be superficial and undeveloped (AO2).</li> <li>• Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>• Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives and the status of the extract is present (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing worthy of credit.</li> </ul>

**0 4**

Analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments in the above extracts for and against the view that initiatives enhance US democracy.

**[25 marks]****Indicative content**

In the analysis and evaluation of initiatives and the extent to which their use enhances US democracy, as made in the extracts, students should be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of how initiatives work (students may also refer to them as propositions). Initiatives are ‘bottom up’ direct democratic devices initiated by voters themselves and not ‘top-down’ decisions made by elected representatives
- analysis and evaluation of the arguments presented in Extract 2 that initiatives can be seen as highly democratic devices. Students may use the quote taken from President Roosevelt to discuss the argument that initiatives help promote ‘popular sovereignty’
- analysis and evaluation of the democratic benefits of initiatives. Students are likely to argue that initiatives directly involve the voters in decision-making on specific issues and encourage greater participation and involvement, which is good for democracy. Students should analyse the argument made in Extract 2 that “citizens voting in initiatives scored overwhelming victories for popular proposals that had gone nowhere in state legislatures”. Students may argue initiatives remove some of the disadvantages of representative democracy, such as ‘blanket votes’ at elections or the avoidance of politically controversial issues by those seeking election. This argument can be compared to the focus of Extract 1 and the idea that “initiatives encourage voting based on fear”
- analysis and evaluation of the concerns expressed in Extract 2 that initiatives are very democratic devices but they are under attack from Republican “lawmakers” in 24 states and why that matters in terms of the quality of US democracy at state level. This can be contrasted with the view expressed in Extract 1 that initiatives “can be written by anyone and receive a public vote without input from lawmakers”
- analysis and evaluation of criticisms made about initiatives in Extract 1 about the fact “they can be written by anyone” and that they “bypass the normal legislative process”. Students are likely to refer to concerns regarding the methods used to collect the signatures, the often unequal funding of campaigns and the dominance of special interests in the campaigns. These points can be compared to the positive view of initiatives expressed in Extract 2
- analysis and evaluation of the consequences of the initiative process expressed in Extract 1 that some initiatives have discriminated against minorities and they “encourage voting based on fear”. It is likely students will make links to arguments regarding the tyranny of the majority. Students may also refer to the argument that initiatives can promote short-term gain against long-term interest despite the positive examples cited in Extract 2. Students are likely to present evidence and examples of controversial decisions made through the initiative such as Proposition 13 in 1978, the Big Green in 1990 or examples from recent election cycles when US voters approved measures on minimum wage levels, marijuana, sentencing reform, gun control, fracking, and abortion policy
- analysis and evaluation of the arguments about the extent to which initiatives undermine US democracy because they make “citizens trust government less” or if Extract 2 is accurate in stating that initiatives “correct” representative government whenever it becomes “misrepresentative”.

The analysis and evaluation of any political information is affected by:

- who the author is – their position or role
- the type of publication – newspaper, academic journal, electronic media
- the overt or implicit purpose of the author – to inform, persuade or influence

- the relevance of the extract to a political issue or concern, and how representative the extract is of a particular viewpoint.

Students will be expected to address some of these factors in their analysis and evaluation of the extracts:

- evaluation of relevant perspectives within the extracts concerning the extent to which initiatives enhance US democracy. Extract 1 offers a critical analysis of initiatives and is written by two academic experts who have researched the impact of direct democracy for 15 years while Extract 2 is taken from an article promoting the democratic benefits of their use. Students are likely to note *The Guardian* is a centre-left leaning newspaper and the author is a senior fellow with FairVote. Both extracts offer differing views as to the never-ending debate regarding the benefits of direct democracy in the US
- comparisons can be made between the strong criticisms described in Extract 1 of initiatives, including how they undermine the legislative process and scrutiny, pluralism, and trust in government, with Extract 2 which offers a much more positive view of initiatives. Extract 2 suggests initiatives are a means for participation and offer an opportunity for citizens to support laws that neglectful or uninterested politicians will not. Students may make synoptic points regarding the role of pressure groups and the nature of federalism.

Students are required to analyse, evaluate and compare the arguments presented in the extracts. Students who identify which arguments support which of the different views regarding the extent to which initiatives enhance US democracy may be awarded marks for analysis (AO2). To gain marks for evaluation (AO3) students must assess the relative strengths of the differing arguments and whether initiatives do enhance US democracy are more or less convincing. The analysis and evaluation must clearly focus on the arguments presented in the extracts.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points, and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples. Students who fail to focus their discussion on the arguments in the extracts, however complete their answer may otherwise be, cannot achieve above Level 2.

## Section C

### Levels of response mark scheme for 25-mark essay

**0 5** 'The major political parties in the UK are more internally united than those in the US.'  
Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

**0 6** 'Within the executive the US president is able to dominate, whereas the UK prime minister shares power.'  
Analyse and evaluate this statement. **[25 marks]**

### Target AO1: 5 marks, AO2: 10 marks, AO3: 10 marks

Level	Marks	Descriptors
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed and accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis is balanced and confidently developed (AO2).</li> <li>Synoptic links are well explained, are focused on the question and fully supported with relevant and developed examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation leads to well substantiated conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives are successfully evaluated in the process of constructing arguments (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is well organised, coherent with a sustained analytical focus on the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
4	16–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accurate knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support analysis of the issue under discussion, though further detail may be required in places (AO1).</li> <li>Analysis is balanced and developed, though some elements of the analysis could be expanded and/or developed further (AO2).</li> <li>Synoptic links are relevant to the questions as set, and supported with examples (AO2).</li> <li>Evaluation leads to conclusions that show some substantiation and are consistent with the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>Relevant perspectives are evaluated in the process of constructing arguments, although in some places there could be further development of the evaluation (AO3).</li> <li>The answer is well organised, analytical in style and is focused on the question as set (AO2).</li> </ul>

3	11–15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally sound knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though inaccuracies will be present (AO1).</li> <li>• Analytical points are made and developed in places, showing some balance, though some points are descriptive rather than analytical (AO2).</li> <li>• Synoptic links will be made, though explanation will lack depth (AO2).</li> <li>• Evaluation leads to conclusions that are consistent with the preceding discussion, but that lack substantiation (AO3).</li> <li>• Relevant perspectives are commented on in the process of constructing arguments, though evaluation lacks depth (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer is organised, occasionally analytical and focused on the question as set (AO2).</li> </ul>
2	6–10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes are used to support points made, though these contain inaccuracies and irrelevant material (AO1).</li> <li>• Analysis takes the form of description in most places, with some attempt at balance, though many points are unsupported assertions (AO2).</li> <li>• Synoptic links tend to be limited and undeveloped (AO2).</li> <li>• Some attempt to draw conclusions is made, but these lack depth and there is no clear development from the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>• Relevant perspectives are identified, though evaluation is superficial (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer shows some organisation and makes some attempt to address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
1	1–5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge and understanding of relevant political concepts, institutions and processes, with inaccuracies and irrelevant material present throughout (AO1).</li> <li>• Analysis takes the form of description and assertion, with little or no attempt made at balance (AO2).</li> <li>• Few if any synoptic links are offered (AO2).</li> <li>• Conclusions, when offered, are asserted and have an implicit relationship to the preceding discussion (AO3).</li> <li>• Little or no evaluation of relevant perspectives is present (AO3).</li> <li>• The answer shows little organisation and does not address the question (AO2).</li> </ul>
0	0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nothing worthy of credit.</li> </ul>

**0 5**

'The major political parties in the UK are more internally united than those in the US.'  
Analyse and evaluate this statement.

**[25 marks]****Indicative content**

In the analysis and evaluation of the statement students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of what party factions are (intra-party differences). Students may argue that within parties there will always be a range of ideas about which direction the party should be going in and the ideas it should be following. There are also ambitious individuals within all parties, and factions may group around them, hoping that these individuals will gain influence. Factions may be focused on controlling the party organisation (eg how policies are made and rules of how candidates and leaders are selected). Students are likely to argue factions are important and useful for parties as they can help establish a sense of unity and they can also formulate new policy ideas (eg the Northern Research Group in the Conservative party, this aims to boost spending and investment in the north of England)
- analysis and evaluation of the range of ideological intra-party factions within the major parties and the fact that the parties have different histories and traditions and that the political spectrum in the US and UK reflects those differences. Students may argue that these divisions are based on differences over economic, social, and foreign policy. Students are likely to argue that both the US and UK have a party on the right, the Republicans and Conservatives and a party on the progressive left, the Democrats and Labour
- analysis and evaluation of the extent to which factions compete for power within parties. Students may argue this can be damaging electorally (eg John Major was seriously weakened by factional fighting within the Conservative Party over its attitude towards the European Union and in the US the Democrats have been divided over climate change policies). Factions fluctuate in influence depending on party leadership, organising ability, public opinion, and external events. Factions don't just represent the views of politicians; they can also represent the views of voters (eg Momentum in the UK; the Trump republicans and MAGA)
- analysis and evaluation of how internally united the parties are. Some students may argue that all four parties are broad because of the need to appeal to a range of voters and that this leads to differences of opinion and in outlook. However, US parties are in many ways broad coalitions when compared to UK parties (it is no longer possible to claim that the parties are like "two empty bottles" or "only separated by abortion")
- analysis and evaluation of how all four parties could be described as having internal coalitions based on policies and personalities. Students may argue that in recent years US parties have become more ideologically united and are moving closer together and while UK parties have always been more united than their US counterparts, they too have become divided over issues such as Brexit. Party leaders in the UK have also faced leadership challenges such as Corbyn 2016, May 2019 and Johnson 2022. For the US, students may refer to the decline in moderates within both parties and the increase in party-based voting in Congress such as for Obamacare, Trump's impeachments, or Supreme Court nominations. The Democrats are divided about how liberal and progressive the party should be, as illustrated in the divisions exposed by the presidential primaries of 2020 and recently there have been arguments over Biden's Build Back Better Bill and whether to end the filibuster in the Senate. The Republicans have libertarians such as Rand Paul, moderates such as Susan Collins and those who support Trump (eg Freedom Caucus). Both the main parties in the UK are divided (within the Conservative Party there is the NRG, One-Nation and Blue-Collar Conservatives and within Labour, the Socialist Campaign Group, the Tribune Group and Labour First)
- analysis and evaluation of how leadership and candidate selection contests can lead to divisions. Students may compare US primaries with leadership contests in the UK. Students may argue US primaries expose bitter divisions within parties and between parties (eg Trump and his

attacks on “Lyin’ Ted” in 2016 and “Sleepy Joe” in 2020). By contrast, contests in the UK tend to be more restrained, such as Hunt v Johnson in 2019 and Truss v Sunak in 2022. Students may note that in the UK the electorate is smaller (MPs and party members) and question how far these contests are about deep divisions over policy, and more about differences over policy and personal ambition as the contest between Truss and Sunak in 2022 illustrates

- analysis and evaluation of US parties as a collection of 50 state parties (and the 100-party system theory) rather than the more centralised party structures found in the UK. The de-centralised nature of the parties means they are different in each of the 50 states despite sharing a party label as Republican Susan Collins of Maine and Ted Cruz of Texas illustrate. Students may use this argument to argue the US parties are less united than the UK parties
- analysis and evaluation of how deep the divisions within parties really are (eg parties are much more united in opposing the policies of their opponents than in uniting around alternative approaches such as Republicans and health reform, or Labour and the Conservatives’ handling of the Covid-19 pandemic). Students may also argue that parties attempt to unite in the lead-up to elections to avoid electoral defeats.

Synoptic links may be made in areas such as voting patterns within legislatures, intra-party divisions and factions, leadership and candidate selection, party policies, political ideology, elections and voting behaviour. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above Level 4.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points, and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples.

**0 6**

'Within the executive the US president is able to dominate, whereas the UK prime minister shares power.' Analyse and evaluate this statement.

**[25 marks]****Indicative content**

In the analysis and evaluation of the statement students may be expected to cover areas such as the following:

- analysis and evaluation of the formal and informal powers of the president and the prime minister
- analysis and evaluation of the structure of the executive in the US and UK, including the cabinet, No. 10, Whitehall, the White House and Executive Office of the President (EXOP). While both leaders have the most administrative support the scale and scope of EXOP is much more extensive than the Prime Minister's Office and the Cabinet Office. EXOP comprises three elements which give presidents an opportunity to dominate policy making via the National Security Council, The White House Office (headed by the White House Chief of Staff) and the Office of Management and Budget
- analysis and evaluation of executive-cabinet relations in the US and UK. In the US the president does not share executive authority with the cabinet and members of the cabinet are not political rivals as can be the case in the UK. The president may only call a handful of cabinet meetings a year. The UK prime minister can be removed from office if they lose the support of their cabinet eg Thatcher in 1990 and Johnson in 2022. Students may refer to the resignations of Sunak and Javid in July 2022 which paved the way for Johnson standing down as PM. In the UK the cabinet remains, in theory, the ultimate decision-making body because of the principle of collective cabinet responsibility. However, PMs can reshuffle the cabinet and in doing so they can exercise patronage and control over policy
- analysis and evaluation of the argument that the power of neither office is fixed, whether by the existence of a codified constitution or by the position of PM as leader of the majority party and the exerciser of the prerogative powers of the Monarch. In the case of the US president, the circumstances that may prevent them exercising their powers include divided government, the actual issues of the time, economic factors, and whether an election is near or not. Students may also argue that in the USA there have been times when the President has been very powerful, and Congress has allowed him to be so (eg Bush after 9/11). While in the UK the power of the PM will depend on the size of the parliamentary majority such as Blair in 1997 or Johnson in 2019 and whether the PM leads a 'united or divided party'. UK PMs have been very powerful (eg Thatcher in her second term and Blair in his first and second terms) but at other times PMs have been weak such as Brown and May
- analysis and evaluation of the argument that executive power in both countries and the extent to which it can actually be used is also related to the personality and characteristics of the person holding the office and the recognition that a study of PMs and Presidents is to some extent a study of their own personality and characteristics.

Synoptic links may be made in areas such as codified and uncodified constitutions, checks and balances, fusion and the separation of powers, elections, legislatures, political parties, executives and cabinets. Any response that does not include synoptic points cannot achieve above Level 4.

Students would not need to cover each and every one of the above points to gain high marks; equally, some may introduce further relevant points, and these should be credited. The conclusion should clearly focus on the issue in question. In their evaluation, it does not matter what view students reach. However, their position must be supported by their arguments and examples.