



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2024

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

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2024

Question Paper Log Number P76458A

Publications Code 9PLO_3A_2024_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

General Marking Guidance

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

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

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

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

2. Finding a mark within a level

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

Levels containing two marks only

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

Levels containing three or more marks

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

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

Indicative content

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

Paper 3A: Comparative Politics: USA mark scheme 2024

Section A

Guidelines for Questions 1a and 1b
AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)
AO1 will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.
Candidates who refer to only one country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1).• Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).• Some emerging comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).• Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1).• Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Question number	Indicative content Examine the differences in how rights are protected in the US and the UK.
1(a)	<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the differences in how rights are protected in the US and the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US constitution can be used to protect rights as it outlines the key powers of political institutions, and contains a number of amendments specifying rights (including the Bill of Rights); this is not the case in the UK where common law is often used to protect rights • The US has a Bill of Rights within the Constitution where the UK only has statute law to protect rights • Interest groups in the US have more access points than in the UK where they may fight to protect rights • Judicial review in the US can declare an Act that infringes rights unconstitutional, but this is not the case in the UK • Presidents can use executive orders to protect rights, but this is not an explicit power of prime ministers <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of the differences in how rights are protected in the US and the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because the Constitution in the UK is uncodified and unentrenched, it means that political institutions cannot be prevented from infringing rights as effectively as in the US, where powers are outlined in an entrenched Constitution • The Bill of Rights in the US is more effective than UK statute law as it is codified and entrenched, whereas UK rights are protected by common law, case law and statute that can be legislated on, repealed or amended, more easily than a formal constitutional amendment in the US, however this does mean that rights in the UK are constantly evolving as new statute is passed e.g. Equality Act 2010 • The ability to protect rights at a local, state, congressional, presidential and judicial level is more wide-ranging in the US than the UK, and there are fewer limitations on the ability of interest groups to lobby for influence in the US- so protecting rights more effectively • The UK Supreme Court can only make a declaration of incompatibility or that an institution has acted <i>ultra vires</i> whereas the ability to declare actions unconstitutional in the US effectively cancels out the law/order/regulation etc • Executive orders can and are used to extend or protect rights when it is difficult to achieve consensus in Congress, such as Obama and DACA, but the prime minister is more reliant on Parliament passing legislation, which may be difficult to do, and so rights may be less effectively protected in the UK <p>Candidates who refer to only one country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.</p> <p>Accept any other valid responses.</p>

Question number	Indicative content Examine the similarities in campaign finance and party funding in the US and the UK.
1(b)	<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)</p> <p>Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of the similarities in campaign finance and party funding in the US and the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Political parties in the US and UK are heavily reliant on donations to fund election campaigns • Individual candidates also rely heavily on donations and endorsement, often from interest groups • Both countries have attempted to regulate campaign finance rules • Both countries have forms of state funding available • Political parties and individuals in both countries have been criticised for increasing spending on campaigns <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) of the similarities in campaign finance and party funding in the US and the UK:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US political parties are much less likely to gain funding from membership and so rely on donations from businesses, interest groups and individuals; UK political parties historically relied on party membership fees for funding, but donations have become far more significant • US candidates often seek endorsement from wealthy, powerful interest groups and may set up PACs/SuperPacs to collect donations; UK candidates, particularly in the Labour Party, may be endorsed by trade unions, or, more recently, by wealthy individuals who wish to make donations • The US, for example, introduced the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act in 2002, while the UK passed legislation such as the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act in 2000 • Presidential candidates in the US can access federal matching funds for elections; in the UK, major political parties are guaranteed free TV advertising time and opposition parties qualify for 'Short Money' • The costs of campaigns and elections has increased dramatically in both countries, leading to criticisms that donations from wealthy individuals, corporations, interest groups and lobbyists has an undue influence over the election of individuals and political parties <p>Candidates who refer to only one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.</p>

Section B

Guidelines for Question 2

AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks)

This question requires candidates to draw on their knowledge and understanding of the USA, including comparative theories and UK politics (AO1) and this will be used by candidates to underpin their analysis (AO2). AO2 requires candidates to develop their answers showing analytical skills to address the question – such responses will be underpinned by their use of knowledge and understanding.

Candidates who refer to only one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3.

Accept any other valid responses.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation. Makes limited comparative theory points (AO1). • Limited comparative analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 2	4–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes some relevant comparative theory points (AO1). • Some comparative analysis of aspects of politics with some focused logical chains of reasoning, referring to similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes relevant comparative theory points (AO1). • Mostly focused comparative analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and/or differences within aspects of politics, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).
Level 4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation. Makes cohesive comparative theory points (AO1). • Consistent comparative analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent, logical chains of reasoning, drawing on similarities and differences within aspects of politics, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2).

Question number	Indicative content Analyse how devolution in the UK differs from federalism in the USA.
2	<p>AO1 (6 marks), AO2 (6 marks) Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) of how devolution in the UK differs from federalism in the USA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devolution in the UK is a fairly recent phenomenon, only being introduced in 1999 in Scotland and Wales and Northern Ireland after referendums in the regions, whereas federalism is one of the founding principles of the US system of government • The UK Constitution is not a formally entrenched one, which means that devolution was passed by an Act of Parliament, unlike federalism in the US which is entrenched in the US Constitution • Devolution bodies have a fusion of powers whereas federalism enshrines separation of powers in the state governments • Legal sovereignty in the UK still remains with the central government unlike in the US where legal sovereignty is considered to be shared between the state and federal governments • Federalism in the US is equal amongst the states whereas devolution is asymmetric in the UK <p>Candidates may refer to the following analytical points (AO2) when analysing how devolution in the UK differs from federalism in the USA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This means that the principles behind devolution are more flexible and more easily amended, as was the case after the 2014 Scottish independence referendum when an increase in power was promised to the Scottish Parliament after a close result in favour of unity. Federalism, however, is a more permanent feature of the US system of government. • This means that devolution can, in theory, be revoked, or can be expanded with additional powers or further devolution being granted. For example, with the expansion of devolution with the introduction of mayors in London and Manchester. Whereas historically in US federalism, the balance of power between the states and federal government has fluctuated with the actions/laws of President/Congress and the interpretation of the constitution by the Supreme Court. It is also highly unlikely that secession of states in the US would be granted or sought by individual states. • The devolved bodies have executives that are drawn from the legislative bodies, whereas both the states and the federal government elect executives separately from the legislature • This means that the UK central government is still ultimately able to revoke the powers of the devolved bodies and make decisions on their behalf e.g. on Brexit, whereas the state and the federal governments have powers explicitly granted or reserved to them by the US Constitution • This means that the individual states in the US have equal powers to make legislation or to try to influence national legislation, whereas the experience of devolution in the UK depends on the region you live in. For example, the Scottish Parliament was originally given limited tax powers whereas the Welsh Assembly was not

Candidates may refer to the following when analysing structural theory:

- USA- Federalism is entrenched in the US Constitution
- UK- Devolution is contained within statute law, which can be repealed/amended more easily

Candidates may refer to the following when analysing cultural theory:

- USA- Federalism has been an important part of US culture from the outset
- UK- Support for devolution- and further devolution- has grown over time, but varied in the degree of support/power within the different regions

Candidates may refer to the following when analysing rational theory:

- USA- Federalism allows individual states to make their own decisions in key areas, which has allowed for increasing variation in policy between states
- UK- The asymmetric nature of devolution has led to demands for greater parity and, in Scotland's case, calls for independence

Candidates who refer to one named country cannot achieve beyond Level 1.

Candidates who do not make any comparative theory points cannot achieve beyond Level 3.

Accept any other valid responses.

Section C

Guidelines for Marking Essay Questions 3a–3c
AO1 (10 marks) Marks here relate to knowledge and understanding. It should be used to underpin analysis (AO2) and evaluation (AO3).
AO2 (10 marks) Candidates should form analytical views which support and reject the view presented by the question.
AO3 (10 marks) Candidates are expected to evaluate the information and arguments presented. They may rank the importance of the prior analysis. They should be able to make and form judgments and they should reach reasoned conclusion.
Candidates must consider both views in their answers in a balanced way. The judgement a candidate reaches about these views should be reflected in their conclusion. Candidates who have not considered both views in a balanced way cannot achieve marks beyond Level 2. Other valid responses are acceptable.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
Level 1	1–6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates superficial knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, with limited underpinning of analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Limited analysis of aspects of politics with partial, logical chains of reasoning, which makes simplistic connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Makes superficial evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing simple arguments and judgements, many which are descriptive and lead to limited unsubstantiated conclusions (AO3).
Level 2	7–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates some accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, some of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Some emerging analysis of aspects of politics with some focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make some relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs some relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing occasionally effective arguments and judgements, some are partially substantiated and lead to generic conclusions (AO3).
Level 3	13–18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates mostly accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, many of which are selected appropriately in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Mostly focused analysis of aspects of politics with focused, logical chains of reasoning, which make mostly relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs generally relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing generally effective arguments and judgements, many of which are substantiated and lead to some focused conclusions that are sometimes justified (AO3).
Level 4	19–24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates accurate knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are carefully selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Consistent analysis of aspects of politics, with coherent logical chains of reasoning, which make relevant connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs mostly relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing mostly effective arguments and judgements, which are mostly substantiated and lead to mostly focused, justified conclusions (AO3).
Level 5	25–30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates thorough and in-depth knowledge and understanding of political institutions, processes, concepts, theories and issues, which are effectively selected in order to underpin analysis and evaluation (AO1). • Perceptive analysis of aspects of politics, with sustained, logical chains of reasoning, which make cohesive and convincing connections between ideas and concepts (AO2). • Constructs fully relevant evaluation of aspects of politics, constructing fully effective substantiated arguments and judgements, which are consistently substantiated and lead to fully focused and justified conclusions (AO3).

Question number	Indicative content Evaluate the view that the US Supreme Court is a political body rather than a judicial body.
3(a)	<p data-bbox="325 264 963 295">AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p data-bbox="325 336 1398 443">Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that US Supreme Court is a political rather than a judicial body:</p> <p data-bbox="325 448 469 479">Agreement</p> <ul data-bbox="373 483 1388 694" style="list-style-type: none"> • SC justices are political appointments • The appointment of SC justices has become an electoral issue in recent years • SC makeup tends to be liberal or conservative • SC has the power to decide whether to hear or decline cases • Power of judicial review inevitably means that the SC must make decisions on political matters <p data-bbox="325 734 504 766">Disagreement</p> <ul data-bbox="373 770 1331 1057" style="list-style-type: none"> • SC rulings do not always reflect the beliefs/ideology of the president who appointed them • SC is not always dominated by one ideology, and may 'swing' either way • SC is increasingly willing to hear controversial cases, despite political opposition to their intervention • Although justices may be asked to rule in political issues, they are still expected to act impartially • SC justices are independent of political influence once appointed <p data-bbox="325 1097 1337 1160">Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul data-bbox="373 1164 1401 1998" style="list-style-type: none"> • Presidents can influence the ideology of the SC when making appointments, particularly if they have the opportunity to make multiple appointments whilst in office (AO2) this makes the SC a more political body, as it's makeup can be influenced by politicians (AO3) • The appointment of SC justices during divided government has caused controversy, with the Republicans refusing to allow Obama to fill a vacancy in his last year of office, but later allowing Trump to make an appointment after he had lost his re-election attempt (AO2) this influenced the ideology of the SC, and was influenced by a political matter- the proximity of the election- rather than judicial matters (AO3) • SC justices tend to be considered liberal or conservative in their outlook, with relatively few 'swing' justices, and have become more so in recent years (AO2) which suggests the SC has become more political than judicial (AO3) • The power to choose which cases are heard means that decisions may be made on a more political basis than a judicial one, with the SC being accused in recent years of declining cases that are politically controversial or at odds with federal government beliefs (AO2) making the SC a more political body than a judicial one (AO3) • Judicial review means the SC is using its powers to interpret a political document (the Constitution), and often intervening in debates over state or federal government rights/power (AO2) this inevitably makes the SC a political body as it has the power to declare legislation or executive actions unconstitutional at the state and federal level (AO3)

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

Disagreement

- SC justices can and do make rulings that are at odds with the views of the president who appointed them (AO2) suggesting they are still a judicial body rather than political (AO3)
- Some justices become 'swing' justices once appointed, making decisions that can vary from liberal to conservative depending on the issue at the heart of the case (AO2) this suggests that the SC remains a judicial body as not all SC justices lean one way or the other ideologically (AO3)
- SC has become more willing to hear and rule on politically controversial cases in recent years such as same-sex marriage, sanctuary cities, abortion (AO2) and with decisions that do not always reflect the views of the government of the day, this suggests that they can and do still make decisions on a judicial basis rather than a political one (AO3)
- SC justices are scrutinised thoroughly when nominated, including a consideration of what has influenced their decisions in previous cases (AO2) suggesting that the ability to rule using judicial reasoning (so using the law and precedent to interpret the Constitution) rather than political beliefs is still significant (AO3)
- SC justices cannot be held to account or directly influenced by the other branches of government so are free to make decisions as they see fit (AO2) suggesting they are still a judicial body rather than a political one (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.

Question number	Indicative content Evaluate the view that the American voters are the biggest influence on legislation.
3(b)	<p data-bbox="325 264 963 297">AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p data-bbox="325 338 1385 443">Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that the American voters are the biggest influence on legislation:</p> <p data-bbox="325 483 469 517">Agreement</p> <ul data-bbox="373 557 1390 1093" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="373 557 1390 663">• American voters influence members of the House of Representatives in particular as they must consider the needs of the American voters during the legislative process as they have one eye on re-election at all times <li data-bbox="373 667 1390 772">• American voters influence both House and Senate representatives who will attempt to use pork-barrel politics to ensure local issues are raised/funded in legislation passed <li data-bbox="373 777 1390 882">• American voters influence presidents as well as members of Congress facing re-election who will try to appeal to the public with broad policies in their legislative agenda <li data-bbox="373 887 1390 992">• American voters influence sitting presidents when they are deciding whether to sign or veto proposed legislation from Congress, especially in an election year <li data-bbox="373 996 1390 1093">• American voters may exert influence through interest groups to put pressure on elected officials, including at state level, to develop legislation they want to see passed/prevent legislation from passing <p data-bbox="325 1099 507 1133">Disagreement</p> <ul data-bbox="373 1137 1406 1673" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="373 1137 1406 1243">• The need for extensive campaign finance means that elected officials are more focused on legislating for their own special interest/re-election than the needs/wishes of the American people <li data-bbox="373 1247 1406 1352">• Party ideology/unity/factions/partisanship may be more influential for members of Congress in passing legislation than the needs and wishes of the American voters <li data-bbox="373 1357 1406 1462">• Members of Congress may not be significantly influenced when passing legislation directly by the American voters who are less likely to support them if they have secure incumbency <li data-bbox="373 1467 1406 1572">• Presidents may be more influenced by their own personal ideological agenda/set of policies when supporting/proposing/opposing legislation rather than the influence of the American voters, especially their second term <li data-bbox="373 1576 1406 1673">• Some interest groups act in the interests of a powerful, wealthy minority and have more influence on legislation than mass membership organisations who represent more American voters

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

- This is due to their short terms of office- this means they must consider the demands of the American voters when making decisions about which proposals to support/oppose/introduce (AO2) so making the American voters the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This leads to more proposed amendments to Bills as individual members try to ensure their issues are addressed or given financial support to benefit American voters (AO2) so making the American voters the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This can lead to focusing on major legislative proposals such as Obamacare, attempts to reform gun laws, the infrastructure bill, the response to Covid in an attempt to secure the American voters continuing support (AO2) so making the American voters the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This means legislative decisions can be made based on populism rather than individual or party ideology to please the majority of American voters (AO2) so making the American voters the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This can encourage electoral candidates to pledge to make/support/oppose legislation that reflects the ideas of supporters of that interest group (AO2) so making the American voters the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)

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

- This means that politicians may vote to support/oppose/introduce Bills and/or amendments to please interest groups/to reflect campaign finance donations rather than their constituents (AO2) so suggesting that the American voters are not the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This may be an issue for a sitting president that aligns with public opinion, but may be a personal issue rather than driven by public opinion (AO2) so suggesting that the American voters are not the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This is because they may be able to rely on constituency support because of their past actions/strong local allegiance to their party and so have less need to campaign to maintain/gain new support (AO2) so suggesting that the American voters are not the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This is particularly true for members of Congress who wish to support other members'/party/executive proposals in Congress as a trade for support for their own personal agenda (AO2) so suggesting that the American voters are not the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)
- This means that interest groups with more effective access to elected officials e.g. through donations/committee system/iron triangles/Super-PACs may have more influence over legislation (AO2) so suggesting that the American voters are not the biggest influence on legislation (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.

Please note that this question allows for a broad range of responses, and so other issues not explicitly identified in the mark scheme should also be credited. This includes examples such as partisanship, the electoral system, the influence of the media and so on.

Question number	Indicative content Evaluate the view that interest groups in the USA have a negative impact on democracy.
3(c)	<p data-bbox="325 264 963 295">AO1 (10 marks), AO2 (10 marks), AO3 (10 marks)</p> <p data-bbox="325 336 1410 443">Candidates may demonstrate the following knowledge and understanding (AO1) in relation to the view that interest groups in the USA have a negative impact on democracy:</p> <p data-bbox="325 483 469 515">Agreement</p> <ul data-bbox="373 519 1362 801" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="373 519 1251 586">• Campaign finance for elections/iron triangles gives interest groups disproportionate power in elections <li data-bbox="373 591 1362 622">• PACs/Super PACs gives interest groups too much influence over candidates <li data-bbox="373 627 1362 694">• Lack of political party loyalty amongst voters allows interest groups to have more impact than political parties, despite not standing for office <li data-bbox="373 698 1315 766">• More able to mobilise mass support based on single issues, rather than matters of national priority <li data-bbox="373 770 1299 801">• Ability to influence SC decisions/bring cases may sway decisions made <p data-bbox="325 842 507 873">Disagreement</p> <ul data-bbox="373 878 1394 1348" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="373 878 1362 985">• Limits on lobbying/campaign finance rules prevent interest groups from having too much influence therefore interest groups may actually enhance democracy <li data-bbox="373 990 715 1021">• Increasing partisanship <li data-bbox="373 1025 1378 1133">• The effectiveness of interest groups to affect any proposition/initiative/bill is limited by popular support and the willingness of elected officials to take action <li data-bbox="373 1137 1394 1272">• Pluralism allows a range of voices to be heard, but also ensures that only the largest/most popular interest groups can have influence which prevents less well-supported/smaller groups from having disproportionate influence which enhances democracy <li data-bbox="373 1276 1283 1348">• Members of Congress may be more influenced by the needs of their constituents than interest groups <p data-bbox="325 1388 1347 1451">Candidates may refer to the following analytical (AO2) and evaluative (AO3) points when agreeing with the view:</p> <ul data-bbox="373 1500 1394 2069" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="373 1500 1394 1608">• Candidates for Congress or the presidency must have a substantial amount of funding to have a realistic chance of success (AO2) which may allow interest groups to have a negative impact on democracy (AO3) <li data-bbox="373 1612 1378 1720">• The increase in the use of PACs/Super PACs has had a negative impact on democracy as they have fewer limits regulating them than political parties do (AO2) which may have a negative impact on democracy (AO3) <li data-bbox="373 1724 1362 1854">• Interest groups may a negative impact on democracy because there is less political party loyalty amongst the electorate, both in terms of membership and, at times, voting behaviour (AO3) which may have a negative impact on democracy (AO3) <li data-bbox="373 1859 1362 1966">• Interest groups are able to exert influence through mobilising mass support on individual issues or broader ideological matters (AO2) which may have a negative impact on democracy (AO3) <li data-bbox="373 1971 1347 2069">• Interest groups can have significant influence on legal cases, particularly related to constitutional matters, through launching individual court cases (AO2) which may have a negative for democracy (AO3)

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

- Legislation designed to limit the impact of lobbyists have made it more difficult for interest groups to influence Congress or the federal government (AO2) which means interest groups may not be negative for democracy and may in fact enhance democracy (AO3)
- Interest groups may have fewer opportunities to influence legislation during times when political parties are more unified around ideology and policy programmes (AO2) which ensures they do not have a negative impact on democracy (AO3)
- This means interest groups are reliant on gaining enough mass support to pressure the elected body into acting in the best interests of their group's ideology/wishes (AO2) which enhances democracy rather than having a negative impact (AO3)
- This means that interest groups who can demonstrate large-scale support can ensure that the public is well-informed and have a positive influence on elected officials by raising issues and holding government to account (AO2) which enhances democracy rather than having a negative impact (AO3)
- This is particularly true of the House of Representatives, with very short terms of office, where introducing legislation or amendments that benefit constituents may have more impact on their chances of re-election than interest group support (AO2) which may enhance democracy and prevent interest groups from having a negative impact (AO3)

Accept any other valid responses.