



---

# **GCE A LEVEL MARKING SCHEME**

---

**SUMMER 2024**

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

---

## About this marking scheme

The purpose of this marking scheme is to provide teachers, learners, and other interested parties, with an understanding of the assessment criteria used to assess this specific assessment.

This marking scheme reflects the criteria by which this assessment was marked in a live series and was finalised following detailed discussion at an examiners' conference. A team of qualified examiners were trained specifically in the application of this marking scheme. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners. It may not be possible, or appropriate, to capture every variation that a candidate may present in their responses within this marking scheme. However, during the training conference, examiners were guided in using their professional judgement to credit alternative valid responses as instructed by the document, and through reviewing exemplar responses.

Without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers, learners and other users, may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that this marking scheme is used alongside other guidance, such as published exemplar materials or Guidance for Teaching. This marking scheme is final and will not be changed, unless in the event that a clear error is identified, as it reflects the criteria used to assess candidate responses during the live series.

---

**GCE A LEVEL GOVERNMENT & POLITICS**  
**UNIT 4 - GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS OF THE USA**  
**SUMMER 2024 MARK SCHEME**

**Marking guidance for examiners**

**Summary of assessment objectives for Unit 4**

The questions in Section A assess both AO1 and AO2. The questions in Section B assess both AO1 and AO3. The question in Section C assesses all three assessment objectives. The assessment objectives focus on the ability to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories and issues (AO1); the ability to interpret and apply political information to identify and explain relevant similarities, differences, and connections (AO2), and the ability to analyse and evaluate the areas of government and politics studied to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions (AO3).

**The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for each question has two parts:

- an assessment grid advising bands and associated marks that should be allocated to responses which demonstrate the characteristics needed in AO1, AO2 and AO3.
- advice outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. The content is not prescriptive, and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Examiners should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by the candidates.

**Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

- The first stage for an examiner is to use both the indicative content and the assessment grid to decide the overall band.
- The second stage is to decide how firmly the characteristics expected for that band are displayed.
- Thirdly, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

**Organisation and communication**

This issue should have bearing if the standard of organisation and communication is inconsistent with the descriptor for the band in which the answer falls. In this situation, examiners may decide not to award the highest mark in the band.

**Level Descriptors**

Using 'best-fit', decide first which set of level descriptors best describes the overall quality of the answer. The following grid should inform your decision as to which band the answer belongs:

|                   | <b>AO1</b>   | <b>AO2</b>   | <b>AO3</b>   |
|-------------------|--|--|--|
| <b>Thorough</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aware of a wide range of detailed and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates fully developed understanding that shows relevance to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are well chosen.</li> <li>• Precision in the use of terminology.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding are consistently applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a clear, developed and convincing interpretation of evidence that is fully accurate.</li> <li>• Is able to fully identify and explain similarities, differences, and connections where relevant.</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used in a consistently appropriate and effective way.</li> <li>• An effective and balanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Detailed and substantiated evaluation that offers secure judgements leading to rational conclusions.</li> </ul>   |
| <b>Reasonable</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has a range of detailed and accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates well developed understanding that is relevant to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are appropriate.</li> <li>• Generally precise in the use of terminology.</li> </ul>        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding are mainly applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a clear and developed interpretation of evidence that is mostly accurate.</li> <li>• Is partially able to identify and explain similarities, differences, and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are mostly used in a suitable way and with a good level of competence and precision.</li> <li>• An accurate and balanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Detailed evaluation that offers generally secure judgements, with some link between rational conclusions and evidence.</li> </ul> |
| <b>Adequate</b>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shows some accurate knowledge.</li> <li>• Demonstrates partial understanding that is relevant to the demands of the question.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are not always relevant.</li> <li>• Some use of appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>                                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding are partially applied to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Is able to form a sound interpretation of evidence that shows some accuracy.</li> <li>• Makes some attempt to identify and explain similarities, differences, and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used in a suitable way with a sound level of competence but may lack precision.</li> <li>• An imbalanced argument is constructed.</li> <li>• Sound evaluation that offers generalised judgements and conclusions, with limited use of evidence.</li> </ul>                                 |
| <b>Limited</b>    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited knowledge with some relevance to the topic or question.</li> <li>• Little or no development seen.</li> <li>• Evidence/examples are not made relevant.</li> <li>• Very little or no use of terminology.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Knowledge and understanding are applied in a weak manner to the context of the question.</li> <li>• Can only form a simple interpretation of evidence, if at all, with very limited accuracy.</li> <li>• Makes weak attempt to identify and explain similarities, differences, and connections where relevant.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analysis and evaluation skills are used with limited competence.</li> <li>• Unsupported evaluation that offers simple or no conclusions.</li> </ul>   |

**Section A Mark bands for Question 1 and Question 2**

| Band | Marks | AO1  | Marks | AO2   |
|------|-------|--|-------|---|
|      |       | The learner:   |       | The learner:  |
| 4    | 4     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows thorough knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the set question</li> <li>uses well-chosen evidence/examples</li> <li>uses material of depth and range</li> <li>makes effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>                     | 10–12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies relevant political knowledge thoroughly</li> <li>interprets political information thoroughly</li> <li>explains relevant similarities, differences and connections thoroughly.</li> </ul>                       |
| 3    | 3     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows reasonable knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses appropriate evidence/examples.</li> <li>uses material of depth and range, but not in equal measure</li> <li>makes good use of terminology.</li> </ul> | 7–9   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies relevant political knowledge reasonably</li> <li>interprets political information reasonably</li> <li>explains relevant similarities, differences and connections reasonably.</li> </ul>                       |
| 2    | 2     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows adequate knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses evidence/examples that are not always relevant</li> <li>uses material of depth or range</li> <li>uses some appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>          | 4–6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies relevant political knowledge adequately</li> <li>interprets political information reasonably</li> <li>explains relevant similarities, differences and connections reasonably.</li> </ul>                       |
| 1    | 1     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows limited knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses evidence/examples that are not made relevant</li> <li>uses little terminology.</li> </ul>  | 1–3   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies limited relevant political knowledge</li> <li>offers a limited interpretation of political information</li> <li>offers a limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul> |
|      | 0     | Response not creditworthy or not attempted.  |       |   |

## Question 1

**Explain the impact of the filibuster on the work of the US Congress.**

**[16]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to assess the influence of the filibuster on the work of the US Congress. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the filibuster on the work of the US Congress.

The response may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

- The filibuster affects the work of the US Congress as it an anti-majoritarian device that can be used to hinder party majorities in the Senate from passing legislation. It encourages legislative gridlock.
- The mere threat of a filibuster (the silent filibuster) affects the work of the Senate; if 41 or more Senators threaten a filibuster, the Senate majority leader can refuse to call a vote.
- The filibuster contributes to partisanship within the US Senate as demonstrated by the vast increase in their usage in recent years and recent polarized debates around cloture motions, for example the Voting Rights Bill.
- The filibuster has caused both parties to challenge long-term Senate conventions; Democrats in 2013 removed the 60-vote threshold for voting on most nominees for administrative jobs. Republicans later invoked the 'nuclear option' in 2017 by extending this rule change to Supreme Court nominations.
- The filibuster, in protecting the principle of unlimited debate for members of the Senate, empowers individual Senate members and allows them the possibility of increasing personal profile and raising awareness of an issue.
- The existence and threat of the filibuster, it could be argued, ensures that both political parties in the Senate work together in a moderate spirit of compromise to enact legislation, for example the American Rescue Plan, Inflation Reduction Act 2022.

## Question 2

**Explain the impact of incumbency on voting behaviour in US elections. [16]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to assess the impact of incumbency on voting behaviour in US elections. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on impact of incumbency on voting behaviour in US elections.

The response may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

- The incumbency effect in US presidential elections favours the incumbent to win re-election. Of the 32 Presidents who have run for re-election 22 have won. Recent exceptions such as Trump (2020), Bush (1992), Carter (1980) go against the traditional expectation that most incumbent Presidents gain re-election. Presidential elections therefore have a clear incumbency effect.
- The fact that an incumbent President traditionally doesn't face a primary challenger allows them to avoid divisive and expensive primary elections which is favourable in terms of gaining electoral support in the election.
- The incumbency effect in Congressional elections is strong with high re-election rates in both House and Congress. Factors such as increased experience contribute to create an electorate that votes for the incumbent.
- The lack of term limits in both House and Senate mean that the incumbency effect is even stronger in Congressional elections with members having represented a state/district for many years.
- Incumbency leads to continuity in voting behaviour as factors including name recognition, pork barrel politics, fundraising prowess, ensures that the incumbent has an advantage over any challenger.

**Section B Mark bands for Question 3, Question 4 and Question 5**

| Band | Marks | AO1  | Marks | AO3   |
|------|-------|--|-------|---|
|      |       | The learner:   |       | The learner:  |
| 4    | 7–8   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows thorough knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the set question</li> <li>uses well-chosen evidence/examples</li> <li>uses material of depth and range</li> <li>makes effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>                     | 13–16 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides a thorough analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers a thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments</li> <li>provides a logical structure</li> <li>reaches an appropriate conclusion based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>   |
| 3    | 5–6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows reasonable knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses appropriate evidence/examples.</li> <li>uses material of depth and range, but not in equal measure</li> <li>makes good use of terminology.</li> </ul> | 9–12  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides a reasonable analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers a reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments</li> <li>provides a mostly logical structure</li> <li>reaches a reasonable conclusion based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>  |
| 2    | 3–4   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows adequate knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses evidence/examples that are not always relevant</li> <li>uses material of depth or range</li> <li>uses some appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>          | 5–8   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides an adequate analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers an adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments</li> </ul> <p><b>OR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>offers a reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>provides adequate structure</li> <li>reaches an adequate conclusion.</li> </ul> |
| 1    | 1–2   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows limited knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses evidence/examples that are not made relevant</li> <li>uses little terminology.</li> </ul>  | 1–4   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides a limited analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers a limited discussion.</li> <li>provides an answer that lacks structure.</li> <li>offers no conclusion.</li> </ul>  |
|      | 0     | Response not creditworthy or not attempted.  |       |   |

### Question 3

Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the Electoral College.

[24]

Candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of the Electoral College. Candidates will construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the strengths and weaknesses of the Electoral College.

The response may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

#### Strengths

- The Electoral College maintains federalism within the United States and ensures Presidents are elected by a broad consensus of the nation in geographic terms – thus safeguarding US democracy.
- The Electoral College maintains stability in US politics as it ensures the continued dominance of the two-party system.
- The Electoral College tends to give a clear majority to a winning President when the popular vote percentage is less than emphatic. The Electoral College can magnify a win into a landslide and thus ensure that the President has a clear mandate to govern.
- The fact that Maine and Nebraska operate a form of proportional representation within their states already shows the capacity of the Electoral College to reform and update itself without the need for its abolishment.

#### Weaknesses

- The Electoral College does not uphold the democratic principle of one person, one vote, one value.
- Small population states have a disproportional effect in terms of Electoral College votes as compared to large population states. Politically this tends to favour the Republican Party.
- The Electoral College enables a scenario whereby the winner of the popular vote can lose the election; 2016 Clinton/Trump, 2000 Gore/Bush.
- 'Faithless voters', whereby state representatives are able to cast their Electoral College vote in a manner that doesn't represent the democratic result of their state. There were seven cases in 2016 and, subsequently, there was need for a Supreme Court judgement, *Chiafalo v. Washington*, 2020, to address the issue.
- The influence of the Electoral College on the election campaign; preventing a truly national campaign and depressing turnout.
- Disproportionate power is given to a few hundred thousand voters across certain swing states to decide a national election.

#### Question 4

#### Evaluate the balance of power between the federal and state governments in the USA. [24]

Candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the balance of power between the federal and state governments. Candidates will construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the balance of power between the federal and state governments.

The response may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

Arguments for the balance of power in favour of the **federal** government.

- The constitutional powers given to the federal government; declaring war, coin money, making laws 'necessary and proper' to achieve their constitutional powers.
- The idea that federalism is not a fixed concept and there have been periods where the balance of power has been in favour of the federal government; cooperative federalism, Obamacare, Bush's education reform 'No Child Left Behind.'
- The importance of the federal government has become increasingly powerful and dominant as a result of federal financing. Events such as Hurricane Katrina, economic collapse of 2008, COVID-19 underline the importance of federal financing to the states, CARES Act (2020) saw \$2.2 trillion economic package passed by Congress, \$787 billion economic stimulus package passed by Congress in 2009.
- Homeland security and national defence has prompted a massive expansion in the federal government in terms of size and scope. The Patriot Act (2001) gave the federal government significant and far-reaching powers in this field.
- Supreme Court decisions in favour of the federal government over the states; the supremacy clause within the Constitution.

Arguments for the balance of power in favour of the **state** government.

- The constitutional powers given to the states; regulating elections, assuming powers not listed in the Constitution through the Tenth Amendment, role in regulating elections.
- The idea that federalism is not a fixed concept and there have been periods where the balance of power has rested with the states; new federalism, dual federalism.
- On issues such as immigration states such as California's use of sanctuary cities in response to Trump's immigration policy have underlined the autonomy of the states.
- There are a wide variety of laws across American states on a range of issues; abortion, gun control, the death penalty, taxes, legal status of marijuana that demonstrate the powers of states to govern themselves.
- During the COVID-19 pandemic states had autonomy over their handling of the issue; 32 states issued states of emergency before the President declared a national state of emergency on 13 March 2020, and there was a wide variety of lockdown policies across the states that reflected autonomous state power.
- Supreme Court rulings in favour of the states over federal government; Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organisation, 2022, US v. Texas, 2016, certain provisions in the National Federation of Independent Business v. Sebelius, 2012.

## Question 5

**‘The Supreme Court is effective at protecting the rights of US citizens.’ Discuss.**

**[24]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the Supreme Court at protecting the rights of US citizens. Candidates will construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the effectiveness of the Supreme Court at protecting the rights of US citizens.

The response may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

Arguments **for** the view that the Supreme Court is effective at protecting rights.

- The Supreme Court has used its power of Judicial Review to uphold and protect a range of citizens’ rights in relation to the US Constitution. These generally have occurred through judicial activism and a broad interpretation of the original text through a series of landmark cases.
- The Supreme Court, in looking at the Bill of Rights, has upheld a range of rights for US citizens; these include freedom of religion, freedom of speech, the right to bear arms and protection from cruel and unusual punishments, for example *Kennedy v. Bremerton School District*, 2022, *New York Rifle and Pistol Association v. Bruen*, 2022, *Shurtleff v. Boston*, 2022.
- The protection of rights is often associated with judicial activism and the practice of ‘legislating from the bench’ in order to fulfil the full meaning and promise of the Constitution.
- The Court has increasingly protected US citizens from overbearing Presidential power in cases such as *Trump v. Vance*, 2020, *NLRB v. Noel Canning*, 2014.

Arguments **against** the view that the Supreme Court is effective at protecting rights.

- The Supreme Court, following a more ‘originalist’ approach, and exercising judicial restraint linked to an understanding of the Constitution’s meaning as being ‘fixed’, has often been an institution unwilling to protect certain rights for US citizens.
- The recent politicisation around voting rights has seen the Supreme Court’s current conservative majority uphold a series of state laws restricting the voting rights of US citizens, for example, *Husted v. Randolph Institute*, 2018.
- Recent conservative judicial activism has taken rights away from Americans, for example, the 2022 decision to end decades of federal abortion rights for women.
- The impact of the current religious composition of the court on its ability to protect rights, for example, the current Catholic majority on the bench.
- The conflict of rights involved in certain cases means that the Court is unable to protect all rights of all citizens.

**Section C Mark bands for Question 6**

| Band | Marks | AO1  | Marks | AO2   | Marks | AO3   |
|------|-------|--|-------|---|-------|---|
|      |       | The learner:   |       | The learner:  |       | The learner:  |
| 4    | 10–12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows thorough knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the set question</li> <li>uses well-chosen evidence/examples</li> <li>uses material of depth and range makes effective use of terminology.</li> </ul>                              | 11–14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies relevant political knowledge thoroughly</li> <li>interprets political information thoroughly</li> <li>explains relevant similarities, differences and connections thoroughly.</li> </ul>                       | 11–14 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides a thorough analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers a thorough discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments</li> <li>provides a logical structure</li> <li>reaches an appropriate conclusion based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>   |
| 3    | 7–9   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows reasonable knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses appropriate evidence/examples.</li> <li>uses material of depth and range, but not in equal measure</li> <li>makes good use of terminology.</li> </ul> | 7–10  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies relevant political knowledge reasonably</li> <li>interprets political information reasonably</li> <li>explains relevant similarities, differences and connections reasonably.</li> </ul>                       | 7–10  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides a reasonable analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers a reasonable discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments</li> <li>provides a mostly logical structure</li> <li>reaches a reasonable conclusion based on the evidence presented.</li> </ul>  |
| 2    | 4–6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows adequate knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses evidence/ examples that are not always relevant</li> <li>uses material of depth <b>or</b> range</li> <li>uses some appropriate terminology.</li> </ul>  | 4–6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies relevant political knowledge adequately</li> <li>interprets political information reasonably</li> <li>explains relevant similarities, differences and connections reasonably.</li> </ul>                       | 4–6   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides an adequate analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers an adequate discussion with well-developed and balanced arguments</li> </ul> <p><b>Or</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>offers a reasonable discussion with only one side of the argument.</li> <li>provides adequate structure</li> <li>reaches an adequate conclusion.</li> </ul> |
| 1    | 1–3   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>shows limited knowledge and understanding of the concepts raised in the question</li> <li>uses evidence/examples that are not made relevant</li> <li>uses little terminology.</li> </ul>  | 1–3   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>applies limited relevant political knowledge</li> <li>offers a limited interpretation of political information</li> <li>offers a limited explanation of relevant similarities, differences and connections.</li> </ul> | 1–3   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provides a limited analysis and evaluation of the relevant issues</li> <li>offers a limited discussion.</li> <li>provides an answer that lacks structure.</li> <li>Offers no conclusion.</li> </ul>  |
|      | 0     | Response not creditworthy or not attempted.  |       |   |       |   |

## Question 6

**'The principles that underpin America's democracy remain important in today's America.' Discuss this view. [40]**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate the ability to analyse and evaluate the importance of principles that underpin America's democracy in today's US to construct arguments, make substantiated judgements and to draw conclusions. In demonstrating this, candidates are required to give an answer which is focused on the principles that underpin US democracy and to assess their importance in contemporary US society.

The response may consider, but is not limited to, the following:

- The Constitution has a range of key principles that include federalism, checks and balances, limited government, separation of powers, popular sovereignty, and republicanism.
- The extent to which limited government is a principle that is important in today's US, that is, do the individual branches of the federal government challenge limited government in a real and meaningful way or does the system of checks and balances work effectively to defend the principle of limited government?
- The extent to which individual rights are protected in the US Constitution, that is, is the Bill of Rights still an important document in US citizens' lives?
- The importance of the constitutional principle of popular sovereignty and how it is applied in the US today elections.
- The extent to which federalism is a principle that is important in the US today. For example, do states exercise meaningful autonomy? Is the federal government encroaching and expanding beyond the intention of the Founding Fathers?
- The extent to which power remains separated in the US today and the effectiveness of constitutional checks and balances.
- The individual branches of the federal government (Congress, President, Supreme Court) and the extent to which their actions maintain or challenge the importance of the key principles of the Constitution.
- The extent to which voting behaviour can be affected by money and social media as a threat to constitutional principles such as popular sovereignty and republicanism.
- The extent to which challenges to the Electoral College threaten federalism.