

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCE in Government &
Politics (6GP04)

Unit 4A: EU Political Issues

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 2014

Publications Code UA039026

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Marking Guidelines

- 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.

Question Number	Question
1.	Explain the main criticisms of the use of Qualified Majority Voting (QMV).
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate understanding that QMV was designed to be a compromise between a veto and straightforward majority voting system, providing each country with a number of votes weighted by size and requiring a super-majority for decisions to be approved.</p> <p>Criticisms of QMV <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It erodes national sovereignty: it means that member states can be outvoted in key areas without being able to block decisions that they disagree with e.g. on CAP, unless they are able to negotiate an opt-out. • Some see it as a step towards supranationalism, particularly given its expansion under the Lisbon treaty. • Its operation is flawed in practice. Re-weighting of QMV has been controversial both because it favours the smaller states in terms of voting strength, but still allows them to be squeezed out by a bloc of larger states. Some larger states, such as Poland, also enjoy disproportionate influence. • It is contrary to democratic principles: very few EU citizens understand how decisions are actually taken, fuelling the concept of the EU as bureaucratic and unresponsive. • It is applied arbitrarily - not all decisions are made by QMV. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of the nature of QMV. • Limited understanding of the criticisms of QMV. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the nature of QMV. • Clear understanding of the criticisms of QMV. 	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
Level 3 (11-15 marks)	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
Level 2 (6-10 marks)	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.

<p><i>Level 1</i> (0-5 marks)</p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates.• ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations.• ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.
---	---

Question Number	Question
2.	What is the Common Fisheries Policy and why has it been controversial?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidate should demonstrate understanding that the EU's Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) sets quotas for which member states are allowed to catch what amount of each type of fish, as well as attempting to encourage the fishing industry through various market interventions.</p> <p>Criticisms of the CFP <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is centralised and bureaucratic: run by EU officials who have little understanding of the situation on the ground and impose overly strict quotas. • It is unfair on the fishermen in certain areas who find their quotas 'given away' to fishermen of other countries – the impact of the Factortame ruling and the decline of fishing in places like Cornwall could be cited as evidence. • It is inequitable with varying enforcement across the EU, whilst Nordic fisherman, outside of the EU, have much more freedom of where and what to fish. • It is ineffective and unsustainable: fish stocks decline whilst prices continue to rise. • It involves questionable practices such as the discarding of fish that are 'over-quota' which damages the industry and is both wasteful and ethically questionable. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of the nature of the common fisheries policy. • Limited understanding of why the common fisheries policy has been controversial. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the nature of the common fisheries policy. • Clear understanding of why the common fisheries policy has been controversial. 	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p>Level 3</p> <p>(11-15 marks)</p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.

<p>Level 2 (6-10 marks)</p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<p>Level 1 (0-5 marks)</p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

Question Number	Question
3.	Explain the ways in which the EU could be seen as federal.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the concept of Federalism. Candidates may creditably make comparison with US as a federal structure but this should be in relation to specific points about the EU, and is not necessary to reach Level 3. A list of ways with no explanation cannot advance beyond Level 2.</p> <p>Ways in which federalism can be seen <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU law takes precedence over national law, and this can be enforced by the ECJ, meaning that national parliaments are no longer sovereign. • EU laws are proposed by the EU Commission which is a supranational and unelected body with no direct accountability to member states. • The President and High Representative for Foreign Affairs could be characterised as the beginnings of a centralised executive for the EU. • Much of the EU shares a common currency, with a loss of economic sovereignty as members no longer control their interest rates or much of their fiscal policy, and are subject to enforced conditions from the centre in exchange for financial aid. • The Schengen agreement has removed countries' sovereignty over national borders, reducing them to states with limited territorial integrity or control of immigration. • The use of Qualified Majority Voting means that member states can be outvoted in key areas, without being able to block decisions that they disagree with e.g. on CAP, unless they are able to negotiate an opt-out. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of the nature of Federalism. • Limited understanding of the ways in which the EU could be seen as federal. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of the nature of Federalism. • Clear understanding of the ways in which the EU could be seen as federal. 	
LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p>Level 3</p> <p>(11-15 marks)</p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.

<p>Level 2 (6-10 marks)</p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<p>Level 1 (0-5 marks)</p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

Question Number	Question
4.	How influential is the European Parliament in EU policy-making?

Indicative content (*this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points*)

Candidates should demonstrate awareness of recent changes to the powers of the European Parliament, in particular arising from the Lisbon treaty, which have increased its role in policy-making.

Ways in which the EU Parliament can be seen as influential on policy making may include:

- Under the treaty of Lisbon the Parliament's role in passing EU legislation has increased – it has equal footing (co-decision) with the Council of Ministers.
- Furthermore because Parliament has the right to *ask* the Commission to draft legislation, and they are following these requests more often, Parliament can effectively initiate legislation.
- The Lisbon Treaty also granted Parliament powers over the entire EU budget, which gives a large indirect influence on policy.
- The increasing level of influence exerted on the selection of Commissioners – such as the withdrawal or re-assignment of several of Barroso's nominees in 2004.

Ways in which the EU Parliament's influence on policy making can be seen as limited may include:

- Much of the influence is indirect through political or media pressure, with formal powers, for example to hire or fire individual commissioners, being limited.
- The Parliament still does not have the power of legislative initiative which is reserved for the European Commission. Therefore, whilst Parliament can amend and reject legislation, it needs the Commission to draft a bill before anything can become law.
- The Parliament also only possesses co-decision with the Council of Ministers and 85% of proposals that do not enjoy the Council's support do not become law.
- Parliament has little control over how policy is implemented in practice, by the Commission, or enforced, by the ECJ.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited understanding of both sides of the debate with respect to the European Parliament's level of influence, or clear understanding of one side of the debate.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of both sides of the debate with respect to the European Parliament's level of influence.

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p>Level 3 (11-15 marks)</p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
<p>Level 2 (6-10 marks)</p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<p>Level 1 (0-5 marks)</p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

Question Number	Question
5.	Explain the ways in which the EU has sought to advance social justice.

Indicative content (*this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points*)

Candidates should show awareness of the general expansion of the EU beyond its original economic focus and into the social sphere. Responses that focus entirely on the Social Chapter will not progress beyond level 2.

The EU has sought to advance social justice in a number of ways which may include:

- The Social Chapter, original adopted by 11 of the 12 member states and later by Britain, which declared 30 general principles, including on fair pay, health and safety at work, rights of disabled and elderly and the rights of workers.
- In the years following the adoption of the Social Chapter the EU has undertaken various social policy initiatives, including labour relations, equal opportunities, public health, protection of children, migrant workers, education, training etc.
- The Charter of Fundamental Rights which reaffirms and strengthens rights granted within the ECHR, Social Chapter and elsewhere.
- EU structural funds, such as Objective One and Convergence, have been targeted at areas with substantially lower living standards than the EU average – Ireland, Wales and Cornwall could be cited as examples of areas that have benefitted.
- The general move towards a more powerful Europe will arguably lead to an increased social role, whilst EU expansion to encompass more countries, with lower living standards and a wider rich/poor divide, means more focus on narrowing such gaps.

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited understanding of the nature of social justice.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which the EU has sought to advance social justice.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the nature of social justice.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which the EU has sought to advance social justice.

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p>Level 3 (11-15 marks)</p>	<p>Good to excellent:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary.
<p>Level 2 (6-10 marks)</p>	<p>Limited to sound:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary.
<p>Level 1 (0-5 marks)</p>	<p>Very poor to weak:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates. • ability to analyse and explain political information, arguments and explanations. • ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary.

Question Number	Question
6.	'There is still too little democratic accountability in the EU.' Discuss.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the concepts of democratic accountability and of a democratic deficit, and of both the traditional criticisms and recent improvements with respect to democracy within the EU.</p> <p>Candidates should make reference to specific institutions, and to their individual democratic strength, but the main focus should be on democratic, rather than internal, accountability.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There continues to be strong resistance to direct election of any EU institutions other than the European Parliament. The EU Commission and ECJ are entirely unelected, whilst other institutions are elected indirectly, such as the Council of Ministers. • The only directly elected institution, the EU Parliament, still lacks sufficient power. It still cannot remove individual commissioners, and has no 'legislative initiative'. • EU Parliament elections have a low turnout with little evidence of voting based on issues within the EU, as opposed to national issues or voters' general views of the EU. • EU institutions, despite their democratic deficit, can and do overrule democratically elected accountable governments – the European Court of Justice for example regularly prevents democratic governments from carrying out their policies. • The general focus of the EU within recent treaties has been on expansion rather than on improving democracy. <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a clear consensus, for example in the Amsterdam Treaty, that the EU should be made more democratic. This has been backed up with genuine reforms. • In particular the European Parliament has increased in power. It now controls the setting of the entire EU budget and has increased powers of 'Co-decision' leading to greater 'checks and balance' and an improved balance of power between institutions • The Council of Ministers is indirectly democratically accountable to the electorate as it is composed of elected government representatives (and Cameron, for example, is often seen as tailoring his approach in the council to the electorate at home). • The whole of the EU is ultimately democratic because all institutions, including the ECJ and Commission, are appointed by and/or accountable to democratically elected governments or bodies. <p>Candidates may also consider the argument that governments and/or EU Institutions do not wish the EU to become <i>too</i> democratic because it might challenge national governments or vested interests. Equally criticisms of lack of democracy often mask general opposition to the aims, existence or national membership of the EU, rather than to its actual operation.</p>	

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited understanding of the nature of democratic accountability.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which the EU still lacks democratic accountability, and the ways in which it does not; or clear understanding of one side of the argument.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the nature of democratic accountability.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which the EU still lacks democratic accountability, and the ways in which it does not.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
AO3	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
7.	'The case for the UK's withdrawal from the EU now outweighs the case for staying in.'
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the increasing Euro-scepticism amongst both the public and politicians and may cite both Cameron's promise of an EU referendum and the growing electoral popularity of UKIP, as evidence for this.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Membership of the EU has meant giving up too much sovereignty. The use of QMV and the power of various undemocratic EU institutions could be cited as evidence. • EU membership is of net cost to the UK, and is damaging the UK economy through policies such as the social chapter which is accused of damaging small businesses. • The recent Eurozone crisis highlights the economic dis-benefits, including a loss of economic policy control, and being 'tied-in' to weaker economies. The UK could thrive trading 'with but outside' the EU as Norway has done within the EEA. • Enlargement has further diluted the UK's ability to influence EU policy, and has exacerbated economic and social issues such as immigration and employment prospects for UK workers. • The UK has never been a committed member of the EU, earning a reputation as the 'awkward partner' over issues such as the social chapter, the Euro etc. If the UK is so isolated from the rest of the EU anyway, there is no point in continuing membership. <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EU membership has been of economic benefit, both to trade in general, and to areas that previously suffered from heavy under-investment but now receive substantial EU structural funds, such as Cornwall, Wales and the North East. • The various non-economic benefits from EU membership – for example from the Social Chapter and the European Arrest Warrant. • The EU has recently undergone a number of reforms that could be seen to counteract the previous accusations of a 'democratic deficit'. • Europhiles argue that countries outside, such as Norway, have to comply with all EU regulations, at considerable cost, to be allowed to continue trading with the EU. Thus 'associated free trade' may not be a practical option. • With the rise of the BRIC countries it could be argued that 'independence is not an option': the UK can only flourish economically by remaining closely associated with the EU (or alternatively opting for an even closer relationship with the US). • The UK's 'awkward partner' reputation arguably arises from <i>insufficient</i> engagement, and refusal to join projects at the start - the social chapter, Euro and the EEC itself. <p>Although arguments as to the benefits of the EU for international peace and stability are acceptable these must be argued and not simply asserted.</p>	

A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Limited understanding of the nature and growth of Euroscepticism in the UK.
- Limited understanding of the arguments for the UK to leave the EU and the arguments for the UK to remain in, or a clear understanding of one side of the debate.

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the nature and growth of Euroscepticism in the UK.
- Clear understanding of the arguments for the UK to leave the EU and the arguments that the UK should remain in.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
A03	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
8.	To what extent has EU integration been weakened by EU enlargement?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the ‘broadening vs. ‘deepening’ debate and the extent to which these two ideas can be seen as mutually contradictory. Specific awareness of recent expansion, and its impacts, is needed to fully address the question.</p>	
<p>Arguments that support the premise that expansion weakens integration <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expansion has made the EU’s bureaucracy and operation even more unwieldy, with the need for further commissioners and a more complex system of voting, as well as increasing practical complications such as more languages and increased distances. • An expanded EU is less able to achieve consensus in decision making and implement reforms necessary to enable further integration, such as CAP and democratic reform. • Arguably the new members, such as Bulgaria and Romania, are more interested in economic benefits than integration. They may also be unstable, further threatening integration. Such fears led to the blocking of Montenegro’s application in 2011. • Expansion has placed a greater strain on EU finances, especially the CAP and regional fund - it is estimated that even with an annual growth of 2% above the rest of the EU, it will take new members 25-60 years to catch up with the average EU GDP. • Expansion has decreased the EU’s popularity in several countries, particularly due to the perceived impact on immigration, weakening potential for further integration. 	
<p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU has both expanded and integrated further throughout its history. • Progressive enlargements have enriched and re-invigorated the EU: Nordics brought traditions of social justice and environmental awareness and newly freed nations in south and Eastern Europe reminded jaded older members of the value of democracy. • Recent expansion has provided an impetus for the internal reform necessary for future integration, since EU apparatus was not suited to a 27-member organisation. • Expansion has allowed the EU to play a greater role on the world political stage, and address security and environmental issues, giving a platform for further integration. • With the re-emergence of multi-polarity, as the BRIC countries grow in economic strength, it could be argued that if the EU has not expanded it would not have been economically powerful enough to survive. 	
<p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of the nature of EU integration. • Limited understanding of the ways in which EU enlargement may and may not limit integration, or a clear understanding of one side of the debate. 	

A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:

- Clear understanding of the nature of EU integration.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which EU enlargement may and may not limit integration.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and/or a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
AO3	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

These grids should be used in conjunction with the fuller Level descriptors.

PART A - SHORT QUESTIONS (15 marks)

Level 3	Excellent	15
	Very good	13-14
	Good	11-12
Level 2	Sound	10
	Basic	8-9
	Limited	6-7
Level 1	Weak	4-5
	Poor	2-3
	Very poor	0-1

PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

<i>A01 / A02 / Synopticity</i>	
Level 3 (Good to excellent)	9-12
Level 2 (Limited to sound)	5-8
Level 1 (Very poor to weak)	0-4

<i>A03</i>	
Level 3 (good to excellent)	7-9
Level 2 (Limited to sound)	4-6
Level 1 (Very poor to weak)	0-3

