

Examiners' Report
June 2014

GCE Government & Politics 6GP04 4A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2014

Publications Code UA039024

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

Introduction

In general this paper saw a pleasing level of focus on contemporary events from many candidates, particularly with respect to the recent European Elections, although some candidates did allow this to partially distract them from the specific question asked.

There was also a strong awareness of recent changes within the EU – not simply of the Lisbon treaty, but also of changes to Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) via 'double majority' (Q1), the charter of fundamental rights (Q5) and potential future enlargements (Q8). Relevant use was also made of previous treaties, especially in terms of the Social Chapter.

It was pleasing to see less candidates than previously placing excessive reliance on historical content by focusing on older treaties where there have been relevant developments that supersede them, or by focusing debates on British views of Europe around the opinions of Mrs Thatcher or Major's Eurosceptic colleagues.

It was also pleasing to see a stronger level of synopticity from many candidates across all of the essays. It was particularly noticeable than on question 6 for example most candidates did not limit themselves to designating some institutions as democratically accountable and others as not, but rather many responses examined a variety of perspectives on the relative accountability of each institution.

Once again most candidates were able to offer a sensible number of developed arguments on short response questions as opposed to a series of assertions or brief undeveloped points.

Candidates were mixed in their ability to offer concise and accurate definitions of key terms. This was better done where specifically demanded by the question, but more candidates could have usefully offered a brief definition of QMV, Federalism or Social Justice to elucidate their subsequent arguments.

One overly common weakness was a failure by some candidates to fully address the requirements of the question, for example not directly linking integration to enlargement but instead considering them separately (Q8). Others discussed the influence of the European Parliament without linking it directly to policy making (Q4) or considered integration but not specifically federalism (Q3).

A linked weakness that was not extensive on any essay, but still too common on all, was a failure to sufficiently address 'to what extent' or 'discuss'. Essay questions on this paper do not request one sided answers, and their rewards are always limited.

As ever some basic errors were still too common, in particularly confusing the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) with the European Court of Justice (ECJ), or asserting QMV to be the voting method of choice in the European Parliament.

Equally it was very pleasing to see some candidates make the rare but accurate link between the EU and ECHR via the Copenhagen Criteria, and the EU's expectation that members sign up to this non-EU document.

Question 1

This was the second most popular short response question. An initial brief definition proved to be useful context for many candidates, but an unnecessarily extensive one cost a few candidates time although not marks.

Given the forthcoming changes to the Lisbon Rules of QMV, it was acceptable, but not required, for candidates to consider criticisms of the new method as well or instead of the old. A number of candidates did pick up on the fact that the two systems would exist side by side for some years with the potential for considerable confusion.

National Sovereignty was the most obvious and often deployed point, and many candidates linked this to examples about the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) reform or bankers bonuses. Equally a good number of candidates considered more than one criticism about voting weights - that they benefit the larger countries, smaller countries, or countries that are less relevant to a particular issue.

Level 1 responses sometimes failed to grasp that QMV is used by the Council of the EU rather than by the European Parliament and this clouded their subsequent points. Others simply asserted the unfairness of the system or its impact on national sovereignty without developing or justifying the point.

Level 2 responses most commonly focused on the impact on Sovereignty and, to some degree, the specific criticisms on voting weights. The most common reason they remained in this level was not clearly explaining *why* the system might benefit one type of nation or another. Some others listed multiple points without clearly developing them.

Level 3 responses were often able to go beyond sovereignty to specifically consider the supranational or federal aspects of QMV. Others achieved this level by providing more detail and different perspectives on the question of 'fairness'.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

There are many criticisms of the use of Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) due to the ever growing demand on the EU. This demand for the right voting system and the increase in democracy is due to the large number of member states (28) that are linked with the EU.

One main criticism of QMV is that it is based on weighted voting. This means that not every country has the same amount of votes. The votes available are distributed in relation to the number of citizens (population) in the member state. This can be seen as a disadvantage to smaller

countries due to their votes not having the same impact on the final decision as other countries do. Germany has the largest say in the QMV system due to their large population. With the voting being weighted, it is not complete a criticism. Some member states would say that if they have the largest population then they should then receive the most votes and have a major say in the

overall outcome of it.

Another main criticism is that it can be seen as more beneficial to larger countries. With the voting system being used in the European Council, it means that they can not smaller countries can not use their national votes as effectively as they would originally be able to. This can put them in an disadvantaged stage.

Final criticisms of QMV is that due to the voting system being used in the European Council it means that it isn't very representative of the population of the EU. This means that there is no clear relation to the ~~decisions~~ decisions made through QMV. It can also be seen as a less organised system and can be used.

In conclusion I feel that the QMV voting system does have its negatives but it can be used a lot better in than the National Vote. The national vote slows the whole process down, whereas the QMV system can be seen as a efficient method to used for the amount of people that the bills and laws affect.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a clear example of a candidate attempting to disguise what is essentially a single point, about the unfair advantage to larger countries, as several points. Alternatively the candidate may be unaware that this comes across as repetitive, but in either case it is limited within level 2. Actual mark 7.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Be wary of making 'several points' that are the same point approached from different angles. If you can only think of one point and still wish to attempt the question then make the point as clearly as you can and then move on to spend the time gaining credit on other questions.

Indicate your first question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 6.

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question that you have chosen.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

Qualified Majority Voting is a system of voting used in decisions in certain areas of policy in the Council of Ministers. In the process of decision making, decisions are made when a majority is met, rather than unanimity. The number of 'points' each state gets in its vote is based on its population, but they are weighted in such a way that smaller countries receive more votes than they should have so their voice is not ignored.

The first criticism of QMV is that it makes sovereignty easy for the states. States could make use of a veto in QMV which makes it hard to protect its national interest. An example of this could be when David Cameron failed to block legislation that would put a cap on bankers bonuses, which he felt would scare business away from the UK. As he was unable to veto it the legislation passed, leaving him the only person who would object to it.

Under criticism is that small states
get a disproportionately large number of
votes. ~~the~~ A state like Malta, with
a population of only a few thousand, gets
five votes but still for as long as it really
should based on population. Although this is
to help the small states, it essentially
means that ~~the~~ ~~of~~ German or British
votes are worth less than a Maltese
one. ~~The~~ this criticism is the democratic
deficit within the EU as not all votes are
equal.

Alternatively it can be criticised by saying
that the large countries are too powerful
and hinder the decision making process. France
and Germany together still not enough for
a majority, for a significant problem
for smaller countries that disagree, they
could need regularly 1/3rd help to form
a majority, meaning they are able to

have complaints from smaller countries and pass
laws that unfairly benefit them.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Unlike the last candidate this response clearly does make two valid and distinct points out of voting weights - that they can alternatively be seen to benefit either the biggest or the smallest countries - and adds this to the common point about sovereignty, backed up by an example. A clearer explanation of the sovereignty issue, or an additional point, might have taken this close to full marks but even so it is solid level 3. Actual mark 12.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Sometimes one area of criticism can be legitimately separated into two distinct points - for example where the criticism can be made from two opposite perspectives (too much or too little, benefits large or benefits small, two supranational or too intergovernmental etc).

Question 2

This specific ground had not been covered previously and perhaps as a consequence this was the second least popular of the short response questions.

Nevertheless a high proportion of those who did attempt it showed an impressive awareness of the criticisms that have been made of the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP). In particular there was rather less over-focus on Factortame (a legitimate point, but clearly not the only one) than might have been expected. Dumping, and in some cases the recent changes in the CFP with respect to this, as well as enforcement, sustainability and economic viability were also commonly discussed.

Most candidates followed the instruction to offer a definition – those who did not *could* still make level 3 but required a rather stronger range or depth of points to do so.

Level 1 responses were rare and often simply confused as to the provisions of the CFP – for example asserting that it limited countries to their own waters, or was primarily a subsidy in the style of CAP.

Level 2 responses generally offered an accurate definition with either one clear grounds for controversy, predominantly the sovereignty aspect, or two reasonable but less clear controversies.

Level 3 responses most commonly showed both a complete and accurate definition and at least two clear controversies that were explained in some detail, often with reference to specific practices or criticisms from different countries – most commonly Spain, Malta, the UK and Iceland (as a country who has chosen not to enter the EU).

The ~~the~~ Common Fisheries Policy is policy created and enforced by the European Union which ~~was~~ declares that European Waters aren't owned by any independent nation, but are equal for all members of the EU. The policy is linked to functionalism^{and spill-over}; can connecting relatively minor areas of policy, such as in this case fishing, or coal and steel in terms of the European Coal and Steel Community of 1951, will lead to further political cooperation and integration. ~~Some~~ Members of this school of thought include Jacques Delors, former head of Commission and Manuel Barroso, current President of the Commission.

The controversy caused by ~~to~~ the Common Fisheries Policy are most clearly seen in the Factortame case of the late 1980s. The Conservative government created the Merchant Fishing Act in 1988, which stated that the commercial fishing ships fish in UK waters

must have 75% or 'more British' crew; this contradicted with EU Common Fishing Policy. The Spanish company

Factorfame Ltd. were banned from fishing and demanded to the EU that the UK pay £20 million in compensation as the 1988 Act contradicted EU law. Indeed in 1997 the UK was forced to pay compensation. ~~Groups such as~~ Eurosceptic groups such as the UK Independence Party (UKIP) and Conservatives such as Nigel Lawson, who was Chancellor at the time, often cite the case as evidence of the UK losing sovereignty to the EU and also, many on the right (such as the far-right groups) would see it as evidence of unnecessary regulations on boats and, because, and the UK being poorly represented in Europe.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The candidate makes the Factorfame point clearly and had this been accompanied by additional points would probably have reached into level 3. Instead they remain rooted in level 2. Actual mark 7.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The most obvious argument is often a good place to start, but other points must also be considered in order to achieve a good mark.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

The common fisheries policy of the EU is ~~also~~ a policy area of the EU that ~~is~~ controls the fishing industry of EU member states. In theory it allows for boats to travel and fish anywhere they want to, however the UK has an opt out which allows it to deny boats up to 8 miles from its shoreline that are not from the UK.

Also included in the policy is quotas and regulations on the numbers and types of fish that can be caught per vessel. This is aimed to prevent the ~~decline~~^{depletion} and eventually ~~the~~ removal of resources. These quotas attract a lot of criticism because they ~~are~~ are very restrictive especially when compared to other areas of the world like America. They also carry very harsh penalties with large fines and even prison time being seen for British vessels that exceed these quotas. This draws a lot of media attention which prints the sentences as harsh which in turn creates a lot of controversy.

Another reason the common fisheries policy is controversial is because it is seen as an attack on British sovereignty. This view is largely created by the Eurosceptic media who see the ~~many~~ foreign boats fishing in our waters as removing the control Britain has over its own land. The ~~any~~ controversy created is actually disproportionate because

The Fishing industry makes up less than 1% of the UK's GDP and in actual fact less than 1% of the GDP of every EU country. This did not however stop it becoming a political issue and in 2009 the UK civil servants and the government argued hard in order to receive an opt out protecting 8 miles off of the British coast.

A final reason for the common fisheries policy ~~is~~ ^{is} controversial is because it is stopping the expansion of the EU. This is because countries like Iceland who's entire GDP relies on the fishing industry are ~~not~~ reluctant to join and be forced to share their waters. While opt outs are evidently available the EU's strong stance on the matter and the doubt this policy causes has stopped Iceland and other countries not to join, ~~the~~ causing controversy especially from those who desire further EU expansion.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Although most candidates did specifically mention Factorame this response shows how a level 3 mark could be achieved without doing so, by providing a clear definition by clear and reasonable criticisms. The Iceland point is not in the mark scheme but is perfectly reasonable and clearly argued.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The mark scheme is not an exhaustive account of every argument that could be credited - credit will always be given for relevant and accurate material.

Question 3

This question was of middling popularity. It was helpful for candidates to begin with a brief definition of federalism – many did so although some made the mistake of defining federalism so extensively that their links to the EU were only perfunctory. Equally many answers without a definition were able to demonstrate clear understanding of the concept through their points, but others did not do this, focusing more generally on integration. Comparison to the USA was clearly acceptable and often helpful, providing that the link was made and not simply asserted.

The degree of assertion in general was a major discriminator, as stronger candidates showed *how* particular aspects of the EU could be portrayed as federal. The most common areas considered were pooled sovereignty, supranational institutions and posts, political symbols and the single currency. It was acceptable for there to be a degree of crossover with question 1, but a sole focus on QMV could not progress very far and only a tiny minority of candidates attempted this.

Attempts at balance – i.e. to explain why the EU is not in fact federal – were not credited, nor was discussion of the desirability or otherwise of federalism.

Level 1 responses either defined federalism *or* outlined the structure of the EU without linking the two, except occasionally by brief assertion.

Level 2 responses generally offered some understanding of both federalism and its link to the EU, but this link was made with only middling competence. Other responses covered relevant material but were more focused on integration generally or on one particular aspect, such as the Lisbon Treaty's similarity to a constitution. Finally some responses limited their credit simply by spending too much of their time on uncreditable material, such as the counter-case.

Level 3 responses focused their attention on the link, as demanded by the question, and covered a range of points, often encompassing more than one of political, economic, judicial and symbolic issues.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

The European union has been in existence for decades and has steadily become stronger and solidified our place in the modern world, because of this a layer of institutions has appeared with powers greater than that of parliament.

A Federal State is one where there is two layers of government one more powerful than the other, example being the Westminster is on one level and dictates laws to the British people.

but the EU, comprising of; the EP, the Commission, Council of ministers, the ECJ and the European Council is more powerful and has the ability to make and enforce laws on its member states and in some cases overrule them and implement instead of. A great example of a federal system would be America as it has the states government and then above that the congress and the white house that has more power and overall control.

However you can also say how the EU is not federal or a federal system because some countries including the UK have an opt out and they can leave at any time and the EU shows that overall the most important part of legislation lies with Westminster. It's also important to note how lots of MEPs regardless of party affiliation in the European parliament will still vote in favour of policies towards their country e.g. A policy that would greatly affect Germany's increase in production was voted for by nearly all of their 99 MEPs, this shows that MEPs still have country affiliations and means that they don't always vote for the EU as a higher tier but for their country.

Collectively we see that the EU is more and more like a federal ^{system} state and is becoming more powerful but people still

feel a nation affiliation more along the style
of intergovernmental cooperation.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Although there is some relevant material here this candidate makes several errors that limit their progress, including spending time giving balance to a one-sided question, and displaying some confusion as to what exactly federalism is. Actual mark 5.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

It is wise to answer the question, the whole question and nothing but the question.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

One way the EU could be ~~sp~~ seen as federal is due to the ~~ex~~ European court of justice. This court is now the highest court in the land and often settles dispute such as Factortame and Gibraltar and its judgement is final. It is federal as it represents the idea of a central body of power court e.g. similar to USA supreme court, with member states having their own, smaller courts. The fact the EU law is above national law further strengthens the ~~court's~~ ECU appearance in being federal. Therefore one way the EU is federal is that the ECJ is highest court and EU law above national law.

Second way the EU appears to be federal is that it has president and heads which mimic that of the USA president. The EU has "leaders" E.g. Herman Van Rompuy, president of the council and Jose Barroso, ~~head~~ head of commission (soon to be replaced by Lihey but not certain candidate Jean Claude Juncker). These figure heads give the EU ~~the~~ direction in policy making much like presidents ~~of~~ and Prime ministers of national countries. In Particular president Obama, who, like Herman and Barroso, gives his administration

direction. Therefore one way the EU is seen as federal is through use of "leaders" or figure heads who give the EU direction in areas such as policy.

last way the EU can be seen as federal is that they control many policy areas such as agriculture. The EU makes legislation ~~which~~ on policy areas which they control and are binding on all member states. Much like Washington ~~foreign~~ ~~tax~~ fiscal policy is binding on all states of America. This gives the impression that the EU is the central body. An example of EU Policy which is binding on all member states is the common agricultural policy (CAP) which aims to preserve farmers income and the environment. Therefore ~~one~~ ^{Final} way the EU is federal is that it controls some policy areas ~~etc~~ such as agriculture.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The three points made here are all clear and relevant, but what distinguishes this from other responses making similar points is the extent to which they are linked back to Federalism, in one case with a very effective comparison to the US. Had the links been left more implicit this response would have been stuck in level 2, but instead it scored highly. Actual mark 13.

Chosen Question Number:

← immigrat

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

The European Parliament is the only directly elected body within the European Union so gains its legitimacy from the citizens. It used to be seen as a talking shop when the power to pass laws purely resided in the hands of the Council of Ministers but through the introduction of the Co-decision making procedure on 80% of issues. This however does leave the Council of Ministers with the ability to decide on 20% of issues using the Consultation procedure on trade, agriculture, energy policy etc.

The European Parliament lacks the power of initiative or this resides with the European Commission who act in the interests of Europe as a whole over representing the people. The Parliament may not be able to draft legislation or propose it officially but using Parliamentary committees can suggest legislation to the Commission for consideration. This was the case with the cap on bankers bonuses at 100% of their salary as it originated

in Parliament. This is seen as in touch with public opinion as people ~~was~~ have negative views on the extent of bankers bonuses especially after taxpayers bailing out the banks after the recession of 2008.

The European Parliament has acted in people's interests on the issue of roaming charges while abroad and these have been reduced by 40% since 1996 as Parliament had pushed the Commission to legislate on this issue. The Parliament had an influence

on the Commission so possesses an indirect influence on policy. Although it lacks the power of initiative it can ~~influence~~ ^{State} its view before legislation is drafted.

Also the Parliament has the function of scrutinising the Commission so through its 20 committees questions and debates proposals to then table amendments. This shows influence as it has the capability to amend, reject or pass legislation. This also influences what the Commission will propose in the first place as the Commission like the UK government will not suggest legislation that it knows will not make it through Parliament or the Council of Ministers.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response also makes the points about accountability and relative influence but develops them further and adds the unusual but valid point about the committee work of the Parliament. Actual mark 12.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

A specific example demonstrating policy influence - as demonstrated here with reference to roaming charges, is very useful.

Question 5

This was the least popular short response question, which perhaps reflected many candidates uncertainly as to the other ways of advancing social justice beyond the Social Chapter. If so then this was probably the correct choice for many candidates, since responses that focused exclusively on that document, however well developed, did not reach Level 3.

Some candidates also proved to be a little confused as to the concept of social justice, and so avoided offering an explicit definition which unfortunately did not help to clarify matters. A small but surprising minority confused it entirely with criminal justice, discussing the European Arrest Warrant and receiving no credit for this.

There was, as ever, significant confusion between the ECJ and ECHR, and too many candidates argued from the position of the Convention being an EU document. This was disappointing but it was very pleasing to see some candidates make the rare but accurate link between the two via the expectation under the Copenhagen Criteria that EU members sign up to this non-EU document.

Level 1 responses focused predominantly, and erroneously, on the ECHR, or else gave a brief or vague explanation of the aims of the EU along with an assertion that these included Social Justice.

Level 2 responses most commonly focused on different provisions of the Social Chapter, their position within the level being determined by the spread and development on these points. Others identified that both the Commission and ECJ helped to advance Social Justice but were insufficiently clear on how they did this to progress higher.

Level 3 responses often did include discussion of Social Chapter, but added detailed consideration of one or more further points to take them into this level. The Charter of Fundamental Rights was the commonly discussed additional point but convergence funding, the Schengen Agreement (as a promoter of economic and social mobility) and the various EU institutions were also creditably utilised.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Question 5

The introduction of the social chapter in 1983, is a method in which the EU has sought to advance social justice. For example through the social chapter under the conservative government in the 1980s, it was made possible for people in full time employment across Europe to be entitled to a minimum of 4 weeks paid holiday and breaks, this is a whole two weeks more than in the USA. This in turn creates social justice since employees

are not exploited by their employers.

Additionally, the social chapter also made it possible for not only maternal leave but paternal leave as well. Therefore both mothers and fathers are entitled to some time off (paid) to spend with their newborn children. For example, maternal leave allows the mother to take 6 months of work fully paid, then 3 months off with half pay and finally 1 month off with quarter pay. The act of Maternal Leave therefore displays ways the EU tries to create social justice as ~~that~~ all parents or guardians within the EU are entitled to this.

Finally, the introduction of the social chapter also made it possible for a person to take some time off (paid) if they were ill. This ensures that the person is able to gain some security of their job and can still earn an income whilst off without having to worry about a day or weeks pay missing. ~~An example~~ An example of this is shown as long-term illnesses enable a person to take 3 months of work full pay.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

A clear and detailed explanation of the social chapter, but this response does not move beyond this to consider other ways in which the EU promoted social justice and is therefore stuck in level 2. Actual mark 8.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Do not place all of your reliance on one relevant area, however well explained - a range of points is needed to enter level 3.

Question 1 Question 2 Question 3 Question 4 Question 5

The EU's ~~social chapter~~ ^{regional policy}, agreed in the Maastricht Treaty, is a huge advance in social justice. This element of treaty law provides a third of the EU's budget to the poorest regions, half going to western Europe, half to the East. Areas with less than 60% of the average GDP per capita of the EU qualify. This chapter enables regeneration of these regions that have no other way to recover and provide work and social mobility for those living there. This is a vital part of the concept of social justice being dealt with by the EU.

Alongside this, in the Nice Treaty, the Social Chapter became a part of EU law. This ~~universal~~ element of treaty law enshrines certain rights for workers across the EU, ~~allowing~~ some of which had never received legal backing before. These include part time and agency workers, ~~many~~ couples with newborn children and disabled workers. Many of these rights were enshrined that all.

workers were afforded equal rights. Some, such as the rights of part time and agency workers, ~~were stopped~~ ~~also~~ were an attempt to stop discrimination towards women.

Finally, to gain entry to the EU, states must, at all times, become signatories of the European Convention of Human Rights. Although it is not part of ~~the~~ treaty law, the importance the EU places on it is obvious. It has protected injustices being done to the poorest and immigrants. It also provides a means to the people of opposing their Government and holding them to account.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response covers the Social Chapter is in less detail than others, but supplements it with a clear explanation of the regional fund and is noteworthy for being a response that manages to get the relationship between the EU and ECHR correct - that the latter is not part of the former, but that members are expected to sign up to it. Actual mark 12.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The ECHR does have a relationship to the EU, but does not come from the EU and is not enforced by it - it can be usefully referred to if you are clear on the relationship but should otherwise be avoided.

Question 6

This was a popular essay question, although slightly less so than question 7.

Most candidates were able to demonstrate a clear understanding of the nature of democratic accountability through the points they made. They did not need to set out a separate definition at the start, although this was helpful and credited.

The keys to success were balance, the quality of illustrative examples, the degree of development and the range of individual institutions considered. Answers that treated the EU as one giant homogenous mass did not gain high marks and were mercifully rare. However a more common limiting factor was to focus exclusively on one or two institutions, usually the Parliament and Commission. Conversely some responses were credited for discussing the ECB and ECJ as well as the more obvious institutions.

Rocco Buttiglione did considerable service as an example of the democratically accountable Parliament's powers over the Commission, but also served to demonstrate some candidates' slightly hazy awareness of the specific procedures. Some candidates asserted either that he had been individually rejected or that the whole commission had been turned down, rather than his withdrawing to prevent the risk of the whole Commission being rejected.

A few candidates fell into the trap of entirely embracing the premise of the question, or failing to consider institutions separately. A few others were marred by inaccuracy.

Middling responses were characterised by either considering a range of institutions, but failing to offer sufficient development or balance to go higher, or alternatively giving a stronger exposition over a more limited range. A few higher responses did discuss a variety of institutions but treated them entirely separately of each other.

The strongest responses tended to consider a broad range of different institutions whilst showing awareness of the relevant links between them, particularly between the Commission and Parliament. They were able to consider the ways in which each institution both offered and lacked accountability, and sometimes to link this to reasons for it (such as the intergovernmental vs supranationalist approach).

In terms of synopticity a moderately effective approach was to group institutions by those seen as broadly possessing accountability and those seen to lack it. However a stronger line of attack was to consider the subtleties within institutions. Some effective use was also made of specific critics of the EU such as Nigel Farage, and this was naturally more effective when closely focused on democratic accountability or lack thereof.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The EU is often criticised for being a supranational state of ~~be~~ bureaucrats who have too many closed doors and where there is a democratic deficit because not enough power lies within the elected European Parliament. However, although much of this remains true, one must also remember that due to

deeper integration - and the resulting treaties, institutions such as the largely criticised Commission have become far more accountable.

Firstly, it can be seen that there is indeed too little democratic accountability as many of the EU institutions such as the ECB ~~and the~~ remain unelected. This has caused much criticism in past years, as this means that the EU is not a true democratic institution. For instance the ECB has often been criticised because of its lack of accountability.

For over 16 years now, the bank has not been able to balance its deficit and although the overall expenditure of around €45 billion is relatively small in comparison to the total expenditure of the EU member states, it still does not explain why so much money is allowed to go unaccounted for.

Furthermore, the Court of Justice has also been criticised because the judges are appointed but do not have a proper check and balance in order to ensure that they do not abuse their power. This is strange as the ECJ is the highest court in Europe and yet it remains democratically unaccountable.

However, arguably the biggest culprits of this democratic unaccountability had been for a while the Commission. The most influential body which was not elected but consisted of appointed commissioners who were not accountable to anyone. However, since the Maastricht treaty in 1997, and especially the Lisbon Treaty, 2007 the powers of the European

Parliament have been increased drastically and so they now act as an effective 'check and balance' to the Commission.

Although the European Parliament's powers of being able to hold the Commission to account are limited, this is a vast improvement.

Now Commissioners have to present a report to the European Parliament detailing their time as a Commission, including successes and failures. The European Parliament also has the power to dismiss Commissioners that they deem unfit. Overall this has helped in increasing the democratic accountability.

Unfortunately, the democratic accountability will remain too low in the majority of our institutions. The Council of Ministers, yet another powerful institution, remains largely unaccountable and although it does have to answer to the Commission of the Council in some areas, there

remain many parts of the institution which are not held to account. For instance the many civil servants or COMPER are greatly unaccountable, with not many knowing who they actually are. This

simply encourages the secrecy and closed door policy which has long been criticised and also runs the risk of creating a culture of bureaucracy. This has meant that there is still too little democratic accountability in the EU.

Furthermore, due to deeper integration the role & significance of the Commission has increased greatly, especially since the SEA, 1986 which saw the creation of the Single Market. This meant that the Commission received even more lobbying from businesses, Trade Unions, pressure groups and even individuals. All of this new incoming traffic of work and lobbying was largely unregulated and although in recent years regulations have been put in place to stop bribery and corruption, due to the closed door of the EU it can be seen that there is not enough democratic accountability in this area of the EU.

Finally the Council - especially the position of Permanent President of the Council, also contributes towards the lack of democratic accountability. Because the President of the Council is appointed, although they are able to hold the Council to account, there is no real way of holding the president themselves to account, as they are not accountable to the people. The use of veto does prevent for any extremism to occur, however, such a 'democratic deficit' serves to encourage bureaucracy and so less merit that this it can be seen that there is too little democratic accountability.

In conclusion, it can be seen that ~~although~~ steps have been taken to increase democratic accountability, such as the increase in powers of the European Parliament who now act as an 'effective check and balance' to the Commission. However, it can also be seen that there is indeed still too little democratic accountability as the vast majority of institutions are unelected, and also regulations in place to reduce bureaucracy and corruption do not go far enough. The EU still has a long way before it can be seen as truly democratically accountable.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate considers a range of institutions and makes some very solid points with clear reference to some examples in practice, and this could have been a very strong response, but they are let down by their lack of balance, particularly in terms of synopticity.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Questions that end 'discuss' require a two sided answer, and offering a one sided answer will limit you.

Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

To be accountable is essentially to be democratically held responsible by the public. In the EU, the only thoroughly accountable institution is the European Parliament (EP) yet this has limited influence. There is to a large extent too little democratic accountability in the EU.

Arguably the most significant institution in the EU is the Commission. This is because it's the institution that formulates policy. Yet, none of the Commissioners in the institution have been elected, a clear case for lack of democratic accountability. Furthermore, once appointed, no commissioner can be singularly removed meaning no individual can be held responsible for decisions they have made. However, supporters argue that each Commissioner is thoroughly questioned and scrutinised by the European Parliament, by increasing democracy as MEPs are at all elected to represent us. Furthermore, the EP have the power to remove an entire Commission as ~~has~~ happened with the Santer Commission when the EP went with the 'nuclear option' due to the emergence of fraud.

Additionally, Commissioners can be called to account by the CP but the crucial downfall of this defence is that Commissioners aren't obliged to go. Overall, whilst the European Parliament have some power over the commission, which in a way makes it indirectly accountable, it's essentially undemocratic, which is furthered by the fact that it's so powerful within the EU.

The European Council may also be considered somewhat lacking in effective democratic accountability. Whilst it is the case that each head of state is elected, it still leaves the fact that ~~for~~ for every citizen, there are 27 unelected Council members designed to 'represent' them. However, it's notable that ~~the~~ although the Council choose impetus and direction

of policy they actually do very little specifics and so although they're highly unaccountable ~~there's also~~ it's somewhat reduced by their lack of specific influence.

The Council of Ministers are similarly all elected in their member states but effectively ~~un~~missively unaccountable in general. This is perhaps the least ~~error~~ democratic

arguable institution because with
of the decision making is done behind
closed doors. How can Ministers be
held to account when no-one knows
specifics of what was said?

Furthermore, at least the Ministers themselves
are indirectly elected as this cannot
be said for those who do most of
the work. COREPER deals with 70-90%
of the Council of Ministers legislation
and is a massively ~~unrepresentative~~
in part of the institution. This blatant
democratic deficit is a clear indicator
that further democratic measures
are needed. Perhaps the only thing
that reduces the lack of accountability
is that the Council of Ministers are

unable to form policy.

~~The~~ As previously stated the
most democratic institution in the EU
and the strongest argument for
adequate responsibility is the European
Parliament. This is because all the
MEPs are elected using a proportional
representation voting system which
ensures minimal votes are wasted. It
bridges a pretty substantial gap
between EU decision making and
the citizens themselves. Arguably the
most significant ~~element~~ element linking
~~the~~ ~~to~~ democracy is the fact that

They have relatively limited influence so that the EP can't initiate policy or block a vast chunk of it. However, ~~it's~~ there's also a case to be made that this is being addressed. Lisbon significantly increased EP powers and this trend is likely to continue as Euroscepticism grows throughout the member state citizens who fear ~~the~~ loss of sovereignty. Overall the European Parliament would help reduce the need for further democratic accountability if it receives more influence.

^{Three} figures are debatably the three most powerful members of the EU and not one can be held singularly accountable, clearly highlighting the need for further action.

Overall, it's abundantly clear there is still too little democratic accountability in the EU because the vast majority of our ~~paid~~ ^{unpaid} institutional members and ~~the~~ so called 'representatives' are unpaid and pretty much anonymous. This democratic deficit needs to be further addressed through either increasing the ~~etc~~ ^{etc} ~~institutions~~ ^{elections} used for institutions or allowing more power to the European Parliament - ~~usually~~ the main case for democracy.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A good answer showing range and balance and with some links between institutions. They might profitably have brought in the European Parliament earlier and to a greater extent in comparison to some of the other institutions but this did not prevent them easily entering level 3.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Questions that invite you to discuss the overall impact of all institutions are best considered by examining individual institutions, linking them, and then drawing overall conclusions - failing to separate them is unlikely to help you achieve well.

Question 7

This was the most popular essay question and saw more candidates than usual adopt a clear line of argument on whether the UK should leave the EU or remain in. Equally it was very pleasing that most of these candidates did not restrict themselves to one side of the debate but instead properly acknowledged and considered the alternative point of view, often to a higher quality than that seen in public debate over the issue.

The major keys to success here were range, balance, evidence and in many cases subtlety as to the balance of evidence. One sided diatribes – in either direction – performed badly but were mercifully rare. Equally whilst reference to UKIP's electoral success was useful context, and indeed 'the public want to leave' was a reasonable point, purely psephological or party political context was not the main pillar of strong answers.

Once again there was some confusion from a minority of candidates between the ECHR and EU, which was not credited, whilst some others failed to distinguish between internal migration by EU citizens and immigration from non-EU citizens.

The weakest responses were either very one sided, or relied too much on assertion over argument. A small number focused exclusively, and not always rigorously, on a narrow area of the debate such as immigration.

Lower responses were generally characterised by an over focus on political commentary, particularly about party views on Europe in general, without sufficient link to specific reasons and evidence. Alternatively they were quite one-sided and/or over-reliant on assertion. Stronger middle responses showed some balance and utilised evidence, but focused this over a relatively narrow range of issues (for example only the economic arguments) or else failed to develop their points quite sufficiently for level 3.

The strongest responses did not necessarily reach a neutral conclusion but were characterised by strong reference to both sides of the argument. They discussed specific evidence throughout, often linked to discussion of those advancing such evidence, and covered a range of points including both economic and political arguments.

In terms of synopticity the most common approach to link specific arguments to party views. Effective consideration was given by some to the views of pressure groups and of business. Some candidates did limit their progress by a lack of subtlety here – asserting that all anti EU arguments were advanced by UKIP, and all pro-EU by the Lib Dems, and ignoring any middle ground. Candidates who did consider the Cameronite position of renegotiation, as other such nuanced positions, were rewarded accordingly.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The UK was a founding member of
the ECSC (European Coal and Steel Community)
in the 1950's ~~when it was founded~~. Since then
the UK has been a huge player within
the EU and has been crucial in maintaining
stability with its international presence. However over the
past twenty years, the biggest question facing the

UK in terms of the EU has been; should the UK leave the EU?

On the one hand, it could be argued that the UK is one of the world's largest ^{gigabit} economies with a total GDP of £1.1 trillion. ~~£~~ The EU only equates to 1/6 of ^{net} total trade per year. It could therefore be argued that the economic benefits of staying in the EU are greatly overstated.

However, on the other hand, while the EU equates to only 1/6 of our total trade per year, when broken down into single trade relationships, the EU is now our biggest trade partner with

a trade relationship of £400 billion per year. This is now more than the UK's relationship with the USA and with China.

Another reason ^{for why} ~~that~~ leaving the EU would be a bad idea is due to the EU benefit system. The EU has a benefit system which allows workers injury pay for a full year if they have a serious work accident. They have their health insurance covered by the EU. They have housing stability paid for by EU member states and they are subject to EU worker rights as they can claim these rights if they are unfairly treated or dismissed. ~~Another benefit system~~ Also, if you are an EU citizen, then you are entitled to a state pension in any member state in the EU. If the

UK left the EU, ~~they~~ their citizens would not be entitled to any of these schemes and benefits.

Currently, every law ~~is~~ made in UK must first be sent to the EU and passed through multiple readings and reviews before it can be officially passed in the UK. Effectively, the EU has sovereign reign over our judicial system. If the UK left the EU, it would be able to pass laws faster quickly, without the hassle of the EU reviews and possibly rejecting them, and this would then increase judicial democracy and it would ~~give the UK~~ Sovereign judicial power back to the UK.

~~The~~ One reason the UK should leave the EU is due to CAP (The Common Agricultural Policy). Firstly, the system has been reformed so many times that it has become a disillusioned and dissolved version of the original scheme. The problem with CAP is the system is open to fraud. In 1992, set aside was ^{a system} created where farmers would be paid to set aside cultivatable land and they would be paid for not farming it. However, farmers realised ~~the~~ geographical area of their ~~farm~~ farm was partly in the sea, so farmers realised they could set aside the land and still use the cultivatable land to make money and therefore they were effectively getting paid for nothing. These farmers were incriminated and jailed and this led to more reforms. An agricultural policy like this is bad for the UK because it causes unnecessary economic strain when being put into it. Another reason why the CAP is a flawed system which would not benefit the UK is because

There are 14 million farms in the EU (There are 2 million in the USA which gives an indication into the size of the power behind European farms). At the same time farms are becoming increasingly angry with CAP and if 14 million farms joined on the EU, the EU would effectively go into a ^{recession} which would be catastrophic for the UK as it imports many resources from the EU (These resources created ~~by~~

and managed by EU farmers.)

In conclusion, I do ~~believe~~ agree with the statement that the ~~UK~~ case for the UK's withdrawal from the EU now outweighs the case for staying in ^{the EU} ~~the~~ mainly due to the danger of the Common agricultural policy and the threat that poses due to the fact that there will never be a unified agreement over a common agricultural policy in the EU. ~~Also~~ Secondly I believe that the economic benefits are greatly overestimated and the UK is ^{not} benefiting sufficiently enough from them.



ResultsPlus Examiners Comments

A mixture of reasonable and marginal points (such as 'EU benefits system'), held back by a lack of balance. A clear example of a lower response.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Balance need not be equal but it needs to be present to more than a very brief or thin degree.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The EU was originally set up in 1957 due to the Treaty of Rome. It was set up as the European Coal and Steel Community. The reason for this initial integration was to keep peace in Europe after two world wars. ~~The~~ The UK joined the EU in 1972 under the Conservative Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. The EU has evolved significantly and now has 28 member states. The deeper integration has led to serious discussions about whether the UK should withdraw or stay in the EU. In this essay I shall discuss whether the benefits of leaving now outweigh the benefits of staying in the EU.

The UK is part of the EU single market. This enables the free movement of people, goods, services and labour. It also has a common external tariff. The UK trades 50% with the EU. This is of huge benefit to the UK as the increase in competition leads to lower prices and increased efficiency. Most importantly it creates jobs and economic growth. I believe that if the UK left the EU then it would have a significant impact on the amount of trade that goes on between the UK and the EU. This could have bad potential consequences of increased unemployment and less economic growth. I believe trade is key to an economy's success and therefore if the UK decided to leave ~~the~~ the EU it would have a negative impact on the trading sector and therefore the economy. However some countries are in the single

market, but not in the EU like Switzerland. This move could be the best option for the UK, however the UK would have no influence on policies which affect the single market and would have to pay the EU vast amounts to be part of it. Therefore I believe trade is enhanced most by staying in the EU.

The EU budget for 2013 was £132 billion which was an increase of 2.1% from the previous year. Furthermore the UK contributed about £12.1 billion to the EU budget. The UK along with 12 other member states is a net contributor to the EU. This means they contribute more than they receive. UK main political parties all agree that the EU budget needs to be reduced. The main piece of expenditure by the EU is on the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). This takes up 47% of the budget. The UK government used this cut as only 4% of the labour force work in agriculture and it only equates to 1.6% of EU GDP. Therefore this is seen as highly wasteful especially after a financial crisis when economies are struggling for funding. Furthermore the EU has just undergone expansion to the East. For example Croatia and Macedonia. These countries are poor and urban deprivation is a regular thing. This means that Regional Policy payments will be going towards these new member states so that their living standards are up to the average EU level. This is bad for the UK as more payments will go to other countries and that the UK will benefit less from such policies. Other wealthy countries lose out on Regional Policy even though there are areas of poverty. Therefore I believe that

with the enlargement of the EU, the UK are having to pay more to support these countries, whilst the UK is benefitting less from EU policies. I believe this has caused the negatives of staying in the EU to outweigh the benefits.

However some politicians would argue that being part of the EU is more vital now than it has ever been before. This is because the global economy is going through the process of globalisation and world power of China and USA are growing. Therefore some would say being part of the EU is a way of rivaling these huge economies. The EU equates for 20% of world trade even though it has 7% of the global population. Without the EU the UK would be a small island unable to compete with the world powers. Therefore some people believe it is necessary to stay in the EU as it enhances the UK's power. Furthermore some would even say that it enhances the UK's democracy. This is because the UK now has a greater voice on the world stage with the backing of the EU. Therefore I believe it to have huge benefits for the UK of staying in the EU in this current time of globalisation.

75% of the UK's statute law comes from EU. Furthermore the rulings over the 'Factortame' Merchant Shipping Act in 1988 and the extradition of suspected terrorist Abu Kadeb from the UK to Jordan were overruled by the EU. This has been seen to erode the UK's Parliamentary Sovereignty. Furthermore the

Lisbon Treaty was basically an EU constitution in all but words. This increased the use of QMV in the Council and reduced national governments input. Now the UK government has a lower say in EU matters and therefore cannot protect the interests of the UK people. The above shows that the EU is heading for a federal Europe with greater integration and more power to Brussels. This has created a huge democratic deficit where the people of the UK have no say in ~~what~~ policies which affect their lives massively. I believe the erosion of democracy and Sovereignty in the UK has gone too deep. ~~and it has not~~ If the UK left the EU then Parliamentary Sovereignty would be restored. Therefore the UK parliament could enforce its own legislation which would benefit the UK people the most. This would maximise benefits and the government could act in self-interest for the people, rather than having to act in what is best for Europe. Overall the deeper integration has taken away the power from the people and ^{UK} parliament and been given to Brussels. On ~~the above~~ these issues I believe it best for the UK to leave the EU as the benefits of enhancing democracy are vital.

Overall I do agree with the statement that the benefits of leaving the EU outweigh the case for staying, to a certain extent. I believe areas like the CAP have become ridiculous and too much money is being chucked ^{at} ~~and~~ these policies, which has created inefficiency. The expenses scandal of European members of Parliament was worse than the UK's MP's expenses scandal. European members of Parliament don't have to show receipts on their

expenses and has led to severe abuse of the system. This has shown that there needs to be increased accountability. Even though I agree with the statement I believe the UK should remain in the UK. This is because it is a way to rival USA and China, and increase the UK's voice on the world stage. Furthermore I believe the UK economy benefits hugely from the increase in trade. However I do think the EU needs reform as it has become too big, with too much power and no direct mandates to rise. In the future if the EU is reformed I believe the benefits of staying will outweigh the benefits of leaving. In conclusion I agree with the statement to a certain extent at this particular moment of time.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate makes some of the same points as the above candidate but does so in a much clearer, balanced and well developed manner, whilst covering political as well as economic arguments. The link to further enlargement is unusual but well made. The factual inaccuracy about Thatcher in the opening paragraph is ignored and the candidate does not suffer for it except slightly for wasted time.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Introductions and conclusions are an important part of essay responses, but should be kept as tight as possible, setting the context or summing up arguments but not falling into repetition or excessive historical commentary.

Question 8

This was, by some distance, the least popular essay question. It is likely that some candidates would have preferred a question that was about either enlargement or integration and not the link between the two, although the latter is clearly detailed in the specification. Indeed some candidates did not allow this to prevent them from attempting such an answer, to their dis-benefit.

Candidates could demonstrate clear understanding of the nature of EU integration and enlargement through their points. They did not need to set out separate definitions at the start although this was helpful and was credited.

However, a significant minority of candidates failed to focus sufficiently on the concept of integration and showed a poor understanding of what it entails, often equating integration with any form of policy change or process rather than on the more specific concept as applied to harmonisation, cooperation and deepening of EU political structures.

Equally a number of candidates did make a strong link between the two concepts, often linked to both past and future integration (both of which were credited). Specific examples were very useful here as was reference to how specific treaties impact on the debate, although this was not essential.

The weakest responses were generally concerned only by the pros or cons of either enlargement or integration and touched only briefly, and incidentally, on the link between them.

Lower answers were often either a stronger version of the same phenomenon, or were competent as far as they went but were unbalanced. A few others were a little inconsistent in their engagement with integration, apparently taking it as synonymous with any form of policy change or process. Higher middling answers did focus on the link between enlargement and integration and were rewarded to the extent that they justified and developed their points.

Stronger responses embraced the link between enlargement and integration throughout and offered a series of points giving overall balance and strongly linking specific examples to general trends – for example using Turkey or the Balkan nations as illustrations of the potential weakening of cultural cohesion caused by enlargement.

There was a wide variety of synoptic approaches on the question, especially given the relatively limited pool of answers, with the most common being the indirect 'for then against' structure. Slightly less common, but more effective, was to alternate the ways in which enlargement does and does not weaken integration, directly contrasting these points where possible. The single most effective synoptic point came from those who specifically considered the contrasting supranationalist and intergovernmental perspectives with regard to this debate. Finally some candidates effectively considered the differing aims of individual new member states and how this might benefit or weaken integration.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The continued enlargement of the EU has arguably significantly damaged EU integration. The ~~long~~ addition of new member states has increased the democratic deficit, intensified euroscepticism and

increased the diversity of member states all of which has impacted ~~to~~ efforts to integrate the EU more closely.

The first way in which enlargement has damaged integration is through the extended use of ~~QMV~~ Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) which has damaged state sovereignty. With 2 major enlargements between 2004 - 2007 it became more and more difficult to use unanimity voting to reach decisions on policy, as there were more states present to exercise their veto. Therefore, to ensure efficiency, QMV was extended in its use under the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009. This meant a majority was required to pass a vote rather than unanimity. The effect of this was their national sovereignty and influence within the EU had been damaged and so led to many

countries increasingly expression their feelings of alienation, and so the increased use of QMV damaged inclusion and integration within the EU.

A further way in which enlargement has damaged EU integration is through citizen disconnect, evident in low election turnouts. A key aspect of integration is closer relations with citizens as well as closer policy. With the combined population of the EU reaching 500 million it has arguably become harder for the EU to connect with the electorate. This disconnect is evident in the low turnout in the most recent EU elections which ~~was~~ averaged a third across the EU. Therefore

enlargement has led to citizen apathy which has damaged attempts to promote closer relations with the electorate.

Enlargement has further damaged integration by promoting euroscepticism across the EU.

Enlargement has increased levels of euroscepticism due to widespread concerns about ~~immigration~~ immigration.

Due to the Single European Act it is possible for all EU citizens to move freely across the EU. ~~the~~ Many states, however, have expressed concern about the level and quality of immigrants from newer EU

states such as Poland, Bulgaria and Romania. The eurosceptic party UKIP expresses a common belief that immigration of low skilled eastern European ~~workers~~ workers is damaging the UK economy and cites this as a reason to leave the EU. ~~the~~ With this in mind it can be argued that enlargement has damaged integration as it has increased immigration which, in turn, has increased eurosceptics calling for their state to ~~leave~~ leave the EU which actively opposes integration.

A further way in which enlargement has increased euroscepticism is through budgetary concerns and high bureaucracy. Eurosceptics often cite the cost of the Common Agricultural Policy, the largest item in the EU budget, as an excessive cost to countries with relatively low farming sectors and so express opposition to 'blanket policies'. In addition, many are concerned about the high bureaucratic costs of the

EU and often cite the €100million+ cost of the parliaments monthly commute to Strausberg as a key excessive example. Excessive spending within the EU budget leads many eurosceptics to call for their state to leave the EU and save costs, so damaging integration.

The diversity of the EU created by enlargement makes integration a far more difficult task. 7 of the countries which joined in the 2004 enlargement were former members of the communist Eastern Bloc and so often lack efficient and comprehensive social protection, unlike developed states such as the UK and Germany. In addition, poverty rates average around 20% across many eastern states whilst is typically under 10% in countries such as France, Italy and Sweden. Indeed, states such as Spain and Portugal are typically left leaning whilst many Scandinavian states are more right leaning in their ideology. This diversity across Europe in social protection capabilities, prosperity and ideology makes shared policy integration much more difficult to achieve and has been made worse by the 2004 enlargement.

In conclusion, the increased EU population as a result of enlargement has damaged government sovereignty through the required extension of QMV which has alienated many states and weakened integration. The increase has also arguably caused ~~apath~~ political apathy among the electorate, evident in low turnout, which has damaged attempts to integrate the

electorate. Enlargement has evidently been a factor in increased Euroscepticism which has hindered desire for further integration. ~~And~~ And, the diversity created by enlargement has made integration a more difficult task. Therefore, it is evident that EU enlargement has predominantly ~~acted~~ acted to weaken integration.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is an excellent exposition of one side of the argument - the points made are clear, developed, and well linked to contemporary issues. However the failure to consider the alternative side of the argument limits this candidate when they might otherwise have gone high within level 3. The synopticity mark is naturally affected the most, although the consideration of different perspectives as to the main challenges posted by expansion does secure reasonable credit.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Questions that begin 'to what extent' require a two sided answer, and offering a one sided answer will limit you.

Enlargement concerning the EU has been an extremely topical debate. Enlargement of the EU refers to the widening of number of member states. Since the creation of the EEC (Now EU) there have been huge waves of enlargement, in particular ~~from~~ in 2004 with the intake of ~~the~~ the Eastern bloc. There has been ~~to~~ much controversy surrounding the extent to which ~~the~~ the EU integration has been weakened by EU enlargement. On ~~the~~ one hand, it has been argued that EU enlargement has weakened integration ~~through~~ through the problems and difficulties it has arose, but on the other it can be argued that enlargement has not weakened integration and that one cannot co-exist without the other.

The debate ~~of~~ of widening versus deepening within the EU can be split ^{between} ~~into~~ the two main ideologies, intergovernmentalism and supranationalism. Intergovernmentalists would argue that EU enlargement is good as it diluted the spread of integration and allows national sovereignty to reign. Supranationalists, who opt for a more federal EU in which ~~a~~ there would be a centralised bureaucracy in Brussels, argues that enlargement weakens integration to a great extent by making it

more difficult for decisions to be passed and made, thus preventing greater integration

One way in which enlargement can be seen to weaken EU integration to a great extent is through increased diversity and a clash of cultures. Within the 28 member states of the EU, 23 languages are spoken showing the large diverse range. One example of how EU integration can be weakened by enlargement through diversity and a clash of cultures is through the 2004 wave of enlargement. This is because all new member states from the Eastern Bloc were seen as transitional economies ~~revert~~ reverting from a communist regime to a capitalist regime. This put much pressure on ~~the existing members~~ existing members in terms of financial terms or this meant adapting to the free market. This weakened integration because this exposed a two-speed Europe in ~~Eastern~~ the Eastern Bloc not

being as fully integrated economically as that of existing members ~~who~~ who have always been capitalist such as the UK *

The strain on institutions is another way in which enlargement has been seen to weaken integration. This is because institutions such as the European Parliament, who has an extremely robust amount of MEPs, ~~was~~ steadily increased as well as the Council of Ministers. Enlargement has weakened ~~with~~ integration through institutions

in many ways. The Lisbon treaty brought in a cap on the number of MEPs at 751. This meant that MEPs have become stretched in covering more constituencies, thus making it harder for integration to take place.

However, the Copenhagen Criteria can be argued to dispute the idea that enlargement has weakened EU integration. The Copenhagen criteria entails a set of criteria that applicants for the EU must follow in order to be granted permission into the EU. This included promising to adopt the euro at some point after being granted membership, and having a ~~low~~ healthy rate of economic growth so as not to put strains on the existing members. The Copenhagen ~~test~~ is key to argument that enlargement has not weakened integration, but perhaps has greatly strengthened it.

There is also the idea that enlargement may have nothing to do with weaknesses of integration. ^{There is also the} ~~the~~ ^{that} ~~the~~ idea of ^{that} the rise of intergovernmentalism ^{that enlargement} has weakened EU integration. ^{that} ~~From~~ ^{From} the creation of EEC in 1957 under the ~~broader~~ ^{broader} programme, Treaty of Rome, it was clear that EU integration was an aim of the EEC. This is seen through the four freedoms provided: movement, goods, capital and services. However the era of euroclerosis ~~marked a rise in~~ ^{marked a rise in} ~~later~~ during the 1980's marked the rise in intergovernmentalist, especially in the UK since then member states

have prioritised for the retention of their national security above EU integration. This has been seen through the opt outs of the fiscal compact of UK and Denmark and many more. The failure of the 2005 constitution also attributes to this idea in that even traditionally pro-European countries such as France, the intergovernmentalist interests of national interests take precedence over a greater integration in the EU. Therefore, the argument that enlargement has weakened EU integration is overshadowed by intergovernmentalism.

Lastly, it can be argued that enlargement does not weaken EU integration but rather acts as a catalyst for change. This refers to the idea that widening entails deepening and that they can in fact co-exist. This is seen through treaties such as Nice and Lisbon in which policies concerning enlargement were followed by policies that would ensure that enlargement would not prevent EU integration. This included increased OMV and in the Lisbon Treaty.

Treaty, ~~where~~ the right to veto was removed from over forty areas. This challenges the idea that EU enlargement has weakened integration.

However, some argue that supranationalists were hoping for a more integrational, ~~or~~ ^{supranationalist} agenda, but much was focused on the laying the foundations for enlargement. This could highlight the idea that enlargement has taken over the importance of further EU integration.

Enlargement can be seen as a huge factor in the weakening of EU integration due to the strain it has placed on finance and supranational institutions. However, it can be argued that enlargement acts as a catalyst for change in creating more opportunities for deeper integration such as ~~the~~ increased EMU and the removal of vetoes. The principle of subsidiarity and the rise of intergovernmentalism could also ~~signify~~ signify that enlargement has nothing to do with preventing or weakening deeper integration because ~~the~~ the deepening of the EU cannot take place while intergovernmentalist countries and features still remain in the EU such as the UK and the right to veto certain ~~policy~~ policies.

* The principle of subsidiarity further prevents EU integration.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

A strong essay with a particularly good analytical link to the supranationalist vs intergovernment perspectives. The arguments for the premise of the question are less strong than in the previous response, but this is more than made up for by the balance shown, with strong quality of argument on both sides.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Do not be put off by a relatively unusual question if you think that it's the question that you can answer the best - unpopular essays almost invariably see some of the best individual responses.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Avoid general introductions or conclusions to short response questions - they do not cost marks but rarely gain them and lose time
- Equally it is useful to define key terms not only where specifically requested, but also by offering a brief definition where it is clearly helpful to addressing the question (for example defining x if asked to 'explain the criticisms of x').
- Ensure that they address the question as set, paying particular attention to the words 'to what extent' or 'discuss' and to the links required between different concepts and institutions.
- Ensure that they avoid confusing similar institutions or concepts, for example the ECHR and ECJ, or the Council of Ministers and the Council of the EU.
- Avoid assertion or general debate in favour of specific argued points - for example the ways in which expansion makes institutions more unmanageable, not simply that it does.
- Maintain a contemporary focus, and avoid overly historical content, but also ensure that the contemporary political context is clearly linked to effective debate, and not simply descriptive.
- Provide a sufficient range of points on short response questions in particular, avoiding either a series of asserted or undeveloped points, or repetition of different aspects of the same point.
- Continue to develop their use of synopticity in essays, avoiding simplistic yes/no, agree/disagree approaches and making use of competing viewpoints between, within and outside of parties, institutions and member states, where appropriate to the demands of the question.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE