

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE Government and Politics 4GP04 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 2015

Publications Code UA041715

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Introduction

This paper saw a pleasing level of focus on contemporary events from many candidates, for example, recent foreign policy developments (Q4), Labour's post-election shift on the question of an EU referendum (Q5), and Cameron's desire for renegotiation (Q6). The rise of anti-European parties across Europe was also relevant to several of the questions. Equally some candidates did, on occasion, allow contemporary developments to partially distract them from the specific question asked. It was pleasing to again see few candidates placing excessive reliance on historical content by focusing on older treaties where there have been relevant developments that supersede them. Naturally some steadfast standbys still saw strong service, such as Factortame, but this was generally due to the lack of a more contemporary example. Once again most candidates were able to offer a sensible number of developed arguments, as opposed to a series of assertions or brief undeveloped points, to short response questions.

The short responses questions were fairly even in popularity with the exception of question 4 which proved surprisingly unattractive to many candidates despite it proving relatively fertile ground to those who did attempt it. Q6 was a little less popular than the other two essay questions but all three options attracted a reasonable number of candidates. Candidates were mixed in their ability to offer concise and accurate definitions of key terms such as 'pooled sovereignty'. Furthermore some basic errors were still too common, in particularly confusing the European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) with the ECJ, or, perhaps more understandably, confusing the Council of Ministers with the European Council. Just as worrying was that too many candidates failed to address key words in some questions, most notably 'assess' in question 2, and 'controversial' in both question 4 and, to a lesser extent, question 1. Equally it was very pleasing to see again 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. Furthermore the one sided essay was a rarer phenomenon than in recent years, and the vast majority of candidates seem to have noted that essay questions on this paper do not request one sided answers, and that the rewards for a lack of balance are always limited.

Synopticity was somewhat variable in this series. Whilst many candidates were able to cite relevant specific views on the single market and constitutional impact of the EU there was rather less knowledge shown of differing views about the balance of power between institutions. There was also a little too much reliance on 'some argue that' without identifying which party, individual, group or institution the 'some' is.

A final point to note is that whilst candidates are not directly penalised for poor handwriting it does in some cases impair communication, making it very difficult for the examiner to decipher, and therefore to credit, the content.

Question 1

This was the second most popular short response question and specifically required a definition. Almost all candidates obeyed this instruction but the quality of definitions offered varied somewhat between those who equated it entirely, and rather crudely, with the loss of sovereignty and those who recognised that, at least in theory, it is meant to lead to a collective sovereignty that is greater than the sum of its parts. In general those who produced a more precise definition tended to go on to consider a stronger range of controversies. In terms of the controversies the first major discriminator was breadth with almost all candidates recognising that the loss of sovereignty was a major point but some failed to move beyond this to recognise other important issues. Second was the link between the controversies in general and specific supporting examples.

Level 1 responses most commonly misunderstood the term entirely, or gave a brief statement that it was synonymous with the loss of sovereignty without offering any evidence to support this assertion.

Level 2 responses most commonly focused on the question of the loss of sovereignty, often linking this to one or two specific examples, or else considered a further point, often the potential for a federal superstate, without quite developing this enough to reach level 3.

Level 3 responses were able to go beyond the alleged loss of sovereignty to consider other impacts, including those within the EU itself such as the relative influence on the pooled sovereignty of different countries, and the lack of democratic accountability in its exercise. Links to specific examples, such as CAP, the CFSP and QMV were also well utilised.

Pooling of ~~sovereignty~~ ^{sovereignty} is the ^{voluntary} transfer of ^{ultimate} sovereignty ^{political} power to make policy decisions from national governments to the EU. This gives the EU control over policy and decision-making in key areas for example agriculture and environment.

Many sceptics are wary of this as it leads to increased integration into the EU and ~~this~~ this may lead to a federalist outcome due to the supranational nature of the EU. This would mean all/majority of policy ^{the} ^{would be} decided by the EU.

Since the 2007 Lisbon Treaty, where ^{using QMV} fifty new areas of policy came under EU control, there has been increased pooling of sovereignty and many people oppose this. The introduction of more QMV in EU decision making, and the subsequent decline in national veto has

raised alarm over the erosion of national sovereignty as the UK has less say over EU issues and must implement all legislation passed by the EU. EU law is also supreme to national law as established by the ECJ in the *Costa v. ENEL* case.

Controversy surrounds this as due to the issue of a democratic deficit in the EU, where institutions are unelected and unaccountable therefore lacking legitimacy and the increase in pooled sovereignty only enhances this deficit by granting more powers to the institutions.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The points here are reasonable and accurate but the initial definition is a little crude in terms of equating the pooling of sovereignty with its loss, which is a legitimate controversy but not intrinsic to the concept.

Final mark 9



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Where questions specifically ask for a definition the accuracy of that definition is an important facet of entering the higher reaches of the mark scheme.

Pooled sovereignty is the practice whereby states lose national sovereignty but gain power / sovereignty over other member states. Sharing power within the union.

Euro-sceptics, like the UK Independence Party and the far right Tory faction criticise this theory of integration as sovereignty is lost. Parliament is no longer sovereign, power to the union has therefore meant that the UK has lost power to the European Union as its laws is higher. This due to sovereignty being pooled.

Pooled sovereignty has also been controversial as larger states dominate smaller states more and more. Larger states therefore push forward their needs, forgetting countries such as Luxembourg. This results in treaties and policies favouring states such as Germany and France as they have been more involved.

Finally, with pooled sovereignty, individual policies and treaties may not be entirely suited to everybody. By sharing sovereignty,

Individuals states sacrifice the ability to
be selfish and adopt policy which suits
the majority.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The definition here is brief but clear, accurate and rather more sophisticated than in the previous example, and there are three clear and pertinent points which just succeed in carrying the answer into level 3. However the points are not sufficiently developed, for example in terms of specific policy examples, to progress further within level 3.

Final mark 11



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

A brief introduction followed by three points in a good basic structure, and can potentially access the full range of marks, but developing the points in sufficient depth is also important.

Question 2

This specific ground will be familiar to most students and, perhaps as a consequence, this was the most popular of the short response questions with candidates showing impressive knowledge of a range of criticisms as to cost, environment impact, trade barriers, variable impacts on different countries, and the difficulties of reform. Frustratingly many candidates ability to discuss the criticisms of CAP was not matched by their ability to follow the totality of the instructions in the question, and specifically to assess at least some of the criticisms offered by considering how those criticisms might be mitigated or countered. There was also some variation in the level of contemporary content – with stronger responses having more focus on contemporary reforms and less on 'butter mountains' and 'wine lakes'. There was also some confusion where candidates argued that the new countries of Eastern Europe were taking more than their share of the CAP due to their large and inefficient agricultural sectors, despite the current limitations on subsidies to these countries.

Level 1 responses were rare and most often simply confused as to the provisions of the CAP – for example by mis-conflating it with the CFP.

Level 2 responses generally offered a range of relevant criticisms but failed to offer any assessment of them, or else offered some assessment but of a limited range of criticisms.

Level 3 responses considered and critiqued a variety of criticisms, often showing awareness that reforms had mitigated some of the previous difficulties of CAP without entirely resolving its weaknesses.

The Common Agricultural Policy was created in 1962 with the aims of creating a stable, consistent food market for those included in the European Union. It could be described as controversial as it does not benefit the majority who fund it and does not meet these standards.

Firstly, the cost of the "CAP" is huge. It cost the average family in the UK £1000 a year, therefore it can be seen that too much of tax payers money is being spent on something only 40% of people in the UK benefit from. Furthermore this large cost is overall worse for the less fortunate

In society. The lower 5% of earners in the UK spend 17% of their overall income on food, whereas the richer 5% of citizens only spend 7.5% of their income on food. This shows that as the food price in the European Union is 20% higher than the rest of the world, it is too expensive for people overall and takes too much of their income away.

Secondly, linked to this one of the aims produced by the "CAP" was to produce safe food for consumption and remove over-production. This target has not proven successful so far, primarily due to the Horse Meat scandal in 2013 which showed food supposedly checked by EU regulations and placed in supermarkets was actually horse meat instead of Beef. Even though the EU can reform this and place fines on countries who do not stick to regulations, it does not prevent it or help overproduction. For example the French were fined every six months for fishing fish that were smaller than EU regulations portrayed.

This shows how the Common Agricultural Policy is not necessarily beneficial to the consumer.

Thirdly, Sean Richards, the economist, says that the Common Agricultural Policy needs reform due to the "one size fits all" approach it currently takes. The CAP is criticised for the ~~the~~ funding which is given to larger companies who own more land compared to smaller farmers who really need it. For example the sugar company "Tate and Lyle" were paid ~~£100 million~~ a huge amount due to their land size, following this the Queen also received ~~£~~ a quarter of a million pounds from the EU. This criticism is the approach taken by most Euro-sceptics.

In conclusion the main criticism to "CAP" are that money is not delegated according to funds needed and the cost to the consumer is too large considering the small benefits, thus proving reform is needed.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is clearly a competent response within itself but the candidate fails to address 'assess' and therefore finds themselves limited to level 2.

Final mark 9



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Questions with the instruction 'assess' require candidates to evaluate how valid their points actually are, for example by considering responses to them.

The Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) is one of the flagship policies of the EU introduced in the 1960s. It aims at protecting food security (initially to protect Europe in the aftermath of WW2) and the farming community, by giving subsidies ^{for agricultural production} ~~primarily~~.

One of the major reasons why it has been criticised is the vast expense with which it burdens the EU. Though its levels have reduced to around 40% of the EU budget from as high as 87% in 1970, it continues to be a large drain on the EU's limited fund pool. This is a particular criticism due to the fact that despite the high proportion it takes up of the EU budget, the farming community represents just 5.6% of the EU's population and just 3% of the EU GDP. Therefore it is considered unfair to the majority of EU citizens, especially members with ^{small} ~~small~~ agricultural sectors ~~constituted~~ like Britain who is a significant net contributor.

This argument has been criticised however for ignoring the extent of success CAP has achieved in protecting the farming

community, and ensuring food security for the EU. It is also worth noting that though the UK is a net contributor to the EU overall, most of the benefit received does come from agricultural subsidies.

Another area of criticism of CAP is that it goes against the free trade principles on which the EU was brought about. Subsidising agriculture represents a form of market intervention that is criticized by free-marketeters. It is argued that it raises EU food prices for citizens by ~~raising~~ increasing inefficient production ~~and~~ ^{while} ~~with~~ the ~~EU~~ member states are already paying a lot into the EU budget only in return for higher prices ^{to protect} for a small minority of EU citizens.

This argument is criticized on the grounds that much of CAP intervention is necessary, particularly due to the fact that approximately a third of CAP subsidy payments now depend on environmental protection measures.

Finally, it is argued that CAP is very unfair to developing nations, by subsidising EU agriculture and imposing tariffs on outside agricultural products (much of which is produced by developing nations) this unfairly harms the competitiveness of poorer nations. This is deemed immoral as the EU is significantly more wealthy than its agricultural competitors but by raising EU supply, world price is lowered and the poorer countries ultimately suffer. However this is defended by some in that it is necessary to protect EU production in order to ensure supply of food within the EU as one of the founding principles.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate has clearly responded to the requirement for assessment - the criticisms themselves are not greatly dissimilar to those considered by the previous candidate, but they are responded to and evaluated, taking this close to full marks.

Final mark 14



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Assessment is most effective when directly targeted onto each individual point made.

Question 3

This was a moderately popular question and, provided they did not lapse into general criticisms of the EU without specific reference to Lisbon, candidates tended to perform well. The similarities to the failed constitution treaty, as well as to the expansion of QMV and the institution of new 'country-like' posts of President and High Representative, were all considered to good effect. Many were also able to link the criticism of the treaty to more recent developments such as the rise of anti-EU parties across Europe. Much less common, although not essential to securing high marks, was consideration of the federalist criticisms of the treaty – that it was too watered down and failed to properly embrace the supranationalism necessary to operate effectively within an expanded EU. Candidates did need to show that they clearly understood the provisions of the treaty but this did not require a list of features – understanding, whether limited or clear, could be shown through the 'controversies'. Attempts at balance – i.e. to explain why the Lisbon Treaty was in fact desirable – were not credited.

Level 1 responses tended to focus on general criticisms of the EU with little or no link to Lisbon in particular, or else mentioned one or two specific criticisms without developing them.

Level 2 responses generally offered two moderately developed criticisms of Lisbon, most commonly the similarity to the failed constitution and the further loss of sovereignty, and would have benefited from greater development, range, or both.

Level 3 responses considered a range of points, usually linking these criticisms to specific provisions of the treaty. Some, but by no means all, responses in this level considered federalist as well as euro-sceptic criticisms of Lisbon.

The Lisbon Treaty was introduced in 2009 by Barroso's Commission. It was 90% the same as the constitution that both France and The Netherlands rejected in 2005, according to Open Europe. The three key reasons it has been criticised is for its extension of QMV, increased power to the European Parliament and impact upon the judiciary, hall of tax areas, UKIP believes it has the goal of a federal superstate which increasingly encroaches upon national sovereignty. Firstly, QMV was extended into 62 areas in the Council of Ministers and double majority voting was introduced. This means instead of

75% of votes only 62% of votes are now required for a motion to pass. This extension of QMV is most controversial because it chips away at the areas where the veto remains, meaning in many areas, including the budget, countries can have things forced upon them. Good examples of this would be other countries blocking the removal of a ban on British beef after the foot and mouth disease crisis of 1996, despite Britain taking measures to ensure cattle's safety. More controversially, ~~the~~ Cameron wanted the 2013 budget austerity to make more austerity and opposed the 6.8% rise but there was still a budget rise of ~~2%~~ 2.79% despite Britain voting against it. Fears of countries joining blocks, such as a block of Eurozone countries, were fears of Britain having banking regulation, like the Tobin Tax forced upon us, ~~imposed~~ ^{erecting} ~~an~~ ^{an} on national sovereignty.

Secretly, the European Parliament got co-decision making power in 40 new areas, including CAP. This means they are equal to the intergovernmental Council of Ministers in many areas. ~~So~~ Giving more power ~~to~~ to a supranational organisation and taking it from an intergovernmental one ~~is~~ could be seen as evidence of Lisbon not only fulfilling Maastricht's goal of 'an ever closer union' but attempting to implement the constitution.

in the guise of a Treaty and aiming at what Farage calls 'creeping federalism.' If there was a proposal for reform of CAP, the European Parliament would likely block it because the majority of MEPs are euro-enthusiasts. Their power over things like the budget mean they could ensure a budget rise, like in 2013, despite government ministers opposing it.

Finally, the Lisbon Treaty gave more power to the ECJ and extended its remit into areas such as human affairs. 34 proposals, including the European Arrest Warrant, are very controversial as they take key powers away from national governments. The European Arrest Warrant could mean Britons must be extradited to other EU countries with no form of appeal and this has been criticised by many. Likewise, the Fundamental Charter of Human Rights (FCHR) was introduced. It only applies to EU law but can be used to over-ride national courts. For example, Sharon Coleman, who was unfairly dismissed from work due to a disabled son, could have used the FCHR to plead her case to the ECJ. ~~totally~~,
↳ To conclude, clearly Lisbon has weakened the intergovernmentalism present within the EU and strengthened supranational institutions. The increasing areas in the EU's remit, such as rights and justice, presents a worrying skew of an attempt to undermine national government ^{with} the aim of creating a 'superstate.'



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate's particular strength is in tying specific examples to general principles - for example the extension of co-decision over CAP to the supranational/intergovernmental debate. This takes them close to full marks.

Final mark 14



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Tying points of theory or principle into specific examples is a very effective approach to securing high marks.

The Lisbon Treaty that was introduced was controversial for a variety of reasons. The ~~first~~^{main} reasons that the Lisbon Treaty has been controversial is due to the Constitutional Treaty, democratic deficit, loss of sovereignty and

The first reason the Lisbon Treaty has been controversial is due to the Constitutional Treaty. Eurosceptics in the Conservative party faction 'Better off out' believe that the Lisbon Treaty is a watered down version of the Constitutional Treaty which was rejected by several member states including Ireland which had several referendums held in relation to this particular treaty. The main reason member states ~~were~~ were not in favour of the Constitutional Treaty was because the concept of subsidiarity was lost to euro federalism. Therefore, the Lisbon Treaty is controversial as it ~~was~~ ~~is not initially~~ was not initially accepted however, the European Commission which is a supernationalist body pushed the treaty.

The second reason ~~that~~ that made the Lisbon Treaty controversial was the loss of sovereignty that was associated with the Lisbon Treaty. The treaty caused a loss of sovereignty because, the national veto that was put in place in specific policy areas was replaced by the extension of Qualified Majority Voting (QMV). QMV was beneficial as it prevented a democratic deficit within the EU however, national sovereignty was lost. National sovereignty is important to member states ~~so~~ therefore, this loss in sovereignty causes the Lisbon Treaty to be controversial. Additionally it defies the idea of subsidiarity which is for decisions to be made at the lowest level possible therefore enhancing the controversy.

The last reason why the Lisbon Treaty has been controversial is due to the fact that legislation relating to accountability has not been changed or amended. The existing legislations in the UK mean that the European Commission is the only institutional body with the power to start legislation. Therefore, reforms are needed in EU institutions which suggests controversy as decisions have not been changed. In conclusion, the most significant reason that the Lisbon Treaty has been controversial is due to the loss in national sovereignty. National sovereignty is extremely important to member states as ultimately national interests can be considered to be of more importance than EU interests which is evident for the UK which remains the 'awkward partner'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate makes two solid and relevant points, but the third point, whilst having potential merit, lacks clarity. It is likely that the candidate meant to argue that the democratic deficit, for example seen in the unelected Commission, has not been properly tackled, but they do not communicate this sufficiently clearly.

Final mark 10.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Ensure that you communicate your points clearly so that your understanding is obvious and the examiner does not have to speculate as to what exactly you were trying to say.

Question 4

This was the least popular short response question but was well addressed by many candidates, with some strong understanding of how the significance of the post, or otherwise, had been seen in contemporary events such as Syria and the Crimea, as well as in Ashton's role after the Haiti earthquake. The key to success was to maintain focus on both the question of significance and the specific post, and not to lapse into general discussion of the CSFP, or the purely descriptive approach to the role. Links between the post and the CSFP were highly relevant however and many candidates effectively discussed how the post of High Representative has given the EU a more noticeable place on the world stage, allowing the EU to speak with one voice, whilst others noted that under the CASFP unanimity is still required. There was also considerable use of Kissinger's famous "Who do I call if I want to talk to Europe?" quote, demonstrating that comments from some decades ago can still be relevant to a contemporary issues paper, in terms of demonstrating political developments.

Level 1 responses were very rare, and those seen commonly appeared to be suffering from timing issues in terms of this being their third short response, or else entirely ignored the post in favour of a general discussion of EU security and foreign policy.

Level 2 were either accurate but one sided, or balanced but a little over focused on theory without relating this to specific examples or (lack of) powers, or on the significance of the CSFP in general rather than the post of High Representative in particular, or on the history of the post rather than its 'significance'.

Level 3 responses tended to treat this question in a very contemporary fashion, often tying in theoretical strengths or limitations with examples of both post-holders and specific events.

The question of how ^{significant} ~~effective~~ the post of High Representative for Foreign and security policy is, is down to a matter of interpretation. UKIP and extreme Eurosceptics in the Conservative Party such as Gove would claim that there is a Foreign policy. However Federalists such as Juncker claim that this has not been developed.

The UK and France have different representatives in the UN Security Council and federalists would like to see the EU have one ~~one~~ representation which indicates that there

and France also operated independently ~~rather~~ from the EU in regards to Mali. The UK could be said to have followed an atlantist rather than an Gaullist approach in relation to the war in Iraq by favouring relationships with the USA over EU memberstates. Most countries in the EU also primarily act through NATO rather than the EU showing that there is no significant foreign policy.

However it would be wrong to claim that foreign policy hasn't been influenced by the EU. ~~as a result~~ There is currently an arms embargo on any parties involved in the syrian war although Home secretary Hange has talked of needing to arm the rebels.

The EU is part of a ~~Quartet~~ Quartet with US, UN and USSR as part of the Middle East peace process. In addition there is a degree of defence cooperation and a united view on fighting terrorism.

This demonstrates ~~that~~ that the ~~EU~~ Foreign and security policy of the EU is significant to some extent although the high commissioner for foreign affairs has not been a significant figure.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate is clearly very aware of issues surrounding EU Foreign Policy, and views from within the UK with respect to it, but they do not tie it into the particular role asked about - they refer to the High Commissioner in the introduction and conclusion but very little within their specific points ties specifically to the post.

Final mark 7



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

A tight focus on the specific role or institution asked about is important to securing a good mark and avoiding spending much time on material that gleans little credit.

The position of the High Representative for Foreign and Security Policy has proved insignificant for many reasons.

Firstly, the appointed High Representative has often been looked at as unexperienced. Therefore, the role does not require skills and duty at a particular level. Therefore, the role is not important and does not require major attention. For example, Baroness Ashton has been viewed at as ~~being~~ lacking experience in recent times proved by her lack of organisation.

Secondly, votes for this area still require unanimity. Therefore, power lies with member states, not the HR. This can be done with vetoes.

Therefore the HR cannot influence the decisions or speed of decisions in this area. Thus the role of an HR proves insignificant since sovereignty remains with member states.

Some countries such as UK see common foreign and security policy in the EU as ineffective thus do not involve themselves or support the HR's decisions. The UK and Poland

view the USA as more of international partner in this policy area. Thus, it is also had for the HR to influence effective measures due to military bodies, such as NATO.

However, the role as HR is significant since the HR can work with the commission. The commission initiates policies and therefore are seen as the most important body of the EU. Therefore the HR has high levels of power in passing laws and adopting laws they have had high levels of influence. However, the policy still needs to be passed by Parliament and Council of ministers, thus the powers of the HR are not as great as previously thought.

Furthermore, the role of the HR provides a lot of significance since it provides a 'face' on the global face. For example it can attend summits and be highly influential towards other global superpowers. Therefore, the EU is seen as a great foreign security force due to a face being given to them. This allows the HR to attend important meetings and provide the opinions of the EU in a respectful and persuasive manner. Thus, this role has a lot of duty with it.

Overall, the HR position allows ~~too~~ many benefits and disadvantages. Often its powers would be limited, as well as its duties.

All these factors allow us to learn the significance of the HR position. Its global representation and powers with commissions allow us to believe the HR is in fact significant.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

In contrast to the previous response this candidate explicitly ties all of their points back to the post of High Representative. The points are not exceptional but the tightness of focus and balance secures a high mark,
Final mark 14



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The mark on short response questions is very closely related to the tightness of focus on the question, which includes any requirements for balance.

Question 5

This question was of middling popularity, although this was itself encouraging since it is an area of the topic not often specifically raised, with candidates being more used to considering the views of the Conservatives, Lib Dems or UKIP. Probably because this was a less common question it provoked a wide range of responses, in terms of both focus and quality, as well as some rather broad definitions of 'recent years', which was most sensibly interpreted to mean from Blair onwards. The discriminators here were first, the degree to which the reasons were made specific to the Labour Party and to its (changing) philosophy not just to pro-Europeans in general. Second, and linked, the level of focus on 'why' as opposed to 'what' – i.e. the reasons for Labour's broadly pro-EU approach rather than simply a description of what it was over time. Clearly with both of these points links from policy evolution to the reasons for it could be very effective, where for example the move from old to new Labour was linked with the view of the EU as a 'capitalist club' evolving into an appreciation of the economic value of the single market. Third, the degree of development within points – some candidates asserted without evidence that a pro-EU position was electorally advantageous whilst others presented varying, and sophisticated, explanations as to why this might be so. Similarly some candidates settled for a rather vague 'support for workers rights' whilst others went into much more detail as to specifics.

Level 1 responses were marred by inaccuracy, for example erroneously equating Labour's HRA to the EU via the ECHR, or were very descriptive as to Labour's approach to the EU without addressing 'why'.

Level 2 responses were sometimes also quite descriptive, albeit with some explanation of why particular approaches to the EU had developed with the position within the level being determined by the level of detail offered. Others were competent in themselves, but overly focused on one aspect of Labour's pro-EU stance, generally either the social or economic benefits.

Level 3 responses focused closely on why the Labour party in particular had been broadly pro-EU in recent years, offering a clear link between the shifting priorities of the party and those of the EU and as well as solid specific detail about the pertinent social and economic benefits.

Delors TUC

Anti-Tory

Social Charter

Since 1995 with Delors as president of the Commission, visit to the TUC the Labour party has favoured a broadly pro-EU policy. He argued that he had a vision for Europe and that the EU was more than just a free trade agreement. He had also introduced the

social charter at Maastricht in 1992 which the Conservative party had opted out of. When Blair became Prime Minister, with the support of the trade unions, he took us in to the Social Charter at Amsterdam in 1997.

The Social Charter was seen as the workers savior. It includes things like paternity leave and in a lot of employment protection. Labour, as the workers party, had to agree. In recent years under David Cameron, employment has become unfair with things like 0-hour contracts. Labour want to revive employment and "being at the heart of Europe" is one way to do that.

Another reason is to be anti-Conservative. The Conservatives are seen as the party for business which links to the last point about Labour being the party of the worker. The Conservatives have increasingly become eurosceptic. Ed Miliband argued that Labour gave people who were pro-EU an option.

The signing of the Lisbon Treaty by Gordon Brown was ~~seen as~~ controversial and has led to protests within the UK among other parties. However, it is unlikely there will be another treaty soon and so Labour will not lose support for being pro-EU at this time.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The points here are valid but the 'why' content is rather vague and asserted in terms of Labour being 'the workers' party' or 'anti-Conservative' and this keeps the response in mid-level 2.

Final mark 8



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Arguments as to 'why' need to be developed, and not simply asserted, in order to score highly.

The Labour Party, traditionally the euro-sceptic party of the British political system have adopted a very different stance in recent years. After the reign of Margaret Thatcher in 1979 and the signing of the Single European Act in 1983, Britain has been on no way to an 'ever closer union'. With the SEA (1983) being the furthest integration that Britain has ever seen, ^{EU} 'New Labour' Party under Tony Blair and Gordon Brown began to see the benefits of being in the EU, such as international trade (imports and exports), increased jobs and ^{opportunities} ~~opportunities~~ for British workers as well as the benefits of international migration providing the UK with highly skilled and hard workers.

More recently with the Conservatives have ^{proposed} ~~proposed~~ an 'EU-IN/OUT Referendum' by the end of ~~the~~ 2017. The Labour Party have taken the stance as the referendum is 'too risky'. This

The Labour party have seen the need of the EU as it benefits the UK in many ways. ~~more than one~~. The trade (sit. of British trade is with the EU), employment as well as holding the UK government accountable all provide the Labour party with a solid foundation to their pro-EU

stance - The chance of ~~the~~ leaving the EU ^{is} seen by Labour as having ~~catastrophic~~ catastrophic results.

With David Cameron being leader of the Conservatives since 2010, and the Prime Minister since 2010, Labour have seen the great divide in the Conservative party over the issue of the EU. Labour, ~~on~~ ^{on} the other hand have used ~~the~~ the Conservative split to their advantage. Europe has been a topic to which ~~the~~ ^{the} Labour party ^{party} ~~party~~ ^{hold} ~~holds~~ great unity. The reason to why Labour has favoured ~~the~~ ^{the} pro-EU stance ^{could} simply be due to the contradiction it holds to the Conservatives.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate makes two solid points that are clearly tied in to the question but, frustratingly, wastes some time with crossing out followed by a point with limited development. More planning could have made this a solid level 3 response.

Final mark 10



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Spending a little time on planning the answer helps to avoid crossing out content, allows focus on the strongest points, and thus often leads to a higher mark.

Question 6

This was the least popular essay question, although still attempted by a good number of candidates. The keys to success were balance, breadth, the quality of illustrative examples, and the degree of development of the points made. Many candidates may have been tempted to descend into a pro/anti EU debate but, whilst the argument that the constitution has been fundamentally altered is most often advanced by sceptics, most candidates managed to remain focused on the question of transformation. A more common pitfall was to give insufficient consideration to the idea that EU membership might not have fundamentally transformed the UK constitution. Candidates who rushed headlong into embracing the premise of the question found their marks limited by their enthusiasm. Others focused more on debating 'change' than on 'transformation', which is a rather more radical concept. Clearly the most critical issue here, and the one discussed by virtually all candidates, was that of parliamentary sovereignty and the threat which EU membership has caused to this central part of the UK's constitution, and some candidates very effectively considered contrasting theories of sovereignty such as pooled and 'zero-sum' as well as the distinction between legal and political sovereignty. The role of the ECJ in relation to UK courts was also much discussed. Much less commonly discussed were issues such as the threat to the unitary state by the EU's emphasis on regionalism. Candidates were permitted leeway on dates since older developments, such as Factortame, were still pertinent. Nevertheless awareness of the impact of Lisbon, expansion, and indeed Cameron's upcoming renegotiations were clearly relevant and creditable. For example the specific provision of Lisbon that countries are able to leave the EU (and thus 'reclaim' sovereignty) tackled the 'elephant in the room' as to whether exit was actually legally possible. With this in mind an explicit awareness of how the constitutional impact has evolved over time was highly creditable, although relatively uncommon.

Many candidates did successfully bring in knowledge from the AS Level unit 2, in terms of their clear understanding of the nature of the UK constitution, which aided their ability to assess how far it had been transformed.

The weakest responses were characterised by brief or overly asserted responses, or else by devoting a considerable portion of their response, time and energy to considering the impact of the ECHR and HRA, to no creditable effect and at a considerable opportunity cost. Middling responses were often competent but a little too one sided, most commonly offering only a brief riposte to the assumption that the UK constitution has indeed been transformed or at least heavily changed. Other candidates did provide more balance but failed to develop sufficient range or depth to progress further.

The strongest responses often showed high awareness of how this debate has evolved over time and through different treaties. Theoretical points about legal, political and economic sovereignty were well developed and linked to specific examples, and balance was present throughout. Synopticity was often more approached in terms of there having been a transformation, usually by citing the views of Eurosceptic groups and individuals who believe that sovereignty has been irrevocably squirreled away, than by considering alternative viewpoints. Those who did consider a variety of views on both sides of the debate were rewarded accordingly. In some cases these included consideration of the views of different legal and political experts.

One of the most controversial areas in the UK's constitution is its membership in the European Union. Some may argue that EU membership has transformed the EU constitutions due to its "green measures" and policies such as the Common Agricultural Policy and even the Single Market, however even though the UK is a member of the EU it is arguable that we still hold sovereignty and are not too transformed by EU legislation.

Firstly, the convincing argument which is supported by parties in the UK such as UKIP, is that the UK's membership to the ~~2014~~^{EU} is hugely influential on the UK constitution. Particularly this is seen in the implementation of "green measures". The EU sets regular regulation to each 28 members stating what environmental friendly targets have to met by a certain year. For example the UK have to have reduced carbon emissions by 20%. by the

year 2020. To do this huge changes have been put in place to reach these targets. For example the congestion charge set in place by the Labour government in 2003 set the daily charge at £7.50 but to reach EU targets the Conservatives raised it to £11.50 in order for less people to travel by car through central London. At the same time the London mayor, Boris Johnson created "Boris Bikes" to encourage greener travel.

However, green measures, although can be seen as influential on UK constitution are not necessarily all down to the EU's ruling.

Global warming is a world wide issue which is more effectively tackled by a larger body of people. Therefore it could be said that implementations such as "green taxes" and cuts in emissions are a national government approach anyway and would still take place if the UK were to leave the EU.

Evidence for this was David Cameron's promise whilst in coalition to be the "greenest government."

secondly, there are EU policies which are controversial and are forced into UK constitution. For example the Common Agricultural Policy. This area is what 70% of EU funding goes towards. Each farming in the UK pays £1,000 towards "CAP" a year. This cost is large and means the bottom 5% of earners in the UK are forced to spend 17% of their overall income on food to feed their family. This would not be so controversial if it did affect the majority of farmers in Britain. It was proposed in 2014 that the "CAP" only benefitted 43% of farmers in the UK and the majority of produce is dumped on third world countries. Furthermore, Nigel Farage stated that this amount of funding should go towards better measures of farming such as technology in order for the UK to modernise and not support inefficient farming methods. This is something which arguable would be better decided outside the EU and solely in Britain. Following this pressure

Groups such as Greenpeace do not agree to "CAP" as it supports harmful pesticides being used on plants such as fertilizers which kill wildlife.

However, conversely the Conservative party would argue that Britain's implementation of the EU's "CAP" policy does benefit the UK and its constitution, even though we are transformed by it it is in a positive way. For example "CAP" means that smaller farms or young farmers are encouraged to work as they receive subsidies from the EU for their work. They also receive a further £20,000 for applying green means such as adding more crops to increase bio-diversity, therefore improving the UK's food quality. It also encourages farmers to set up farm shops and holiday homes so they are not solely relying on European subsidies and therefore concentrating more on the British economy.

Lastly, the single market is an area hugely criticised by eurosceptics as its influence on the UK constitution is huge despite we have not conformed to having the Euro. As a member of the EU Britain is required to conform to standards financially set by the ~~the~~ EU and this power was extended to the European Commission who were granted budgetary powers under the Treaty of European Union in 2011. This is controversial as the economy of the UK is hugely different to those of France and Germany and should be seen as competition and not equal. As we do not have the Euro we are showing we are hugely effected by EU membership and our own elected government cannot set the financial budgets for us as a nation. However cases such as Microsoft in 2011 show how the economy is helped by EU. However, the more convincing view is that Britain has held political sovereignty by not conforming to having a single currency and that

even though we hold membership in the European Union we do not always transform ourselves to fit the EU. For example with the Greece scenario, where Greece created so much debt, expected to be paid by the EU but the UK went against this funding.

// In conclusion to this it is convincing the UK's constitution is hugely transformed by its membership to the EU, especially in the role of meeting EU requirements and taking policies into account, however the stronger argument is that we benefit from being a member of the EU and if anything it strengthens our Political Constitution as it opens it up to scrutiny and holds our political sovereignty. For example Sharon Coleman fought a two year battle and managed to go to the European Court of Justice in 2008 with the help of Carers UK, meaning now a legislation was passed which benefits all carers in the UK, 70% of whom are women, this

was denied by the British court system, therefore her membership to the EU benefited everyone socially. Proving beneficial to UK constitution.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is more of a decent answer on the extent to which the EU influences UK politics, rather than the constitution per se. The structure is clear, there is balance, and much of the content does touch on relevant issues, for example the green measures illustrating the sovereignty point, but this could be done more explicitly. A tighter link to the constitution could have seen the candidate secure a strong mark.

Final Mark: 7+7+6+6 = 26



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Marks are awarded for how closely content addresses the specific question asked, not for its intrinsic quality, so always focus tightly on the question.

Due to its uncodified nature, it has been argued that the constitution of the UK is easier to change than the entrenched constitutions of Germany or the USA. Although the sources of the UK constitution have certainly been altered with Britain's membership of the EU, the extent to which it has been transformed has caused much political debate. Although the likes of Major have pessimistically argued that "the days of the national government are over", meaning that the sovereignty of Parliament is eroded and the constitution, therefore, radically changed, Pro-Europeans believe that what they see as pooled or enhanced sovereignty has not had a detrimental effect on the traditional nature of the UK constitution. I believe it could be argued to a greater extent that as further integration of the EU continues, the UK constitution must inevitably adapt; however, I will assess the degree of these changes before reaching a final, informed judgement.

Firstly, Eurosceptics have argued that too much power has been given to the "top-heavy bureaucracy in Brussels" and they firstly point to the fact that approximately 80% of British law is nowadays instigated by the EU. It could be argued that this undermines the fundamental principle of parliamentary sovereignty as described by Dicey and

therefore leads to a fundamental transformation of the UK constitution. This has been particularly true since the Union has expanded its area of jurisdiction to Justice and Home Affairs and Common Foreign and Security Policy at the 1992 Maastricht Treaty, which arguably "transformed a trading bloc into a political Union" (Tommins) and particularly after the 2007 Lisbon Treaty which abolished the pillar structure of the EU, therefore subjecting JHA to QMV voting and possibly eroding the UK's influence over its internal affairs, as it has ~~been~~ been argued in the Student Journal of Law that "EU bureaucrats now decide on everything - from the size and shape of accumbers to proper garbage disposal".

QMV has, therefore, been another area in which, arguably, Britain's sovereignty has been surrendered and, therefore, the constitution radically changed. Although some policy areas such as CFSP and the CAP are still decided on by unanimity, it has been argued that members are unable to protect their national interests in an increasing number of areas, particularly as the 2000 Nice Treaty and the 2007 Lisbon Treaty have expanded the use of QMV into over 80 new areas, much to ^{the} dismay of Eurosceptic conservatives who have harshly condemned the new double majority system introduced at Lisbon where decisions are made when 55% of members representing 65% of the EU population have voted for a particular policy. They further argue that despite the fact that a blocking majority can be formed comprising 4 states, Britain's interests can often not be safeguarded as her interests are often isolated

from the other members (as, for example, the Anglo-Saxon Social Model is the most pro-capitalist, neo-liberal and does not encourage governmental interference).

However, it has been argued that Britain could, if she wished, abandon the Union and therefore regain its sovereignty and the traditional values of its constitution, a claim further confirmed by the Lisbon Treaty which contained an "exit clause". Nevertheless, Liberal Democrat ex-leader Nick Clegg has warned that such a thing as an "amicable divorce" will not be an option for the country, with Merkel hostile to the idea of the UK leaving the EU. Taking the economic benefits that the UK would lose out on, it has been argued that the possibility of the UK leaving has simply been presented to appease Eurosceptics and is not, in actual fact, a realistic possibility. Therefore, it could be argued that Britain has permanently surrendered its sovereignty to a supranational body, thus inevitably changing the nature of its constitution.

This has been further supported by the role of the European Court of Justice which has assumed greater powers in recent years, as well as jurisdiction over JHA post-2007 Lisbon Treaty, therefore making it the final court of appeal in the UK, much to the dismay of the Supreme Court, with the senior judge Lord Phillips arguing that this has been a fundamental transfer of legal sovereignty to the EU. This essentially means that if a supranational body can impose legal decisions on the UK, its constitu-

national provisions are practically meaningless. This was the case with the 1990s Factortame Shipping judgement, where it was decided that the UK's 1988 Merchant Shipping Act is incompatible with community law and it was, therefore, overruled, meaning that the UK no longer had the power to control fishing in its territorial waters. Furthermore, the Union has also assumed greater powers over environmental policy, when it can issue financial penalties if member-states do not comply with EU regulations; for this reason Britain is currently facing a £300 million fine a year, branded by Mr Reckless of the UKIP (and a Tory defector) a 'disgrace', as it failed to meet air quality targets in London.

However, those of a more pro-European stance point to the fact that Britain has secured opt-outs in a number of areas where this would go against its constitutional provisions (e.g. it has opted out of the eurozone), meaning that community law does not apply to it in this case. Furthermore it has been stated by the House of Commons Select Committee on the EU that in 2009, only 13/207 ECJ rulings applied to Britain, meaning that most decisions are still made by national bodies and the constitutional provisions are, therefore, retained.

Finally, UKIP and Nigel Farage point to the fact that the UK cannot hope to maintain its constitution intact if the Commission continues to be the 'driving force of all EU legislation' (Majone), yet it is a supranational body and a 'technocracy' according to Moravcsik, as it is run by bureaucrats who are not elected and, therefore, not accountable nationally.

For this reason, it could be argued that the Commission will only protect the interests of the Union, to which it swears an oath of allegiance, and with recent scandals such as that of the 1999 Yantel Commission over 'financial irregularities', the integrity of this body and the amount of power it should have to change national constitutional provisions has been continually questioned.

However, it could be argued that further safeguards can have been put on retaining the principle of subsidiarity and, therefore, national sovereignty over issues which are arguably better dealt with by member-states, with the introduction of "early warning mechanisms" at the 2007 Lisbon Treaty. This means that national parliaments can raise a yellow card or an orange card if 1/3 and 1/2 of members respectively believe that a certain proposal infringes the principle of subsidiarity, which has led some commentators to brand them the "watchdogs of the principle of subsidiarity". With these new powers and the power to leave the EU, it could be argued that ~~the~~ ^{further} transfer of sovereignty and, therefore, fundamental changes to the UK constitution can be prevented.

In conclusion, I believe that some changes have been made to the UK constitution in recent years; however, this has been as a consequence of Prime Ministers signing up to treaties such as the 1986 Single European Act, which Heseltine has criticised for being "the largest transfer of sovereignty to a supranational body" and the 1992 Maastricht and 2007 Lisbon Treaties in particular. Furthermore, I

believe that although leaving the EU to regain constitutional provisions does not seem a viable solution, it could be argued that the coalition government's 'referendum lock' will, in fact, prevent any further changes to the UK constitution, unless these receive popular consent.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Here the focus is on the constitution throughout, and this secures an appropriate reward. The synoptic viewpoints are also much more ascribed to those who advance them than in most responses which results in a very high synopticity mark.

Final Mark $11+11+11+8 = 41$



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Accurately ascribing viewpoints to specific individuals, groups, parties or institutions earns a higher reward than ascribing the same arguments to 'some argue that'.

Question 7

This was the most popular essay question. In some cases this was clearly because candidates had revised for a generic 'is x the most powerful institution?' question, and such responses tended to remain stuck in level 2. The key to success here, besides the usual elements of balance, quality of illustrative examples, the degree of development and the range of individual institutions considered, was to link all points back to the Council of Ministers. A discussion of the ways in which the Parliament or Commission interact with, limit, or are limited by the Council was credited considerably more than simply a discussion of another institution followed by a statement that it was more or less powerful than the Council. A good number of candidates did display accurate knowledge of the EU's institutional framework, recognising that the influence of each institution evolves over time. The Lisbon Treaty, for example, had shifted the power balance over law-making and budgetary matters, with many candidates correctly identifying that the European Parliament's enhanced powers of co-decision had meant that the European Parliament was now on an equal footing with the Council of Ministers over virtually all legislative matters. Some candidates went beyond this by specifically citing those areas where the Council retains sole control, and were rewarded accordingly. A small minority of candidates seemed unclear about the distinctive roles of the Council of Ministers and the European Council, and it was not uncommon for candidates to merge the two institutions into one. The best way to avoid this was clearly, if briefly, to define the nature and composition of the Council at the start of the essay, and then to compare it with the European Council during the course of their arguments. Equally where such confusion was occasional and did not impinge on the discussion of the role and powers of the Council of Ministers, it did not significantly affect marks. However where candidates did show permanent confusion between the two and their roles they suffered accordingly. Although the European Council and Council of Ministers are based in the same building in Brussels, it should be emphasised to candidates that they are two separate institutions. The European Council defines the strategic direction of the EU, whereas the Council of Ministers adopts laws and coordinates specific policies. Candidates offered differing approaches to the role of COREPER – some seeing them as a boost to the power of the council, and some as a control within it, and either approach was acceptable with credit being determined by how well it was argued. The weakest responses suffered from significant misunderstanding of EU institutions, at their worst by confusing the Council of Ministers and either the European Commission or European Parliament. Other weak responses lacked analysis with infrequent and generalised assessments as to how the points raised related to the influence of the Council of Ministers. Middling responses were most commonly characterised by either accurately considering the Council of Ministers entirely in terms of its own powers and limitations, without much reference to other institutions, or by considering institutions at length but without sufficient direct engagement of their role and powers against that of the Council. The strongest responses showed clear awareness of both the role and powers of the Council of Ministers and the ways in which that role and those powers interact with a range of other institutions. The Commission and Parliament were most common here, but the relationship with the ECB, ECJ and Council of the EU was also creditably used by some candidates. These candidates were able to assess how the influence of the Council of Ministers very much depended on the policy being debated, the crisis being tackled or indeed the country holding the Presidency. Very strong candidates made impressive reference to recent budgetary negotiations between the Council of Ministers, the European Parliament and the Commission, highlighting specific instances where influence had been gained or conceded.

Council of Ministers.	Other.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Makes main decisions - Scrutinises the EP. - Intergovernmental. - Uses QMV. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EP. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → elected - so are accountable. → "Only democratic institution" → Eurosceptics. - Commission → national sovereignty maintained - Commission.

The extent to which the Council of Ministers remains the most influential body in the EU, is debatable. On one hand, their scrutinising of policies suggested by the European Parliament makes them influential. However, as its members are directly elected, the European Parliament could be argued as the most influential as they are accountable. I believe that the European Parliament is the most ^{democratic} influential as it is, as some Eurosceptics state, "the only democratic institution in the EU", but the Council of Ministers are more influential as they dictate policies in the EU. A reason why the European Parliament is the most influential institution as its members are directly elected. Although in the

UK, the European Parliament election is seen as a "protest vote" (Nick Robinson). Its members are accountable and are able to represent their constituents. This shows how they are influential, as they can represent their people better, especially as the Council of Ministers are directly elected so the public have no say.

Another reason why the European Parliament are more influential is because their national sovereignty is maintained.

In the Council of Ministers, they adopt a supranationalist theme so instead of doing right for your country or putting your country's interests first, they must do what's best for Europe. ~~which all in all~~ This could be an argument for the Council of Ministers, which I shall refer to later, but ~~by~~ by keeping their national sovereignty, the European Parliament are able to protect their country.

However, the Council of Ministers could be argued as more influential. A reason why they could be seen as more influential is because they scrutinise ~~and~~ the European Parliament. As they European

Parliament introduces policies, the Council of Ministers scrutinise these policies so they are beneficial for Europe as a whole, not as beneficial for one country and not ~~another~~ for another. Some Europhillies stated that "because of their supranational approach, the Council of Ministers are able to introduce policies which are beneficiary for all members"

The Council of Ministers' ~~are~~ members specially selected. Thus making them more influential. When elected, they must produce a portfolio which depicts what they want to introduce/change. This makes them more influential as they have specialised areas in which they wish to address. This shows that they are more influential.

In conclusion, the European Parliament are more democratic as they are accountable as they represent their constituents. However, I believe that the Council of Ministers is the most influential institute as they are specialised and, more importantly from a Europhillies' ^{respective} ~~perspective~~,

they are^u able to scrutinise the European Parliament's policies so they are not just beneficiary to one country, they can benefit the whole of Europe.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate would clearly have preferred a question about the European Parliament, and goes on to show serious confusion between the Council, Parliament and Commission. They escape L1 only on communication since the structure and phraseology are quite clear, albeit with limited content.

Final mark 4+4+4+4 = 16



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Basic mistakes and confusion between different institutions is often very costly, especially where the question requires you to compare and contrast them.

PLAN

YES

- Co-decision ✓
- Allows all member representatives ✓
- Commission must follow CoM directions ✓

No

- Commission initiate legislation ✓
- Unelected so unrepresentative ✓
- Merely a seal of approval ✓

~~YES follow the lead made~~

ECB

The Council of Ministers within the EU refers to the meetings of all policy making leaders in each individual member state. Much like select committees in the UK, they discuss issues and suggest possible solutions. For example, ECOFIN, the economic and financial meeting will be attended by the Chancellor George Osborne.

The Council of Ministers approve legislation within the EU process. This is done ~~together~~ in conjunction with the European Parliament, in a process known as co-decision. The Parliament and the Council of Ministers can therefore be seen as sharing the important power in the EU. However, the European Parliament is just a "talking shop" due to its size and the fact that its main function is to debate. The European Parliament is made up of 732 MEPs who ~~at~~ ~~have~~ sit in blocks. There are roughly 10 blocks in the EU parliament after Maria Løper announced a new "anti-migration" block on

the 16th of June 2015. There is no real "government and opposition" in the parliament which means that reasonable developments over certain issues are had to come by. This is why the Council of Ministers is the most influential body within the EU as each meeting is conducted with all 27 interior ministers, each having an equal share of time and all representing their own national interests.

Some argue that the European Commission is the most influential body in the EU as it is the only body who can actually initiate legislation. This means that the Commission can influence what is discussed in the European Parliament and what topics are of an important nature, currently the migration migrant crisis. However, the European Commission must follow the direction of the Council of Ministers. This means that the Council of Ministers can severely influence what the commission is doing. Therefore, if the ~~EU~~ Commission must follow the Council, which ~~was~~ ~~the~~ initiated legislation, it also has a large influence over the European Parliament.

However, the Council of Ministers are not EU-elected, they are elected on their own domestic manifestos. They just automatically get a seat at their department meetings. This means that the Council of Ministers suffer from a democratic deficit within the whole EU. This weakens their influence over EU policy and its implementation. The implementation

of laws are done by the commission, and then the ECJ (European Court of Justice) ensures that it is being followed. The Commission issues directives to member states which ensure a smooth transition and the implementation of EU laws set domestically. The fact that the Council of Ministers are not ~~the~~ directly elected means that they are unrepresentative to the whole of the EU.

Additionally, the Council of Ministers is merely just another layer of bureaucracy within the EU. They effectively just issue a stamp of approval. This makes the decision making process harder within the EU and means that it takes longer.

Furthermore, ~~is specific~~ ~~the~~ the ECB (European Central Bank) is probably the most influential body within the EU. This is because the ECB sets interest rates over all EU nations and also sets economic targets for individual countries. The ECB also has the power to issue bailouts to EU countries that are failing to get a grip on inflation, unemployment and a failure to see economic growth. For example, Greece and Ireland have both struggled to solve their economic troubles internally, so the ECB agreed loans (alongside of the IMF) to Greece especially. This means that individual countries must adhere to a strict set of policies set by the ECB, making it the most influential.

Furthermore, the European Parliament must approve the commission as a whole or reject it all. Individuals cannot be rejected. However, in the case of Barosso, the ~~revised~~ Parliament "Suggested" that certain members of his proposed commission were inappropriate, such as a Polish representative who was put forward for an economic position but had been caught ~~at~~ cheating some expenses. Barosso then removed some potential problem appointments and the parliament approved it. This shows that the parliament has the greatest influential power in the EU.

In addition to this, MEP's are also elected so are representative. Even though they are merely elected on the vote against the government of the day, UKIP winning most MEP's in 2013, they are democratically elected. UKIP does believe though that the UK would benefit from leaving the EU and by negotiating an own trade deals would get better results.

In conclusion, the Council of Ministers is the most influential body within the EU as it does influence nearly all parts of the decision making body. However, they do suffer from a democratic deficit and are also seen as only a stamp of approval. The real power, and some would argue ~~some~~ influence, lies with the European Parliament as they share co-decision with the Council of ministers but also as they are the main debator and amendment maker of legislation.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate's knowledge of the institutions is strong and their only limitation is a lack of a specific link back to the Council of Ministers with all of their points. Adapting their impressive understanding of the institutions to constantly assess the specific institutions asked about in the question could have taken this consistently high within level 3.

Final mark $10+8+7+6 = 31$



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

For maximum success on institutions questions link all comparisons back to the particular institution(s) cited in the question.

Question 8

This was a popular essay question, albeit slightly less so than question 7. The major discriminators here were balance, evidence, the breadth of focus, and the quality of analysis. The vast majority of candidates correctly grasped that this was a two-sided discussion, and that the Single Market could be seen to be both successful or unsuccessful, or as mainly successful with clear areas of limitation. It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates clearly understood that the purpose of the Single Market was an attempt by the EU to break down trading barriers so as to make it easier and cheaper for businesses to operate across borders. Candidates displayed good understanding of how this worked in practice, and many responses were able to pinpoint specific illustrations of where this had proved successful or less so. This evidence could be in terms of success in different countries, in different aspects of the single market, or at different times in its development, and was strongest when specific, measurable and accurate. Breadth most commonly meant avoiding an over-focus on monetary union, a path that tempted a small but noticeable minority of candidates and often left them in mid-level 2. However it was pleasing to see few candidates treat 'the single market' as a straightforward single track concept. Some adopted the approach of examining each of the 'four freedoms' – of people, goods, services, and capital, in turn and this was often a highly effective strategy. A few candidates also made effective comparison between the EU's single market and the current economic condition of other countries such as China, the USA and the Asian tiger economies. It was also acceptable, although relatively rare, to consider the question not just from an economic angle but also from a cultural or social standpoint. Where such approaches introduced relevant argument and evidence they were often very strong, for example considering how the lack of a European social model could be perceived to be hindering the potential of the Single Market due to divergent tax regimes or cultural differences. The weakest responses either focused on the EU in general, rather than the single market in particular, and were consequently side-tracked into discussion of political sovereignty and democratic deficits, or else committed two or three of the deadly essay sins of being brief, one-sided, and lacking evidence. Lower middling answers often committed one of the above sins, or alternatively were analytically lacking, for example by failing to specifically link individual successes or failures, such as the single currency or social chapter, to the single market. Higher middling answers did include both balance and evidence but did not include the level of breath necessary to progress further. This was most commonly due to an over-focus on monetary union, but the freedom of movement was also sometimes overly dominant. Stronger responses considered a range of aspects of the single market – sometimes considering the four freedoms in turn and discussing the ways in which each could be considered either a success or a failure. Contemporary and accurate evidence was used throughout and candidates often showed awareness of how the single market had produced different levels of success for different member states. Many stronger candidates comfortably referenced key economic indicators on such areas as GDP growth, foreign direct investment, international trade or trends across business sectors.

As with all essay questions synopticity was best when it avoided the ubiquitous 'some' and ascribed contrasting views to particular sources. Party views were clearly creditable here, as were the views of EU institutions, pressure groups, and both big and small businesses, which could fall on either side of the debate. Contrasting international views, in terms of different perceptions of success or failure from different countries, were also acceptable although there was, surprisingly, relatively little Grecian synopticity in terms of the election of Syriza. Considering the alternative viewpoints with respect to particular individual features of the single market, such as the freedom of movement, was also highly effective and again strongest when these views were ascribed to those who hold them.

The single market was set up by the EU to try and promote fair competition between its member states. It means they can trade without regulations & restrictions. It also enables the free movement of labour, capital & goods & services. Some people, broadly known as pro-EU parties, say the SM (single market) has been a success. This can be argued to be true after the fact as most of the EU members survived and recovered from the global recession. Euro sceptics however argue against the success of the SM.

It can be argued that the SM has worked because an estimated 6 million British workers now work abroad. This means that unemployment has gone down. This can be shown by recent figures showing unemployment at a record low of 7%.

The SM can also be argued to have worked because most countries survived the global recession of 2008. It can be argued that

Without the SM, countries would struggle to trade because of exchange rates and inflation not acting in their favour.

However ~~it can be argued~~ eurosceptics would argue that the SM hasn't proved to be a success. Firstly, the single market can't operate properly because some countries still place rules and regulations which restrict their trade. The SM also can't fully work because there is no law harmonisation and not all members are part of the Euro. Additionally, the one size fits all approach limits the success of the SM because countries economies are too different in terms of wealth & agriculture.

Another reason why the success of the SM is limited ~~is because~~ was shown after the 2008 recession. Some argue that it had a 'domino effect' on the economies which could have been

candidate it there wasn't a single market.

To conclude, the single market has proved successful for many reasons, however its success is limited because it isn't fully enforced, for example some states still have regulations. In order for the single market to be here greater success its needs to be enforced better with more punishments for countries that don't abide by it properly.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The issues considered here are relevant and creditable but the candidate is limited to mid-level 2 by their over-reliance on assertion, perhaps reflecting a lack of time to fully develop their points.

Final mark $7+7+6+5 = 25$



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

It is critical to allow sufficient time for answering essays in order to develop and argue your points.

In order to understand whether the Single Market has proved to be a success, you must understand what the aims and purpose of the Single Market is/was.

Starting as the ~~ECSC~~ ECSC at the Treaty of Paris in 1951, one of the main aims of (what was the very beginning of a Single Market) was peace between European nations, this has undoubtedly been achieved and through rapid growth and a number of treaties, the ECSC has grown into a 28 member state economic and political union known as the EU, the Single Market being one of the main elements of this Union.

This EU Single Market is largely successful as it has allowed for the EU to account for 25% of World GDP in 2013, whilst only having $\frac{1}{4}$ of its citizens, this suggests economic success of the Single Market.

This has been achieved through the creation of an EU Free Trade Zone in which there are no internal tariff barriers, and allows for free movement of the factors of production under the Schengen Agreement. This has proved to be a success as there are 2 million UK citizens working abroad, something which is only possible due

to the single market principles, it is also successful as 20% of the NHS nurses are EU migrants, the NHS could not function without this influx of foreign labour, contrary to the beliefs of Growthpoc UKIP. This shows that the single market has been successful in allowing citizens to find employment where they are needed, helping to maximise efficiency of the EU workforce.

On the other hand, the EU single market could be seen to be unsuccessful in creating efficient employment due to the disparity between employment rates within countries, not all citizens have benefited, shown in that Greece has a 27% unemployment rate at peak, whereas Austria has 4.9% unemployment, this shows that free movement of labour has not been successful, as there should not be such a wide employment gap between two countries, however this could be largely due to citizens' reluctance to cut family ties and move abroad to find work.

The Single Market is a primarily economic project and it is therefore important to evaluate its impact on business and commerce. A CBI report in 2014 showed that 71% of CBI businesses said that membership of the EU, and therefore the single market, has had a positive impact on their business, this was supported by 67% of small medium enterprises saying the EU had a positive impact. This has been due to free trading allowing firms to access larger markets of up to \$16.6 trillion dollars worth, meaning they can produce and sell on

a larger scale, therefore being able to benefit from economies of scale. CBI businesses also explained that because EU manufacturing focuses on 'complex, high added value industry' it is often the case that products created are niche, and while there may not be a large enough domestic market, the EU market is viable. This clearly shows that the EU Single market has been largely successful in the economic growth of business, though if 67% of SME's benefited from Single market, do 33% suffer? perhaps EU regulation and bureaucracy has harmed some SME's, though this is difficult to quantify, it is a possibility raised by Nigel Farage who called the EU "A union of mass unemployment and low growth".

One of the pursuits of the Single market that may not have been successful is the implementation of the Euro (€). A common currency is one of the most important elements of a Single market, and one that has prevented the EU from becoming a fully fledged Single market. Not all members of the EU free trade zone have adopted the Euro, and indeed some countries such as the UK and Denmark have negotiated an opt-out of the single currency (John Major, Maastricht '92). This stops the Single market from functioning efficiently as there are uncertainties and extra costs when trading between Germany and the UK for example, as changing exchange rates can offset the profit margins and

Stabilities of a deal between firms, so in this regard the EU Single Market can be seen as unsuccessful, if not, at the very least incomplete.

Though the EU has had Single market benefits those within the free trade zone, allowing for 25% of world GDP and mass specialisation, on a global scale, the Single market has been detrimental to cross-continent cohesion, as Common External Tariffs (CET's) make the exports of Africa and other countries less competitive especially food produce due to the CAP, this means the Single Market has been successful for those within it, but at the cost of other nations such as Africa, so perhaps globally the Single Market is disastrous for international relations, the USA have had complaints over it a number of times.

On the whole, the Single Market of the EU can be viewed as a largely successful project, and one of the major benefits of EU membership, it has allowed for the rapid economic growth of EU countries, and OBI speculated it accounts, as a net benefit, for 5% of the UK's GDP per annum, that's \$78bn. The free trade area has allowed for greater economic prosperity as UK does 40% of its trade with EU and has allowed for the countries of Europe to live in peace and economic prosperity, a main aim set out at both the Treaty of Paris '51 and Treaty of Rome '57, though the project is incomplete and far from perfect, on the

Whole it has been successful and will likely become of increasing importance in our ever more globalised world economy.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Had this answer continued a little longer to encompass another 1-2 points it might have got close to full marks or even achieved them. Even so it does well within level 3 due to its strong balance, use of arguments and links back to the question. Note that whilst the context at the beginning is historical, and peace is perhaps not the strongest contemporary argument, it is legitimate in terms of considering a founding purpose of the single market that is of less contemporary relevance precisely because the single market has been successful in fulfilling it.

Final mark $10+10+9+7 = 36$



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

If an answer is strong enough to enter level 3 then its place within the level will generally be determined by the breadth depth, relevance and balance of the points discussed.

Paper Summary

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

- read the question carefully, and then read it carefully again, and ensure that they are answering the question, the whole question and nothing but the question.
- in particular pay attention to command words such as 'assess', which requires some critique of the points advanced.
- maintain a contemporary focus, and avoid overly historical content, finding and utilising all opportunity to introduce relevant contemporary political context, whilst ensuring that it is clearly linked to effective debate, and not simply descriptive.
- avoid general introductions or conclusions to short response questions - they do not cost marks but rarely gain them and lose time. However they should 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 avoid confusion between similar institutions or concepts, for example the ECHR and ECJ, or the Council of Ministers and the European Council.

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 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.