

Examiners' Report
June 2016

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 2016

Publications Code 6GP04_4A_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

This paper saw a pleasing level of focus on contemporary events from many candidates, particularly in terms of the EU renegotiation and referendum with respect to question 6 as well as to questions 4 and 7. Most candidates also now appear to be fully conversant with the impact of the Lisbon Treaty although there do remain some instances where candidates are reliant on an out of date understanding of the institutions and processes of the EU.

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 both short response and essay questions.

The short response questions were fairly even in popularity although the quality was rather more variable, with question 5 in particular seeing a surprisingly high number of weak responses for a question with a clear structure and content. In contrast on the essays question 8 was by far the least popular although quality was more consistent between questions, and this unbalance of popularity perhaps reflected the degree of contemporary relevance of the other two questions.

Candidates remained mixed in their ability to offer concise and accurate definitions of key terms such as 'neo functionalism' and 'European Social Model'. Furthermore, some basic errors were still too common: whilst it is perhaps understandable for the average person in the street to confuse the European Court of Human Rights with the European Court of Justice, or to mix up the different 'Presidents', A Level students studying EU Politics should not do so. Equally it was pleasing to again 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.

There was noticeable improvement in the declining number of candidates failing to fully engage with the questions, with generally good levels of balance on question 1, engagement with both how and why on questions 2 and 5, and appreciations of the significance of 'significance' on question 4 as well as the implications of 'implications' on question 3.

A significant number of candidates continue to use general introductions or conclusions to short response questions which do not cost marks but rarely gain them and lose time: introductions should focus on brief context and definitions, whilst conclusions to short responses are entirely un-necessary.

One sided essays remain a relatively rare phenomenon although synopticity remained rather patchy on two of the three essays. Whilst most candidates recognised the clear to discuss different party positions on question 6 there was less use of this still relevant knowledge on question 7, and very little on question 8. There also remained 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 the increasing use of relevant examples, particularly in terms of awareness of the impact of different significance EU politicians such as Juncker, Tusk and Van Rompuy as well as, a little less auspiciously, Buttiglione. Cresson and Santer.

Question 1

This was the most popular of the short response questions even though it was the only one to specifically require a two-sided response. Popular themes included the various methods of accountability of the Commission to Parliament, and the degree to which the appointment process incorporated accountability. There was also strong general awareness of the distinction between individual and collective accountability, and the reliance on the threat of the 'nuclear option' of mass dismissal. There was also some pleasing awareness of contemporary developments such as the emergence of Spitzenkandidaten', but equally some variable levels of accuracy as to examples and process. Some candidates confused the withdrawal of Buttiglione with the mass-resignation of the Santer commission, whilst others inaccurately asserted that the latter had been dismissed rather than resigned under pressure. There was also some confusion about the approval process and how it applied to commissioners being individually scrutinised but collectively approved. Level 1 responses displayed little awareness of what was meant by the term accountability, or were inaccurate in their assertions surrounding the EU's institutional framework; suggesting, for example, that the European Commission was an elected body, or that the European Parliament could not amend any laws. Such weak responses were, however, infrequent. Level 2 responses engaged well with the general debate surrounding accountability, but were less specific when it came to the procedural mechanisms which promoted or hindered accountability. In some cases they were extensive but one sided. Level 3 responses showed accuracy and balance, with some excellent responses offering direct assessment of each accountability mechanism, highlighting limits where appropriate. The accurate use of examples, and awareness of sometimes complex relationships between the Commission and other institutions, were also common features of the strongest answers.

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

~~EU Part~~ ~~Santer Comm 1999~~ Question 4 Question 5

~~Main legislative body~~

~~Hearings~~

One way in which the European Commission is held accountable is the European Parliament. The European Parliament has the ability to sack a commission if they should need to. This holds ~~from~~ the Commission to account as it makes sure they are doing their job correctly. For example, ~~in~~ in 1999, the Santer Commission was criticised by the European Parliament for being too "reckless". The Commission resigned in 1999 after severe pressure from the European Parliament. Although the EU Parliament did not ~~sack~~ ^{sack} the Commission, this demonstrates how the EU Parliament holds the EU Commission to account through the fear of being sacked. The EU Commission is held accountable to a fair extent.

Another way is the hearings held. The EU Commission and Commissioners must attend hearings in which they are questioned on their role and success. These hearings help keep Commissioners in check demonstrating how the EU Commission is held accountable. One example is the famous "hearing from hell" in which a Slovakian ~~Commissioner~~ Commissioner was seen as unqualified and

unaccountable. She was ruthlessly questioned and, following this hearing, she resigned. This shows how the EU Commission is being held accountable.

Another way is the judiciary. The European Court of Human Rights makes sure that a decision made in the EU Commission is legal. This is mainly done through Judicial Review. This means that the Commission is unable to create legislation that is against people's rights or illegal. This holds the Commission accountable to the European Court of Human Rights.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The points made here are valid and clear but the answer is one sided leaving it in level 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

A one-sided answer to a two-sided question will not reach level 3.

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

EP - Yellow Card
- Budget
- dismissal

(26)

One way in which the European Commission can be held to account is by the European Parliament. Under recent their recent growth in powers, the European Parliament are able to dismiss entire commissions. This can be seen with the Santer Commission. ~~things~~

On the other hand, the European Parliament are unable to dismiss individual commissioners. Some may view this to be a hindrance on their power to hold the Commission to account as the Parliament can't sanction individu-

also. Conversely, they may influence the Head of the Commission to make a decision in their favour. This was seen with Italian Commissioner Buttiglione. Many saw the European Parliament's outspoken approach to be a key factor in the dismissal. Moreover, showing them to be able to hold the Commission to account.

Additionally, the introduction of the yellow and orange card system has given the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament significant powers. This enables the institutions to voice concerns of legislation created by the ~~EU~~ Commission - thus showing them to be held accountable. However, this ~~is~~ system has only been used twice highlighting to some the reluctance of ~~the~~ ^a Commission to hold the Commission to account.

One of the ~~part~~ more significant ways the European parliament and Council of ministers can hold the commission to account is through their powers of approval. This is seen as the commission required approval for policies such as the budget ~~to ensure~~ for the process of implementation can continue. The other institutions can hold the commission to account by voicing concerns and rejecting policy. Furthermore, showing significant powers to hold the commission to account.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer is clear and shows balanced which is enough to take it into level 3. It reaches high level 3 by dint of its specific examples and detail.

Mark: 14



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Clear and relevant examples can make a significant difference to marks, especially in terms of position within levels.

Question 2

This was the second most popular short response question. Important factors to addressing this question effectively were the consideration of both 'how' and 'why', with a generally stronger performance on the latter, and an appreciation of the significance of EU institutions over simply targeting the EU in general. Common 'why' factors considered were the supremacy of EU law, the continent wide potential impact the EU can have, and the availability of EU funding. In terms of how many candidates discussed trans-national groups, the use of lobbyists and the relocation of many pressure groups to Brussels. Level 1 responses talked about pressure group activity in very general terms, sometimes ignoring that the question asked about UK pressure groups, or referencing activities, or examples of pressure groups, that would more likely be seen at the national rather than European level. Level 2 responses tended to offer good reasons as to why EU institutions were targeted, but were more general in terms of the how often with no specific examples used. Other responses discussed both the how and why of targeting the EU in general but with no reference to institutions. Level 3 responses considered both the how and why part of the question fully, with the strongest answers exploring, often with examples, how particular institutions are targeted. The very best responses explained how and why UK pressure groups adapt their behaviour within the context of the EU, in order to gain meaningful influence.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

Put a cross in the box indicating the second 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

One method through which UK pressure groups target EU institutions is ~~just~~ ^{by} ~~allied~~ ^{allying} themselves with their European counterparts. They do this for a variety of reasons, for example joining forces gives them access to greater resources, such as money, members, media, etc. ~~Perhaps the~~ ^{By} ~~giving~~ ^{gaining} Through gaining new resources, UK pressure groups gain better chance at influencing EU decision making.

A second method through which UK pressure groups target EU institutions is by employing professional lobbyists in Brussels to target ~~both the~~ ~~MEP and~~ ~~EU~~ influence EU decision makers. These lobbyists often have intricate knowledge of the EU and are therefore best suited to achieving the targets that UK pressure groups desire.

One reason why UK pressure groups target EU institutions is due to the fact that the EU has decision ~~sovereignty over~~ ^{vast} decision making powers over the issues that many UK pressure groups care about most. For example, on the issue of global warming and the environment, UK pressure groups are much more likely to gain traction with a sympathetic EU parliament than they would with a ~~by~~ more ~~conservative~~ UK parliament.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer covers how and why and has relevant content taking it to the top end of level 2, but lacks the level of development to reach level 3.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Depth of points is equally important to breadth when looking to get a high mark.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

Put a cross in the box indicating the second 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

Pressure groups mainly target EU institutions through lobbying, especially the European Parliament and Commission. The Commission often consults insiders pressure groups on policy, such as the ETUC in 2005 over the development of policies for gender equality in the workplace. Even outsider groups are able to gain influence through campaign methods, such as by having access to the European Parliament buildings - as ~~the~~ Greenpeace lobbyists do - and so targeting individual MEPs. Groups are also able to lobby government representatives in the Council of Ministers, especially when in ~~the~~ grouped summits, such as over economic policy with Ecofin.

Pressure groups partly target the EU because increasingly certain policy areas are being developed by the EU instead of national

governments. The NFU, for example, is able to affect the Common Agricultural Policy through consultation with the European Commission; admittedly this is not always successful, as for instance agricultural groups lobbied against the cap on subsidies of €300,000, however ~~even~~ it is still true that certain policy areas are increasingly handled more by EU institutions instead of national ones.

Groups also lobby the EU institutions because as there are 28 countries in the EU, a successful pressure group can implement policy across most of Europe, instead of only in one country as they would if they lobbied a national government. Greenpeace is especially effective at this; ~~it~~ they notably gained a cross-EU ban on GM crops, and in 2009 was able to successfully lobby the European Parliament and achieve a ban of real products in all EU countries. ~~that~~ To get a similar effect ^{without the EU}, groups such as Greenpeace would instead have to lobby 28 individual governments, which is a lot less efficient.

Finally, UK pressure groups target lobbying in the EU because by doing so they are able to ally themselves with other EU member state groups, often ~~created~~ creating large federations. The CBI, for instance, is part of the business and trade concerned federation, 'Business Europe'. In these federations groups have access to a lot more resources and influence, making them more likely to achieve their aims. The ETUC, for instance, represents 60 million workers, and has achieved the success of almost entirely dominating EU consultation in employment and social issues.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer makes specific reference to particular institutions but also covers both how and why.

Mark: 13



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

It is important to give weight to every word in the question – in this case 'how', 'why', and 'EU institutions' were all important.

Question 3

This was, despite the very specific technical definition required, a moderately popular question with many candidates having closely memorised an accurate textbook definition and examples.

Equally, those candidates who did not fully grasp the concept offered a wide variety of alternative conceptions of neo-functionalism which were credited in proportion to their level of accuracy. These definitions often related to ideas that could be tied into the concept if properly argued, such as creeping federalism or a two-speed Europe. With candidates who discussed the very relevant concept of spillover there was generally the most accuracy on technical and functional (sometimes labelled 'economic') spillover and more variable discussions of political spillover. Level 1 responses failed to offer a definition, or alternatively were inaccurate in their understanding, with a concomitant impact on their understanding of its significance for EU integration. Level 2 responses typically had a reasonable understanding of the impacts of the theory but missed the important points of spillover, or else dwelt overmuch on one particular aspect with fully expanding on its significance. Level 3 responses considered both the definition and explanation of implication comprehensibly and convincingly. Spillover was understood and explained with clarity, and it was often the case that candidates assessed technical, economic as well as political spill over. Strong responses also drew wider conclusions about the impact on a federal EU, and in some cases noted the views of both supporters and opponents of the neo-functionalist approach.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

Put a cross in the box indicating the second 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

Define neofunctionalism / and explain its implications for European integration.

- Functionalism
- sharing functions eg trade / Single market
- CFP
- CAP
- for convenience
- and Spillover
- political
- EEC
- functional
- ends up w/ increasingly supranational EU without voters

~~Neofunctionalism~~

Neofunctionalism is a theory of EU integration which is essentially functionalism with 'spillover'. This means that functions are shared for convenience, such as the common fisheries policy, the common agricultural policy, and the notion of the single market and ~~the~~ signing free trade deals as a 'big bloc'.

Spillover means such functions spill over into another function for convenience. For instance, functional spillover could be the EU's monetary policy spilling over into fiscal policy. Political spillover would be pressure groups in ~~member~~ member states becoming EU wide, and technical spillover is member state technical standards merging together.

For European integration, it means that in the end, every member state has ~~shared~~ ^{integrated} so many of its functions that the European Union becomes increasingly supranational and member states have little control. This differs to federalism because neofunctionalism is non-ideological, and neofunctionalists would not want to see the erosion of the ~~the~~ nation state. Federalism means pooling and actively sharing/dividing sovereignty.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate clearly understands the concept of Neo-functionalism and some of its implications but is not able to develop either of these far enough for level 3. Had they combined the first and second paragraphs they would have had more time to add further points.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Avoided repetition – time is tight and only distinct content will add extra marks.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.
You will be asked to indicate your third question choice on page 9.

Put a cross in the box indicating the second 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

Neo-functionalism is a process of integration that hopes to achieve further integration by creating conditions that are favourable to integration. This is primarily done through "spill-over" effects. Jacques Delors said that neo-functionalism was the only realistic means by which further integration could be achieved.

The first type of spillover is functional. This is the argument that as some areas become integrated, it makes sense for other areas to be integrated. This can be seen in the Eurozone. In order to prevent the sovereign debt crisis in Greece from leading to the break-up of the Union, further integration was needed. This included the setting up of a ~~European~~ the ESM. A fund containing £500bn for bailout of Eurozone countries.

There was also the six pack of fiscal regulation introduced in 2012. Automatically imposing a 0.1% of GDP fine on any country with a deficit about 3% of GDP. Guy Verhofstadt argues that "full economic and fiscal union" is necessary - this is an example of functional spill-over from monetary to fiscal union.

The second type of spill-over is technical. This is when the single market forces member states to harmonise technical regulations. For example, to prevent toy makers in one part of the union from undercutting those in another part by making toys less safe, the Toy Safety Directive (2009) was introduced. This harmonised standards of flammability or chemical properties. This is an example of integration in a technical area.

The final type of spill-over is Political. This is related to the efforts of lobbying groups on ~~international~~ ^{supranational} institutions. If the Confederation of European Business were to successfully lobby an EU institution to implement a

policy, the policy would be applied across the EU. which would, in effect lead to further integration



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Although this candidate spends a long time on the details of spillover this is all relevant content, and tied into the question.

Mark: 13



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Time spent developing relevant points is seldom wasted.

Question 4

This was the second least popular short response question although still tackled by a good number of candidates.

The majority of candidates understood which 'president' this question referred to, and had a clear understanding of the role post-Lisbon. Some preferred to separate the role from the significance, whilst others highlighted the individual significance of different roles, and both were acceptable approaches. References to specific post-holders were beneficial to candidates where tied into roles and significance, and a good number of candidates showed highly contemporary knowledge of Tusk's involvement in the UK renegotiation.

Some candidates particularly focused on how the role and significance of the post drew on the role and significance of the Council itself and where their understanding of the latter was accurate this was a legitimate approach.

Level 1 responses often confused the role with that of the president of the European Commission, or focused on the pre-Lisbon rotating presidency and on the ways in which Presidents might advance national agendas.

Level 2 responses tended to sufficiently discuss aspects of the role, sometimes with excellent examples, but were less strong in considering how such aspects related to significance. Others showed some confusion about the appointment of the president but nevertheless discussed relevant material about both role and significance.

Level 3 responses clearly understood both role and significance, making effective use of specific examples to illustrate these. Some candidates explained how rival posts within the EU hierarchy served to hinder or enhance the president's significance, while others effectively assessed how a president's personality may shape the practical significance of the post.

Indicate your third question choice on this page.

Put a cross in the box indicating the third 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

The European Council consists of the heads of government for from each member state ~~at~~ and meets at least twice a year.

The current ~~pr~~ President of the European Council is Jean-Claude Juncker which is a politician from Luxembourg. The president of the European Council affectively has ultimate power and is extremely crucial in the role of policy-making. The President has the ability to call all members of the council particularly if there is a detrimental problem that needs solving. He has the ability to set the agenda of the meeting which can help benefit them. The council contains the heads of each government from each member state which means that he is extremely influential. Also, the European Council ~~are~~ ^{is} the institution which receives the most ~~is~~ media attention which can further enhance his ability to control power. As he is the President of heads of government anything that he says can make a huge impact on the EU as the heads of government must go back to their country.

and consider what he has said.

To conclude, the President of the European Council is a very important role and is highly has the ability to make changes as they can influence the heads of government.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate is clearly confused between the president of the council and the president of the commission. They gain a small amount of credit for 'agenda setting' and references to heads of government, but do not escape level 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

It is critical to be accurate in your understanding of the different posts, particularly the various 'presidents'.

Indicate your third question choice on this page.

Put a cross in the box indicating the third 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

The President of the European Council, currently Donald Tusk ~~has~~ has to set the agenda for meetings. The ~~European~~ European Council is a collective of the leaders of all different member states within the EU. The agenda that he sets is usually topical and important issues around and concerning the EU. An example of such meetings are in 2014 when the European Council had to discuss the Greek Bailout. Setting the agenda is also a significant role as due to the number of countries on the Council, each will have specific concerns they will want to raise so this role is important to discussing the most important decisions.

Another role for the President of the European Council is to act as a figurehead for the EU. In such a role, the President will be required to become a global figure responding to events occurring within the EU and as a presence to creating trade deals with the rest of the world. This is ~~a~~ a significant role for the President as without such a figure there would not be anybody appointed nor elected to show the direction

of EU policy on the global scale.

Another role for the President of the European Council is that he will settle disputes from member about the EU. An example of this is in 2016 with Donald Tusk arranging the reforms David Cameron (UK Government) wished to gain from the EU regarding the upcoming referendum on the UK's membership of the EU on June 24th. Alongside members of the European Council, Donald Tusk was able to help negotiate a number of reforms from which David Cameron wished to gain. This is significant as without such leadership, peaceful and co-operative negotiations would have been hard to attain.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is relatively brief for a mid level 2 answer but is closely focused on the question and makes good use of pertinent examples.

Mark: 12



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Answers do not have to be long to do well provided that they focus tightly on the question.

Question 5

This was the least popular of the short response questions, perhaps reflecting the fact that this specific area had not previously been addressed. It was nevertheless still tackled by a good number of candidates.

Sadly however a surprisingly large number of these candidates had only a vague grasp of what is meant by justice and home affairs, sometimes erroneously equating it to any domestic policy impact (including such areas as CAP or CFP) and in some cases jumping directly from the question to a discussion of the Common Foreign and Security Policy. Other candidates discussed the Social Chapter and other actions related to workers' rights, which was creditable if explicitly linked to the concept of Social Justice. Equally some candidates dealt very effectively with contemporary developments offering clear links between the 'how' and 'why'. Level 1 responses did not grasp the key components of what constituted justice and home affairs. In some cases there was extensive and unhelpful detail about the ECHR, and in others a general discussion of the role of the European Court of Justice but not linked to specific relevant policy areas. Level 2 responses showed a general grasp of the policy area, often with a strong focus on either how or why, or on justice but not home affairs. Level 3 responses considered both the how and why part of the question fully and offered a number of pertinent and contemporary examples such as the European Arrest Warrant, Europol or the Charter of Fundamental Rights. 'Why' content included both points specifics to justice and home affairs, such as the growth of cross-border terrorism, and more general points about integration.

Indicate your third question choice on this page.

Put a cross in the box indicating the third 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

The EU has managed to involve itself within Justice and Home Affairs in a number of ways, whether it be to do with the growth of the project, the amount of different issues it has the job of dealing with, or the positions set for members who have to fulfill for their particular role.

Justice and Home Affairs focuses on particular issues, one of which involves making sure that the relationship between the countries within the EU and its neighbours of the EU are to have these problems looked at. An important factor of all Justice and Home Affairs is to make sure that the countries are co-operating well together and that they are all happy. The way in which they make sure that each country's needs are looked into is through meetings between the different countries. For instance, Jean-Claude Juncker, head of European Commission, is able to help with this.

particular situation through annual meetings between the 8 superpowers in the EU called the G8 Summit. This allows for the different member states ~~to~~ to talk about how they are co-operating with each other and how it has been over the last year.

Another area in which Justice and Home Affairs deals with is the rights of each country and where they stand in terms of nationality in terms of trade, money and movement. Specialising in the rights of nations allow for them to listen to how the member state feels they have been treated, and whether it has been fairly or not in their opinion. This allows for the EU to work on ways to improve the countries that may feel need it more. This shows involvement into Justice and Home Affairs as it shows they are looking to make sure a peace is kept between the countries, whilst improvements are still looked into to be made.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

It is not clear whether this candidate has any understanding of the concept of 'justice and home affairs' as it applies to the EU, and their answer, which is slightly longer than some level 3 responses, gains no credit.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Do not waste time on answering a question, especially at length, if you do not understand its key terms.

Indicate your third question choice on this page.

Put a cross in the box indicating the third 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

Since the imposition of Schengen, the free movement policy of people policy across the EU, the EU has needed to involve itself in justice and home affairs.

The ability of an EU national to move freely between EU states has increased the risk of criminals moving to another state in order to avoid prosecution. This has caused the need for the common arrest warrant whereby criminals that move to another EU country are extradited quickly back to the country of origin. The common arrest warrant allows a criminal to be arrested in any EU state and taken to another in order to face prosecution. The UK has received over 1,000 criminals after fleeing the country and on average, 91% of returned criminals are then convicted. This shows the need for the EU to be involved in justice and home affairs due to the ability of people to move freely across Europe.

As well as this, the EU has also set a requirement of member states to establish a minimum wage due to

the vast differences in standards of living across the EU. The difference in average wage between EU countries often sees a German wage six times gone off from a Romanian wage in their country of origin. The case of social justice for labour in many eastern EU states has provided the need for the EU to ~~intervene~~ intervene. The EU has enforced each state to set a minimum wage in accordance with the cost of living. They allow workers in eastern states such as Bulgaria or Poland the ability to earn the amount needed to afford the same level of consumption as a German, French or British in the same proportion. This is evidence of the EU involving itself in justice and home affairs in order to deal the inequality across Europe in terms of wealth.

In conclusion, the EU has involved itself in justice and home affairs through the Common Area without and imposition of national minimum wage due to the free movement of people and inequality across the EU due to integration and engagement.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The European Arrest Warrant point is clearly relevant and creditable. The Social Chapter point is more arguable, but the candidate does clearly tie it to the question through the concept of 'social justice' which is acceptable.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Content is credited as you legitimately relate it to the question asked: provided you can make a reasonable link it will be accepted.

Question 6

This was a moderately popular essay question, and gave candidates a particularly strong opportunity to display their contemporary knowledge, being almost prophetic by having been written some time before the timing of the EU referendum was known and proving by the time of the exam to be of extremely high relevance. Almost all candidates made an effort to consider different party positions, particularly in terms of the outright opposition of UKIP and the internal divisions within the Conservative Party. There was also some good awareness of tensions between old and new Labour, as well as discussion of the more avowedly pro-European positions of the Lib Dems, Greens and Nationalist parties. Beyond the specific party policies, a significant discriminating factor was the extent to which candidates discussed the wider politics landscape, and tied the party positions into shifting political priorities such as immigration and political and economic control. Discussion about party leadership, grassroots activism, parliamentary representation (both in the UK and EU Parliaments) and factionalism could also all be credited. Synopticity was generally strong, albeit with variation as to its level of sophistication. Many sound responses, for example, possibly gave much attention to considering the fortunes of UKIP as a direct reaction against the EU, whereas stronger responses explored other possible reasons which might arguably explain the rise of the party, such as dissatisfaction with the consensus politics, a perceived bland leadership of the established parties, or a protest against government austerity etc. Candidates often named individual politicians of differing views, and where their views were clearly explained this could glean good credit. Weaker responses tended to overly focus on one party (typically the Conservatives), with very minimal or no attempt to introduce any balance. Middling responses were accurate and sometimes extensive but typically restricted their discussions to the party policies. At times political parties were treated as single homogenous entities whilst other candidates became overly engrossed in discussions about a party's view on a certain aspect of the EU or on listing different politicians' views without exploring them. Stronger responses demonstrated a good grasp of party policies and factions within parties as well as an awareness of the impact of the EU on the wider political landscape, backing of their well-developed arguments with specific evidence. Some strong responses challenged the premise of the question by exploring drivers other than the EU that seemed to be influencing UK party politics, whether it be disillusionment with the mainstream in general, or the popularity of a leader perceived to be an outsider.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

Given the fact that Brexit is has become a controversial, yet substantial ~~and~~ political discussion topic, it is clear to depict the ~~cyber~~ eurosceptic views may have on UK party politics.

It was so significant a factor that David Cameron called for a referendum on 23rd June 2016. Therefore, in the run up to the campaign both; UK party politics has become segregated by differing 'in or out' ~~views~~ ideas and opinions.

It could be said that the Conservative party has been ~~cyber~~ ~~segregated~~ significantly, with there currently a political scism within the party. This is emphasised by the fact that PM David Cameron (and party leader) has openly pledged his support to remaining in the EU. On the contrary; the Mayor of London, Boris Johnson has stated his belief that leaving would be the best option. Of which, his argument derives from the fact that the membership is of a significant cost to UK taxpayers. Furthermore the fact that the democratic

deficit within the EU is yet to be entirely addressed; with Parliament still the only directly elected institution, even so only achieved a 34% turnout in 2014 EU elections in The U.K. Emphasising the nature of apathy of U.K. citizens towards The European Union.

With the growing popularity of UKIP within UK politics, evidence of their views are clear for all other parties to see. Along with many other eurosceptics, UKIP argue that membership erodes national sovereignty, ~~being~~ will it act as a restraint by ~~the~~ The EU's policy implementation; of which EU precedence overrides UK law. However, it is not merely just the U.K. who holds some of these views. With Greece also contemplating their future; ~~of~~ of which their views are epitomised by the eurosceptic party 'Golden Dawn'.

David Cameron argues that the EU provides significant funding to UK trade, providing funds to North Wales and Cornwall to encourage trade. As well as emphasising the fact that there will be a 5% tariff on imports. Of which is agreed to be

a minor setback as opposed to the membership
push by Bedfordshire and Conservative MP,
Richard Fuller. Of whom, similar to
many believes that ~~prior~~ prior to joining
in 1971 the U.K economy was steady, as
well as U.K politics in general, despite
the devaluation of ~~the~~ two world wars.
As well as the fact that Charles De Gaulle
declined several applications to join.

Whilst The U.K. is also seen as
'The Arsenal Partner' after its lack
of involvement in The Social Chapter.

However, Labour argue that the
EU is a sui-generis body therefore it
is too tedious to depict whether it is
a success or failure, at this stage. Yet;
emphasise that it provides integrity to U.K
politics.

Whereas evoseptics highlight Norway's
shady position outside of The EU in
order to emphasise ~~that~~ that the U.K. is
perfectly capable of carrying out gestures
effectively outside of the restraints of the
EU. Whereby, all precedence must
be adjoined to



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This content is all reasonable but is too narrowly drawn to reach level 3 and needs to discuss a wider range of parties or issues to go higher.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Just as depth of points is important in essay questions, so is breadth and range.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

UK party politics is growing increasingly eurosceptic, sceptical of the European Union. The EU Referendum has demonstrated there is no longer a consensus on Britain's membership of the European Union: with MPs from the Conservative, Labour, and UKIP and DUP calling for Britain to leave the EU. On the other hand there is considerable support for the EU among British political parties: the SNP, Liberal Democrats and Green are all pro-European and the Labour party is broadly Euro-programatic though arguing the case for reform, whilst emphasising the benefits of a 'social Europe'. The Prime Minister David Cameron and George Osborne stress the economic benefits of the EU but are opposed to EU federalism and are fictionalists. Professor Vernon Bogdanor argues everyone in British politics is 'eurosceptic' now as a result of the Euro crisis and high levels of EU Immigration. There is little support for EU supranationalism or federalism and only ^{two tier} limited support for variable geometry and a 'two speed' Europe. British party politics is essentially eurosceptic.

Over 130 Conservative MPs now support a vote for Britain to vote to leave the EU in the 2016

Referendum. Cabinet Ministers such as Michael Gove, Chris Grayling and John Whittingdale with senior Conservatives Boris Johnson and Iain Duncan-Smith, are hostile to the EU. The Conservative MP Jacob Rees-Mogg argues the EU is fundamentally undemocratic, due to the democratic deficit in the EU. He points out the Commission is unelected and therefore unaccountable to the voters. Britain is underrepresented in the core institutions of the Council of Ministers and the European Parliament. Rees-Mogg has criticised the fact Malta has 15x more voting power per head of population in Qualified Majority voting than the UK and in the EU Parliament Malta is 10x better represented. Chris Grayling has also criticised the supra national elements of the EU as it undermines the ability of Britain to get its own way. Britain has always been outvoted when it opposes a Commission proposal.

Many Conservatives such as Michael Gove have grown hostile to the EU due to the erosion of sovereignty. The European Court of Justice and EU law takes precedent over the UK judiciary and laws, meaning the UK is no longer sovereign. This is a basic principle of being a member of the EU and one which is opposed by many Tories such as Boris

Johnson who claims EU membership means Parliament is overruled by an unelected Brussels bureaucracy.

There is however support for the EU inside the Conservative party. Ken Clarke is strongly supportive of the EU and has previously called for Britain to join the euro. It could be claimed that Clarke is unrepresentative of the Conservative party and that broadly they are opposed to further UK integration into the EU, hence David Cameron's renegotiation of Britain's terms of membership. Cameron's renegotiation shows the Conservatives are hostile to the concept of 'ever closer union' and so the UK achieved an opt out from it. The Conservatives are opposed to joining the euro which is central to the monetary and economic integration which has been a central feature of the EU since the Delors Report of 1989 and the Maastricht Treaty. Cameron is committed to preserving 'variable geometry' so the UK maintains its opt outs for example on Schengen and EU quotas for refugees under the Home Affairs and Justice pillar. The Conservatives are strong supporters of subsidiarity = that decisions should be taken at the most appropriate level. The Home Secretary ^{Theresa} May has therefore supported the European Arrest Warrant as it deals with

Cross border Crime. The Fresh Start group called for the repatriation of powers from the EU such as Employment Law as it was argued this would be best done at the national level. Therefore many Conservatives support the President of the European Council Tusk when he says that further political integration is 'utopian'. On the other hand a considerable proportion of the Conservative party wants Britain to leave the EU and is hostile to the ideas of supranationalism, underpinning EU organisations such as the Commission.

The Labour party particularly since New Labour and Tony Blair has been pro-European or Euro-pragmatic. Labour signed the Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon Treaties whilst in office though choose not to join the euro, but did opt into the social chapter. This pro-europe attitude was continued under Ed Miliband who opposed a referendum on Britain's membership of the EU. Jeremy Corbyn as leader of the Labour party has been less enthusiastic about the UK's membership arguing against the TTIP trade deal with the USA, and claiming the EU has imposed forced austerity on Greece. On the other hand Labour is broadly committed to the EU on the grounds

It supports workers rights through the Social Chapter. Labour is in favour of pooling sovereignty in order to protect workers rights and secure growth. In terms of international influence Labour argues with critics that sovereignty is 'soft' and sees supranational co-operation as essential if Britain is to 'punch above its weight'. The Labour party support the High Representative position, Baroness Ashton a Labour peer being the first in that role, who demonstrated the strength of a common foreign and security policy in representing the EU in negotiations with Iran. On the other hand Labour is still in favour of reforming the European Union criticizing the democratic deficit, Labour have suggested electing the commission, opposing its unelected nature. MP Rachel Reeves MP, claims EU migrants should be allowed to send child benefit home to children who do not live in the EU. This is hostile to the EU commitment to non-discrimination of EU citizens, showing Labour is eurosceptic. Ten Labour MPs support a vote to leave such as Kate Hoey, Gisela Stuart and Frank Field who claim the EU is undemocratic and have raised concerns over immigration.

Bogdanor claims the high levels of immigration have made the UK political parties more hostile

to the EU. UKIP's success in winning the European elections and gaining 3.8 million votes in the 2015 General Election was a result of its opposition to immigration. Godwin claims UKIP is the most hostile party to the EU, Nigel Farage, its leader says people 'want their country back' arguing the EU is undermining the nation state. The high levels of EU immigration have led to net immigration rising to 350,000 in 2016. This has led to many in the Conservative party questioning the single market, a critical part of the EU, due to the high levels of immigration. David Cameron and George Osborne argue the economic costs to leaving the EU would be severe - they claim there could be a loss of 800,000 jobs a recession if the UK left the single market. By 2030 they claim this could make the average household £4,300 worse off and that it could place a 'bomb' under the economy. Many in the Conservatives such as Michael Gove do not like to the single market as they claim it ^{means} ~~is~~ Britain cannot control its borders and that the UK would be better off leaving the single market by 4% of GDP by 2030. UKIP have shifted the mainstream political parties in a eurosceptic direction due to their political success. The Deputy leader of the Labour Party Tom Watson has argued that Britain needs to have controls on free movement

of people, showing even Labour have grown more hostile to the EU idea of free movement of people.

The Liberal Democrats have traditionally been the most pro-European, supporting Supranationalism and the Euro. The Green party also support the EU due to its actions on ^{the} environment which it has achieved through supranationalism. The SNP does support EU membership though wants the UK to opt out of the Common Fisheries Policy due to its destruction of 60% of the UK fishing fleet. There is also cross party consensus on the need to reform the CAP ^{from Labour and Conservative} as it is seen as expensive with 39% of the budget going on it, and subsidising rich landlords. The UK's contribution to the budget has also ~~proved~~ ^{proved} unpopular with Boris Johnson claiming the UK gives the EU £350 million a week, a net contribution of £10 billion. He argues £100 million a week should be spent on the NHS. There is no consensus in British politics on whether Britain should continue to pay into the EU budget.

As a result of UKIP and increased EU immigration which it is claimed has put downward pressure on wages and strain on public services, UK ~~party~~ ^{party} politics

has grown increasingly eurosceptic. Labour, SNP, Liberal Democrat and the Greens remain broadly pro-European supportive of supranationalism and variable geometry but keen on reform to make the EU more democratic. Cameron's renegotiation ^{attempted} ~~attempted~~ to make the EU more intergovernmental and to opt the UK out of ever closer union. Despite this a large minority of the Conservative MPs and UKIP want the UK to leave the EU as they claim it is undemocratic and undermines the UK's sovereignty. All political parties have grown increasingly eurosceptic as has the British public. The UK's EU referendum has shown UK party politics is increasingly hostile to the EU and the Labour and Conservative parties increasingly divided over Britain's future in the EU.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate shows extensive knowledge of party positions, and of tensions within some parties, but is also able to link these to wider issues and debates in UK party politics.

Mark: 11, 10, 10, 7 = 38



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The relevant policies of different parties is often highly creditable, particularly when accurately related to wider relevant issues.

Question 7

This was clearly the most popular essay question and was attempted by over half of the candidates. This no doubt partly reflected the fact that it is a common topic for debate, but also the fact that it was one of great relevance to the referendum debate. In general it was answered well, although those candidates who offered a clear definition of 'federal super state' tended to be more likely to stick closely to the question.

Common themes included the growth of QMV vs the retention of the veto, the presence – but not universally – of the Euro, debates over the quasi-constitutional nature of the Lisbon Treaty, the question of supranationalism vs intergovernmentalism, and the supremacy of EU law as against the right to withdraw. Creditable use was made by some candidates of comparisons and contrasts with the USA.

In addition to the range of themes another key discriminator was the extent to which the EU was considered as one homogenous entity, as against an exploration of the different natures of particular institutions and aspects of its structure.

Synopticity was generally weaker than on question 6 and although some candidates did make effective use of the positions of different parties, EU office-holders and commentators, many did not and were overly reliant on 'it can be argued that'. Equally some candidates did effectively link arguments to contemporary campaign positions, for example the 'Vote Leave' contention that that EU was fast becoming a federal super state due to the control it had assumed over free movement, versus the 'Stronger In' argument that EU membership strengthened rather than diminished national interests.

Weaker responses generally failed to grasp what was meant by the term 'federal super state' causing them problems from the outset, or else were very brief perhaps signifying difficulties with timing.

Middling responses were either accurate but one sided or raised relevant ideas on both sides but were less secure in fully explaining the specific links to federalism. In other cases candidates gave a clear and balanced exposition of the level of Federalism within the EU overall but without considering how this was apparent in different aspects of its structure; whilst a few candidates got distracted by whether a federal model was desirable, rather than whether it was reality.

Stronger responses demonstrated good understanding of the different aspects of the question. They often featured clear introductory definitions of the term 'federal super state', although this was not essential to success, and employed a good mixture of evidence from both sides of the argument. Answers that gave direct counter-analysis to an argument offered tended to perform better in terms of both analysis and synopticity.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

~~A Federal~~ Federalism refers to political federalism with different states and sovereignty shared at different levels. A federal state often involves the loss or pooling of sovereignty. It also tends to have ideologically formed institutions and it ~~is~~ is much more difficult to achieve than a federalist version. A super-state is a state with large political, economic and military influence. Through the growth of the EU and the spill over effect, the EU has become increasingly like an EU super-state.

Firstly, the EU is particularly supranational in nature. Supranational refers to the process where states delegate power to a body above them. ~~The~~ Many EU states have done this. This can be seen in the US political system too. The eurozone

operates on an increasingly supra-national basis. All monetary policy is decided by the European Central Bank and all Euro states must abide, ~~but~~ despite their personal economic needs. For instance, Spain and Ireland experienced a huge property boom and were unable to maintain it because they couldn't reduce interest rates. The ECB would not reduce interest rates because Germany was suffering from a small recession. ~~Increasing interest rates~~ Increasing interest rates would have been disastrous for Germany and because they account for 35% of EZ activity, the interests of Spain and Ireland were ignored. The EU also has a supranational institution - the ~~ECB~~ ECJ. All laws imposed by the ECJ are binding on all member states. This was evident during the Factortame case. The UK government introduced laws to make the Spanish reduce its amount of fishing boats, ~~for the law~~

introduced British fishing quotas. However, this was ruled as illegal by the ECJ and as a result UK law was overruled. The UK had to pay £300 million in taxpayers money to Spain as compensation. ~~As a result~~, this highlights how the EU is becoming further integrated, ~~moving towards~~ into a federal super state.

However, it could be argued that the EU is still primarily a inter-governmental organisation. This is because it is still just a collection of states deciding to cooperate on matters of common interest. Ultimately, most powers / legislation can be traced back to economic rules, the original reason for the existence of the EU. The EU shows some loss of control, ~~mostly~~ primarily through the European Council and the Council of Ministers. ~~They are~~ ~~able to veto on 20% of the~~ ~~policy, but they disagree with.~~

~~They are still able to maintain~~ States are still able to maintain sovereignty. For instance, ~~the~~ the Netherlands and France both had a referendum when it came to the ~~the~~ implementation of the European Constitution. Both referendums resulted in no's (France 55% no and NL 60% no). As a result the European Constitution was rejected and abolished. This shows how the EU is not a federal ~~the~~ superstate. A federal state would have a constitution ~~and~~ states would ~~not~~ have veto. and there would be no "opt-out" options like the UK had with the second Chapter.

However, the EU does seem rather like a federal institution. This could be seen through the expansion of Qualified Majority Voting (QMV) within the EU. 80% of all powers is now decided using QMV. As a result, decisions no longer need

unanimously in order to go through. This makes the process of further integration much easier. The extension of EMU results in the further loss / pooling of sovereignty. For example, the Bankers Bonus was reduced due to agreement from other states among Britains more 29 votes. As a result, bankers bonuses are capped to 10% of the bankers salary. EMU has been extended to 40 new areas in the US by Treaty. This highlights how it is becoming a more federal state.

~~The EU has been a success in the sense that it has generated a new type of state - the federal state - over some countries.~~

However, states ~~still~~ ^{still} have the use of the veto on 20% of policy. States primarily maintain this veto in tax ~~foreign~~ and foreign powers. As a result, closer integration and a move towards federalism is prevented. For instance, Poland vetoed the Pensions Transfer Scheme because they had more

criminally atrocious than if they had foreign prisoners in their jails. This highlights how states are so capable to act in the interests of themselves. Poland has also vetoed policies preventing environmental changes. For instance they vetoed the CO2 Road Policy. As a result, the EU is not federalist in nature.

¶

However, it can be argued that the EU is a huge element of creeping federalism into the EU. This is because firstly, through ~~substitution~~ the principle of subsidiarity, ~~the~~ the EU is able to claim that most decisions should be made at EU level, as that would be the most effective. Moreover, the EU constitution was rejected by ~~2 states~~. But, it was reintroduced as the Lisbon Treaty. There was only cosmetic changes made to the treaty, 95% of it is the same as the EU constitution. As a result, the EU

does have a ~~weak~~ "constitution". Also, it may be argued that ~~it~~ states are aware of this and are pro federalism but are reluctant to let the general public know. For instance, Gordon Brown signed the Lisbon Treaty privately instead of on live television.

However, ultimately the EU is not a federal superstate because states seem have the ability to leave the EU. For instance, the UK is having a referendum in 2016 on whether they should remain a member of the EU. Many people believe that the huge loss of sovereignty and mass immigration is a reason to leave. ~~Thus~~ ~~this~~ ~~high~~ Federal states do not give its members such easy options. This provides evidence that the EU is not in fact a federal superstate. It has the ability to say no.

To conclude, the EU is not a complete federal superstate, ~~to~~

but it is on route to becoming one. Perhaps a greater integration is required for the EU to eventually become a federal superstate. But, as the EU lacks the ability to stop states from ultimately leaving, it cannot yet be ~~correctly~~ described as a federal superstate, all but in the name.

* States do not share all the same policies either. For instance, on foreign policy - States are reluctant to hand over control of foreign and security policy as it is thought of as a part of their identity. The UK government put in the Conservative manifesto that they would resist any attempts of the EU to push forward only on foreign policy. The different states also have very different opinions. For example, the UK, Spain and the US were pro Iraq war but Germany was against it. The lack of consensus shows how federalism is not currently occurring in many areas.

(Total for Question = 45 marks)



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate makes especially effective use of 'the magic however', directly comparing different aspects of the same issue to show strong analysis and synopticity. Synopticity would be even higher if more views were specifically ascribed to those who hold them.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Directly engaging contrasting points will generally gain higher analysis and synopticity marks than simply listing all the points on one side and then the other.

Question 8

This was by some distance the least popular of the three essay questions on offer, although this may partly have been due to the relative topicality of the other two questions.

It was striking that a significant number of candidates offered responses to this question that would have done equally well or even better if offered in responses to question 7. Quite aside from the clear distinction between a single superstate and a single social model it is also generally important for candidates to grasp that essay questions will always cover distinct ground.

Some candidates were hampered from the start by a lack of understanding as to what was meant by a European Social Model. Others seemed to understand the concept but failed to make this totally explicit by linking their points back to the question: the quality of such links was a key discriminating factor between responses. Equally, whilst knowledge of the different social models could be highly relevant and creditable, an over reliance on this knowledge without relating it to the contemporary nature of the EU could also hamper candidates.

Equally there was much useful and relevant discussion of the social chapter, policy harmonisation, and the role of supranational institutions in promoting a single social model. However, there was also evidence of inaccuracy in some answers, for example a contention that the EU had introduced a common minimum wage through the social chapter, or that acceptance of the goal of a single social model was now a condition for entry.

Weaker responses generally failed to grasp what was meant by a European social model.

Middling responses either demonstrated a limited grasp of the term but offered a reasonable level of relevant evidence, or else showed very detailed knowledge of its intricacies but with insufficient evidence as to whether or not it had been achieved.

Stronger responses offered a good understanding of the term, with high-level and wide ranging examples of the EU's moves towards or away from a single social model. The strongest candidates recognised that there was a debate as whether a single model was even possible, and how recent events, such as the Eurozone crisis, might have affected its achievability.

This was by some distance the least popular of the three essay questions on offer, although this may partly have been due to the relative topicality of the other two questions.

It was striking that a significant number of candidates offered responses to this question that would have done equally well or even better if offered in responses to question 7. Quite aside from the clear distinction between a single superstate and a single social model it is also generally important for candidates to grasp that essay questions will always cover distinct ground.

Some candidates were hampered from the start by a lack of understanding as to what was meant by a European Social Model. Others seemed to understand the concept but failed to make this totally explicit by linking their points back to the question: the quality of such links was a key discriminating factor between responses. Equally, whilst knowledge of the different social models could be highly relevant and creditable, an over reliance on this knowledge without relating it to the contemporary nature of the EU could also hamper candidates.

Equally there was much useful and relevant discussion of the social chapter, policy harmonisation, and the role of supranational institutions in promoting a single social model. However, there was also evidence of inaccuracy in some answers, for example a contention that the EU had introduced a common minimum wage through the social chapter, or that acceptance of the goal of a single social model was now a condition for entry.

Weaker responses generally failed to grasp what was meant by a European social model

Middling responses either demonstrated a limited grasp of the term but offered a reasonable level of relevant evidence, or else showed very detailed knowledge of its intricacies but with insufficient evidence as to whether or not it had been achieved.

Stronger responses offered a good understanding of the term, with high-level and wide ranging examples of the EU's moves towards or away from a single social model. The strongest candidates recognised that there was a debate as to whether a single model was even possible, and how recent events, such as the Eurozone crisis, might have affected its achievability.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 6 ☒ Question 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒

Since the Maastricht Treaty in 1992, the EU has tried to integrate member states into one social model. ~~As~~ The EU started off as only a way for countries to keep peace and negotiate deals ~~including~~ ^{involving} coal and steel after the second World War. However, this has slowly evolved to create an 'ever' closer union.

As membership dramatically increased in the Treaty of Nice 2003, integration became the EU's main focus. In 2004, 10 countries entered the EU in the sixth wave of enlargement. This meant that the EU ~~was~~ needed to create a new structure in which all countries could co-operate together. There was also a proposal of an EU constitution - however, this failed due ~~to~~ ^{Following this} the Lisbon Treaty in 2007 to a lack of support from member states.

The failed constitution ~~is~~ is an example how ~~EU~~ ~~states~~ member states still remain sovereign and do not wish to allow the EU to gain full power.

Following this, the Treaty of Lisbon. On the other hand, Schengen was also introduced in the EU.

Following this, the Treaty of Lisbon became an important treaty as it gave the EU a legal personality. This shows how the EU has evolved to become one social model as member states' law becomes second priority. This drastically undermines member states' sovereignty. This can also be seen as federalist as the EU becomes a microcosm of the USA. In the USA, all states are allowed to create law (this is the same as member states creating their own law). However, the executive remains supreme and can veto any law or create a new law which is applied to all states. The Belmarsh case is an example of how EU supremacy has defeated UK's law. In this case, the European Convention on Human Rights ruled the UK ~~could not~~ ^{could not} detain a terror suspect indefinitely due to the 'right to fair trial' ~~was~~ written in the European Convention of Human Rights. This shows how the EU have begun

~~turn~~ to become one social model.

Furthermore, Schengen is another example of the EU turning into one social model as it removes countries' boarder controls with the EU. There are also some countries ~~with~~ that are not with the EU that are allowed to travel freely in the Eurozone such as Iceland. This is another form of undermining ~~the~~ member states' supremacy as they no longer have control over people who come ~~out~~ in to their country. This can be seen, ~~may be~~ ^{the} main ~~the~~ reason Eurosceptics have lobbied for an EU referendum. However, as seen on January 1st 2014 ~~the~~ ~~freedom~~ with UKIP at London Luton Airport, migration may not be excessive. Also the UK has received opt-outs for the Schengen agreement as we still have boarder controls. Although, Schengen can be seen as a ~~the~~ form of turning member states into one social model, it now seems that Schengen is slowly failing. In 2016, France, Belgium, Germany etc are reinforcing boarder controls due to the £ Refugee crisis and terrorist attack. The erosion of the Schengen treaty means the EU's ideology of one social

model will not be easy.

As of 2017 countries will also not be able to veto legislation. This was established in the Lisbon Treaty. If member states right to veto legislation it ~~is~~ removes member states supremacy. However, the Council of Ministers and the European Council often vote unanimous. This is also known as political log rolling. This means the need to veto becomes rare as most countries agree. To ~~protect~~ To ensure that ^{unanimity} unanimity is not reached unfair a criteria is set which 65% of the EU population must agree and 75% of the member states, ^{representatives} with ~~in the Council of~~ must agree. This shows how although as social model may be closer than ever, countries and citizens ~~is~~ are still able to disagree.

In conclusion, the EU has been heavily criticised for its attempts to become a federalist government.

concepts

- supranational
- intergovernmental
- sui generis
- neo functionalism
- federalism
- finalite politique
- MUG
- TED
- Accountability
- sovereignty
- eurosclerosis
- Eurocrat
- eurosceptic

social model

- Treaties - maastricht - deepening relationships
- Amsterdam
- Schengen - Nice big 20 deep integration
- Lisbon - legal personality
- EU law becomes supreme
- CoMR - Belmarsh



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

There is very limited engagement with the specific question asked here and although it is clear that the candidate intended to answer this question he would in fact have done better to use this knowledge to address question 7 where more of it would have been relevant.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Knowledge and analysis, however accurate, will only ever be credited insofar as they address the question.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: Question 6 Question 7 Question 8

To what extent has the EU brought its member states closer to a single European Social Model?

Plan: Different social models → Nordic 33%
EU Social Model: ① Ensuring social regulations Continental 29%
② Harmonisation of economy and social rights Anglo-Saxon 24%
Bjorn Hacker → "strong, harmonised economy with a comprehensive set of welfare rights" Social Expenditure GDP

It has	It hasn't
- Social Chapter 1992.	→ 3 social models operate within the EU.
- Charter of Fundamental Rights 2000	→ Human rights violations. eg.
- Copenhagen criteria	→ Only 19 in Eurozone.
- Minimum wage.	→ Opt outs.
- Euro	→ Not all member states are in Schengen.
- 1990 Parental leave Directive	→ Principle of subsidiarity
- Cassis de Dijon Mutual Rec.'79	
- CAP. → Decoupling.	

Social models represent how a country or a collection of countries manage their social and economic policies. Within the European Union, three social models are in operation, the Anglo-Saxon model, the Nordic model and the Continental model. This alone demonstrates how the EU, to a large extent, has not brought its member states

closer to a single European social model. Bjorn Hacker ~~suggested~~ defined the European social model as having "cohesive social and economic policies with a ~~strong~~ ^{comprehensive} set of welfare regulations." Through ~~for~~ the Social Chapter, the Charter of Fundamental Rights, the creation of the Eurozone and the Schengen Agreement, Hacker's definition of an ~~an EU Social Model~~ European Social Model does appear to exist. However, due to the number of opt-outs, differences in cultures and opinions and each member state's desire to retain sovereignty, whilst the EU has attempted to bring its members closer to a European Social Model, it has been relatively unsuccessful.

The main reason for the EU's lack of success in bringing its member states closer to a European social model is because of the fact that three social models already exist in the EU and they are all fundamentally different. For example, in terms of social expenditure, those that are in the Nordic model spend 53% of GDP, whereas the Continental model only spends 29% of GDP. The Anglo-Saxon model differs even more and only contributes 24% of its GDP to social expenditure. This is because the three models all have very different approaches to their respective welfare states. The Nordic and Continental models

have large welfare states with very few regulations and checks to prevent people from having access to these benefits. The Anglo-Saxon model, however, does have several lots of regulations that prevent someone from accessing benefits. For example, tests now take place every five years to justify giving someone with a long-term disability, the Disability Living Allowance in the UK. Also, the Continental model spends more money on pensions than the other two social models but this is due to the ageing populations of countries like Spain and Germany. Whilst taxes are high in the Nordic model, they are relatively low in the Anglo-Saxon model. This demonstrates how fundamentally different the views are within the EU on social welfare, illustrating how a European Social Model is unachievable. Furthermore, in David Cameron's negotiations with the European Union, particularly President Donald Tusk, he wants to restrict the benefits that migrants from the EU have access to. It is evident that the EU has not convinced the UK or the Anglo-Saxon model to conform to a European Social Model.

However, the creation of the Social Chapter in 1992 and the Charter of Fundamental Rights in 2000 were two substantial moves towards a European social model. The Charter of

Fundamental Rights enshrined the European Convention on Human Rights into EU Law, guaranteeing that human rights were upheld across the member states. Whilst the UK did opt out, it was already signed up to the convention and thus, human rights are still upheld across the EU. It was the Social Chapter in particular that suggested a step towards a European Social Model as it introduced a minimum wage and re-instated the Equal Pay Act of 1975, bringing it into EU law. It also guaranteed ~~a certain~~ certain standards of working conditions across the Union. Once again, under Major the UK opted out but Blair had entirely different perspective and is renowned for being a "europophile" and opted us into the Social Chapter in 1998. These ~~two~~ Charter and the Chapter have made member states share similar social values and cross-border companies can operate with ease, knowing that ^{and standards} working conditions[^] are similar across the entire EU. Therefore, in terms of Hacker's definition, a comprehensive set of welfare regulation do already operate within the EU, suggesting that in terms of social welfare, the EU ~~does have a~~ has been successful in bringing members slightly closer to a European Social Model. Angela Merkel has often said that the EU requires a "cohesive approach" in order to

be successful and its approach towards social welfare is quite co-ordinated. Even within the three official social models, there is only a 9% difference in the amount they spend on social expenditure which is not really a huge difference and would not prevent the existence of a European social model.

However On the other hand, there are several aspects to the EU that prevent it from having a European social model. In terms of having a cohesive economy, it does not. Only 19 of the 28 member states have a the euro and are a member of the Eurozone. Furthermore, there are different approaches to VAT. Whilst the EU has set the minimum at 15%, the UK for example has VAT at 20%. whilst Hungary's is at 27%. This demonstrates how a European social model cannot have not been completely achieved as there is no level economic playing field and different economies operate in the EU. Gordon Brown actually created "5 Economic Criteria" to test the euro, one of which questioned if it would benefit employers and new companies. The euro actually failed all of his tests and after the Eurozone crisis, Braun.

appears to have been right.

However, since & since the Cassis de Dijon case in 1979, mutual recognition does operate in the EU and this does have an impact on upon economies and thus unites them. Furthermore, the Copenhagen Criteria that is used to test new member states guarantees that new members share social values to existing ones.

Overall, it is clear that a European Social Model does not entirely operate within the EU due to three differing social models that already exist. However, several positive steps have been made towards potentially achieving one in the future.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate makes it clear from the start that they grasp the key concept of the question, and uses this to show consistent engagement with the relevant issues. A brief but clear plan clearly helps with this.

Mark: 10, 10, 10, 8 = 38



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Although it is unwise to spend too long on the plan at the expense of the answer itself a brief but clear plan can greatly help your structure and engagement with the question which will significantly boost your mark.

Paper Summary

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

- Pay careful attention to the meaning of the question, and in particular to key terms with a specific meaning such as 'justice and home affairs'.
- Ensure that they avoid confusion between similar sounding institutions or concepts, for example the ECHR and ECJ, or the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission.
- Remain up to date in their knowledge of institutions and process, such the introduction of and the move away from rotation in the Presidency of the European Council.
- 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 why the EU has become involved in x').
- Avoid assertion or general debate in favour of specific argued points (for example the ways in which the social chapter advanced a European Social Model, not simply that it does).
- Bear in mind the need for balance between range and depth of points, particularly on short responses where three well explained points will usually out-perform seven brief points, or one very in-depth point.
- Continue to develop their use of synopticity in essays, 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 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.