

GCE 2004

June Series



Mark Scheme

General Studies A

Unit GSA6

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from:

Publications Department, Aldon House, 39, Heald Grove, Rusholme, Manchester, M14 4NA
Tel: 0161 953 1170

or

download from the AQA website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2004 AQA and its licensors

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales 3644723 and a registered charity number 1073334. Registered address AQA, Devas Street, Manchester. M15 6EX. *Dr Michael Cresswell Director General*

Unit 6

(GSA6 Society, Politics and the Economy)

INTRODUCTION

The nationally agreed assessment objectives in the QCA Subject Criteria for General Studies are:

- AO1** Demonstrate relevant knowledge and understanding applied to a range of issues, using skills from different disciplines.
- AO2** Communicate clearly and accurately in a concise, logical and relevant way.
- AO3** Marshal evidence and draw conclusions; select, interpret, evaluate and integrate information, data, concepts and opinions.
- AO4** Demonstrate understanding of different types of knowledge and of the relationship between them, appreciating their limitations.

All mark schemes will allocate a number or distribution of marks for some or all of these objectives for each question according to the nature of the question and what it is intended to test.

Note on AO2

In all instances where quality of written communication is being assessed this must take into account the following criteria:

- select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and complex subject matter;
- organise relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate; and
- ensure text is legible and spelling, grammar and punctuation are accurate, so that meaning is clear.

Note on AO4

In previous General Studies syllabuses, there has been a focus on the knowledge and understanding of facts (AO1), and the marshalling and evaluation of evidence (AO3) – on what might be called ‘first-order’ knowledge. AO4 is about understanding what *counts as knowledge*; about how far knowledge is based upon facts and values; and about standards of proof – what might be called ‘second-order’ knowledge.

By ‘different types of knowledge’ we mean *different ways of getting knowledge*. We might obtain knowledge by fine measurement, and calculation. This gives us a degree of certainty. We might obtain it by observation, and by experiment. This gives us a degree of probability. Or we might acquire it by examination of documents and material remains, or by introspection – that is, by canvassing our own experiences and feelings. This gives us a degree of possibility. In this sense, knowledge is a matter of degree.

Questions, or aspects of them, which are designed to test AO4 will therefore focus on such matters as:

- analysis and evaluation of the nature of the knowledge, evidence or arguments, for example, used in a text, set of data or other form of stimulus material;
- understanding of the crucial differences between such things as knowledge, belief or opinion, and objectivity and subjectivity in arguments;
- appreciation of what constitutes proof, cause and effect, truth, validity, justification, and the limits to these;
- recognition of the existence of personal values, value judgements, partiality and bias in given circumstances;
- awareness of the effects upon ourselves and others of different phenomena, such as the nature of physical, emotional and spiritual experiences, and the ability to draw upon and analyse first-hand knowledge and understanding of these.

GENERAL MARK SCHEME FOR SECTION A

Level of response	Mark range	Criteria and descriptors: knowledge, understanding, argument, evaluation, communication
LEVEL 3	7-8 (-9)	A good to comprehensive response demonstrating overall grasp of the range and nature of issues; knowledge and understanding of key principles and evidence; interprets and illustrates arguments coherently and convincingly with fluency and accuracy.
LEVEL 2	4-5-6	A modest to quite good attempt showing some competence and grasp of the issues; some understanding and realisation of key principles; moderate arguments and exemplification; reasonable clarity and accuracy of expression.
LEVEL 1	1-2-3	A bare to limited response showing uncertain grasp, knowledge and understanding; lack of clarity of argument and little appropriate exemplification; weak expression.
LEVEL 0	0	No valid response or relevance to the question.

Approximate distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Section A

Question Numbers	1	2	3	4	AO marks for Section A
Assessment Objectives AO1	1	1	1	1	4
AO2	1	1	1	1	4
AO3	5	3	-	1	9
AO4	2	4	6	6	18
Total marks per Question	9	9	8	9	35

Note: It is the questions themselves which are designed to elicit the range of response appropriate to the assessment objectives for each question. Examiners are required to assign each of the candidates' responses to the most appropriate level according to **its overall quality**, then allocate a single mark within the level.

A2 UNIT 6 CASE STUDY SUMMARY OF EXTRACTS JUNE 2004**THE EUROPEAN UNION****EXTRACT A** *Data on the existing and future European Union.*

The EU is composed of 15 countries, six of which were founder members in 1958. The UK, Ireland and Denmark joined in 1973, Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986 and the remainder in 1995. All but 3, the UK, Denmark and Sweden are members of the Single Currency. Sweden held a referendum on joining in September 2003, but the government's recommendation to join was rejected. A further 10 countries, mostly eastern European nations, are set to join in 2004.

Germany has the largest population, the highest GDP and contributes the most to the EU budget. The UK has the second largest population and although the size of its economy is third after Germany and France, it is not among the wealthiest and its per capita GDP is well below the average for the EU as a whole (approx. €22,000). The smallest member state, Luxembourg, is also the richest on a per capita basis, and Portugal, Greece and Spain are the poorest.

Spain, Greece and Italy have the highest levels of unemployment and Spain receives the highest level of support from the EU budget. The net contributors to the EU budget are those with positive figures in the penultimate column.

Although the majority vote for membership is quite high in the 10 countries preparing to join the EU in 2004, some of the turnouts have been relatively low, meaning that less than 50% of the population in some cases have voted for membership.

EXTRACT B *Advantages of United Kingdom membership of the EU*

Size of potential market for business and greater potential for faster trade growth, which brings increased output, employment and income.

Increased efficiency from greater competition without trade barriers. EU is the UK's major trading partner (approx. 60%).

Has stimulated increased investment from overseas from other countries, notably Japan, seeking to gain access to the market and raising employment and output.

Gives a greater voice in the global economy, influence in WTO and economic and political stability leading to a rising standard of living.

EXTRACT C *Disadvantages of UK membership of the EU*

Countries can still be prosperous without membership – the UK is a net contributor to the EU budget (more £1bn per annum) and the CAP has led to high food prices.

Enlargement will increase costs and expenditure, and free movement of labour may well cause economic migration to the wealthier countries and greater competition for jobs. (The average per capita GDP of the 10 new members is less the half the current EU average.)

The European Commission which effectively runs the EU is unelected, bureaucratic and has been found to be corrupt in the past.

The principle of ‘partnership’ is a myth with individual countries seeking merely to gain best advantage and membership entailing loss of sovereign control over the economy and other policy areas.

Too much intervention in economic and social policy and loss of monetary control and flexibility in the Single Currency.

Loss of control in greater integration threatening the sovereignty of national political, legal and social institutions – ‘the British way of life’, as some see it.

EXTRACT D *The new draft constitution of the EU*

A new elected longer-term president and more ‘co-decision making’ powers to replace current 6-month rotating arrangement. Will enhance status of European parliament, provide continuity and give strategic direction to policy. Generally favoured but Commission against, and there is concern about greater bureaucracy and powers. France against co-decision making powers over agricultural spending.

Reshaped Commission with fewer members from 2009 to keep executive to a manageable size and rotate commissioners on an equal basis between the 25 states. Future head to be chosen by EU leaders and then approved by parliament. Seems to offer no increase in democratic legitimacy and commission against. Not all states will have representation as at present, but larger countries broadly happy.

New foreign minister, common defence policy and guarantee on mutual defence. Could have big impact and would bring new coordination, depending on where authority would come from (qualified majority voting), and enable Europe to speak with a more common voice. Felt to be unworkable. If NATO was weakened over Iraq war, would EU defence force fare any better? UK insists that NATO will remain the centrepiece of European defence.

Genuine common policy, definitions, standards and enforcement on immigration and asylum working with UN. Current system not working and cooperation needed. UK seems to want to retain right to decide who enters.

Charter of rights already agreed will have enhanced status. Concern about new economic and social rights not enshrined in UK law undermining national powers and legal applicability still to be clarified.

Appointment of European public prosecutor who could operate in any country to tackle cross-border crime. Supporters, including France and Germany argue that links between national police forces need strengthening, but 8 countries including the UK believe it would not successfully tackle fraud and would mean loss of national accountability.

Abolition of national veto in taxation matters. Tax harmonisation would assist move to genuine single market and make Europe as a whole more competitive, although conversely the current regime encourages internal competition between members to offer the most attractive tax rates. Taxes would most likely move upwards to meet rates of high-tax countries, which could drive some companies elsewhere to find more favourable rates.

EXTRACT E *Interest groups, the media and the ‘Yes’ and ‘No’ campaigns*

British companies well represented in Brussels and putting pressure on government to continue to support the process of integration. Joining the euro, supported by CBI and large multi-national companies, would mean significant reductions in transaction costs and TUC sees Europe as a hope for greater protection of workers’ rights. Leaders see ‘utilitarian’ economic advantages, but members more concerned with loss of sovereignty. SMEs strongly opposed and concerned about threat to domestic competition and inflexibility of single interest rate decided by European central bank.

British press largely anti-European, apart from FT, although Guardian, Observer and Mirror tend to favour integration as a progressive policy and the Economist would see greater freedoms and checks on regulatory powers in a more federal design for the EU. The DT and ST, Mail and Express, Times and Sun are vehemently opposed.

There are several pressure groups on both sides and those against enjoy the support of the Conservative Party leadership. Tony Blair argues that further integration is in the UK’s greater interest, but is reluctant to commit to the euro, whereas Gordon Brown seems more firmly opposed.

British voters appear moderately euro-sceptic at best. It is largely the professional middle class who are in favour, but the greater public appears extremely doubtful about the benefits of further integration, perhaps fuelled by the press. The leadership race for the CP was heavily influenced by Europe, largely on ‘affective’(non-material) grounds, rather than economic.

A referendum on British membership of the euro has been promised, if and when the Chancellor’s 5 tests have been met, but its outcome would be much less predictable than the only previous UK referendum held in 1975 on remaining in the EEC.

EXTRACT F

Observer leader: UK response to draft constitution is typically negative and emotive; most proposals already in existence
 Reforms much needed to reduce bureaucracy, waste, confusion
 UK influence too limited and preoccupied with national interest on the sidelines
 Idea of national governments out of date; federation of EU states the only way forward.

Sun commentary: EU remote, bureaucratic and undemocratic; cannot be changed from inside as Tony Blair hopes
 Conservative/IDS policy of remaining outside EU leaves UK free to prosper and control its own destiny; warns of soaring unemployment, collapsing welfare systems and economic recession.

SECTION A**1 Briefly summarise the key features of the European Union which emerge from the data in Extract A.****9 marks**

- The EU is composed of 15 countries, six of which were founder members in 1958. The UK, Ireland and Denmark joined in 1973, Greece in 1981, Spain and Portugal in 1986 and the remainder in 1995.
- All but 3, the UK, Denmark and Sweden are members of the Single Currency. Sweden held a referendum on joining in September 2003, but the government's recommendation to join was rejected.
- A further 10 countries, mostly eastern European nations, are set to join in 2004.
- Germany has the largest population, the highest GDP and contributes the most to the EU budget.
- The UK has the second largest population and although the size of its economy is third after Germany and France, it is not among the wealthiest and its per capita GDP is well below the average for the EU as a whole (approx. €22,000).
- The smallest member state, Luxembourg, is also the richest on a per capita basis, and Portugal, Greece and Spain are the poorest.
- Spain, Greece and Italy have the highest levels of unemployment.
- Spain, Greece, Portugal and Ireland receive the highest level of support from the EU budget.
- Although the majority vote for membership is quite high in most of the 10 countries preparing to join the EU in 2004, some of the turnouts have been relatively low, meaning that less than 50% of the population in some cases have voted for membership.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment, consideration of the nature of the evidence or concepts (AO4). The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria. A genuine sense of overview and command of the detail should be required for a Level 3 mark.

2 What are the intended benefits of the proposed Constitution for the European Union and what obstacles may lie in the way of its successful implementation?**9 marks**

- A new elected longer-term president and more ‘co-decision making’ powers to replace current 6-month rotating arrangement. Will enhance status of European parliament, provide continuity and give strategic direction to policy. Generally favoured but Commission against, and there is concern about greater bureaucracy and powers. France against co-decision making powers over agricultural spending.
- Reshaped Commission with fewer members from 2009 to keep executive to a manageable size and rotate commissioners on an equal basis between the 25 states. Future head to be chosen by EU leaders and then approved by parliament. Seems to offer no increase in democratic legitimacy and commission is against. Not all states will have representation as at present, but larger countries broadly happy.
- New foreign minister, common defence policy and guarantee on mutual defence. Could have big impact and would bring new coordination, depending on where authority would come from (qualified majority voting?), and enable Europe to speak with a more common voice. Felt to be unworkable. If NATO was weakened over Iraq war, would EU defence force fare any better? UK insists that NATO will remain the centrepiece of European defence.
- Genuine common policy, definitions, standards and enforcement on immigration and asylum working with UN. Current system not working and greater cooperation needed. UK seems to want to retain right to decide who enters.
- Charter of rights already agreed will have enhanced status. Concern about new economic and social rights not enshrined in UK law undermining national powers and legal applicability still to be clarified.
- Appointment of European public prosecutor who could operate in any country to tackle cross-border crime. Supporters, including France and Germany argue that links between national police forces would be strengthened, but 8 countries including the UK believe it would not successfully tackle fraud and would mean loss of national accountability.
- Abolition of national veto in taxation matters. Tax harmonisation would assist move to genuine single market and make Europe as a whole more competitive, although conversely the current regime encourages internal competition between members to offer the most attractive tax rates. Taxes would most likely move upwards to meet rates of the high-tax countries, which could drive some companies elsewhere to find more favourable rates.
- Whilst the ideas behind the proposals make sense and are clearly designed to represent necessary improvements for an enlarged EU, much of the crucial detail has been ‘fudged’ to make it acceptable to different partners. Many individual concerns are about protecting or promoting vested interests and this tendency makes agreement on any changes and their subsequent implementation very laboured and possibly ineffectual. Some countries have flouted such agreements in the past.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment, consideration of the nature of the evidence or concepts (AO4). The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria. Some discussion along the lines of the last bullet point along with overall command of the detail should be required for a Level 3 mark.

3 Explain why opinions on membership of the European Union are so divided in the United Kingdom.**8 marks**

- As can be seen from Extracts B and C the arguments for and against membership are extensive on all sides, economic, political and social, and are extremely balanced.
- Economists and politicians are divided about the benefits both on principle and practical grounds and many of the detailed arguments run counter to each other (e.g. Extract F).
- The EU is a grand design based on high principles (Extract D), but tries to balance too many national concerns and established interests and the processes are laboured, time-consuming, costly and ultimately unworkable(?).
- The vested interests of the most powerful nations, France, Germany and the UK in particular, and the corporate lobby dominate the European agenda.
- Extract E shows how the individual interests of different groups determine their support or opposition.
- The factors which help to shape opinion, the political parties, the press and the government itself (and the opposition), are openly divided, so that an over-riding consensus does not emerge and the ordinary voter is left only with their own personal intuition or prejudice (e.g. ‘affective’ versus ‘utilitarian’ attitudes).
- Many British people feel that history has shown that Britain has succeeded on the world stage without dependence on other nations, whilst others would argue that we can no longer ‘go it alone’ and we need to be part of a larger grouping.
- The government sits on the fence and the 5 economic tests for UK entry into the euro are very broad and vague and, one suspects, could be made to mean whatever the key players want them to mean.
- Most of the daily press is openly opposed and would certainly carry a large proportion of the electorate. If a referendum were to be held, the outcome is by no means certain.
- Arguments presented in Extract F are largely emotive and do not rely overmuch on rational argument.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment, consideration of the nature of the evidence or concepts (AO4). The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria.

4 Discuss the claim that ‘a European superstate is nothing more than an impossible and undesirable pipedream’. Give reasons for your views.

9 marks

This question gives candidates the opportunity to develop their own view on the EU and its expansion. They may choose to support or challenge the claim, or to argue the pros and cons of the statement as they see them. Stronger candidates may distinguish between ‘impossible’ and ‘undesirable’ and argue separate cases on each. Extracts B, C and F should provide the stimulus for arguments and reasons and both dimensions should receive treatment in a comprehensive response worthy of Level 3 marks.

For and against ‘undesirable’

- grand design which has brought stability, peace and prosperity to an area that saw the largest wars in history during the 20th century
- facilitates trade and promotes economic and social development and improvements, greater wealth and well-being
- stimulates growth and promotes an economic model that is out of date and unsustainable in the face of diminishing resources and environmental threats
- strong voice is needed in global economy to ensure that broader interests, such as the power of multi-national corporations, environmental and social issues, world poverty etc, are addressed
- strengthened EU is necessary to counteract US economic and political dominance, but could lead to future mutual suspicion and conflict
- EU membership is restrictive, represents a loss of democratic control and is unnecessary for prosperity in a global economy.

For and against ‘impossible’

- EU is too large, costly, wasteful, unwieldy, undemocratic and restrictive in global economy
- interventionist approach is too sweeping, inflexible and inappropriate for individual members
- partnership is a myth with individual countries seeking to gain best advantage over each other
- too much power is in hands of unelected and, in the past, corrupt bureaucrats
- EU is ungovernable; linguistic and cultural differences make idea of genuine, integrated federation unworkable.

It may be feasible to think in terms of awarding 1 mark for each valid and coherent point, including others not covered above, as well as for good development of ideas, use of argument or illustration, depth of comment, consideration of the nature of the evidence or concepts (AO4). The number of ticks need not however equal the final mark awarded, which should reflect the overall grasp and quality of the candidate's response to the question, as reflected in the General Mark Scheme criteria.

GENERAL MARK SCHEME FOR A2 ESSAYS

The essay questions in General Studies A are designed to test the four assessment objectives (see INTRODUCTION above) as follows:

AO1 – 6 marks AO2 – 5 marks AO3 – 7 marks AO4 – 7 marks **Total – 25 marks**

Each answer should be awarded two separate marks, comprising a mark out of 20 for content (Assessment Objectives 1, 3 and 4) and a mark out of 5 for communication (Assessment Objective 2).

The mark for content should be awarded on the basis of the overall level of the candidate's response in relation to the following general criteria and descriptors for each level.

Level of response	Mark range	Criteria and descriptors for Assessment Objectives 1, 3 and 4: knowledge, understanding, argument and illustration, evaluation.
LEVEL 4	16 – 20 (5)	Good response to the demands of the question: sound knowledge of material (AO1); clear understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); valid arguments and appropriate illustrations, coherent conclusion (AO3).
LEVEL 3	11 – 15 (5)	Competent attempt at answering the question: relevant knowledge (AO1); reasonable understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); some fair arguments and illustrations, attempt at a conclusion (AO3).
LEVEL 2	6 – 10 (5)	Limited response to the demands of the question: only basic knowledge (AO1); modest understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); limited argument and illustration, weak conclusion (AO3).
LEVEL 1	1 – 5 (5)	Inadequate attempt to deal with the question: very limited knowledge (AO1); little understanding and appreciation of topic, nature of knowledge involved and related issues (AO4); little or no justification or illustration, inadequate overall grasp (AO3).
LEVEL 0	0	No response or relevance to the question

The mark for communication (AO2) should be awarded using the following scale and criteria.

5 marks	Clear and effective organisation and structure, fluent and accurate expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
4 marks	Clear attempt at organisation and structure, generally fluent and accurate expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
3 marks	Some organisation and structure evident, variable fluency, occasional errors in expression, punctuation and grammar.
2 marks	Limited organisation and structure, little fluency, a number of errors in expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
1 mark	Lacking organisation, structure and fluency, frequent errors in expression, spelling, punctuation and grammar.
0 marks	No response

Note: A totally irrelevant response (Level 0) should also receive 0 marks for communication. A brief and inadequate response (Level 1) should be awarded not more than 2 marks and a limited response (Level 2) normally not more than 3 marks for communication. Responses at Level 3 and 4 for content may be awarded up to 5 marks for communication.

SECTION B**5 Discuss the arguments for and against the United Kingdom joining the single European currency and explain your preference.**

Candidates are required to produce both a balanced assessment (*for and against*) which should be reasonably comprehensive and objective, although not necessarily as detailed as the notes below, and to indicate their own view with appropriate reasons (*explain*).

Opinion polls currently show that a majority of British adults do not want to join the euro. The arguments against are:

- **Transition costs.** Consumers and workers will suffer because they will have to learn to think about transactions in a new currency. Business which will have to update software, change counter tills and vending machines and reprint price lists. The one-off costs will run into billions of pounds and prices are likely to rise.
- **Sovereignty.** Joining the euro will further increase the powers of the EU and diminish the powers of national government. Many voters have a deep mistrust of the EU and its competency.
- **One interest rate for all.** Inevitably, the central bank of a monetary union has to set a monetary policy which it believes is in the best interests of the majority. However, it may be inappropriate for some regions. For instance, in 2000 Ireland was enjoying what some argued was an unsustainable boom; with above average inflation. Interest rates in Ireland would probably have been much higher to counter the inflation threat if Ireland had had independent control of its monetary policy. Within a UK context, it is often argued that a tight monetary policy, appropriate for a booming London and the South East, is harmful to areas such as Wales or Northern Ireland where there is above average unemployment.
- **Exchange rate.** The rate at which the UK enters the euro is crucial. The very high value of the pound against the euro in 1998-2000 was the wrong exchange rate to use, according to most exporting businesses. A high exchange rate would be likely to lead to large current account deficits. So a much lower exchange rate is needed, perhaps even lower than the current rate of €1.40.
- **Not necessary.** Many argue that the UK doesn't need to be part of the euro-zone to benefit from it. For instance, although foreign businesses complained about the high value of the pound, the UK saw record levels of inward investment in 1999. So long as the pound doesn't fluctuate wildly against the euro, the UK can get benefits without membership.

Those arguing in favour of the joining the euro say that any potential drawbacks are outweighed by the benefits:

- **No exchange costs.** Individuals and firms will not have to pay fees and commissions to exchange UK currency for EU currencies. This reduces costs and encourages trade.
- **Ends exchange rate uncertainty.** This will be abolished in the area which accounts for 60 per cent of our foreign trade. Importers and exporters will know how much they will be charged when dealing with each other. This too will reduce costs and encourage trade.
- **Standard prices.** Consumers should benefit because there will be greater price transparency. Firms will find it more difficult to segment markets in Europe and charge higher prices for goods in, say, the UK than in Belgium.

- **Genuine single market.** Monetary union is a further step towards creating a wholly single market in Europe. Single markets, like the United States, allow firms to exploit economies of scale and this reduces prices to consumers.
- **Influence in EU affairs.** By staying out of monetary union, the UK is losing its ability to influence how the EU is run and how it should develop. This is against the long term interests of the UK.

Overall perhaps, the main argument of the anti-euro lobby is a **political** one, centred around the issue of sovereignty and who should control British affairs. On **economic** grounds, there are **strong arguments both for and against** entry. Most economists agree that the exchange rate at which the UK enters the euro, if and when it does, will be crucial whether the UK benefits or suffers in the short term from entry. They also agree that the UK should be at roughly the same point in the trade cycle as Europe to prevent the European Central Bank from setting interest rates which are either too high or too low for the best interests of the UK. The Chancellor of the Exchequer has identified **5 tests** to determine whether it is in the UK's best economic interest to join the euro and all of these must be met before the proposal is put to the electorate in a promised referendum. These tests are:

- Are business cycles and economic structures compatible so that we and others could live comfortably with euro interest rates on a permanent basis?
- If problems emerge is there sufficient flexibility to deal with them?
- Would joining EMU create better conditions for firms making long-term decisions to invest in Britain?
- What impact would entry into EMU have on the competitive position of the UK's financial services industry, particularly the City's wholesale markets?
- In summary, will joining EMU promote higher growth, stability and a lasting increase in jobs?

In the long term, with the euro-zone being such an important trading partner for the UK, some argue that it is difficult to see how the UK could stay out of monetary union forever. On the other hand, if put to the electorate in a referendum with a recommendation to join, the majority, encouraged by a largely anti-euro press, would most likely vote against, as in Sweden in September 2003.

Notes adapted from *The Student's Economy in Focus 2000/01*

by Alain Anderton, Causeway Press, 2001

6 What, if any, is the relevance of the Monarchy to the political life of the United Kingdom in the 21st century?

Discuss the need for any changes to the role and position of the Monarchy.

The question requires candidates to review the monarchy and its contemporary role in the government of the UK and to discuss appropriate changes according to their view. In other words we are seeking their knowledge, opinions and arguments on the value of the monarchy today and they are free to argue for the retention of the institution as it is, for changes in its role and form, or for its abolition. If they argue for the latter there must be some discussion of alternative arrangements to fulfil the functions it currently carries out. A strong answer will most likely seek to weigh the arguments in favour and/or against and come to a reasoned conclusion.

Arguments in favour of the monarchy might include:

- The need for certain ceremonial and representative functions in our unwritten constitution to be carried out by someone, e.g. assent to legislation, dissolving Parliament, even if they are nominal in terms of the actual power exercised over and above the Prime Minister.
- The stability a monarchy provides – the Queen has reigned for fifty years, is vastly experienced and can offer unbiased advice to her ministers, she remains above party politics and helps safeguard democracy; she provides continuity.
- The monarch provides a focus for loyalty and promotes Britain's national identity and national pride.
- The Royal Family serves the nation loyally, promotes charities and good works, supports good causes – candidates might refer to the Princess Royal or the Prince of Wales Trust.
- The Royal Family represents the nation abroad, the Queen is an excellent ambassador for Britain, promotes trade and heads the Commonwealth.
- The monarchy provides good value for money if we balance the Civil List against income from tourism; a Presidency might be more expensive.

Arguments against a monarchy might include:

- The monarchy is outdated, out of touch and undemocratic. In a democracy the Head of State should be elected. A president with little power could still carry out ceremonial and representative functions on behalf of the nation.
- The Royal Family is isolated and no longer reflects the nation's values.
- The Royal Family is not good value for money in that too many people on the Civil List are seen as 'parasites who live off the state'. Tourism is based on the nation's history as opposed to the monarchy.
- The Queen has no political power or influence. Even her role as Head of the Commonwealth has no real value as Britain needs to break her traditional links based on colonialism and look more to Europe.
- The monarchy heads and perpetuates a class system based on privilege, snobbery and inherited wealth. The monarchy should disappear along with the House of Lords in its current form.

Some candidates may draw distinctions between the monarchy as an institution and members of the Royal Family as individuals and they should be given credit for this. Some reference might be made to the popularity of the less formal monarchies of say, Holland or Denmark. They might comment on the Royal Family's increased awareness of public feeling and willingness to modernise, as evidenced by the reduction of formality and reform of the law governing succession. As always the response should be assessed on the basis of the knowledge shown and the quality of the case presented.

- 7 The government is considering wide-ranging changes to the AS and A Level curriculum and replacing it with a British-style baccalaureate or diploma. What would be the advantages and disadvantages of such a move?**

What would you include in a revised post-16 qualification to meet the future education and employment needs of young people in the United Kingdom who currently follow advanced level programmes?

There are two major questions here, both of which need to be addressed in a full answer.

Candidates will need to know something about the differences between a single subject-style qualification, as we have now with the current AS and A levels, and a baccalaureate/diploma, whatever structure and content this may have. At the time of writing the latter is only at proposal stage. It includes:

- a compulsory core of literacy, numeracy and IT (at levels 2/3?)
- 3(?) specialist subjects (academic or vocational)
- supplementary subject(s), e.g. foreign language, statistics
- extra curricular activities, e.g. music, drama, arts, sport, community service.

Candidates will need to be aware of the implications of such changes in terms of choice of course of study and what requirements might be imposed by institutions who will use the qualification for selection purposes. The question requires them to comment on potential advantages and disadvantages. These could include:

- fewer examinations overall, particularly in Year 12
- more freedom to include general cultural activities
- less choice and flexibility than with current modular AS/A structure
- loss of opportunity to resit units(?)
- uncertainty about response/requirements of HE institutions.

Candidates are free to argue a case from their own point of view, but we should look for logical and coherent discussion and justification of arguments for marks in the level 3 and 4 ranges of the mark scheme. The same applies to the second of the two questions, where candidates have the opportunity to set out an alternative to the baccalaureate proposals, or the current arrangements, or to defend the status quo.

8 With the benefit of hindsight, were the United States and United Kingdom right to take military action in Afghanistan and Iraq?

Discuss how successful these actions have been in combating international terrorism.

At the time of writing the post-war troubles in Iraq and to a lesser extent Afghanistan (perhaps because it attracts less coverage in the shadow of Iraq) continue unabated and the US and UK armed forces have suffered more casualties in the aftermath of the invasions than during. At this stage progress in stabilising security, law and order, distributing aid and restoring vital services and the economy in Iraq has been slow, and far more problematic, one suspects, than was envisaged. There seems to be growing frustration with and resistance to the continuing armed occupation. There has been sabotage of electricity installations and oil pipe-lines, assassinations of emerging political figures and terrorist attacks on the armed forces on a weekly, if not daily basis, including a major attack on the UN compound and personnel. The US administration has now actively sought the assistance of allied security forces and the United Nations in helping to solve military and political problems, which it initially refused to do. There appear to be deep rifts between the various political and religious factions seeking a role in the new embryonic governmental council. All this has inevitably brought into question the wisdom of military action and bringing it to a successful conclusion, in addition to the continued questioning of the original pretext of weapons of mass destruction.

The situation in Afghanistan is less critical it seems, but there are still frequent guerrilla attacks directed towards political leaders, government institutions and security and peacekeeping forces, which includes an International Security Assistance Force (Isaf). Bin Laden, if he is still alive, has not been tracked down and progress seems altogether very slow and hampered by subversion from within.

The question requires candidates to review and possibly re-evaluate the arguments and justification for the invasions and their objectives and to discuss progress made to date. The reference to ‘hindsight’ suggests that views may have changed as a result of subsequent events and less than satisfactory progress. There needs to be some reference to the original reasons, stated or otherwise, for the invasions (threat to world or regional peace and stability, removal of leader and regime change, harbouring of terrorists, elimination of weapons of mass destruction, oil supply), and the decision not to seek a second resolution of the UN in the case of Iraq. There was a concern that the invasions, particularly of Iraq, would encourage more terrorist attacks against Western powers rather than reduce them and the question calls upon knowledge of subsequent events and progress in this respect. Recent reports suggest that bombings and attacks by Islamic terrorists have increased with over 300 killed and 1,000 injured during the past year in Riyadh, Casablanca, Mombassa, Karachi, Jakarta and Bali. Candidates will need to have a justified view with examples of whether the terrorist threat has indeed increased or decreased and why. There may also be the findings and fall-out from the Hutton Enquiry to consider.

Approximate distribution of marks across the questions and assessment objectives for Unit 6

Question Numbers	Section A				Section B	AO marks per Unit
	1	2	3	4	5-8	
Assessment Objectives AO1	1	1	1	1	6	10
AO2	1	1	1	1	5	9
AO3	5	3	-	1	7	16
AO4	2	4	6	6	7	25
Total marks per Question	9	9	8	9	25	60

