

# Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2013

GCE Government and Politics (6GP04)  
Paper 4A EU Political Issues

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson. Their contact details can be found on this link: [www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices).

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at [www.edexcel.com/ask](http://www.edexcel.com/ask). You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service.

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

January 2013

Publications Code UA034593

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2013

Question Number	Question
1.	To what extent has the EU developed an effective Common Foreign and Security Policy?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of developments towards a Common EU Foreign and Security Policy, including through the Lisbon Treaty. Examples of specific issues may also be advanced to support both sides of the argument, such as the responses on Iraq and Libya.</p> <p>Ways in which this could be seen to be effective include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The appointment of an EU High Representative – effectively an EU ‘Foreign Minister’ to lead and coordinate a Europe wide Foreign Policy.</li> <li>• The effective common position taken in relation to Libya, including on sanctions.</li> <li>• The Eurocorps has existed for nearly 20 years as a core of military staff with the capacity to rapidly expand to take on an EU or NATO mission – for example it led an ISAF deployment in Afghanistan.</li> </ul> <p>Ways in which this could be seen to be ineffective include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreements on policy under the CFSP require unanimity, which in practice is very difficult to achieve – for example on Iraq or Kosovo.</li> <li>• The UK and some partners (such as Poland) continue to emphasise their Foreign Policy links with the USA over the EU.</li> <li>• Any practical military action is still highly likely to take place through NATO, making the EU’s role effectively irrelevant.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of recent developments towards a common Foreign and Security Policy.</li> <li>• A limited awareness of specific arguments as to effectiveness, which may be largely focused on one side of the question.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, awareness of recent developments towards a common Foreign and Security Policy.</li> <li>• Clear awareness of specific and detailed, not general or vague, arguments as to effectiveness with at least one argument on each side of the question.</li> </ul>	

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

Question Number	Question
2.	How significant is the Council of the EU (Council of Ministers)?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the basic nature of the Council of Ministers as a meeting of Ministers from each member country covering a specific area.</p> <p>Ways in which this could be seen to be significant include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council makes most policy decisions under co-decision with the European Parliament (whereas the Commission generally makes proposals), dealing with such key issues as trade, environment, budget, foreign relations, employment rights.</li> <li>• The Council has an effective apparatus for preparing and co-ordinating national responses to policy proposals.</li> <li>• The Council is where key inter-ministerial negotiations take place.</li> </ul> <p>Ways in which its significance could be questioned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the real policy formulation goes on in other institutions – Commission, Parliament, COREPER etc- The Council is only the final ratification.</li> <li>• Much real negotiation goes on outside the Council, between ministers from the larger member states.</li> <li>• The council also has no real role in implementing and enforcing policy, which is done by the Commission which enjoys substantial discretion as to how this is done</li> <li>• Various arguments could be made as to the relative significance of other institutions, particularly given the changes in the Lisbon Treaty (increasing role of the European Parliament, office of the High Representative etc.).</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of the basic role and composition of the Council of the EU.</li> <li>• A limited awareness of specific arguments as to its significance, which may be largely focused on one side of the question.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, awareness of the basic role and composition of the Council of the EU.</li> <li>• Clear awareness of specific and detailed arguments as to significance with at least one argument on each side of the question.</li> </ul>	

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

Question Number	Question
3.	What have been the main effects of the creation of the Single Market?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate a basic awareness of the nature of the Single Market, as providing free movement of goods, services and labour throughout the EU.</p> <p>Effects that may be identified include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased competition due to the free market in goods which has reduced costs but also led to loss of jobs, often in regions that already suffer high unemployment.</li> <li>• Increased opportunities in employment and educational opportunities across the continent, couple with greatly enhanced tourism, due to the free movement of people.</li> <li>• A substantial increase in migration from poorer EU countries to wealthier ones, for example from Eastern Europe to the UK following EU expansion in 2005.</li> <li>• The single market, and in particular the Euro, could be seen as making the EU more vulnerable to the Global Economic crisis by binding it more closer together, leading to a 'domino effect' if one economy fails.</li> <li>• Arguments could also be advanced as to the impact of the Single Market on other areas of integration, including political and social.</li> </ul> <p>Advantages and disadvantages of the Single Market can only be credited insofar as they identify and explain effects of it.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited, and possibly implicit, awareness of the basic nature of the Single Market.</li> <li>• A limited understanding of one effect of the creation of the Single Market.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, awareness of the basic nature of the Single Market.</li> <li>• A clear understanding of at least two effects of the creation of the Single Market</li> </ul>	

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



Question Number	Question
4.	Why and how has membership of the EU affected UK pressure groups?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should address both the 'why' and 'how'; aspects of this question, identifying both the reasons for, and the manifestations of, the effects of the EU on UK Pressure Groups</p> <p>Reasons why membership of the EU has affected UK Pressure Groups include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increasing degree of powers held by the EU arguably makes the EU government much more influential than the UK government in areas such as the environment and consumer protection.</li> <li>• The increasing use of QMV enables Pressure Groups to circumvent the UK government by appealing to the governments of other EU countries to support EU legislation that advances their aims.</li> </ul> <p>Ways in which this can be seen include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many larger Pressure Groups have opened offices in Brussels to be close to the Commission and Council of Ministers – e.g. Environmental Groups and Trades Unions</li> <li>• Pressure Groups have worked to build European wide structures, joining groups with similar aims in other states, and increasing their levels of international governance (e.g. Environmental Groups).</li> <li>• The degree to which Pressure Groups now proactively seek to push the EU in new directions (e.g. business interests championing the single market in the 1980's) working with EU institutions to advise on policy</li> <li>• The willingness to Pressure Groups to act as whistle-blowers against the government when EU policies they favour have not been enacted, effectively using the ECJ to pursue their aims.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A limited understanding of both the 'how' and 'why' the EU has affected UK Pressure Groups, <u>or</u> a clear understanding of either 'how' or 'why'.</li> <li>• Limited or general reference to examples of Pressure Groups affected.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A clear understanding of at least one reason that EU membership has affected UK Pressure Groups <u>and</u> at least one way in which this can be seen.</li> <li>• Clear reference to specific examples of Pressure Groups affected.</li> </ul>	

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

Question Number	Question
5.	Distinguish between federalism and functionalism as theories of EU integration.
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Federalism is building a political federation of different countries, with sovereignty placed at differences levels.</p> <p>Functionalism is building cooperation among countries based on common interests through the integration of one or more important, often economic, <i>functions</i> shared by all of them, whilst the individual countries maintain their general distinctiveness.</p> <p>Differences between these two concepts include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Functionalism seeks to retain the nation as the basic political unit within the EU, whereas Federalism, by definition, requires some loss or 'pooling' of sovereignty leading to a weakening of the concept of nation.</li> <li>• Functionalism is a more pragmatic organic process, whereby EU structures and institutions evolve to fulfil the necessary functions, whereas Federalism could be characterised as more ideological and planned with EU structures and institutions being created to fit the desired federalist ideal.</li> <li>• Federalism could also be seen as more ambitious and more difficult to achieve, with Functionalism characterised as the original starting point of the EU and Federalism as its ultimate goal – moving 'a step beyond functionalism'.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited and possibly implicit understanding of both Federalist and Functionalist theories of EU integration, with one clear difference between them <u>or</u></li> <li>• Clear understanding of the nature of both Federalist and Functionalist theories of EU integration, with limited and possibly implicit understanding of the differences between them</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of the nature of both Federalist and Functionalist theories of EU integration.</li> <li>• Clear, and probably explicit, understanding of at least two differences between the theories.</li> </ul>	

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

Question Number	Question
6.	To what extent is the EU an example of supranational governance?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the concept of supranational government, and of its significance to debate about the role and nature of the EU.</p>	
<p>Candidates should also be able to identify recent developments with respect to this issue, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments. These <u>could</u> include:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Lisbon Treaty centralised decision-making more e.g. changing the role and powers of key institutions</li> <li>• The extension of the role of the ECJ</li> <li>• Changes to the voting rules in recent years, including with EU expansion.</li> <li>• The impact of the global economic crisis.</li> </ul>	
<p>Arguments in support of the premise that the EU is an example of supranational governance include:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The degree and breath of areas with which the EU now deals, including those traditionally left to individual nations such as Foreign and Security Policy.</li> <li>• The extension of QMV which, coupled with expansion, has reduced the ability of individual states to block changes.</li> <li>• The right to veto decisions in certain policy areas has been cut further (although member states still have the option of a 'yellow' or 'orange' card).</li> <li>• The ECJ is a truly supranational institution and its role has been extended into Home Affairs.</li> <li>• The European Parliament operates effectively in supranational blocks of allied parties, with relatively little block voting on a national basis.</li> <li>• Much of the EU has a single currency, which has in turn led to a much more homogenous economic policy.</li> <li>• Arguably, this has also moved the EU more towards its own brand of Euro-federalism, where member states share sovereignty with supranational organisations.</li> </ul>	
<p>Arguments that the EU is not an example of supranational governance include:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attempts to make the EU more federal have failed, e.g. the Constitution Treaty, whilst not all states are equally enthusiastic about further EU integration- the UK in particular is seen as reluctant to give up any more national sovereignty.</li> <li>• Certain areas remain outside EU jurisdiction, notably most criminal and civil law, most social policy and still a great deal of economic policy, whilst there remains no <i>effective</i> supranational defence or foreign policy.</li> <li>• The institutions of the EU are still essentially intergovernmental rather than Supranational – e.g. the Council of Ministers is still entirely drawn from member states' governments, who also appoint commissioners.</li> <li>• The Euro has not fully integrated the economies of Europe as not all member states have joined the Eurozone. The recent economic crisis saw a distinct lack of supranational direction as most states dealt with the crisis in their own country rather than following an EU-wide policy.</li> <li>• Enlargement has also prevented the EU from becoming supranational as</li> </ul>	

- reforms have focused on how to make decision-making smoother
- There also remains a lack of consensus on a European social model, thus inhibiting the feasibility of greater supranationalism.
  - States also ultimately preserve their sovereignty by reserving the right to leave the EU, and via the veto on certain issues.

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

- Limited and possibly implicit understanding of the nature of supranational government.
- Limited awareness of specific developments that impact on this debate.
- Largely one-sided or general in the arguments presented.
- Some, limited, awareness of competing viewpoints.

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

- Clear and probably explicit understanding of the nature of supranational Government.
- Clear awareness of specific developments that impact on this debate.
- Clear balance with at least two detailed arguments on each side of the question and an evaluative conclusion.
- Strong awareness of competing viewpoints.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 1 (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
7.	'The major UK parties agree more over Europe than they disagree.' Discuss.
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that, whilst the three biggest UK parties all favour UK membership of the EU, there is considerable debate over the specifics of UK membership.</p>	
<p>Candidates should make reference to the views of both Labour and the Conservatives. Credit should also be given to reference to the views of UKIP, as well as to those of the Liberal Democrats, as they could arguably be seen as a major party within the context of the issue, although neither is necessary to reach Level 2, and only either to reach Level 3. References to other parties – BNP, Green etc. – should not be credited.</p>	
<p>Ways in which the major parties can be seen to agree include:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The three biggest parties all support remaining in the European Union, and are committed to the ideals of a European Single Market, international co-operation and harmonisation, but with democratic reform.</li> <li>• The coalition partners, despite superficially opposing policies, have managed to agree a relatively amicable position on Europe, and it has not been the cause of many intra-coalition divisions. For example they have agreed to a 'referendum lock' on future treaties and have agreed a more or less neutral position on transferring or reclaiming powers.</li> <li>• None of the major parties support joining the Euro at the current time, whilst both Labour and the Conservatives appear to have ruled it out for the considerable future.</li> <li>• Both Labour and Coalition governments have prioritised relationships with the USA over the EU, for example over their approach to the War in Iraq.</li> <li>• It could be argued that in practice very little has changed since 2010 in that the UK remains an 'awkward partner' within the EU.</li> </ul>	
<p>Ways in which the major parties can be seen to disagree include:</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their rhetoric and general approach to Europe, with the Conservatives generally characterising it as a threat, whilst Labour and the Liberal Democrats have taken a more positive 'engaging whilst protecting Britain's interests' approach.</li> <li>• Differences in practice can be in the vetoing of an EU agreement by David Cameron, and in recent EU budget negotiations, with the Conservatives taking a bullish, confrontational approach criticised by both Labour and the Lib Dems.</li> <li>• A 'two-speed' Europe which is opposed by both Labour and the Liberal Democrats but supported by the Conservative party who are in general opposed to further integration into the EU, particularly any further loss of sovereignty, and wish to negotiate further opt-outs.</li> <li>• Labour and the Liberal Democrats supported the Lisbon treaty whilst the Conservatives and UKIP opposed it.</li> <li>• UKIP's clear position in favour of a referendum on UK membership leading to UK withdrawal is in clear contrast to the other major parties.</li> </ul>	



Some credit may also be given to reference to internal divisions within the major parties, insofar as it is relevant to their disagreements with each other, but this should not be the main focus of responses.

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

- Awareness of the positions of Labour and the Conservative Party as they impact on this debate.
- Limited awareness of specific views and policies – may focus on general positions.
- Limited understanding of the main areas of discussion such as the Euro, the principle of Membership, transfer of further powers etc.
- Largely one-sided in the arguments presented.

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

- Awareness of the positions of both Labour and the Conservatives and *either* the Liberal Democrats *or* UKIP, as they impact on this debate.
- Clear awareness of specific policies and views.
- Clear understanding of the main areas of discussion with specific details of these.
- Clear balance with at least two arguments on each side of the question and an evaluative conclusion.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 1 (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
8.	To what extent is a single EU social model either desirable or achievable?
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the concept of a single social model as it applies to the EU, and should address both aspects of the question in a balanced way.</p>	
<p>Candidates may make reference to different social models that can be seen within the EU, e.g. Anglo-Saxon, Continental, Nordic/Scandinavian, Mediterranean etc, and this should be credited where tied in to either desirability or achievability, although it is not necessary to reach Level 3.</p>	
<p>Arguments that a single model is desirable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A single social model could be seen as necessary to achieve a single market, for example with a common position of provision for old age, high levels of research and innovation, common approach to regulation etc.</li> <li>• A single social model would fit well with an integrated approach to a range of issues, including foreign policy, welfare and taxation, as differences and disputes in these areas stem from social differences</li> <li>• Even, Conservatives, who are generally Euro-sceptic, argue that an underlying basis of common values is necessary to a harmonious society, as a lack of a cohesive society leads to conflict and tension.</li> </ul>	
<p>Arguments that a single model is not desirable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forcing all countries to subscribe to a single social model could result in less effective business cultures.</li> <li>• Diversity could be considered to be an asset, both socially and economically, spurring competition and promoting a 'marketplace of ideas'.</li> <li>• A single social model could be seen as another step on the road to a federal 'United States of Europe' which could be criticised on several grounds, including loss of sovereignty, bureaucracy etc.</li> <li>• Such a social model is likely to put restriction the free market and could therefore be criticised for excessive interference.</li> </ul>	
<p>Arguments that a single model is achievable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are several common elements to the existing European social models, generally including a commitment to full employment, social protection, social inclusion and democracy.</li> <li>• The EU has made tremendous strides in the implementation of a single market, and achieving a single social model is simply a natural extension of this process and no less achievable.</li> <li>• The Social Chapter and the commitment towards Social Justice represent an existing basis of a common social model.</li> </ul>	
<p>Arguments that a single model is not achievable include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is little agreement on what the single social model would look like, or else such a common vision is vague and utopian</li> <li>• Enlargement of the EU has made a single social model (even) less likely, as</li> </ul>	

former Eastern bloc states arguably have very different social models from Western Europe.

- Attempts to impose significant social change would only fuel Euro-scepticism across the EU, generally damaging its ability to operate effectively

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

- Limited and possibly implicit awareness of meaning of a 'single EU social model'.
- Limited understanding of the arguments for and against both achievability *and* desirability or
- Clear understanding of the arguments for and against either achievability *or* desirability.
- Some, limited, awareness of different viewpoints.

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

- Clear and probably implicit awareness of meaning of a 'single EU social model'.
- Clear understanding of the arguments for and against both achievability *and* desirability.
- Clear balance with an evaluative conclusion in answer to the question.
- Strong awareness of different viewpoints.

A candidate *may* achieve the threshold for Level 3 by addressing three of the four aspects – achievability, desirability, lack of achievability and lack of desirability, if their response does one or more of these in a particularly creditworthy manner.

<b>A01</b>	<b>Knowledge and understanding</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
<b>A02</b>	<b>Intellectual skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
<b>A02</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b>Level 3 (9-12 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and clear insight into how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 2 (5-8 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a reliable awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions
<b>Level 1 (0-4 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to identify competing viewpoints or perspectives, and a little awareness of how they affect the interpretation of political events or issues and shape conclusions

<b>A03</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b>Level 3 (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 2 (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b>Level 1 (0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

## SUMMARY A2 MARKING GRIDS

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

### PART A - SHORT QUESTIONS (15 marks)

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

### PART B – ESSAY QUESTIONS (45 marks)

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

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



Further copies of this publication are available from  
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA034593 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website  
[www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com)

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

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

