

# Examiners' Report

## June 2016

### GCE Government & Politics 6GP03 3A

## 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2016

Publications Code 6GP03\_3A\_1606\_ER

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

## Introduction

As in other recent series this paper saw a concentration on contemporary events from many candidates, with a strong focus on the policies of the coalition, as well as some awareness of the emerging priorities of both the Conservative government and the Corbyn-led Labour party. The questions were structured to encourage a contemporary approach, although this did not prevent some over-reliance on historical content, particularly with regard to law and order policy, where some candidates remain too fond of the policies of the Blair and even Major governments.

The choice across the short response questions was reasonably even, although quality was less consistent than in some recent series. Too many candidates were caught out by a failure to carefully attend to all of the demands of the question, notably in a failure to give sufficient weight to both the 'how and why' of questions 1 and 4, or a sufficiently contemporary focus on questions 3 and 5. Even relatively straightforward demands such as 'agree' confused a small minority of candidates who wasted too much time, effort and potential marks on disagreements.

Equally, with the essay questions a significant number of candidates did not fully appreciate that where a question used two distinct content words, such as 'sustainable and desirable', there was a need to consider both concepts and not to treat them as one.

Candidates must remain vigilant in their attempts to respond to exactly what is asked. This will allow them to access the maximum marks whilst making the most effective use of their time.

It was pleasing to again see the vast majority of candidates maintaining a political focus with most candidates accepting the additional hint of question 2 of the word 'political' which helped them to avoid an overly statistical analysis.

Timing was sound overall with most candidates apparently devoting a roughly equal amount of time to each response, including the essay. A few candidates' grades were affected by spending too long on certain questions. Similarly, a few candidates clearly spent rather longer on either section A or section B and again this affected their grade adversely.

Balance remained critical to achieving Level 3 in essay responses, especially on question 3. Only a small number of candidates offered one-sided responses.

Synopticity was particularly strong on question 8, where candidates were specifically invited to consider party views. Candidates' responses to question 6 were generally robust, especially in terms of different approaches to welfare. They were generally weaker on question 7, where a number of otherwise capable candidates failed to specifically ascribe different views to those who hold them. Too many opposing arguments were credited to 'it could be argued that' or 'some say', rather than to the individual parties, persons or other relevant groups who have actually argued that point.

A final point of note was a moderate but nevertheless noticeable number of avoidable factual errors, some as basic as which party and politicians were in power in a particular year, but also details lacking, for example, in terms of individual party policies. This may partly reflect an assumption on the part of some candidates that the view of one individual represents the whole of that party. Candidates should therefore be advised of this fallacy.

## **Question 1**

This question was of middling popularity.

The key to answering this question well was a focus on specific policies that were relevant to unemployment, giving weight to both the 'how and why' of the situation.

A number of candidates addressed the question more in terms of welfare policy than economics, and this was an acceptable route to a reasonable mark provided those policies were clearly linked to their impact on unemployment. A more serious limitation for many candidates was a failure to significantly engage with why limiting unemployment is an important political goal.

The efforts of the Coalition to both incentivise work benefit claimants were thoroughly discussed, as (to a lesser extent) were attempts to expand apprenticeships and to invest in infrastructure. In terms of 'why' there was much discussion of reducing benefits bills but less mention of the wider political significance of unemployment, or of the link between unemployment and the more general economic health of the nation.

Weaker candidates restricted their 'why' to brief or general points (often about reducing the cost of welfare), and were limited in how well they linked the policies described to their specific impact on unemployment.

Level 1 responses were rare, but where they did occur tended to be very general, or to discuss policies that had a very tenuous link to unemployment, such as the posited retention of Trident as a job creation scheme.

Level 2 responses tended to focus more on 'how' than 'why', often limiting the latter to a brief reference to cost, and focusing the former on different aspects of welfare reduction.

Level 3 responses showed balance between 'how' and 'why', with the former being clear, specific and covering more than one government, and the latter showing awareness of the economic impacts beyond welfare as well as sometimes reflecting on the electoral significance of unemployment.

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 ☒

~~There is a~~ most.  
It is argued by economists that there is a direct link between unemployment and growth. The UK government always seeks to achieve economic growth - especially following the 2007/8 crash. One way in which the recent coalition government sought to limit unemployment was through the tackling of youth unemployment. They scrapped Labour's 50/10 target for those in higher education and sought to promote apprenticeship schemes instead such as those with PWC and JLR in the Warwickshire area. Providing youth with the necessary skills to get jobs here in the UK reduces the structural unemployment we face as a country. The reason the government has done this is to allow them to target the dependency culture from a young age by having less youth claiming job seekers allowance.

A main reason as to why the government seeks to reduce and limit unemployment is to save money on benefits payments. In his 2010 Budget, George Osborne said he would "eliminate the deficit" and one way to achieve this is through cutting back on benefit payments. <sup>as shown with the £26,000 welfare cap.</sup> In order to reduce the number of claimants, the government made it harder to claim the benefits through compulsory weekly meetings before receiving the benefit ~~and through~~ making it harder to claim jobseekers is meant to provide an incentive for people to go out and find work thus reducing the number of unemployed. This was coupled with

a raising of the personal allowance threshold in 2011 to £10,000 to further provide incentive for people to go out and find work.

If more people have jobs, then more people have extra discretionary income to spend on goods. When more people spend money in the economy we experience demand led economic growth. ~~Higher wages~~ <sup>Higher wages</sup> is a main aim of the coalition government was to achieve sustainable economic growth. A fall in unemployment achieves such growth as not only is more money being spent in the economy by consumers, but there is less of a negative output gap due to increased employment. The UK becomes a more attractive place when we have high levels of growth and low unemployment. This is because there is increased consumer confidence. Low unemployment was achieved through the fall \*

Recent governments faced high unemployment levels following the 2007/8 recession. ~~However~~ Much of this unemployment came from young unemployment as they did not have the necessary skills for jobs or experience. The government achieved a reduction in unemployment through the promoting apprenticeships and funding schemes like the NCS schemes to provide such skill. Incentives were also used to promote employment as shown through the increase in personal allowance and cuts in benefits, shown through the welfare cap in 2012. The ~~gover~~ coalition government achieved low unemployment reaching an unemployment rate of 5.1% by the time they left office. Turning unemployment improved the budget deficit position by ~~taking in~~ <sup>through</sup> helping ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~half~~ <sup>half</sup> ~~it~~ <sup>through</sup> money saved from cuts in jobseekers payments and money gained <sup>through</sup> an increase in tax revenue both through direct tax like income tax and indirect tax like VAT.

\* This has been achieved through investments in government funded projects. For example, one proposed venture into fracking by the coalition and current Conservatives is expected to create 64,000 jobs and bring in £137bn of investment.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Comments**

This candidate gives clear weight to both 'how' and 'why' content with good contemporary knowledge of policy.



**ResultsPlus**  
**Examiner Tip**

Linking each 'why' to a specific 'how' can be a very effective way of tackling this kind of question.







In both cases, these policies were designed to tackle dependency.

Secondly, the ~~last~~ Coalition government reform incapacity benefit to make them more rigorously means tested, meaning more people would be made to work. This was ideologically driven, since the Conservatives often take a tougher stance on what they deem to be idleness.

Incapacity benefit had also become the default benefit for the long-term unemployed under Labour, and was costing too much to the treasury. So, under the ~~last~~ economic imperative, incapacity benefit was reformed into the ESA to make less people eligible and thus reduce unemployment and the burden on the treasury.

Lastly, the coalition sought to limit unemployment through the benefit cap. This was very ideologically driven, since it relied on the belief that benefits should never pay more than work, since this is 'unfair on hard working families.' Therefore, the benefit cap was set at £26,000 pa (around the same as an average salary) but this is set to reduce further. This lowered unemployment

because but benefits forced people to work in order to get a better salary. Benefits ~~was~~ are no longer enough to live on, so people had to get jobs. This policy was also electorally fulfilling, since the majority of the general public agreed that benefits should not pay more than work.

Recent governments have sought to reduce unemployment by linking benefits to work and reducing welfare payments. New Labour did it in order to show they could be tough and appeal to voters, whereas the coalition did it to tackle dependency due to ideology and because austerity forced them to cut the welfare budget.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The material covered here is relevant but it quite narrowly focused on benefits, and the 'why' aspect is quite repetitive.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

'Unemployment' is a key concept from the economy topic and although different topics are clearly linked an economy question should include specific reference to economic policy as well as to welfare policies.

## **Question 2**

Key to answering this question was a focus on controversiality and crime statistics, rather than on crime in general.

Candidates were generally good at distinguishing between police statistics and the National Crime Statistics, and linking these effectively to controversiality. The quality of examples was variable, and was a significant discriminator between middling and strong responses, but there were some excellent illustrative points, for example, about knife crime, sexual offences and cyber-crime.

Level 1 responses sometimes focused on political controversies surrounding crime in general, such as the London riots or the rise in youth crime, but often lacked more detail.

Level 2 responses tended to either explain one controversy well, often the different pictures painted by different statistics and resulting potential for political dispute; or else examined a wider range of points but without specific examples.

Level 2 responses showed clear understanding of the different statistics available, as well as political criticisms of the use of crime statistics generally, tied into specific examples of particular crimes that helped to elucidate the points discussed.

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 reason why crime statistics are politically controversial is because they suggest that crime is falling in society while its commonly known that there is a greater fear of crime amongst the population.

Police statistics and crime surveys suggest that excluding internet and cyber crimes overall the crime is falling, this contradicts with the fact, ~~that crime is falling~~ <sup>to police</sup> reporting in criminal activity is increasing.

Not only this but, an online poll taken by the BBC also suggests that people fear crime more now than they did 10 years ago saying they feel less "safe".

A second reason why crime statistics are politically controversial is because of the lack of similarity or even large

differences and variations between the police ~~statistics~~ statistics and the crime surveys statistics. For example in 2011 the crime survey suggested that there was an 11.3% increase in assaults of women while the police reported that assaults were down, they claimed anti social behavior orders contributed to the reduction in assaults. The differences between the ~~the~~ police ~~and~~ and crime surveys results ask questions to society of who is hiding what and why so. The differences could be contributing to increased fear of crime as citizens lack clarity and are aware of the large disparities creating a climate of a lack of trust towards the police.

A final reason why crime statistics are controversial politically is because of the manipulation of the statistics by the police. The police have been found to change the terms / meaning of words such as "violent" and "seniors" which impact on the levels of crimes committed. This I believe is ~~the most~~ the largest factor contributing to

high levels of controversy amongst crime  
statisthcs as people understand that the  
police have the ability to change <sup>the amount</sup> ~~assess~~  
of crimes committed by changing ~~assess~~  
the meaning and definition of words



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The points here are relevant and clearly explained, taking the answer into level 3, but the examples are consistently explicit enough to go higher within the level.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make your examples detailed and specific as you can, especially where the question specifically says 'using examples'.



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 ☒

High UK crime statistics, including reoffending rates (on average 32%) show that prisons do not work. It is ~~large~~ often debated on whether prisons should punish or rehabilitate however recent crime statistics suggest that prisons are not fit for purpose. High reoffending rates show that not enough is being done inside prisons to make sure those convicted do not commit another offence upon leaving prison. This may be due to the large amount of short sentences, in which prisoners do not have time to make any changes, or be persuaded to change their lifestyle once out. This means people are being released back into society who are a danger to the public. This is one the reasons that prison reform has been called for.



it has also been said that too many ~~prts~~ custodial sentences are being given, and that community orders should be more widely used. The IFE found that an increase in the number of in-the-community sentences would save enough money to close 4 prisons. It would also help battle the overcrowding issue in prisons.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This candidate clearly wanted to discuss penal policy rather than crime statistics and tries, but fails, to fit the key question around their intended answer.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

If the question you want to answer is not asked then do not try to twist an answer to a different question, as it rarely results in a good mark.

### **Question 3**

This was the most popular of the short response questions, perhaps reflecting many candidates' own experiences of academy schools and their first-hand understanding of both their strengths and weaknesses.

Lack of balance was a relatively uncommon issue for candidates. The main discriminators were the extent to which candidates specifically tied their points to post-2010 approaches to academies, as opposed to Labour's previously academisation programme, and the quality of examples used to back up their points. The most common points discussed were the greater degree of autonomy vs a lack of accountability, debates as to the positive or negative impact on standards, and different views about the voluntary or forced nature of the academisation process. Interestingly, in terms of accountability, there seemed to be no awareness from candidates about recent developments in terms of Regional Commissioners, and this may be an area that more centres will wish to note with students.

There were a small but surprising number of candidates who appeared to be confused by the distinction between free schools, faith schools, and academy schools. This may reflect the fact that a school can feasibly fall into all three of these categories, but nevertheless it hindered some candidates' progress, for example in terms of weakly made links between academisation and the 'Trojan horse' affairs.

Level 1 responses were uncommon. These responses tended to misunderstand the nature of academies, or to make one or two vague points about the need to improve education.

Level 2 responses often focused on general points about academisation without a clear explicit focus on post-2010 policy, or else considered a reasonable point on each side of the debate, but without the further range of reference necessary to go higher.

Level 3 responses possessed a clear Coalition focus, balance, and a good mixture of depth and breadth. They often drew effectively on personal experiences, and were clear on how strengths and weaknesses linked specifically to academisation as opposed to other policies.

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 ☒

Academies were initially introduced under New Labour as a partnership between schools and firms to buy and raise standards. However, since 2010, and the coalition government academies have changed.

~~Academies~~ Academy status was offered to the highest performing schools and meant that the school was removed from local Education Authority control and given control of its own budget. This was designed to give the schools more autonomy and choice which was supposed to push up standards. The Conservative Party would argue that removing the layer of bureaucracy will mean that schools get more money to spend and will become more efficient. However, Academies have

been criticised as some Heads of Academies were being paid more than the Prime Minister.

In addition, there have been concerns about the quality of teachers in academies because teachers do not have to be paid on traditional pay scales. This was intended to attract better teachers with higher wages but it is believed that it is being used to pay unqualified teachers less.

The NUT have voiced many concerns about the quality of teaching in academies and have expressed disgust at plans for all schools to become academies.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The arguments advanced are reasonable but are more closely related to academies in general than to governments from 2010-2015 in particular - most apply just as much to Labour's academies programme.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Take careful note of instructions about dates or particular governments and tailor your arguments closely to these.

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 ☒

~~With the two Education Secretaries between this time, Michael Gove~~  
and ~~Mr~~ With Michael Gove being the main most notable  
Education Secretary during this time his ~~the~~ policy on academies was  
considered divisive with positives such as devolved autonomy and  
an increasing of standards. However negatives such as a Two-tier  
System are shown.

With the Gove's policy on ~~educat~~ Academies a huge positive  
was that the academies were given devolved autonomy. ~~the~~  
Such autonomy was given over their budget which came straight  
from the department of Education removing local authority  
bureaucracy. The Academies also have greater control over  
the hiring and dismissal of staff, leading to the poor performing  
staff or how G. Gove termed, 'Squeezed lemons' being able to  
be dismissed within a term, rather than a year. You could  
argue that this level of devolved autonomy is positive as it allows  
the Academies to use their budget how they wish and are able  
decide the best method of hiring staff which suits their Academy.



Secondly, another positive on academies is seen with the ~~fact~~ ~~in~~ ~~forgetting~~ ~~the~~ attempt to drive up the standards of schools. These academies are institutions of education. As the academies have control of their own budget and are able to choose the curriculum they will teach you could argue that the academies will be more inclined to use this money for in certain areas and subjects to excel in this allowing them to improve their standards for the students.

However, an issue with Gove's policy is that it can create a 2-tier system. This means that ~~because~~ as academies have greater control over their budget and curriculum, you could argue that this creates a two-tier level standard of education between academies and non-academies. Such an issue is controversial as academies are usually oversubscribed, meaning that students may be forced to go to a school which may not give the same standard of education. This issue is difficult to resolve as the policy to essentially force failing schools to become academies and ~~which~~ ~~more~~ Secretary of Education Nick Morgan's proposals to convert all schools to academies by 2020 have been met with resistance as some schools do benefit from local authority ruling. This making the academies academy policy's greatest positive in fact ~~an~~ a negative.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

The content here is not greatly more developed than in the previous response but is much more contemporary. Had the final point been further developed this might have reached the top of level 3.

Mark: 12



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Try to avoid rushing your stronger points at the end – they can make the difference between a good mark and an excellent one.



## **Question 4**

This question was of only middling popularity, but was perhaps the best answered question overall, with a generally better balance and wider policy awareness than on question 1.

In terms of 'why' almost all candidates were aware of the motivational importance of climate change, with the level of specific discussion of targets and international agreements marking out the strong candidates from the middling, whilst energy security and the sustainability of resources were all well discussed. On the 'how' side of the question the responses demonstrated detailed understanding of recent developments on both fracking and nuclear energy, as well as the more traditionally 'green' area of wind power.

Level 1 responses were uncommon, most being too brief, resulting from poor timing.

Level 2 responses were sometimes strong on 'how' but brief and a little vague on 'why', or were consequent on too much time spent on irrelevant diversions such as the *objections* to some methods of tackling energy diversity.

Level 3 responses showed clear understanding of the driving forces behind energy diversity, and often linked these to the different methods for tackling the issue – for example fracking as reducing dependency on foreign oil, and wind energy as mitigating climate change.

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 ☒

The UK government have found that the Environment is a key issue and that it needs to be addressed, in this case the supply of energy.

The government have sought out to increase the amount of windfarms in the country side as a alternate supply of extra energy. Reason being is that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are rising due to the increased industrialisation, therefore understand that this cannot continue forever brings the government to find another supply of energy.

The UK government had a conference with other governments in Kyoto on the environment topic. The issue was raised that global warming was a major factor. An agreement held at the conference was that each country which signed up must not over exceed a certain quota. ~~for example~~ As a result to meet these expectations, the government have worked on more solar and tidal energy as a way of refunding the missing energy.

The UK government in history have had a problem with finding locations to produce energy efficiently without disrupting local residents from wind farms to destroying the scene by the increase in wind farms. With that being said the UK have had to take into consideration of these accounts and have ~~found~~ increased the diversity of energy supply ~~in~~ from solar panels on top of residents houses. By allow residents to have solar panels, this allows ~~be~~ an increase of it and that governments may purchase energy from the locals thus making this option valuable.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate gives consideration to both how and why but some of these points are quite underdeveloped whilst the content on the second page is not especially helpful to answering the question.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Keep all content tightly focused on the question – wandering from it loses time and gains no marks.

**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** ☐

Plan 3

Q - How - fracking / Nuclear

Renewable  $\rightarrow$  Wind / Water / Hydro

Why → Needed better sustainable energy

↳ Less political

- renewable - better for the environment

lower emissions - Kyoto and EU environment plans

↳ Nuclear goe mile out of it  
↳ Better alternative

Flashing cheaper - more businesses  
can do it

The government has taken many different actions to do this was in Fracking.

Fracturing involves a drill going into the earth and then turning at  $90^\circ$  angle and drilling.

Vertically. The cause focuses on either side of the drill and shale gas is rock released. ~~There~~ <sup>this</sup> has been known as the 'Bath for Gas'. The gas is a new supply of energy that can be used ~~to~~ as an alternative to coal.

Fracturing has been used because it is a new & larger source of energy than previous alternatives such as coal. It has a larger supply that will last us longer, furthermore it produces much less emissions than coal and will therefore not damage the ozone layer and therefore seen as a cleaner, more environmentally friendly alternative. As the Conservative government is trying to reduce emissions ~~it is seen~~ this has been chosen as another form of energy supply.

A second diverse way of energy supply is renewable energy such as wind farms, solar panels and hydro-electricity. This has been used as an alternative to energy supply as it is much more eco-friendly and it is unlike the other forms of energy. As renewable therefore it will never run out. One of other reasons we have chosen to use this form of energy supply is to meet



the EU's emissions target, to reduce emissions by 20% throughout the EU and our in, particular there being 15%. As this is a perfect way of doing so more wind farms, solar farms and hydro electricity have been set up as an alternative.

A third way of achieving way of supplying energy is nuclear power. This has been used as it meets the requirements of the EU agreement to lower emissions and it meets the 1988 Kyoto agreement to lower emissions. It is a cleaner source of energy than coal and can generate more energy. Although it still produces some nuclear waste, it is much cleaner than the emissions produced by coal. This is why it has been used as a new more diverse way of supplying energy.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The candidate shows clear awareness of the both why and how, effectively linking them and providing accurate policy examples.

Mark: 14



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

'Why' content is the reasons something is done, and 'how' is the ways it is done - balancing these two elements is key to success in 'how and why' questions.

## Question 5

This was the second most popular of the short response questions, but also saw the largest number of weaker answers. As is often the case with law and order questions there were too many candidates who desired to give a general and overly historical response.

The number of candidates who failed to address 'agreements' was relatively small but nevertheless higher than would be hoped, as was the number who focused exclusively on one particular aspect of law and order policy. More importantly, too many candidates remain over-reliant on out-of-date developments – Blair's 'tough on crime' speech continues to receive more attention than would be expected on a contemporary issues paper, whilst Howard's even pithier 'prison works' continues to be used by candidates who could be aware of more contemporary debates.

A number of candidates did recognise that agreement was not always between all parties, but could take place in different combinations, for example between Labour and the Conservatives on Crime Commissioners, or the Conservatives and Lib Dems on ID cards.

Level 1 responses were generally vague and historical, often relying on assertions about all parties now being 'tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime' with little or no base of policy evidence. There were also some factual inaccuracies in terms of police numbers and budgets.

Level 2 responses sometimes suffered from a lack of specific policy, but covered shared principles across a wider range of policy areas, such as terrorism, prison policy and policing, or alternatively were much more detailed but narrowly focused.

Level 3 responses were highly contemporary and offered good exposition of the 'rehabilitation revolution', recent shifts in Labour policy towards Police and Crime Commissioners, and the more up-to-date law and order issues raised by the war on terror.



~~1.39 1 hour~~  
~~2.734 36 1/2~~  
~~3.00~~

Chosen question number: **Question 1** ☒ **Question 2** ☒ **Question 3** ☒  
**Question 4** ☒ **Question 5** ☒ 2014 *2014*

young samples, for the first few years, the numbers are primarily unrevealed.

Explain the ways in which the major parties agree over law and order policy?

The major parties agree over law and order policy in aspects such as anti-terrorism. After the ~~1992 bomb blast~~ the 2001 world trade centre terrorist attack, there was a large consensus on anti-terrorism with the political parties. ~~Opposition~~ New Labour ~~agreed with~~ ~~then~~ created the 2001 anti-terrorism act, which increased powers and enabled the right imprisonment without charge. This was followed by anti-terrorism acts in 2005, 2006 and 2008, that increased powers for any encouraged terrorist and involved terrorist activity. It also placed house arrest on terrorist to go around the 90 day infection.

The coalition government also agreed to these law and order policies, by following through these policies and increasing powers to ~~stop~~ <sup>to stop</sup> ~~have the power to stop~~ political debates.

The major parties also agree over law and order policy, concerning policies, where the Conservatives it has introduced 27 point plan, followed by new Labour's increased powers to stop and search, neighbour hood watch etc. Then followed by the coalition and the introduction of parenting commissioners



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The first point is reasonable albeit not spectacular, whilst the second adds little.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Including only one developed point will limit your marks.

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 way in which the major parties agree over law and order policies has seen a large shift over recent years.

Traditional the Conservative Party are the party of punishment and Labour that of retribution and restoration. Labour contradicted this policy under Blair with the creation of ASBOs, Youth Boards and implementation of mosques.

In recent years we have witness an ever increasingly ~~Advers~~ consensus on law and order policies in the UK.

One huge issue in which the major parties are in agreement is the harsh laws on terror. Under Blair Britain saw a huge sum of ~~£~~ Anti-terror legislation being created.

and implemented e.g. 2001, 2006. These all restricted the rights and freedoms of suspected terrorists. Similarly, the Coalition and Conservative Party have tried to implement legislation to the same effect with the ~~data~~ Data Protection Bill, which although faced opposition, ultimately supported the same ideal.

There has also been a ~~consensus~~ political consensus on the way ~~the~~ crime should be tackled. The Coalition's "rehabilitation revolution" and Labour's election of their new extremely left-wing leader is evidence of this. Recent crime statistics have shown a huge failure in the current punitive system, with parties therefore in agreement on the way crime should be tackled and punished.

Despite this apparent move toward ~~to~~ Restorative Justice, the major political parties - Conservatives, Labour, SNP -



all also tend to be in agreement with the building of new prisons. Many would argue that this "harsh" attitude towards law and order is politically popular.

Despite some disagreement and opposition is the introduction of an elected police commissioner in 2012, supposedly ~~to~~ politicising the police force, ultimately all of the major parties agree with similar principles.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

None of the points made are spectacular, but they are all concise and reasonable and there is clear engagement with 'agreement'.

Mark: 12



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

On short responses addressing a range of common relevant points concisely will enable you to access high marks more than a smaller number of more unusual points.

## **Question 6**

Although this question was perhaps the most complex structurally, requiring as it did a balanced consideration of two different concepts, it was the most popular of the essay responses.

As is always the case with questions that relate to welfare generally, rather than 'benefits' in particular, candidates were welcome to discuss health and education as well as benefits policy, and some candidates did so. Nevertheless, level 3 could still be achieved with an exclusive benefits focus.

A surprisingly small number of candidates chose to offer a clear definition of 'universality', although in most cases it was apparent from the subsequent arguments that they did in fact grasp the concept. Equally 'sustainability' and 'desirability' were often not clearly delineated, and this did make it harder for some candidates to enter level 3.

In addition to the clarity of the key concepts the other key discriminators were the degree of balance, the quality of argument over assertion, and the links to specific evidence – for example in terms of the 'pensions time-bomb' or strain of the NHS.

Synopticity was reasonable overall, with a number of candidates discussing the policies of Labour, the Coalition and the Conservatives and linking these back to the question. Equally some candidates did fall back on 'some argue' and were limited accordingly.

The weakest candidates either misidentified the question as being about whether the welfare system is still based on universality, or all were marred by excessive brevity or inaccuracy.

Middling responses were characterised by either a balanced response that overtly focused on either sustainability or desirability but not both, or else addressed both aspects but were too one-sided to progress higher.

The strongest responses recognised the importance of both sustainability and desirability, and were often able to recognise that the system could be desirable without being sustainable or indeed the reverse. These responses also made good use of evidence and developed their points to clearly link them back to the question posed.

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 ☐

~~In recent~~

Many of the reforms to the welfare state in recent years have concerned the universal entitlement in many aspects, often on the basis of affordability. Yet, at the same time there are aspects of the welfare state that remain universal, such as pensions.

Firstly, it could be said that a welfare state based on the principle of universal entitlement is no longer sustainable due to the vast cost of it. Spending on welfare has consistently been the largest component of government spending in recent years. It is clear that universal benefits make this spending even greater, as they go to everybody. The coalition government demonstrated that they were willing to move universal entitlement on an affordability basis. They did this by ~~removing~~ ~~the~~ making child benefit means tested. Following this reform, in order to receive child benefit any form of child benefit, the year household income could have to be below £60,000. Indeed, child benefit begins to drop off for households with income of over £50,000. The Conservative



Justified such action by saying that it simply wasn't affordable to hand out child benefit for every single child across the UK. It was really expensive. May has elected on a pledge to cut the budget deficit. May could justify such a policy. Furthermore, ideologically, the Conservatives are always committed to decreasing the role played by the welfare state. May believes that it isn't fair that the ~~the~~ government should pay child benefit on a universal basis, and it means that the cost of doing so has to be covered by general taxation. It is clear that there is, largely speaking, a consensus within the Conservative Party regarding this, however some concerns are raised as to the fact that a core Conservative principle is that of family values, and therefore by withdrawing the universal element of child benefit, May runs to some extent threatening these values. Furthermore, the principle of universal welfare isn't compatible with the policy of austerity. It is clear that the public support austerity, shown by the fact that the Conservatives won an outright majority in 2015, and therefore measures need to be taken to ensure May fulfil their pledge made to the electorate, and moving

the universal claim to the form to welfare state is  
a core way of doing it.

Ironically, it could be said that a  
universal state isn't desirable because it  
helps those who don't need to help.  
The fact that a millionaire is entitled to a  
pension, funded by the state, once they turn 67 is  
completely unjustifiable. By simply don't need to  
money, and it is less well off people who  
are denied such policies through general taxation.  
Indeed, removing the universal claim from state pensions  
would clarify who were safe for tax cuts.  
Even the Labour Party under Tony Blair, to prove  
that even they had suspicions when it came to  
universal welfare also in the fact that they  
introduced the minimum income guarantee to  
pensions. This was a means tested system, whereby  
the poorest pensions could be given more assistance  
for the wealthy. It is clear that in removing  
the universal claim, more can be done to  
help ~~the~~ those in need. Indeed it could be  
said that much of the J. K. Bennett giants which  
outline the core principles of the welfare state,  
suggest that a universal welfare state isn't  
~~the~~ desirable. A giant of welfare, which refers to

• The fact that the welfare state should ensure that everyone's basic needs are met suggests that actually it needs more state to have a means tested system. This is because the universal welfare state isn't going to help cater to the needs of the rich; their needs are already catered for on their own accord. It is clearly necessary therefore for the state to provide assistance as well. In ideological terms this is a view that Conservatives could agree with; essentially they want the welfare state to be as small as possible, as they believe in the free market. Therefore, by securing a universal entitlement, the size of the welfare state undoubtedly decreases.

Thirdly, my would say that a universal welfare state is no longer desirable as it doesn't help to decrease inequality. Many on the left of British politics see the welfare state as being a key body to help tackle social exclusion and injustice. Therefore they were only opposed to much of the cuts made by the Conservative-led coalition, such as in 2010 when they put a freeze on working tax credits, as to that they wouldn't

increase by more than 1% for the next 3 years. Additionally, they were opposed to the spare room subsidy, which those living in social housing have to pay a tax on spare bedrooms they have. This was a populist policy in return, the general taxpayer isn't happy subsidising social housing which recipients are able to live so comfortably that they have an excess in space. Ultimately though, this cut was based on the basis of affordability. It is clear, that such a cut wouldn't have been necessary if it wasn't for the way in which the welfare state is universal in other areas, principally pensions. Therefore, it is actually the poorest that were cut as a result of a universal welfare state, as the cost of maintaining the universality of the welfare state is that cuts have to be made in other areas. These cuts that then arise are arguably far more of a threat to the principles of a welfare state than merely universal or universal. The spare room subsidy was a challenge to the ~~basic~~ principle of equality, which many of the elderly in social housing were forced out of their homes. From an ideological point of view, these cuts are



extremely ~~to the~~ but in the eyes of the  
Labour Party, as they lead to rising inequality  
and social ~~exclusion~~ exclusion.

However, it could be said that a  
~~basic~~ universal welfare state is actually  
still affordable, as it can be paid for by  
increasing general taxation. This is the view  
taken by the current Labour party under  
Jeremy Corbyn. He is committed to only  
austerity and increasing the size of the welfare state.  
He believes it is indeed possible for a  
universal welfare state to remain, whilst still  
having a welfare state that protects the  
most vulnerable in society. He would  
point towards all of the tax cuts made  
by the coalition and the current Conservative  
government. In the run up to the 2015  
election the Labour Party proposed a  
Mansion tax on all homes over £2 million,  
stating that this would be key in creating  
additional tax revenue in order to  
maintain the welfare state. Furthermore, the  
move of the coalition to cut the  
additional rate of income tax from 50%  
to 45% in 2012 attracted criticism,

as it can slowly fall apart by removing the universal element from child benefit. Universality would've been maintained if it wasn't for the tax cut. Furthermore universal benefits can be delivered as desirable as they are easier to administer.

Finally, it could be said that ~~the~~ ~~fact that~~ a universal welfare state is indeed still desirable as it is the best way of ensuring that people don't live in want or in need. This is because the bureaucracy of means tested benefits often deters people from applying. This was a criticism of Labour's minimum income guarantee for pensioners, as many people who were entitled to more weren't applying for it as they ~~the~~ simply didn't understand how to, or what it was they were entitled to. This is part of the reason that the Conservatives have been committed to increasing universal entitlement when it comes to pensioners, rather than increasing means testing in terms of pensioners. This is shown by the fact that they increased the minimum income guarantee in line of ~~the~~ the triple lock system; child



needs fact the pensions of all or  
better protected. ~~By a new vote~~ through  
the triple lock system pension will rise  
by which is greatest out of 2.5%, wages  
or inflation. It is clear that this is  
poorly on some or detailed grounds, as  
it will please all the pensioners, rather than  
just the few who will be affected via means  
testing. ~~the~~ as old people are the most likely  
to turn out and vote, and therefore it makes sense to  
please them.

In conclusion, it is clear that given  
the current economic conditions of austerity, &  
that a universal welfare state simply isn't  
affordable. Despite this, it's fair to say  
that there are desirable elements to using  
universal entitlement in some sectors in  
the provision of welfare, such as pensions.  
Overall this debate is now underway in  
action following Tony Blair's election as  
leader of the Labour party, as he  
maintains that it is affordable, and  
can be paid for by increasing the tax  
burden of the rich.



### **ResultsPlus** Examiner Comments

This is a strong level three essay that clearly engages the question throughout and shows strong balance.



### **ResultsPlus** Examiner Tip

The quality and relevance of examples are keys to essay success.

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 ☒

It is argued that the welfare system on universal entitlements is no longer sustainable or desirable to many who live in the UK. The UK and its universal entitlements allow those who are less fortunate to <sup>have access to</sup> ~~receive~~ basic necessities. However, it can be argued against that this is costing the UK government more than it should.

Firstly, the entitlement of free health care is what defines the UK - It essentially separates this government from other with the impression of care. However, with this being said, the NHS is costing the government an extra £2bn a year with the result meaning authority cuts from other areas such as schools (education). The NHS is argued to be funded by the tax payers, however those who don't work and pay tax still benefit from it. In some cases the NHS is exploited from free prescriptions. Moreover, this goes to prove that those who work and pay taxes might find this entitlement undesirable, and costly.

Secondly, entitlements to Benefits is a major concern as it similarly costs the government a fortune. Benefits, ~~making~~ <sup>costing</sup> the government 14bn a year as those who are unemployed get funds and necessity such as housing accommodation.

in. The problems that might occur such as economic problems  
like recession mean that the government need  
money to cope at situations of distress. With the entitlements  
of Benefits, funding is redirected as a must to those  
in need and as a result hold the country economically  
back. As a result goes to show it is unsustainable.

In a society where the majority of the population makes  
a decent wage, it can be said that by the Tory government  
that people should have private health rather than relying on  
free healthcare. There have been decisions where the Tories have  
suggested to privatise the NHS, however with the majority of  
the population disagreeing thus not forcing the whole topic.  
However, by privatising the NHS private investors may  
improve its services and as a result have the government  
fund it through tax payers money thus making it  
sustainable.

However, it is then counter argued that the welfare system  
is sustainable, the NHS has been built into the UK for  
over 100 years with no problems despite the tax payers  
paying they know they have free health care and that  
their future inheritance will have free health care so it is  
considered sustainable.

To conclude, it is argued that the entitlements are unsustainable and that to many are considered undesirable due to the exploitation. But it goes to show that the welfare state ~~was~~ <sup>is</sup> only truly needed for a specific time period and will <sup>have to</sup> no longer need it in the future.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

The candidate makes clear efforts to engage sustainability but the candidate clearly seems to lack sufficient time to fully engage the question to the extent required.

Mark: 6, 6, 6, 4 = 22



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

It is critical to allow enough time to develop your essay and fully engage with the question asked.



## **Question 7**

This essay was of middling popularity but attracted more responses than economy essays sometimes have in the past, perhaps reflecting the importance of economic policy to the 2015 General Election campaign.

Most candidates recognised that both domestic and international factors were important to this question, as well as appreciating that some developments in global economics could be both empowering or constraining depending on the circumstances, with Britain's membership of the EU particularly well discussed in this regard.

Similarly, there was some dispute, and on occasion confusion, as to how the economic influence of the Bank of England related to government control although many candidates recognised the complexities of the relationship.

The level of argument over assertion was particularly important with this question and those candidates who could cite specific evidence about the role of multinational corporations or global bodies in the modern economy did better.

In terms of Synopticity very few candidates discussed the different views on completing economic theories, but equally only a relatively small number considered how Brexiteers and Remainers might view the role of the EU differently in the context of this question, or how different parties or politicians might view the degree of impact that government could have.

The weakest responses were one-sided and overly assertive, and in some cases focused entirely on one particular issue such as the government's ability to control deficits.

Middling responses tended to focus excessively on either international or domestic factors to the exclusion of the other, or alternatively to consider a range of pertinent points but fail to fully develop these and link them back to the question of government control.

The strongest responses focused on government control throughout, showing balance, and offering clear evidence to support their arguments regarding both domestic and international issues of relevance. In some cases they were able to paint a picture of a changing level of control, and in others to argue that governments had always either possessed or lacked control and continued to do so.



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 ☒

~~While many have argued that UK governments are~~

Although ~~at~~ ~~the~~ Cameron and George Osborne would argue that in terms of the economy the ~~conservative~~ current conservative government and all UK governments are able to exercise meaningful control over the economy through our reduction in the budget deficit, use of fiscal and monetary policy and control over government spending UKIP and many Eurosceptics would argue that whilst still in the EU we do not have complete control over our economy due to ~~part~~ our involvement in free trade removing UK control over imports and exports, in addition to this external shocks to the UK's economy in the past proving to be devastating such as the 2008 financial crisis.

In recent years ~~the~~ many pro conservatives could argue that under Cameron ~~the~~ UK governments have been able to exercise meaningful control over the UK economy, with policies such as austerity proving to be effective in achieving Cameron and Osborne in achieving their targets for reducing the budget deficit.

In addition to this in terms of government spending it can be seen that Cameron and Osborne were effective in implementing a budget for the UK in response to its economic climate.

In addition to this the UK has not entered into the Eurozone meaning that the UK has its own form of independent currency and is not a part of the EU's one size fits all monetary policy, therefore giving British government complete control over its own fiscal and monetary policy.

However Nigel Farage and many Europeans have gone on to argue that while we are still a member of the EU we can never have complete control over ~~our~~ our economy as

our sovereignty is over ridden and due to policies such as free trade the UK has no ~~any~~ power in putting protectionist policies or bans or trade that come in and out of the UK's economy, with ~~the~~ free movement of capital seeing major UK industries stagnate themselves elsewhere. ~~in the~~

■ In addition to this after the events of the 2008 financial ~~crisis~~ <sup>crisis</sup> ~~in the~~ <sup>Britain's</sup> lack of control over its own economy have been exposed with a crash in the housing market in the US sending the UK into a ~~down~~ a double dip recession and vast economic decline.

In conclusion I would say that while UK governments have been seen to have control on the UK economy I would argue that it is too an incredibly <sup>minute</sup> ~~minute~~ level and that there is ~~no~~ nothing UK government can do to prevent external influences on the UK economy.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is another relatively brief essay although it is less clear the candidate has run out of time, or simply not been able to fully develop their points.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

The level of detail and development of points is more important than the number – it's key to know your arguments in depth for any essay.

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 ☒

Control

Fiscal and Monetary.  
Bank of England control  
Inflation 0.5%  
Control over policy  
(spending)  
Austerity  
Quantitative easing when  
we had a liquidity  
crisis

No Control

Globalisation  
Banking Crisis 2008  
China's slow down  
EU -  
- 'Dangerous cocktail'  
Steel and oil  
- Commodity prices  
- Public opinion

The Government is able to exercise meaningful control over the economy in a number of ways.

The Government still has fiscal and monetary control, and influence the inflation rate, as well as control over policy and spending, like the current austerity measures right now or through Quantitative easing which was used during the liquidity crisis after the 2008 crash.

However due to Globalisation the government has ~~lost~~ less control over the economy with



Factors outside the UK affecting the economy such as commodity prices, oil and steel prices, the regulation that the EU sets that the UK must abide by especially with trading laws. ~~Osborne~~ Osborne has stated that the UK is affected by 'Global weather'. Factors in the UK can affect governments ability to meaningfully exercise power like public ~~opinion~~ opinion.

The UK government still has control over both fiscal and monetary policy despite being part of the EU as they are not a part of the Eurozone and set their own interest rates.

The Interest rates are currently set at a low 0.5% which has gone up from ~~what it was~~ 0.3% in March.

This has been done by the government to encourage spending and borrowing after the 2008 crash and to stimulate growth in the economy as there has been the UK longest recovery taking over 7 years.

The government also exercised control over



the economy to encourage ~~spend~~ borrowing by implementing Quantitative Easing, giving money to the banks to encourage them to lend more in an attempt to stimulate growth.

The ~~main~~ main way governments ~~exercise~~ exercise control over the economy is through policy and controlling the budget, spending and taxation.

Under the conservative government there is currently a program of austerity.

This shows governments are able to exercise meaningful power over the economy through the controlling of taxation and spending.

Osborne claims that it's through austerity measures ~~and~~, the lowering of corporation taxes ~~to~~ from 28% to 18% and increasing the tax band to 45,000 that the economy has been able to recovery with all the economic signs ~~showing~~ being positive, low unemployment which is now only 5.4%, low inflation, high investment, steady GDP and that it's due to government policy that the UK is the fastest growing economy out of the E G 7, has been able to

keep the Triple A rating and halt the deficit.

However, Osborne has missed the deficit reduction targets that the conservative government set for itself ~~in 2010~~, Osborne claims that it's due to the 'dangerous cocktail' of global ~~the~~ weather.

Global factors have limited the extent to how able the government is to exercise its power.

The ~~government~~ economy is now greatly affected by what happens in other economies. Shown ~~what~~ with commodity prices bring down prices in the UK including the supermarket war happening with companies like Lidl and Aldi bringing Tesco's to lower prices.

~~Oil prices~~ Saudi Arabia and Russia's flooding the market with oil has also meant prices have gone down.

Although Conservative have ~~been~~ frozen prices in the UK showing they can still exercise some control.

Steel prices lowering due to China also put ~~the~~ the steel industry especially in towns like Port Talbot & Ebbw Vale showing how effective

the UK is on other countries.

The government was greatly involved in the securing a buyer for the steel company showing it still ~~can~~ ~~has~~ has control over some bits of the economy.

The ~~ex~~ governments meaningful control over the economy has also been restricted due to the EU.

The EU means that the governments have less control over trading agreements and tariffs.

The UK government is not allowed to put tariffs on EU goods and is restricted on trading as negotiations on trading agreements have to go through the EU; the government can't trade as much with the BRIC and MINT countries. They also are unable to ~~then~~ bail out falling UK industries.

The UK government did however make a trading deal with China over a nuclear power plant.

The UK government can also be restricted from exercising power by the public.



Some cuts can be unpopular with the public and the government must keep <sup>the</sup> majority support. This limits what they can do, the conservative government has had to ring fence NHS ~~as~~, as well as not touch pensions and U-turn on some policy such as ~~not~~ cutting working family tax credit and disability as it proved to be too unpopular and even had backbench rebellion from conservative MPs.

In conclusion it is clear to see that the UK government can still exercise meaningful control over the economy in many ways however Global factor has caused ~~to~~ their control to be limited.

It can be seen that governments tend to ~~blame global factors~~ to emphasise the effects of global factors when the economy is doing bad and emphasises governments control when the economy is doing well.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response is strong all round but particularly strong on synopticity on a question where many scored relatively poorly on this aspect.

Mark: 10, 10, 11, 8 = 39



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Synopticity is a significant contributor to essay success; explore different views and try to specifically ascribe them to the people, parties or groups who hold them.

## **Question 8**

In contrast to question 6 this was an apparently quite straightforward question, which gave a clear premise and directly invited synopticity, and yet gained a relatively modest number of responses. This may partly reflect the reduced profile of environmental issues during the general election and its aftermath, where the economy and austerity, and therefore welfare, sparked a much higher level of debate.

Many candidates were able to effectively debate tensions and agreements within parties, between parties and, in some cases, cutting across party lines. Equally the cross-cutting nature of the topic confused some candidates into inaccuracy, for example in terms of competing party policies on Heathrow, HS2 and the Green Investment Bank.

There was wide awareness of how Cameron had shifted the environmental position of the Conservative Party, although those candidates who moved beyond the slogans to seek competing evidence in practice, performed much better.

Synoptically the question clearly invited competing views and many candidates embraced this, discussing the positions of UKIP, the Greens, and the nationalist parties as well as the Conservatives, Labour and Liberal Democrats. Fewer candidates discussed the relevant views of pressure groups, for example, or of international bodies driving some economic consensus.

The weakest responses were marred by inaccuracy, or strongly focused on general perceived party positions on the environment, without sufficient reference to specific evidence.

Middling responses either described the different party views accurately but without sufficiently engaging them with each other, or alternatively were overly focused on one side of the debate, albeit again with a good level of accuracy on the policy areas that were covered.

The strongest responses were balanced, synoptic and policy-driven, and showed good awareness of the political complexities of environmental policy where parties often disagree amongst themselves or shift, or dilute, their positions over time.



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 ☐

Environmental policy has been of great political importance across major parties, a cross party consensus has largely been formed. The main objectives are to deal with the effects of our modern world and finding sustainable alternatives to energy. There has been little difference between environmental policies of the major parties, it is argued.

The first point to agree with this is that Thatcher in 1988 made a speech to the royal society claiming that environment was of great concern, in 1989 the national rivers authority was set up. This illustrates how the conservatives made environment a key target. ~~Similarly~~ Similarly to this Blair's government followed after Britain was named the dirty man of Europe and forced to clean up it's beaches. Blair led the G8 summit on tackling climate change. This highlights a sense of cross party consensus on targetting the environment. There was also a pledge from the conservatives to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> levels back to 1990 levels, that was a success.

~~However~~ However, it can be argued that environmental policy does

differ between parties. An example of a difference in opinion is over nuclear power. During the recent Labour governments no new nuclear power stations have been built. This could suggest that they are opposed to it due to its disadvantages such as high cost and easy targets for terror attacks in a society where that risk is high. Whereas the Conservatives favour them, under the coalition they made arrangements for a new EDF nuclear station to be built and funded by the French + Chinese, however due to cost this power station at Hinkley point has been halted. This illustrates a difference in opinion between parties over strategies used to generate more energy.

Furthermore, parties are further divided over the concept of HS2 being implemented by the Conservatives. This train is to run North down to London and is favoured by the Conservatives because of their claim it'll make over 10,000 new jobs and improve business, bringing people to London. However other parties are opposed due to it wiping out hundreds of acres of forest, ~~and~~ disturbing the landscape and habitats as well as causing noise pollution to those who live nearby.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response is not only brief but also wastes precious space on very historical content which gleans little credit.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

On a contemporary issues paper focus your efforts on current and recent developments – content prior to 2000 is unlikely to gain much credit, and discussion of the policies of the Thatcher and Major governments even less so.

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 ☐

There has been an increased amount of environmental policy made by the major parties since 1997 as it has become a mainstream topic that has gained public attention. The topic of the environment in UK politics has also led to the increase in popularity of smaller parties such as the Green party as they have had an MP since 2010. I believe that there is little difference between the environmental policies of major parties.

The major parties such as the Conservatives, Labour, and Lib Dems have all started to use much more environmental policies as they have seen it as a vote winner from the great concern of the public for it to be improved. We have not just seen this with policies as for example the Conservatives changed their party logo to a tree under Cameron, and he posed with huskies in his bid to become Conservative leader,



He also pledged in 2010 that the Conservatives 'will be the greenest government ever' and also said 'vote blue, go green'.

All the major parties also pledged in 2010 to continue targets set by the new Labour government such as staying ~~at~~ in the Kyoto protocol, sticking to long term targets set from the Climate Change Act 2008, and short term targets such as the EU's 20/20/20 scheme to produce 15% of the UK's electricity from renewables by 2020. The coalition got ~~the~~ in 2010 also kept the congestion charge in London, and continued many environmental projects such as developing tidal energy which led to plans for the redevelopment of Swansea Bay, tidal power was in its infancy under Labour and would have also continued it.

The major parties also disagreed over environmental policies such as the go ahead with HS2, as it also split



The individual parties into factors such as the Conservatives MPs such as Fehi Goldsmith disagreed with it as it creates deep cuttings in the country side ruining the picturesque landscape and increasing biodiversity, ~~a~~ ~~pleasant~~ other Conservative such as George Osbourne and John Hayes suggested it needed to lift to rebalance the economy with the current north-south divide, it will create 40,000 jobs, ~~and~~ it is needed to keep the UK's infrastructure in line with other major economies as France has had high speed rail since the 1970s, and all of China's ~~at cost cost~~ has ~~then~~ got high speed rail, and they have also said it will be better for the environment in the long run as it will transfer 4.5 million flights to train and ~~reduces~~ 9 million car journeys to train, also as it is electric and produces no CO<sub>2</sub> there will be a short-term loss to the environment, but a long-term environmental and economic gain. Other parties such as the Lib Dem ~~also~~ in particular Nick Clegg and pressure groups ~~such as~~ ~~against HS2 saying it will only benefit the~~

Stop HS2 and 5/m are against HS2 saying it will only benefit the south and only the wealthy will be able to afford to use it. Other MP such as Andrew Jones have suggested it saying it will benefit the environment in the future as it will half journey times e.g. Leeds to Birmingham at from 2 hours to 57 mins.

The Conservative party is also split under the ~~the~~ potential kind answering which was asked out as some ~~say~~ Tories saying it will be beneficial for business such as Tim Yeo and it's needed to compete with Amsterdam and Frankfurt. However other conservatives such as ~~David~~ ~~David~~ David Cameron and Paul G. Goldsmith have said it's not worth it as it will create large noise and air pollution in construction and from increased planes, also it will create unnecessary strain on our infrastructure that is already old, and ~~as~~ our ~~infrastructure~~ as NHS is already under huge pressure. Lib Dem and Green MPs ~~believe~~ ~~this money should be spent elsewhere~~ ~~on~~ such as Covid-19 believe

think should be great elsewhere as we are only half way to our EU target and we will not reach it if we built a third runway, and if we did it will be too small to fit the large ~~plane~~ planes on. Because of these reasons the coalition said no to a third runway which was different to new Labour view as they gave it the go ahead under Blair.

Also under Blair New Labour allowed research into GM crops, potentially allowing them to be used and the products to be sold in the UK, however the coalition stopped this and they are not allowed to be used in the UK.

This & many other decisions have been happened because of pressure groups such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth affecting environmental policy.

Some parties have ~~the~~ different environmental policies as they believe the current policies are not severe enough, as many Lib Dem and as Farmer and Greens such as

Natasha Bennett and Andrea Lucas believe that more should be done. For example the Lib Dems want 50% of energy to come from renewables by 2050. However the Green party are split like the other major parties over nuclear energy as it ~~can~~ produces harmful toxic waste which threatens health and some countries such as George Osbourne suggested it's harmful to the environment as it produces no  $CO_2$ , it's tried and tested in countries such as France and China so we know it can be used on a large scale. However Nick & Clegg has suggested it is not worth it as they take many years to build nuclear power stations and they have a short life time. The Lib Dems have also been split over the use of biofuels with some such as Plaster's Committee suggesting they worsen food security and the land should be used for food ideas others say they are harmful as they lower the  $CO_2$  amount and use energy



to produce.

Major parties have also agreed on the contribution of developing renewable technologies and increasing the investment in them with all parties pledging green jobs and renewable energy projects such as Labour in 2010 pledging 400,000 new green jobs, ~~and~~ and the Conservatives developing White Paper on the UK's biggest wind farm projects. Also more investment in offshore wind farms.

The major parties do agree with the Conservatives Sp of long change to encourage re-cycling bins and not wasting.

In my opinion I believe that the major parties have little difference in these environmental policies as they all believe the environment needs to be improved. But they do disagree on a few of the major environmental issues, leading to different policies.





## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This argument is extensive and balanced but also, critically, refers to specific policy throughout. The structure is also very clear and readable.

Mark: 11, 11, 11, 9 = 42



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Policy knowledge is very important to gaining high marks, and understanding how different parties agree and disagree will help you score well.

## Paper Summary

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

- Divide their time roughly equally between Section A and Section B, and between the three short responses within question A.
- Explicitly define key terms, make concepts clear, and avoid ambiguity in analysis.
- Read the question carefully, then read it carefully again, and ensure that the question is being answered.
- Give roughly equal weight to the different parts of the question.
- Maintain a contemporary focus and avoid overly historical commentary. This applies particularly where a question specifies a particular time period, but even if it does not candidates should now expect to spend most of their time on post-2010 content, with 20th century material discussed only briefly, if at all.
- Endeavour to strike a 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.
- Prioritise argument over assertion, the specific over the general, and the particular groups or individuals offering synoptic arguments over 'some argue that'.
- Take care to avoid careless errors of fact.
- Ensure that sufficient balance is offered in all essay questions.

## **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.