

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE in  
Government & Politics (6GP04/4A)

Paper 4A: EU Political Issues

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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).

## **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)

Summer 2016

Publications Code 6GP04\_4A\_1606\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

Question Number	
1.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the tensions within the issue of the Commission's accountability.</p> <p>Arguments that the EU is held accountable may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The European Parliament, which is directly democratically accountable, elects the President of the Commission.</li> <li>• The European Parliament is also able to reject or dismiss the whole Commission, e.g. over corruption allegations in 1999, and in practice individual commissioners may be reshuffled or withdrawn to prevent this.</li> <li>• Commissioners and the Commission President must appear regularly before the European Parliament to account for their actions and must, after each election, be scrutinised and approved as a team.</li> <li>• The European Parliament and the Council of Ministers can reject Policy Initiatives from the Commission.</li> </ul> <p>Limitations on this accountability may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no direct accountability to the electorate, and a lack of public and media interest in their role.</li> <li>• Individual commissioners cannot be dismissed or rejected by the EU Parliament.</li> <li>• There is an imbalance of resources whereby the commission has much higher staffing and funding than those tasked with holding them to account.</li> <li>• Although commissioners must account for their actions, in practice they operate freely with their portfolio with little check on their work or decisions.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of ways in which the European Commission is held accountable and the limitations to this accountability; or a clear understanding of 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 understanding of ways in which the European Commission is held accountable and the limitations to this accountability.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></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><i>Level 2</i></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><i>Level 1</i></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	
2.	
<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, UK pressure groups work within the EU.</p> <p>Ways in which UK Pressure Groups target EU institutions (how) may 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 trade unions – and to try to influence the future direction and legislation of the EU.</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>• Many Pressure Groups sub contracts their Brussels work to large lobbying firms who are more familiar with the complex policy-making process.</li> <li>• Pressure groups increasingly target the European Parliament, with a particular focus on those MEPs working as rapporteurs (given their responsibility for drafting committee reports)</li> <li>• Pressure groups have shown themselves increasingly willing to use the European Court of Justice, effectively acting as whistle-blowers against their own national governments.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons why UK pressure groups target EU decision makers may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The increasing degree of formal powers held by the EU, and the proportion of legislation made by them, arguably makes the EU government much more influential than the UK Government in some areas.</li> <li>• A number of policy areas, such as the environment and economy, are increasingly global in scope, and national governments have decreasing control over them in practice.</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> <li>• The general logic of targeting multiple access points in the hope of influencing at least one of them.</li> <li>• The level of grant funding potentially available from the EU for Pressure Groups to advance their aims.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of specific ways in which UK pressure groups target EU institutions.</li> <li>• Limited understanding of reasons why UK pressure groups target EU institutions.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of specific ways in which UK pressure groups target EU institutions.</li> </ul>	

- Clear understanding of reasons why UK pressure groups target EU institutions.

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<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	
3.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Neo-functionalism is a theory of integration that greater integration can be achieved, and resistance to integration overcome, by creating conditions that make greater integration more attractive or semi-inevitable, particularly by developing integration within specific sectors to stimulate spill-over into other areas.</p> <p>Implications of neo-functionalism for European integration <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A general trend towards greater integration in a step-by-step process of gradual and incremental, but almost inevitable, increasing powers given to the EU.</li> <li>• Greater harmonisation of technical standards between states caused by increasing trade (technical spill over).</li> <li>• A 'domino effect' in terms of areas of competency as one economic sector becomes more integrated, it makes sense to integrate another, related, sector, e.g. transport integration leads logically to infrastructure integration (functional spill over).</li> <li>• Political forces, usually pressure groups, building coalitions to ensure that they enjoy the same advantages as their counterparts in other member states whilst business campaigns to ensure that their competitors must suffer the same restrictions. This gives the institutions greater legitimacy leading to increased supranational oversight (political spill-over)</li> <li>• As a result of these factors, a federal superstate may be seen as the ultimate inevitable consequence of neo-functionalism.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of the nature of neo-functionalism.</li> <li>• Limited understanding of the implications of neo-functionalism for European integration.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of the nature of neo-functionalism.</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the implications of neo-functionalism for European integration.</li> </ul>	



LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></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><i>Level 2</i></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><i>Level 1</i></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	
4.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the post of President of the European Council (sometimes known as the President of the European Union) as amended by the Treaty of Lisbon.</p> <p>The role of the President can be seen in both administrative terms chairing meetings and ensuring the smooth running of the European Council's body and policies and seeking consensus – and in political terms – as 'leader of the EU'.</p> <p>Ways in which the role might be seen to be significant may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The perception of the President as a potential 'President of Europe' who can speak for the whole of the EU.</li> <li>• The lack of a clearly defined division of the President's responsibility could be seen as paving the way for a stronger President to expand their role – as for example strong Prime Ministers in the UK have done. Van Rompuy, for example, called more regular meeting of the European Council, arguably expanding its role into a cabinet-style institution.</li> <li>• Similarly the President's profile and character in relation to their major 'rivals' as EU representatives, in particular the President of the Commission and the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, could also have a major impact on the post's significance.</li> <li>• The role of President is particularly significant during major crises – for example Van Rompuy chaired meetings on the economic crisis and provided strategic guidance to member states on economic issues, whilst Tusk has worked to promote a unified European response to Russian's intervention in the Ukraine.</li> </ul> <p>It is essential to achieving high marks that candidates directly engage with 'significance' as well as 'role' – merely descriptive answers are unlikely to score highly. Answers that confuse the role of President of the European Council with that of President of the European Commission, or any other role, are unlikely to escape Level 1.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of the role of the President of the European Council.</li> <li>• Limited understanding of the significance of the President of the European Council.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of the role of the President of the European Council.</li> <li>• Clear understanding of the significance of the President of the European Council.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<p><b><i>Level 3</i></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><i>Level 2</i></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><i>Level 1</i></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	
5.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidate should demonstrate an understanding that justice and home affairs, previously known as ‘the third pillar’ of the EU, are an area of increasing interest for the EU, with their influence expanding in recent years particularly since the Lisbon Treaty.</p> <p>Ways in which this can be seen (<u>how</u>) <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Schengen agreement was the first main move into justice and home affairs, initiating genuine freedom of movement for persons by abolishing controls at internal borders while adopting measures of external border controls, visa policy, and judicial and police cooperation.</li> <li>• Issues such as judicial cooperation in criminal matters and police cooperation, are now under similar rules to the single market and, consequently, subject to the judicial review of the European Court of Justice.</li> <li>• The introduction of the European Arrest Warrant, valid through the EU, from 2004 with expanding use since then.</li> <li>• The adoption of an EU counter-terrorism strategy in 2005.</li> <li>• The Charter of Fundamental Rights, legally binding since the Lisbon Treaty, sets out rights and freedoms in aspects such as dignity, freedom, equality, solidarity, citizens’ rights and justice.</li> </ul> <p>Reasons for this expansion (<u>why</u>) <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperation in justice and home affairs could be argued to follow logically from the single market and common approach in other policy areas.</li> <li>• The growing levels of international crime, in particular trafficking in drugs and people and international financial fraud, which requires a ‘joined up approach’.</li> <li>• The growing need to tackle terrorism at an international level since 9/11.</li> <li>• The recognition that extradition procedures were cumbersome, whilst EU countries had sufficiently similar justice systems to justify making them faster and more efficient with the removal of barriers such as ‘double criminality’ in serious cases.</li> <li>• The desire to consolidate and codify the various rights and freedoms set out in different EU documents.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of specific ways in which the EU has involved itself in justice and home affairs.</li> <li>• Limited understanding of reasons why the EU has involved itself in justice and home affairs.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of specific ways in which the EU has involved itself in justice and home affairs.</li> <li>• Clear understanding of reasons why the EU has involved itself in justice and home affairs.</li> </ul>	

LEVELS	DESCRIPTORS
<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	
6.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness that, in addition to the rise of UKIP, anti-EU feeling in the UK remains represented by a variety of individuals and factions from across the political spectrum.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The significance of the current EU referendum with UKIP, as well as prominent figures in other parties, campaigning for a 'leave' vote</li> <li>• The increasing electoral success of UKIP, particularly in European Elections, winning 11 MEPs in the 2009 elections and 24 in 2014, followed by the defections of Conservative MPs and subsequent by-elections in late 2014.</li> <li>• The increasing shift of the Conservative Party to a more Eurosceptic position, which was elected with an overall majority on a platform of a renegotiation followed by an, in-out, referendum.</li> <li>• The increasing public concerns over the impact of the Eurozone crisis and the effects of expansion on immigration.</li> <li>• The poor election results suffered by the Lib Dems, the most pro-EU mainstream party, in both 2014 after the Clegg-Farage debates and 2015.</li> <li>• The election of Corbyn as Labour leader who, despite his official 'remain' position holds a more Eurosceptic 'old Labour' position based on a perception of the EU as a 'capitalist club' and whose position on a referendum remains to be seen.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outright anti-EU parties still hold little representation in the UK Parliament.</li> <li>• All the traditional major parties, as well as most of the Nationalist parties, are campaigning for a 'remain' vote, and are united in their continuing support for retaining EU membership, albeit in different forms and to different degrees.</li> <li>• The growing popularity of UKIP in particular could be ascribed to factors other than the EU, including a protest vote or continuing economic challenges or an 'anti-establishment' backlash.</li> <li>• The Liberal Democrats in particular staked out a much more overtly pro-Europe campaign during the 2014 European elections, suggesting that there may be a 'fight-back' by EU proponents.</li> <li>• Euroscepticism has arguably been fuelled by the clear anti-EU majority within the media, which influences but does not necessarily represent public opinion.</li> </ul> <p>Comparisons of the level of pro or anti EU feeling with other European countries are creditable.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of the ways in which anti-EU ideas now influence UK Party Policy and the ways in which they do not; <u>or</u> clear understanding of one side of the debate.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of the ways in which anti-EU ideas now influence UK Party Policy and the ways in which they do not.</li> </ul>	

<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>AO2</b>	<b>Synoptic skills</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i> (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><i>Level 2</i> (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><i>Level 1</i> (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>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i> (7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i> (4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i> (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	
7.	
<b>Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)</b>	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the ongoing debate over whether or not the EU is or should be federal.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supranationalism, and therefore federalism, has been extended in recent years, with the extension of QMV and the reduction of the veto.</li> <li>• The ECJ is also a truly supranational institution with the power to overrule national courts and with an expanding role, including into home affairs.</li> <li>• The Lisbon Treaty moved more decisions away from national governments, changing the role and powers of key institutions.</li> <li>• The EU has increasingly acquired 'the trappings of a nation state' including a currency and President, as well a 'constitution' and 'foreign secretary' under other names.</li> <li>• The principle of 'subsidiarity' is akin to federalism – institutionalising the taking decisions at different levels of government.</li> <li>• Arguably, this has moved the EU more towards its own brand of Euro-federalism, where member states share sovereignty with supranational organisations, which could be seen as similar to the US model.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The institutions of the EU are still essentially intergovernmental in nature and attempts to make the EU more federal have failed, e.g. aspects of the Constitution Treaty.</li> <li>• There are still a number of 'gaps' in EU control of areas traditionally run by states, such as tax harmonisation, criminal law, defence and much of foreign policy.</li> <li>• The euro has not fully integrated the economies of Europe as not all member states have joined the Eurozone, whilst the zone itself saw a lack of supranational direction in response to the Euro-crisis.</li> <li>• 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 and could exercise its right to leave.</li> <li>• Enlargement has also prevented the EU from becoming federal as reforms have focused on how to make decision making smoother.</li> <li>• There also remains a lack of consensus on the European social model versus the free market model, inhibiting the feasibility of greater supranationalism.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of the ways in which the EU can be seen to be a federal super state and the ways in which it cannot; <u>or</u> clear understanding of one side of the debate.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of the ways in which the EU can be seen to be a federal super state and the ways in which it cannot.</li> </ul>	

<b>AO1</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>AO2</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>AO2</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>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(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	
8.	
<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. They may make reference to different social models that can be seen within the EU, e.g. Anglo-Saxon, Continental, Nordic/Scandinavian, Mediterranean.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Social Chapter and the commitment towards social justice represent a significant stride towards a common, and more Nordic, social model.</li> <li>• European Objective One and Convergence funding has successfully narrowed the economic and social gap in a number of countries and areas, making for a more consistent social model.</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>• Increasing integration on a range of issues, including foreign policy, welfare and taxation, make a single social model more desirable, as differences and disputes in these areas stem from social differences</li> <li>• Those who argue from the neo-functionalist view, that there will be a continuing creeping federalism, might contend that this process also makes a common social model inevitable.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There remains a variety of different social models that are still clearly identifiable within the EU.</li> <li>• Equally there remains 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 arguably halted any progress made towards a single social model, as former Eastern bloc states arguably have very different social models from Western Europe.</li> <li>• The Eurozone crisis showcased the dangers of a single economic approach, demonstrating that harmonisation is still far away.</li> <li>• The EU is experiencing increasing Euro-scepticism, stemming in part from a perceived 'one size fits all' approach to many issues.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited understanding of the ways in which the EU has brought its member states closer to a single European Social Model and the ways in which it has not; <u>or</u> clear understanding of one side of the debate.</li> </ul> <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear understanding of the ways in which the EU has brought its member states closer to a single European Social Model and the ways in which it has not.</li> </ul>	

<b>AO1</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>AO2</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>AO2</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>AO3</b>	<b>Communication and coherence</b>
<b><i>Level 3</i></b> <b>(7-9 marks)</b>	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 2</i></b> <b>(4-6 marks)</b>	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
<b><i>Level 1</i></b> <b>(0-3 marks)</b>	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

