

Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2018

GCE Government & Politics
EU Political Issues
6GP04 4A

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

Our website subject pages hold useful resources, support material and live feeds from our subject advisors giving you access to a portal of information. If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

www.edexcel.com/contactus

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

Summer 2016

Publications Code *

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Question Number	Question
1.	Explain the main reasons why people voted to leave the European Union in 2016.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should be aware that the 2016 UK vote to leave the EU was based on a variety of factors, and cannot be ascribed to a single cause.</p> <p>Factors that contributed to the 2016 UK vote to leave the European Union <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about perceived excessive immigration from EU member states, particularly new members, which could not be limited from within the EU due to the freedom of movement. • The cost of EU membership and the alternative ways in which leave voters wished this money to be spent. • The loss of political sovereignty and control to EU institutions seen as undemocratic and unresponsive to UK voters. • A perceived protest vote against a political establishment seen as out of touch, and predominantly in favour of EU membership. • A failure by the remain campaign, and arguably the Labour and Conservative party leaderships, to convince voters of the value of the EU. • A belief that many of the economic and trade advantages of EU membership could still be negotiated whilst outside the EU. • The strength of the media campaign for a leave vote. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited understanding of the main reasons why people voted to leave the European Union in 2016. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear understanding of the main reasons why people voted to leave the European Union in 2016. 	

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

Question Number	Question
2.	Why is the concept of a European Social Model controversial?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the concept of a single social model as it applies to the EU. They may make brief reference to different social models that can be seen within the EU although this is not necessary for this question.</p> <p>Ways in which the concept of a European Social Model can be seen as controversial <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There remains little agreement on what the single social model would look like • Where there is agreement on the definition of such a model it can be criticised as vague or utopian. • The Eurozone crisis showcased the dangers of a single economic approach, especially given the disparities in wealth between different member states, demonstrating that harmonisation is still far away. • A European Social Model requires a larger degree of economic and social intervention than some consider desirable. • A European Social Model could be seen as weakening national identity, and is arguably a further step towards a European federal superstate. • The recent, and possible future, expansion of the EU exacerbates these issues in that 'widening' can be seen to hinder 'deepening'. <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited understanding of the reasons why the concept of a European Social Model is controversial. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A clear understanding of the reasons why the concept of a European Social Model is controversial. 	

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

Question Number	Question
3.	Explain the role and significance of the President of the European Commission.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of the post of President of the European Commission as it operates under current treaty arrangements.</p> <p>Roles of the President of the European Commission include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are the leader and highest profile member of the Commission. • They chair weekly Commission meetings and lead in setting the Commission's policy agenda. • They are part of the wider function of the Commission as a whole, as the bureaucracy and in some sense government of the EU, and the lead body in the current Brexit negotiations. <p>Ways in which the role can be seen to be significant <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ability for the President to determine the Commission's policy agenda and all the legislative proposals it produces is particularly significant given that the Commission is the only body that can propose EU Laws. • The power of the President to allocate portfolios and to reshuffle, and in theory, dismiss commissioners, as well as setting up special taskforces such as on Brexit. • The importance of the President, together with the President of the European Council and the High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, in representing the EU abroad. • The limits to the accountability of the Commission can further be seen as enhancing the significance of the President, since they have the ability to act freely within broad limits. <p>Candidates may also creditably explain ways in which the significance of the post can be seen as limited in significance, or can vary with circumstances, although this is not essential.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of both the role and significance of the President of the European Commission. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of both the role and significance of the President of the European Commission. 	

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

Question Number	Question
4.	Why have some UK nationalist parties adopted a pro-European stance?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Nationalists in most parts of Europe, including England, tend to be hostile to the EU because it represents a loss of sovereignty. By contrast, nationalists in Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and Cornwall tend to be pro-EU because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SNP, Plaid Cymru, Sinn Fein, the SDLP and Mebyon Kernow recognise that their areas have all benefitted through an enhanced political status based the concept of 'a Europe of the Regions' which promoted subsidiarity and the further devolution of political power. • Wales and Cornwall in particular, as relatively poor regions, have received considerable regional funds dispensed by the EU, whilst Scotland's skills shortage makes the free movement of people especially beneficial. • Aside from the economic benefits Sinn Fein and the SDLP see EU membership as beneficial to the peace processes, as seen in the issues arising from the possibility of a 'hard border' after Brexit. • If Scotland or Wales were to become independent countries EU membership would provide the necessary starting point in terms of security and trade, as well as an automatic share in the EU's international 'clout'. • Nationalist parties would have less concerns about loss of sovereignty to the EU, since their nations have already lost it to the UK. • Following the Brexit vote some nationalist parties see a pro-EU position as being a path to independence within the EU – for example the SNP calls for 'indyref2' immediately following the EU referendum. This fits with these parties' wider narrative of being outward-looking and progressive. <p>Candidates are expected to discuss two or more parties in order to achieve level 3, and this will allow them to achieve the full range of marks. No credit will be given for the discussion of why some UK nationalist parties have an anti-European stance.</p> <p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of why some UK nationalist parties have adopted a pro-European stance. <p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of why some UK nationalist parties have adopted a pro-European stance. 	

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

Question Number	Question
5.	Explain how future EU expansion can be justified.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate awareness of various driving factors contributing towards this the EU's tendency to expand. They may make reference to specific transition, candidate or potential candidate nations, but this is not essential to achieving a high mark.</p>	
<p>Ways in which future EU expansion can be justified <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It increases the benefits of the single market, allowing for free trade and labour mobility over a wider area. • It increases the geo-political clout of the EU, giving it a greater ability to have an impact on global issues. • It promotes the extension of human rights and social justice to more former soviet bloc countries whilst also promoting economic development in those states. • It could be seen as providing a bulwark against increasing Russian tendencies to an aggressive foreign policy, radical Islam in the Middle East, and the differing challenges created by a varyingly interventionist or isolationist United States. • The UK's departure could be seen as creating both a void to be filled, and an imperative to demonstrate that EU membership remains an important benefit. • Those who are opposed to a federal Europe see 'widening' as putting a limitation on 'deepening' making it harder to strengthen EU institution and integrate further. 	
<p>Candidates may also approach the question from the point of view of the benefits to the candidate nations themselves, as well as to the EU. No credit will be given for the discussion of criticisms of EU expansion, except insofar as they help to elucidate its benefits.</p>	
<p>A threshold Level 2 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited understanding of how future EU expansion can be justified. 	
<p>A threshold Level 3 response will typically exhibit the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear understanding of how future EU expansion can be justified. 	

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

Question Number	Question
6.	"Unsuccessful and unreformable". Discuss this view of the Common Agricultural Policy.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness that the success, failure, and potential reform of the CAP are long-standing issues within the EU.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAP is seen as unfair by member states who have smaller agricultural sectors and so benefit less • The CAP is disliked by neo-liberals as it distorts markets, limits free trade, and prevents access to agricultural markets from developing countries; it has for example incentivised over-production and created considerable waste surplus food. • Some farmers have become dependent on CAP leading to fears of collapse in the agricultural sector if too many subsidies were reformed. • The cost of CAP has been and remains a major drain on the EU budget. • CAP reform has been attempted or discussed on a number of occasions, and the changes made have not addressed many of the key concerns. • Each member state has a veto over CAP reform and many states, and their agricultural sectors, have a vested interest in certain aspects of the policy, so significant future reform is also unlikely. <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EU is both self-sufficient in food and a large exporter, which was one aim of the CAP. • Perceived unfairness in the system could be argued either as inevitable in any government system, which can never be fair to everyone, or else as a 'price worth paying' relative to the benefits. • The EU, under CAP regulations, has much higher standards of food hygiene and quality than other countries – as seen with the 'chlorinated chicken' controversy about possible US trade following Brexit. • CAP has enabled many farmers to survive when they would otherwise have not been able to • Reforms in recent years have given greater incentives to sustainable and organic farmer, whilst the McSharry reforms built in a sliding scale of compensation to help medium and small farmers cope with the changes and future reform is still on the agenda • Since 2005, the CAP has no longer been the single greatest budget item of the EU, which was one aim of the reforms. <p>Candidates may legitimately distinguish between success and reformability, arguing for example that the policy has failed but can be reformed, or indeed that it has largely succeeded but that reform is still unlikely to succeed. This is likely to be a feature of high level responses.</p>	

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

- Limited understanding of the ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy has and has not been successful, or a clear understanding of one side of the debate.
- Limited understanding of the ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy is and is not reformable, or a clear understanding of one side of the debate.

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

- Clear understanding of the ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy has and has not been successful.
- Clear understanding of the ways in which the Common Agricultural Policy is and is not reformable.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	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
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	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
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	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
AO3	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
7.	To what extent is further EU integration still a desirable objective?
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an awareness of the ongoing debate over the extent to which the EU should or could be integrated further.</p> <p>Arguments advanced to suggest that further EU integration remains a desirable objective <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration means the pooling rather than loss of sovereignty allowing states much greater control of their affairs in practice, particularly in a globalised world. • Further integration will further strengthen the single market by simplifying both internal trade and the negotiation of external trade agreements. • A lack of full integration has caused issues within the EU, for example the lack of fiscal union to accompany monetary union which arguable exacerbated the Eurozone crisis. • Reforms to streamline the EU's practice in the light of expansion have made it more efficient and accountable and therefore better able to accommodate further integration. • Brexit may strengthen rather than weaken the EU due to the loss of the EU's 'awkward partner'. • On foreign and defence policy, further integration could be desirable due to the erratic nature of US policy under Trump. <p>Arguments advanced to suggest that further EU integration is not still a desirable objective <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration will inevitably mean the further loss of national sovereignty as the veto becomes more and more limited. • The EU retains a large democratic deficit, particularly in the Commission, and thus cannot be justified in taking control of further areas. • There is a lack of EU unity as to what further integration would look like. • The Eurozone crisis demonstrated that a 'one size fits all' model does not work and that integration has already gone too far. • Further integration could be seen as incompatible with further expansion, which might be seen as a higher priority in order to further expand the single market, and social and human rights benefits of the EU. • The UK's Brexit vote, along with the increasing growth of anti-EU movements in other member states, demonstrates the strength of the public backlash against EU integration. <p>Candidates may also creditably argue that EU integration was <i>never</i> a desirable objective, although this is not essential to a high level response.</p>	

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

- Limited arguments and evidence of the ways in which further EU integration is still a desirable objective.
- Limited arguments and evidence of the ways in which further EU integration is not still a desirable objective.

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

- Clear arguments and evidence of the ways in which further EU integration is still a desirable objective.
- Clear arguments and evidence of the ways in which further EU integration is not still a desirable objective.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

AO2	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	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
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	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
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	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
AO3	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

Question Number	Question
8.	'The Lisbon Treaty reforms have not made a significant difference in practice to the EU institutions'. Discuss.
Indicative content (<i>this is not an exhaustive account of relevant points</i>)	
<p>Candidates should demonstrate an understanding of the main provisions of the Lisbon Treaty, which may be used as examples to support their substantive arguments.</p> <p>Arguments advanced in support of the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The treaty did not create or abolish any existing institutions, did it alter the fundamental governmental structure of the Union. It only altered the powers and status of some of the institutions. • Many of the actual changes to institutions were cosmetic – for example the post of President of the European Council could be seen as having relatively little power (this proposal having been watered down from that in the draft EU Constitution) • Its main focus was to streamline and simplify institutional processes which were designed for a club of six but have been used for a club of 27, rather than to fundamentally alter them – for example the ordinary legislative procedure is quite similar to 'co-decision'. • The treaty did little to increase the democratic accountability of institutions, particularly the unelected Commission. • The most significant policy areas not controlled by EU institutions remained outside largely their jurisdiction or subject to a national veto: for example Human Rights and Foreign Policy, Defence, Taxation etc. <p>Arguments advanced against the premise of the question <u>may</u> include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It increased the use of QMV within the Council of Ministers, making it more federal in nature. • It created the post of High Representation for Foreign Affairs and Security within the Commission, and significantly amended the post of President of the European Council. • Under the new ordinary legislative procedure it significantly extended the number of areas where the European Parliament shares decision making with the Council of Ministers. The Parliament also gained parity in approving the EU annual budget, and a role in electing the Commission President, giving the Parliament much more say in EU policy, legislation and spending. • By increasing the involvement of the EU in areas such as justice and home affairs, it extended the remit of the European Court of Justice. • The treaty granted the European Central Bank and the European Council the status of official EU institutions, confirming their significance and potentially paving the way for them to be given further powers in future. • The general increase in accountability under the treaty has affected all institutions in term of the EU culture, and well as effecting some more directly. 	

Candidates should be credited insofar as they focus on the extent to which reform has impacted on the institutions, rather than on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the treaty or the extent to which it represented a general transformation of the EU.

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

- Limited understanding of the arguments and evidence that the Lisbon Treaty reforms have not made a significant difference in practice to the EU institutions.
- Limited understanding of the arguments and evidence that the Lisbon Treaty reforms have made a significant difference in practice to the EU institutions.

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

- Clear understanding of the arguments and evidence that the Lisbon Treaty reforms have not made a significant difference in practice to the EU institutions.
- Clear understanding of the arguments and evidence that the Lisbon Treaty reforms have made a significant difference in practice to the EU institutions.

AO1	Knowledge and understanding
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak knowledge and understanding of relevant institutions, processes, political concepts, theories or debates
AO2	Intellectual skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	Good to excellent ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations

Level 2 (5-8 marks)	Limited to sound ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to analyse and evaluate political information, arguments and explanations
A02	Synoptic skills
Level 3 (9-12 marks)	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
Level 2 (5-8 marks)	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
Level 1 (0-4 marks)	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
A03	Communication and coherence
Level 3 (7-9 marks)	Good to excellent ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making good use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 2 (4-6 marks)	Limited to sound ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making some use of appropriate vocabulary
Level 1 (0-3 marks)	Very poor to weak ability to construct and communicate coherent arguments, making little or no use of appropriate vocabulary

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UA032365 Summer 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit our website
www.edexcel.com

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

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

