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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The questions were structured to encourage a contemporary approach, although this did not prevent some over-reliance on historical content, particularly with regard to law and order policy, where some candidates remain too fond of the policies of the Blair and even Major governments.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 argue 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.
It is argued by economists that there is a direct link between unemployment and growth. The UK government always seems to achieve economic growth, especially following the 2007/8 crash. One way in which the recent coalition government sought to reduce unemployment was through the tackling of youth unemployment. They scrapped Labour’s 5% target for more in higher education and sought to promote apprenticeship schemes instead. Such as those with the E4C and JLR in the Worcestershire area, providing young people the necessary skills to fill jobs here in the UK. Reducing the structural unemployment we face as a country. The reason one government has done this is to allow them to target the dependency culture from a young age by having less young claiming jobseeker’s 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 do this was by: axing DLA to GCPS and making it harder to claim the benefits through Guinnessey weekly meetings before receiving the benefit, making it harder to claim jobs, and that more must be done to reduce the number of unemployed. This was coupled with...
a raising of the personal allowance threshold in 2011 to £10,000 to further provide incentives 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. 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 and 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 austerity measures taken in government in 2010 following the 2008/9 recession. Much of this unemployment come from young unemployment as they did not have the necessary skills for jobs or experience. The government achieved a reduction in unemployment through promoting apprenticeships and forming schemes like the NCS schemes. To provide such real 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 previous coalition government achieved low unemployment reaching an unemployment rate of 5.1% by the time they left office. Knowing unemployment improved the budget deficit position by helping people have enough money saved from cuts in jobseekers payments and money gained through an increase in tax revenue born through direct tax like income tax and indirect tax like VAT.

Recent governments faced high unemployment levels following the 2008/9 recession. 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 promoting apprenticeships and forming schemes like the NCS schemes to provide such real 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 previous coalition government achieved low unemployment reaching an unemployment rate of 5.1% by the time they left office. Knowing unemployment improved the budget deficit position by helping people save enough money saved from cuts in jobseekers payments and money gained through an increase in tax revenue born 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 tracking by the coalition and current Conservatives is expected to create 64,000 jobs and bring in £37bn of investment.

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

Examiner Tip
Linking each 'why' to a specific 'how' can be a very effective way of tackling this kind of question.
Recent governments have sought to limit unemployment through the New Deal and Workfare schemes, the ESA reforms and the benefit cap.

Fifthly, Blair was determined to 'make work pay' due to criticisms that Labour were unable to tackle welfare dependency. So, in order to fulfil the electoral imperative and win the votes of the middle classes, a tougher stance was taken on unemployment in the form of the New Deal. This linked benefit with work and training schemes, implying people to undertake work placements in order to receive benefit and combat idleness. This was replaced by the Workfare scheme by the coalition, where agencies sought to find people jobs. But, this has been criticised on the basis that it made it easier to prioritise easier cases, since the payment for these agencies was linked to success.
In both cases, these policies were designed to tackle dependency.

Secondly, the Conservative government reforms 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 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...
The material covered here is relevant but it quite narrowly focused on benefits, and the ‘why’ aspect is quite repetitive.

Examiner Comments

‘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 it is 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 crime is falling, this contradicts with the fact that police 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 and crime survey 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 police and crime survey results asks 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 "serious" which impact on the levels of crime committed. This I believe is the largest factor contributing to
high levels of controversy amongst crime statistics as people understand the police have the ability to change the amount of crimes committed by changing the meaning and definition of words.

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.

Examiner Tip

Make your examples detailed and specific as you can, especially where the question specifically says 'using examples'.
High UK crime statistics, including reoffending rates (on average 32%), show that prisons do not work. It is 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 of the reasons that prison reform has been called for.
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.

Examiner Comments
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.

Examiner Tip
"Results Plus"
"It has also been said that too many custodial sentences are being given, and that community sentences are being used less. It would be more widely used if sentences of a closer term were more often given. The number of crimes that were committed. It should also help battle the overcrowding issue in prisons."
**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.

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
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.

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 pay, 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.

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.

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 Will Michael Gove being the main most notable Education Secretary during this time his effect on academy law considered divine with fortes such as cherished autonomy and an increasing of students. However negatives such as a Two-Tier System are shown.

With Gove’s policy on academies a huge positive lies that the academies were given devolved autonomy. Such autonomy was given over the budget until Care Standards from the Department of Education removed local authorities from the demand. The academies also have greater control over the hiring and dismissal of staff, leading to the poor performing staff or those 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 to decide the best method of hiring staff which suits their academy.
Secondly, another positive on academies is seen with the freedom to drive up the standards of schools. Academies are institutions of education. As the academies have control of their own budget, they are able to choose the curriculum they will teach and argue that the academies will be more inclined to raise this money for in certain areas and subjects to excel in this allowing them to improve their standards for the students.

However, one issue with Gove's policy is that it can create a two-tier system. This means that 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 concerning 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 is difficult to resolve as the policy to establish more failing schools to become academies and with more Secretaries of Education Nicki Morgan's proposals to benefit all schools to become academies by 2020 have been met with resistance as some schools do benefit from local authority funding. This means the academies' academy policies greatest positive in fact can be negative.
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

Try to avoid rushing your stronger points at the end – they can make the different 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.
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 wind farms in the countryside as an alternative supply of extra energy. The reason being is that CO₂ 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 exceed a certain quota. As a result to meet these expectations, the government have worked on more solar and tidal energy as a way of reducing the melting energy.
The UK government in history have had a problem with finding locations to produce energy efficiently without disrupting local residents from ideal wind farms. With that being said the UK have had to take into consideration of these accounts and have sought increase the diversity of energy supply. It forms solar panels on top of residents homes. By allow residents to have solar panels this allows for an increase of it and that growers may purchase energy from the locals thus making this option valuable.

**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.

**Examiner Tip**

Keep all content tightly focused on the question – wandering from it loses time and gains no marks.
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 government has taken many different actions to reduce the use of fracking. Fracking involves a drill going into the earth and then turning at a 90° angle and drilling...
Vertically, this course focuses on either side of the drink and drink gap to better release. There has been known as the "Path for God." The gap is a new source of energy that can be used better as an alternative to coal.

Fracking has been used because it is a new, larger source of energy than previous alternatives such as coal. It has a larger supply and will last as long. Furthermore, it causes much less emissions than coal and will therefore not damage the ozone layer and function as a cleaner, more environmentally friendly alternative. The Conservative government is trying to reduce emissions in a green and 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 putting the other few sources of energy in perspective therefor it will never win as one of the other reasons we have chosen to use this form of energy supply to meet.
The candidate shows clear awareness of the both why and how, effectively linking them and providing accurate policy examples.

Mark: 14

Examiner Comments

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.
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 ☑

Explain the way 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 9/11 terrorist attack, there was a large consensus on anti-terrorism with the political parties. Opposition New Labour government 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 terrorists to go around the 90-day detention.
The coalition government also agreed to these law and order policies, by following through these policies and increasing power to stop major unrest and political debates.

the major parties also agree on law and order policy, concerning policies, unless the government is new towards 27 point plan, followed by new labour increased power to stop and reach, neighbour hood watch etc. then followed by increase in research and the introduction of policing commissioners.

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

**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 X Question 2 X Question 3 X Question 4 X Question 5 X

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 mosquitos.

In recent years we have witnessed an ever increasing political 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 Protection Bill, which although faced opposition, ultimately supported the same ideal.

There has also been a widespread political consensus on the way 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 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 politicise the police force, ultimately all of the major parties agree with similar principles.

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

Mark: 12

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 desirably 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.
In recent years, there has been a universal entitlement in many aspects, often on the basis of affordability. Yet, it is seen that the tax as 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 cost of it. Spending on welfare has consistently been the biggest component of government spending in recent years. It is clear that universal benefits made it spendy even greater, as key goes to everybody. Per condition you want demonstrated for key was willing to cause universal entitlement on an needability basis. By did this by making child benefit was tested. Following this reform, in order to receive child benefits, some form of child benefit to your household income would have to be below £60,000. Indeed, child benefit begins to taper off for household with income of over £50,000. Researchers...
Judging such reform by Spix and West is simply isn't affordable to fund out child benefit for every single child across the UK. It was very expensive, they have elected on a pledge to cut the budget deficit by making this a policy. Furthermore, liberals to conservatives are always committed to lowering the role played by the welfare state. It is better that it isn't done that the government should pay child benefit on a universal basis, and it means that to cost funding to be covered by general taxation. It is clear that tax is largely paying for services which the Conservative Party regards as necessary. Some concerns were raised as to whether the core Conservative principle is that of family values, and whether by withdrawing the universal element of child benefit, they can to some extent preserving these values. Fortunately, the principle of widespread welfare isn't compatible with the policy of austerity. It is clear that to public support austerity, and by the act but it would have been an outright majority in 2015, and the figures revealed not to believe to serve very faithfully this pledge made to be electric and moving.
originally, it can be said that a
unions state isn't desirable because it
helps those who don't need to help.
In fact, to a millionaire is entitled to a
passion, funded by the state, one job for 67 is
completely unjustifiable. They simply don't need to
rely, and it is less well off people who
are funded. Such policies through general taxation,
while, certainly the unions efficient for state pensions
would clearly make even more sense for tax cuts.
Even the Labour Party under Tony Blair, to good
fortune, has had suspicions who it can be
unions welfare else be fact try
introduced to minimum basic guarantee to
pensions. This welfare means tested system, only
the poorest pensioners could be given more assistance
for the wealthy. It is clear that in economy
to unions ensures, one can be close to
"ideals" these in real. Indeed it could be
said that much of the "bureaucratic giants" which
act on core principles of the welfare state,
suggest that a unions welfare state is in
the ideal. A giant of extent, which refers to
It's my view that a larger delinquency is at the heart of this. It doesn't help if political theory
helps to make us only aware of social excursions and injustices. We need to address the root
causes of these issues. It is clearly necessary to consider the social, economic, and political
factors that contribute to this. In the UK, for example, the need for more
education and support systems is crucial. It is costly, but necessary for our
economy and society to thrive. We need to work together to
create a better future for all.
create by me too. For the next 3 years. Additionally, try to even spread to a more even subsidy, duty tax living in social housing to pay a tax on income benefit by hours. This was a popular policy in others to equal taxes. Don't happy subsidies. Social housing duty recipients are due to the £ 3 comfort level of being home a excess in space. Ultimately, though, the cut created on the basis of affordability. It is clear that had even cuts wouldn't have been necessary if it wasn't for the increase in other cases, mainly pensions. Before, it is clear there was not one cut as a result of a reduced welfare state is to cut of other reasons, namely pensions. These cuts that can arise are originally due to one of the most important principles of a welfare state for many universal entitlement. To spare room subsidy was a challenge to this principle of equality, initially my view of social housing was forced out of my head. From an ideological point of view, these cuts are
Moreover, it could be said that a universal welfare state is costly and still affordable, as it can be paid for by increases in general taxation. By 2015 it was being funded by the current Labour party under Jeremy Corbyn. He is committed to only austerity and believe it is of the welfare state. It belies the belief that it is 'indeed possible for a universal welfare state to cancer, whilst still having a welfare state that protects the most vulnerable in society. He would point to all of the tax cuts made by the current and the current Conservative government. In 2015 to run up to 2025, the Labour party proposed a pension tax or additional tax revenue in order to maintain the welfare state. Furthermore, to move of the coalition to cut the additional rate of income tax from 50% to 45% in 2012 attracted criticism.
As it is slowly followed by growing to criminal decent from child theft. Initially, we've been confused if it wasn't for the cat. Furthermore, criminal ability can be detected as debatable as to care using to administer.

Finally, it could be said that the fact a criminal would state is indeed still debatable do it all to least my of ensuring that people don't live in rent or in need. It is because of having been tested and is often elected people from applying. It's very a criticism of colours minimum income guarantee for pensions of any people who were entitled to everyone else's duty for its. They simply didn't understand how to use it or that it could be used entitled to. As a part of the reason that to conservatives have been committed to nicely universal entitlements it would to pensions, refer to increasing means testing in tons of persons. This is known by it does not help to children to minimum income guarantee in terms of triple lock system old.
news that it proposes all be better protected. Though the triple lock system of pensions will rise by hotter in government of 2.5% every year to inflation. It is clear that this is partly a new idea. It will please all the politicians. But the first to see if there will be added new keen to turn out out anti-trade and before it makes sense to.

In conclusion, it is clear that given water some conditions of existing that universal welfare state simply isn't affordable. Despite this, it is for the foreseeable future or desirable enough to universal entitlement in some sectors in the position of welfare and social pensions. Overall this debate is now emerging in actors selling long-term election rail. The idea of the state paying and be maintained that it is affordable, and can be paid for by ensuring tax burden of. Then.
This is a strong level three essay that clearly engages the question throughout and shows strong balance.

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 [x]  Question 7  Question 8 [x]

It is argued that the welfare system on universal entitlement 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 receive basic necessities. However, it can be argued against that this is costing the UK government more than it should.

Firstly, the entitlement to free health care is what defines the UK. It essentially separates this government from others with the impression of care. However, with this being said, the NHS is costing the government an extra £2bn a year with the results meaning authority cuts from other areas such as schools (education). The NHS is argued to be funded by the tax payers to in return 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, such as unemployment benefits, have cost the government £4bn a year as those who are unemployed lose funds and necessity such as housing allowances.
Problems that might occur such as economic problems such as recession mean that the government need money to cope at times of distress. With the entitlement of benefits, funding is redirected as a must to block in need and as a result hold the country economically back. As a result gives 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 occasions where the Tories have suggested to privatise the NHS, however with the majority of the population disagreeing this raises the whole topic. However, by privatising the NHS priors invested may improve on services and as a result have the government finding it through tax payer money thus making it sustainable.

However, it is then counter argued that the welfare system is sustainable, the NHS has been built into the life for our 100 years with no problems despite the tax payers paying they know they have free health care and that their future welfare will have free health care so it is considered sustainable.
to conclude, it is argued that the entitlements are unsustainable and that too many are considered undesirable due to the exploitation. But it goes to show that the welfare state only truly needed for a specific time period and will no longer need it in the future.

 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

 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 Bremainers 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 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 ☒

Although 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 reliance in the budget deficit, use of fiscal and monetary policy and control over the government spending. UKIP and many Eurosceptics would argue that while still in the EU, we do not have complete control over our economy, due to our involvement in free trade, removing UK control over import and export. 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, many pro-conservatives would argue that under Cameron, UK governments have been able to exercise meaningful control over the UK economy, with policies such as austerity proving to be effective in aiding 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 boost for the UK in response to its economic climate.

In addition to this, the UK has not entered into the eurozone meaning it 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 governments complete control over its own fiscal and monetary policy.

However, Nigel Farage and many Eurosceptics have gone on to argue that while we are still a member of the EU, we can never have complete control over our economy.
In addition to these events, the UK was also affected by the 2008 financial crisis. The country's exposure to a crisis in the housing market in the US sent the UK into a double-dip recession and a slow economic decline.

In conclusion, I would say that while UK governments have been seen in some conflicts in the UK economy, I would argue that it is too an inordinately minute level and that there is nothing the UK government can do to prevent external influences on the UK economy.

---

**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.

**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.
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 influences 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 control over the economy.

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 influences 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 control over the economy.
Factors outside the UK effecting 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. George Osborne has stated that the UK is effecting by Global weather. Factors in the UK can effect governments ability to meaningfully exercise power like public 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 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's largest recovery taking over 7 years. The government also exercised control over
the economy to encourage growth by implementing Quantitative Easing, giving money to the banks to encourage them to lend more in an attempt to stimulate growth.

The main way governments 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 government are able to exercise meaningful power over the economy through controlling taxation and spending. Osborne claims that it's through austerity measures and the lowering of corruption that the economy has been able to recover with all the economic signs 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 G7, has been able to
However, Osborne has raised the deficit reduction targets that the Conservative government set for itself. Osborne claims that it's due to the "dangerous cocktail" of global weather.

Global factors have limited the extent to which the government is able to exercise its power. The government economy is now greatly affected by what happens in other economies. Shown with commodity prices bring down prices in the UK, including the supermarket war happening with companies like Lidl and Aldi forcing 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 frozen prices in the UK showing they can still exercise some control.

Steel prices lowering due to China also put the steel industry especially in towns like Port Talbot & Scunthorpe 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 has control over some bits of the economy.

The 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 regulations 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 their 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 majority support. This limits what they can do. The Conservative government has had to ring-fence NHS funding as well as not touch pensions and U-turn on some policy such as cutting working family tax credit and disability. It was proud to be unpopular and even had backbench rebels 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 factors have caused their control to be limited.

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

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

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.
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 the 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 to this Blair’s government followed after Britain was named the duty man of Europe and forced to clean up its beaches. Blair led the G8 summit on tackling climate change. This highlights a sense of cross party consensus on targeting the environment. There was also a pledge from the Conservatives to reduce CO2 levels back to 1990 levels, that was a success.

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 Conservative favour them, under the Coalition they made arrangements for a new EDF nuclear station to be built and funded by the French and 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 will 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, disturbing the landscape and habitats as well as causing noise pollution to those who live nearby.
This response is not only brief but also wastes precious space on very historical content which gleans little credit.

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 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 ☒

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 been in power 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 started to use much more environmental policies as they have seen it as a vote winner from the general consensus of the public for it to be improved. We have not just been left with policies on for example the Conservatives changed their party logo to a tree under Common / 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 "we bleu, go green!"

All the major parties also pledged
in 2010 to continue targets set
by the previous Labour government such as
staying 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 Conservatives got this in
2010, also kept the commitment
to change in London, and continued
many environment projects such as developing
tidal energy which led to plans for
the redevelopment of Sizewell bay, tidal
power near in the infamy under labour
and could have also continued it.

The major parties also disposed over
environmental policies such as the go
ahead with HS2, as it also split
The individual policies into policies such as the
Congregations Act and the Fox Goldsmith
draftsman with it or it creates deep
cuttings in the countryside - ruining the
picturesque landscape and necessary
biodiversity, as others. Other Conservative and as
George Osborne and John Hayes suggested it
needed to fall to reduce the economy
will the current oil - related decline,
it will create 40,000 jobs, and it is
needed to keep the UK's infrastructure in line
with other major economies as those have
been lost yard and since 1970 and
all of China's current cost has been yet
high yard will, and they have also
said it will be better for the country
in the long run as it will benefit
4.5 million frights to train and
9 million car journeys to train, also
as it is electric and produces no CO2.
There will be a short - term loss
to the country, but a long - term
enormous and economic gain. Other
parties such as the Lib Dems and in
particular Nick Clegg and pressure groups such as
against HS2 campaigning I will only benefit the
Stop HS2 and 51m 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 Turner have supported it saying it
will benefit the environment in the future
as it will half journey times e.g.
Leeds to Birmingham 1 hour 2 hours to
57 min.

The Conservative party is also split under
The potential hard reveal which may
lead not as some think Tony saying
it will be beneficial to business such
as Tim Yeo and it needed to compete with
Amsterdam and Gulf. Whereas other countries
such as David Cameron and
Tulip Siddon have said it's not with
it as it will waste huge costs and
air pollution in contruction and from insured
planes also it will waste unnecessary strain
on our infrastructure that is already old,
and on our NHS is already under
huge pressure. Lib Dem and Green MPs
thinks this money should be spent else
where such as Cardiff mass raili

The coalition would be more likely to support our EU target and we will not reach it if we build a third runway, and if we did it will be too small to fit the large planes we have. Because of these reasons the coalition said no to a third runway which was different to new Labour's 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, hence the coalition stopped this and they are not yet allowed to be used in the UK.

This and many other decisions have been happen because of 6 pressure groups such as Greenpeace and Friends of the Earth altering environmental policy.

Some policies have very different environmental policies as they believe the current policies are not severe enough as many hit Direct Action. For example, over 100
In his recent and candid lecture, he states that more should be done. For example, the Lib Dems want 50% of energy to come from renewables by 2050. However, the Green party was split like the other major parties over energy, as it was perceived harmful to the economy as it produces no O2, is toxic, and is boiled in countries such as China and India. We know it can be used on a large scale, however, Mike & Cherry harrumphed that it is not worth it as they took 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 biodegradable plastic, such as plastic straws. A local comedian suggested they wear the food security and the local should be used for food. Although they say they are biodegradable, they lower the CO2 amount and we only
Major parties have also agreed on the continuation of developing renewable technologies and increasing the amount in them, with all parties pledging green jobs and renewable energy projects, such as Labour in 2010 pledging £3.5bn over four years. These efforts have led to the UK's biggest wind farm projects. More were involved in offshore wind farms.

The major parties also agree with the Conservatives to change to encourage or encouraging large-scale wind energy.

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

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