

GCSE CITIZENSHIP STUDIES

8100/1

PAPER 1

Draft Mark scheme

V1.0

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly level 3 with a small amount of level 4 material it would be placed in level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this.

Levels containing two marks:

If the response fully meets the level descriptor then both marks should be awarded. Award one mark if the response only meets some of the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three marks:

Markers should start at the middle of the level and then move the mark up if the level has been fully met or down if the level has been barely met.

The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Q	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
---	------	------------------	-------------

Section A – Active Citizenship

01	1	<p>What is a pressure group?</p> <p>Award one mark for – an organised group of citizens who support a common cause or wish to bring about a change. AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	--	---

01	2	<p>What is meant by the term ‘lobbying’?</p> <p>Award one mark for -Individually or in a group meet with a person or organisation that you wish to influence.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	---	---

01	3	<p>Identify two ways in which a pressure group differs from a political party.</p> <p>Award one mark for each correct answer up to a maximum of two. Responses might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pressure groups don’t contest elections. • Pressure groups have a limited range of issues they campaign about. • Political Parties campaign on a very broad range of issues. • Political Parties contest elections in order to gain power. <p>Other possible correct responses should be discussed during standardisation.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	---	---

01	4	<p>Using an example, explain what is meant by the term ‘advocacy’.</p> <p>Award one mark for correct understanding of term. Award a second mark for appropriate example.</p> <p>Advocacy is the skill of being able to put forward a reasoned point of view. This is sometimes done on behalf of others.</p> <p>The example may relate to the student’s own citizenship activity or to the broader community, or relate to a formal advocacy role, eg solicitor.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

01	5	<p>Using an example explain one of the functions of a Trade Union.</p> <p>Award one mark for a correct function and a second for identifying a Trade Union (a set of initials is acceptable).</p> <p>Trade unions represent workers: in wage negotiations with employers, provide legal advice representation to members lobby on behalf of the Union, or other suitable response.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
01	6	<p>Examine why the Million mask march is unlikely to achieve its aims.</p> <p>In your response you should refer to Source A and examples of successful campaigns.</p>	8

Level	Marks	Descriptor
4	7–8	Well-chosen evidence is selected from Source A and own examples. Demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments which are well developed and analysed. The arguments lead to a coherent conclusion.
3	5–6	Appropriate evidence is selected from Source A and from own examples Demonstrates good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed or analysed. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.
2	3–4	Some evidence is selected from Source A and from own examples. Demonstrates some, occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions discussed in Source A. Little or no attempt is made to analyse the evidence presented or to provide own examples. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.
0	0	Nothing to credit.

Indicative content

The account will relate to the source which indicates (AO2/AO3)

- The ill-defined nature of the protest group. It has no clear structure or leadership and is dependent upon the internet for communication. A campaign that has a formal structure is able to attract a wider audience and develop a membership, which enables it to fund itself and promote its cause.
- There are a range of causes taking part, so therefore it lacks a clear focus regarding its aims and whom it wishes to target. By relating to a single issue or cause a campaign group is able to gain ownership of that issue and more easily apply pressure to its target audience.
- The media report includes some negative elements such as references to violent scuffles and arrests. This may not assist successful campaigning. Most successful campaigns need

		<p>public support and that is often gained by positive media coverage, which promotes the cause, impacts upon target groups and gains support and membership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each of the points made will incorporate the use of suitable case study examples. <p>AO2 = 4 AO3 = 4</p>	
--	--	--	--

02	1	<p>Explain how either one primary or one secondary source assisted in regard to your investigation.</p> <p>The example quoted needs to give a context in regard to the Investigation.</p> <p>Primary source – eg meeting, interview, survey, poll. Other correct examples should be credited.</p> <p>Secondary source – media, library, press coverage, books, use of the internet to research. Other correct examples should be credited.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

02	2	<p>Discuss which part of the whole investigation process you consider was the most successful and why.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>3–4</td> <td>Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>1–2</td> <td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content The response will contain the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A clear choice is made as to an element of the investigation that was successful. This may relate to the nature of the research, the methodology employed, the results of the research, the planning of the action, the taking of the action or reflections about the task. The choice is supported by evidence to justify why that choice was made. <p>AO2 = 4</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.	1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor													
2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.													
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.													
0	0	Nothing to credit.													

02	3	<p>Summarise the evidence you gathered at the research stage.</p> <p>Evaluate its usefulness in relation to your issue /question</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Level</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Marks</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td> Comprehensive summary of the evidence gathered at the research stage. For the evidence presented, arguments regarding its usefulness are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td> Basic attempt to report and organise the evidence gathered at the research stage. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the evidence presented but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td> Little report of the evidence gathered at the research stage and little or no attempt to organise this evidence. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the evidence presented. There is little or no coherence in what is written. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>AO1 The account will discuss a range of evidence that has been gathered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to either primary or secondary sources or both • The methods used to collect the evidence may be mentioned • The response may include data or extracts from the evidence gathered. <p>AO3 The account should relate to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The findings to the Key Question/Hypothesis that was posed. • The results will relate to the aims of the investigation. • An order of importance will be placed upon each piece of evidence mentioned. • The response will clearly indicate how the evidence gathered relates to the aims of the Investigation. • The results will be drawn together into a conclusion or series of conclusions that clearly link back to the hypothesis/question and show linkage to the ability to take action in regard to the question. <p>AO1 = 2 AO3 = 4</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	3	5–6	Comprehensive summary of the evidence gathered at the research stage. For the evidence presented, arguments regarding its usefulness are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.	2	3–4	Basic attempt to report and organise the evidence gathered at the research stage. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the evidence presented but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.	1	1–2	Little report of the evidence gathered at the research stage and little or no attempt to organise this evidence. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the evidence presented. There is little or no coherence in what is written.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	6
Level	Marks	Descriptor																
3	5–6	Comprehensive summary of the evidence gathered at the research stage. For the evidence presented, arguments regarding its usefulness are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.																
2	3–4	Basic attempt to report and organise the evidence gathered at the research stage. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the evidence presented but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.																
1	1–2	Little report of the evidence gathered at the research stage and little or no attempt to organise this evidence. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the evidence presented. There is little or no coherence in what is written.																
0	0	Nothing to credit.																

02	4	<p>Analyse the ways in which your investigation was a good example of taking citizenship action.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="347 349 453 383">Level</th> <th data-bbox="453 349 571 383">Marks</th> <th data-bbox="571 349 1283 383">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 383 453 685">4</td> <td data-bbox="453 383 571 685">10–12</td> <td data-bbox="571 383 1283 685"> <p>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrate excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions.</p> <p>Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action.</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 685 453 1055">3</td> <td data-bbox="453 685 571 1055">7–9</td> <td data-bbox="571 685 1283 1055"> <p>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>The evidence is used to support arguments analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context.</p> <p>Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1055 453 1391">2</td> <td data-bbox="453 1055 571 1391">4–6</td> <td data-bbox="571 1055 1283 1391"> <p>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context.</p> <p>Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1391 453 1626">1</td> <td data-bbox="453 1391 571 1626">1–3</td> <td data-bbox="571 1391 1283 1626"> <p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1626 453 1659">0</td> <td data-bbox="453 1626 571 1659">0</td> <td data-bbox="571 1626 1283 1659">Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	10–12	<p>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrate excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions.</p> <p>Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action.</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</p>	3	7–9	<p>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>The evidence is used to support arguments analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context.</p> <p>Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent</p>	2	4–6	<p>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context.</p> <p>Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</p>	1	1–3	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</p>	0	0	Nothing to credit.	12
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	10–12	<p>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrate excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions.</p> <p>Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action.</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</p>																			
3	7–9	<p>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>The evidence is used to support arguments analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context.</p> <p>Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent</p>																			
2	4–6	<p>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context.</p> <p>Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</p>																			
1	1–3	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</p>																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			
		<p>Indicative content</p> <p>AO2</p> <p>The response will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relate to the student's own participation in the investigation • relate to the aims of the Investigation and a description of the action taken will be presented • clearly indicate a linkage between the aims, the results of the research and the action taken. 																			

	<p>AO3</p> <p>The response will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give a justification as to why the activity involved ‘taking citizenship action’ • relate to the Taking Action section of their investigation • draw upon evidence from both the research and reflection elements to aid the reasons given. • give a range of reasons and will be valid in regard to the task undertaken. <p>All the reasons given clearly relate to ‘taking citizenship action’ and relate to the student’s own participation and will be clearly embedded within the investigation undertaken.</p> <p>AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8</p>	
--	---	--

TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION – 40

Q	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
---	------	------------------	-------------

Section B – Politics and participation

03	1	<p>What is a referendum?</p> <p>A – When citizens are asked to vote on an issue B – When citizens can propose new laws C – When citizens can remove an MP whom they no longer support D – When citizens ‘write in’ candidates’ names on a ballot paper</p> <p>Correct answer – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
03	2	<p>Identify two situations in which a referendum might be used.</p> <p>One mark for each possible situation correctly identified.</p> <p>The response will indicate a major constitutional issue or change and may support the response with a past example Situations identified may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issue of devolution to Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland • issue of changing the voting system (alternative vote) • issue of the UKs membership of the EU <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
03	3	<p>Using Source B, consider two reasons why the British constitution makes it easier for elected UK politicians to bring about changes affecting citizens’ rights than for the US President.</p> <p>Two marks maximum for each clear application of understanding of the workings of the UK constitution against that of the USA as outlined in the source. Award one mark for a limited application of understanding of the workings of the UK constitution against that of the USA as outlined in the source.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The source outlines an example of the difficulties facing US politicians in a situation, which does not apply in the UK because of different constitutional arrangements. The response should contain two reasons why it is easier to make changes affecting citizens’ rights in the UK than in the USA by reference to the source.</p> <p>The account will relate to the source which indicates:</p>	4

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USA has a written constitution which is inflexible whilst the UK has an unwritten constitution which is flexible, so UK politicians are not so restricted in introducing new ideas • A US President does not have the power to change laws without the agreement of Congress, which may be controlled by a party different to that of the President, whilst the UK government normally commands a majority in the House of Commons and is able to amend or introduce new laws more easily, in the UK political power is centralised within parliament • In the UK amending laws is more straightforward as the UK does not face the obstacle of having different states with different laws, the law is applied consistently across the whole country. <p>AO2 = 4</p>	
04	1	<p>What is the title usually given to someone elected at a local government election in England?</p> <p>A – Councillor B – MP C – MSP D – Secretary of State</p> <p>Correct answer – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
04	2	<p>Name two services provided by local government in England.</p> <p>One mark each for each local government service correctly identified.</p> <p>Local government services identified may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning • housing • refuse collection • social services • schools • car parking/traffic management/bus shelters, etc • swimming baths/sports centres/recreation grounds, etc • libraries. <p>Other correct responses should be credited.</p> <p>Also accept services identified with broad headings shared with other levels of government or agencies (eg education) or services possibly contracted out (street cleaning).</p>	2

		AO1 = 2	
--	--	---------	--

04	3	<p>Referring to Source C consider what two methods you would suggest the local residents take to help them stop the proposed development?</p> <p>Two marks maximum for each clear application of their knowledge and understanding of appropriate campaigning methods these citizens could use in this specific campaign. Award one mark for a limited application of understanding of a campaigning method the citizens could use.</p> <p>Indicative content The source outlines a number of reasons why a group of local residents oppose a proposed supermarket being built in a rural village location. The response should outline two campaigning methods that these protesters could use to help them achieve their aim that are linked to the information in the source.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citizens could organise a protest outside the local District Council offices about their opposition to the development • Demand a public Planning Inquiry because of the impact of the development to the local wildlife • Write to the developers about their concerns • Involve their local MP • Speak with the local newspaper to see if they can run an article about the proposed development • They could contact the RSPB and the National Trust and seek their support in opposing the planned development. • As elections are being held shortly they may wish to endorse candidates who support their views or even stand candidates fighting on the single issue of the development <p>AO2 = 4</p>	4
----	---	--	---

05	1	<p>The UK Prime Minister is also two of the following:</p> <p>A – Constituency MP B – Black Rod C – Head of State D – Speaker of the House of Commons E – Chairman of the Cabinet F – Mayor of London</p> <p>Correct answer – A and E One mark each = 2 marks (AO1) AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

05	2	<p>Which of the following two jobs do civil servants undertake?</p> <p>A – High Court judge B – advising ministers on government policy C – Cabinet Secretary D – Local councillor E – Government Chief Whip F – Junior Minister</p> <p>Correct answer – B and C</p> <p>One mark each = 2 marks (AO1)</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

05	3	<p>Describe the impact on the result and formation of the next government if the election shown in Source D had been held using a Proportional System of voting?</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Level</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Marks</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td>Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative comment</p> <p>The source shows the outcome of a general Election under the First Past the Post electoral system. The response requires the application of knowledge about the workings of Proportional voting systems and how a government is formed applied to the result shown in the source.</p> <p>The account will relate to the source that indicates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of MP’s elected under a PR system would be different than under FPTP. The Conservative numbers would be reduced, Labour would be reduced, the Liberal Democrats would increase, no change for Others. (Actual numbers are not a requirement for awarding marks) • That no Party under a PR system would have won a majority of the seats • To form a majority government two parties would have to work together i.e. any two from Conservatives, Labour and Liberal Democrats. • <p>AO2 = 4 marks</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.	1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor													
2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.													
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.													
0	0	Nothing to credit.													

06	1	Which of the following accurately describes the UK? a) Direct democracy b) Representative democracy c) Republic d) Federal Correct answer – B AO1 = 1	1
----	---	--	---

06	2	<p>Considering a range of views, justify the claim that UK citizens can participate in politics more fully than citizens in a non-democratic country.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Level</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Marks</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7–8</td> <td> Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td> Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td> Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td> Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made. </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Analysis of evidence should justify the statement that UK citizens can participate in politics more fully than in a non-democratic country. This indicative content provides possible routes through the question. It is not a requirement that responses contain all the elements identified below.</p> <p>A response considering a wide range of points of view will include commentary on the contention in the question including differing viewpoints. The question allows for examples, and analysis of ‘non-democratic’ countries may include countries which regard themselves as ‘democratic’, so long as the response justifies this. Arguments in support of the contention are likely to be based on analysis of examples and evidence about ways that citizens in the UK can participate in</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.	3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.	2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.	1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	8
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.																			
3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.																			
2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.																			
1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			

		<p>politics that are not normally found in non-democratic countries. These may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • petitions • marches and demonstrations • writing to newspapers • forming and joining competing political parties and pressure groups • campaigning • free and fair elections • standing as a candidate against, as well as for, government • criticising government policy and suggesting alternatives • seeking redress through an independent judiciary. <p>Arguments against the contention may analyse examples and evidence about ways in which non-democratic countries may obstruct political participation. These may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one party states • police states • media controls • voting restrictions • electoral limitations/malpractice. <p>A range of viewpoints considered may include consideration of views about UK politics opposed to the claim (eg UK politics dominated by elites, voters offered limited policy choice, non-proportional electoral systems, influence of powerful groups, policy framework determined above UK level, eg EU, IMF, WTO).</p> <p>A link may be made with concepts such as democracy, representation and accountability and may analyse evidence about how democratic freedoms (eg free speech) and rights (right to vote in secret) which may allow political participation in the UK are not always observed in non-democratic countries. Ideological differences between totalitarian and democratic political systems may also be analysed.</p> <p>AO3 = 8</p>	
--	--	--	--

07	1	<p>For elections to the House of Commons, what is the minimum voting age? Shade in the one correct answer.</p> <p>A – 16 B – 18 C – 21 D – 25</p> <p>Correct answer – B</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	--	---

07	2	<p>“All prisoners should have the right to vote in elections”</p> <p>Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree with this statement?</p> <p>In your answer you should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How we deal with those who commit crime • Who can and cannot vote <table border="1" data-bbox="347 555 1283 1644"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="347 555 453 591">Level</th> <th data-bbox="453 555 571 591">Marks</th> <th data-bbox="571 555 1283 591">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 591 453 831">4</td> <td data-bbox="453 591 571 831">7–8</td> <td data-bbox="571 591 1283 831"> Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 831 453 1070">3</td> <td data-bbox="453 831 571 1070">5–6</td> <td data-bbox="571 831 1283 1070"> Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1070 453 1339">2</td> <td data-bbox="453 1070 571 1339">3–4</td> <td data-bbox="571 1070 1283 1339"> Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1339 453 1608">1</td> <td data-bbox="453 1339 571 1608">1–2</td> <td data-bbox="571 1339 1283 1608"> Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="347 1608 453 1644">0</td> <td data-bbox="453 1608 571 1644">0</td> <td data-bbox="571 1608 1283 1644">Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.	3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.	2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.	1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	8
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.																			
3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.																			
2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.																			
1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			
		<p>Indicative Content</p> <p>Points made to justify the statement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All people over 18 should have the right to vote so why exclude prisoners? It is a basic human right and prisoners should not lose their human rights due to imprisonment • They are already paying a price for their crime so why add an additional punishment by taking their voting rights away. • It would help to improve voter turnout 																			

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letting prisoners take part in civic life could be seen as a way of ensuring they remain integrated within society and may mean they are less likely to re-offend when they are released • Arguments making a case for certain types of criminals being allowed to vote but not others <p>Points made against the statement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If someone breaks the rules of the state they should not have a say in who runs the state • Losing the right to vote forms part of the punishment of prison, as a prisoner you lose your freedom and your right to take part in society • Arguably it could be claimed that crimes of a certain severity should warrant losing the right to vote (e.g murderers, rapists and paedophiles should not have the right to vote) have prisoners forfeited their human rights through their crimes? • A discussion regarding who can and cannot currently vote, why should criminals be given the right to vote but those under 18 years of age are not able to vote, immigrants that have come here to work and contribute to society through paying taxes etc but do not have British citizenship are not able to vote so why should prisoners be given the vote • Giving prisoners the right to vote may increase voter apathy amongst the public who see it as an injustice that a criminal still has the right to say who they think should run the country <p>AO3 = 8</p>	
--	--	---	--

TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION – 40

