



**GCSE
CITIZENSHIP STUDIES
8100/2**

Paper 2

Mark scheme

June 2020

Version: 1.0 Final Mark Scheme

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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2020 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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. 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.

Section A – Life in Modern Britain

| Qu | Part | Marking guidance | Total marks | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|-------------|------------|-----------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 01 | 1 | <p>Identify the year in which the Human Rights Act was passed.</p> <p>Correct response – D</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 | | | | | | |
| 01 | 2 | <p>Name two ‘British values’.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for the accurate identification of each value.</p> <p>These could include any two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democracy • The rule of law • Individual liberty • Respect • Tolerance. <p>Also accept any other appropriate response.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> | 2 | | | | | | |
| 01 | 3 | <p>Describe why it is important for British society that citizens fulfil two other duties, not mentioned in Source A.</p> <p>The candidate’s answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the duties which it is important for British citizens to fulfil, other than those mentioned in Source A.</p> <p>Source A mentions the importance of the citizen’s duty to vote as it is important for all citizens’ voices to be heard.</p> <p>Examples of the two duties described by the candidate may therefore include citizens needing to:</p> <p>Indicative Content</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 50%;">Duty</th> <th style="width: 50%;">Importance</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>• Obey the law.</td> <td>• This will make society more peaceful and cohesive.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>• Pay their taxes.</td> <td>• This will mean more money for the</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Duty | Importance | • Obey the law. | • This will make society more peaceful and cohesive. | • Pay their taxes. | • This will mean more money for the | 4 |
| Duty | Importance | | | | | | | | |
| • Obey the law. | • This will make society more peaceful and cohesive. | | | | | | | | |
| • Pay their taxes. | • This will mean more money for the | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tolerate and respect other people. • Be active citizens (in ways other than voting). • Be a juror. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> government to spend on public services. • This will make society fairer and free from discrimination. • This gives citizens a voice and strengthens democracy. • This ensures that citizens are judged by their peers/get a fair trial. | |
| | | <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a duty and 1 mark for developing a description. (x2)</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p> | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 02 | 1 | <p>What does the 2010 Equality Act protect citizens from?</p> <p>Correct response – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 02 | 2 | <p>Identify two ways Britain could be described as a multicultural society.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an accurate identification of each way Britain could be described as a multicultural society. (x2)</p> <p>These could include any two of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Britain is a multi-faith society • Britain is made up of four separate nations • Britain is a multiracial society • Britain has a long history of immigration. <p>Also accept any other appropriate response.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> | 2 |
|----|---|--|---|

| 02 | 3 | <p>Describe two ways, not mentioned in Source B, that could make British citizens more tolerant of diversity.</p> <p>The candidate’s answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the ways in which British citizens could be made more tolerant of diversity, other than those mentioned in Source B.</p> <p>Source B discusses 15–17 year olds to taking part in National Citizenship Service as a way to gain an understanding of social diversity and the importance of tolerance for others.</p> <p>Examples of the two ways described by the candidate may therefore include:</p> <p>Indicative Content</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 831 1273 1525"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 831 719 904">Ways</th> <th data-bbox="726 831 1273 904">How this promotes tolerance of diversity amongst citizens</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 913 719 987"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More citizenship lessons in school. </td> <td data-bbox="726 913 1273 987"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will increase young citizens’ understanding of British society/common values. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 996 719 1070"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More British history lessons in school. </td> <td data-bbox="726 996 1273 1070"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will increase young citizens’ awareness of shared identity and common values. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1079 719 1153"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage more volunteering/community action. </td> <td data-bbox="726 1079 1273 1153"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will encourage citizens to work with others and integrate more fully into society. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1162 719 1236"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass laws. </td> <td data-bbox="726 1162 1273 1236"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That will promote equality, encourage fairness and prevent discrimination. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1245 719 1319"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deny publicity to extremist views. </td> <td data-bbox="726 1245 1273 1319"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will prevent intolerant ideas gaining credibility. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a way and 1 mark for developing a description. (x2)</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p> | Ways | How this promotes tolerance of diversity amongst citizens | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More citizenship lessons in school. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will increase young citizens’ understanding of British society/common values. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More British history lessons in school. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will increase young citizens’ awareness of shared identity and common values. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage more volunteering/community action. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will encourage citizens to work with others and integrate more fully into society. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass laws. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That will promote equality, encourage fairness and prevent discrimination. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deny publicity to extremist views. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will prevent intolerant ideas gaining credibility. | 4 |
|---|--|--|-------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| Ways | How this promotes tolerance of diversity amongst citizens | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More citizenship lessons in school. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will increase young citizens’ understanding of British society/common values. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More British history lessons in school. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will increase young citizens’ awareness of shared identity and common values. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage more volunteering/community action. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will encourage citizens to work with others and integrate more fully into society. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pass laws. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That will promote equality, encourage fairness and prevent discrimination. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deny publicity to extremist views. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As this will prevent intolerant ideas gaining credibility. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 03 | 1 | <p>Which of the following has an elected parliament?</p> <p>Correct response – B</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 03 | 2 | <p>Name the organisation which created the European Convention on Human Rights.</p> <p>Correct response – Council of Europe</p> <p>NB: Do not award marks for the EU or the UN.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 03 | 3 | <p>Identify two methods used by the UK to resolve international conflicts.</p> <p>Award one mark for the accurate identification of each method.</p> <p>The methods identified may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Humanitarian Aid (accept 'Aid' as a correct answer) • Use of force • Sanctions • Mediation (accept negotiations or arranging conferences/treaties). <p>AO1 = 2</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

| 03 | 4 | <p>With reference to Source C, describe how an NGO might respond to this humanitarian crisis.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;">Level</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Marks</th> <th style="width: 70%;">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 the issues. 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 the issues. 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> | Level | Marks | Descriptor | 2 | 3–4 | Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context. | 1 | 1–2 | Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. 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 the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1–2 | Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | Nothing to credit. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Indicative Content

The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge regarding how an NGO would respond to a humanitarian crisis to **Source C**. The source discusses a humanitarian crisis in Mozambique.

The candidate’s answer **may** include some of the following points:

| Mozambique (Source C) | NGO response |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The flooding stranded survivors. • The flooding destroyed houses. • The flooding destroyed crops. • The flooding resulted in the loss of clean water (and as a consequence increased the risk of disease). • The flooding destroyed roads, bridges and power supplies. • Cost to rebuild/provide aid. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide volunteers and equipment to help rescue stranded survivors. • Provide volunteers and materials to build temporary shelter for survivors. • Provide food aid to feed the survivors. • Provide medical aid and doctors to treat the injured and deal with any outbreak of disease. • Provide money, volunteers and expertise to help rebuild the infrastructure of Mozambique. • Fundraising efforts to help provide financial support for the rescue/rebuilding efforts – which could include lobbying relevant governments and organisations. |

AO2 = 4

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 04 | 1 | <p>Which of the following is a pressure group?</p> <p>Correct response – D</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|

| 04 | 2 | <p>‘Citizens, by working together, can change public policy, challenge injustice or resolve local community issues.’</p> <p>Examine this statement.</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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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> | Level | Marks | Descriptor | 4 | 7–8 | Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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>Answers may examine the effectiveness of citizen group action with reference to the following factors which tend to determine how successful the fight to change public policy, challenge an injustice or resolve a local community issue proves to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives • Membership • Strategy and tactics • Opposition • Funding • Relationship with government • Relationship with the media. <p>AO3 = 8</p> | |
| 05 | 1 | <p>Explain the term ‘voter turnout’.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an accurate explanation of the term ‘voter turnout’ as either the number, or percentage, of voters who actually vote.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |

| 05 | 2 | <p>‘Democracy in the UK needs to be strengthened.’</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with this statement?</p> <p>In your answer you should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • opportunities for participation in democracy • barriers to participation in democracy • issues relating to voter apathy and the debate about voting age. | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|---|-------|-------|------------|---|-----|--|---|-----|--|---|-----|--|---|-----|--|---|---|--------------------|
| <table border="1"> <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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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> | | | | Level | Marks | Descriptor | 4 | 7–8 | Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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. |
| Level | Marks | Descriptor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 7–8 | Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 which may be included to argue that democracy needs to be strengthened:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many important institutions are socially unrepresentative and therefore undermine key values such as equality and representation • Cuts to public services and public funding, in particular things such as legal aid or youth clubs, undermine attempts to integrate young people into society and promote equal access for all citizens to the law • E-democracy is ineffective as online petitions are ignored by government • Cuts in education funding have undermined attempts to promote British values throughout the school system • The voting age of 18 is unfair as 16-year olds are held responsible for their actions in other ways (criminal responsibility and joining the armed forces) but are not allowed to vote • The electoral system is undemocratic as First Past the Post' (FPTP) system is unrepresentative and referendums are rarely used • Current political institutions are no longer trusted by the public • The media is no longer trusted as a reliable source of information. <p>Points which may be included to argue that democracy is already strong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important institutions are increasingly socially representative, and legislation such as the 2010 Equalities Act have helped to encourage this further • All citizens still have access to the law and are guaranteed fair treatment in the justice system • E-democracy is an active feature of UK democracy, in particular online petitions • The UK Government's Prevent strategy in schools and colleges is an active attempt to counter extremism and promote the key values of tolerance, fairness, understanding and democracy • The voting age reflects the age at which a young person can be considered fully responsible for their actions and is therefore the appropriate age for being able to vote • Proportional representation (PR) is used in many elections in the UK and referendums are an increasingly important feature of British democracy • Although the public's trust in current politicians has been weakened, the UK's political institutions are still effective in performing their roles • Many organisations in the media, such as the BBC, are still trusted to be impartial and reliable. <p>AO3 = 8</p> | |
|--|---|--|

Section B – Rights and responsibilities

| Qu | Part | Marking guidance | Total marks |
|----|------|--|-------------|
| 06 | 1 | <p>Which one of the following represents a citizen in court?</p> <p>Correct response – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
| 06 | 2 | <p>Identify two legal entitlements UK citizens gain at 16.</p> <p>Correct response – D and E</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> | 2 |

| 06 | 3 | <p>With reference to Source D, describe two ways civil law differs from criminal law in the UK.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Answers require the application of knowledge regarding the ways in which civil law differs from criminal law in the UK, as outlined in Source D.</p> <p>The answer needs to include two of the following points of difference:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 689 1273 1424"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 689 778 725">Criminal law (Source D)</th> <th data-bbox="785 689 1273 725">Civil law</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 725 778 837"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case brought to court by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). </td> <td data-bbox="785 725 1273 837"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case brought to court by an individual or group/organisation. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 837 778 972"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of proof lies with the prosecution. The accused is innocent until proven guilty. </td> <td data-bbox="785 837 1273 972"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of proof lies with the claimant who must give proof of their claim. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 972 778 1106"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard of proof needed, to find the accused guilty, is beyond reasonable doubt. </td> <td data-bbox="785 972 1273 1106"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard of proof needed, to find the defendant liable, is preponderance of evidence or balance of probabilities. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1106 778 1240"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision is either guilty or not guilty. </td> <td data-bbox="785 1106 1273 1240"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision is either liable or not liable. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1240 778 1424"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The punishment, if found guilty, is either a non-custodial sentence or custodial sentence. </td> <td data-bbox="785 1240 1273 1424"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The punishment, if found liable, is damages, compensation or an injunction. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a difference and 1 mark for developing a description of the difference. (x2)</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p> | Criminal law (Source D) | Civil law | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case brought to court by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case brought to court by an individual or group/organisation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of proof lies with the prosecution. The accused is innocent until proven guilty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of proof lies with the claimant who must give proof of their claim. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard of proof needed, to find the accused guilty, is beyond reasonable doubt. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard of proof needed, to find the defendant liable, is preponderance of evidence or balance of probabilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision is either guilty or not guilty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision is either liable or not liable. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The punishment, if found guilty, is either a non-custodial sentence or custodial sentence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The punishment, if found liable, is damages, compensation or an injunction. | 4 |
|---|---|--|--------------------------------|------------------|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|--|--|---|---|
| Criminal law (Source D) | Civil law | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case brought to court by the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case brought to court by an individual or group/organisation. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of proof lies with the prosecution. The accused is innocent until proven guilty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The burden of proof lies with the claimant who must give proof of their claim. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard of proof needed, to find the accused guilty, is beyond reasonable doubt. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standard of proof needed, to find the defendant liable, is preponderance of evidence or balance of probabilities. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision is either guilty or not guilty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The decision is either liable or not liable. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The punishment, if found guilty, is either a non-custodial sentence or custodial sentence. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The punishment, if found liable, is damages, compensation or an injunction. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 07 | 1 | <p>Which of the following can decide the verdict in a Youth Court?</p> <p>Correct response – B</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 07 | 2 | <p>Identify two citizens' rights considered to have been established by the Magna Carta.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correctly identified right. These might include the right to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trial by jury • a fair trial • not be arrested without a reason • equal treatment by the law • own property • inherit property. <p>AO1 = 2</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

| 07 | 3 | <p>Describe how two strategies, not mentioned in Source E, could be used to reduce knife crime.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The candidate’s answer requires the application of knowledge regarding strategies which could be used to reduce knife crime, other than those mentioned in Source E.</p> <p>Source E mentions the establishment of a taskforce to provide extra police officers to investigate knife crime and community engagement work to encourage gang members to stop being involved with gangs.</p> <p>Examples of the two strategies described by the candidate may therefore include:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 869 1273 1520"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 869 778 927">Strategy</th> <th data-bbox="783 869 1273 927">Impact on reducing knife crime</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 934 778 1025"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased prison sentences for knife crimes. </td> <td data-bbox="783 934 1273 1025"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would deter people from carrying knives. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1032 778 1144"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased police powers to stop and search people suspected of carrying knives. </td> <td data-bbox="783 1032 1273 1144"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would find knives before they were used to commit crimes. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1151 778 1263"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in the use of a knife amnesty. </td> <td data-bbox="783 1151 1273 1263"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would mean that fewer knives were “on the streets.” </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1270 778 1382"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in funding for youth clubs to keep teenagers “off the streets.” </td> <td data-bbox="783 1270 1273 1382"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would reduce the risk of their involvement in knife crime. </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1388 778 1500"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction in the number of exclusions from schools. </td> <td data-bbox="783 1388 1273 1500"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would reduce the number of teenagers who might become gang members. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a strategy and 1 mark for developing a description. (x2)</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p> | Strategy | Impact on reducing knife crime | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased prison sentences for knife crimes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would deter people from carrying knives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased police powers to stop and search people suspected of carrying knives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would find knives before they were used to commit crimes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in the use of a knife amnesty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would mean that fewer knives were “on the streets.” | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in funding for youth clubs to keep teenagers “off the streets.” | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would reduce the risk of their involvement in knife crime. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction in the number of exclusions from schools. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would reduce the number of teenagers who might become gang members. | 4 |
|---|---|--|----------|--------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Impact on reducing knife crime | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased prison sentences for knife crimes. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would deter people from carrying knives. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased police powers to stop and search people suspected of carrying knives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would find knives before they were used to commit crimes. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in the use of a knife amnesty. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would mean that fewer knives were “on the streets.” | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An increase in funding for youth clubs to keep teenagers “off the streets.” | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would reduce the risk of their involvement in knife crime. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A reduction in the number of exclusions from schools. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would reduce the number of teenagers who might become gang members. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 08 | 1 | <p>Which one of the conventions in Source F established rules of war?</p> <p>Correct response – B</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 08 | 2 | <p>Which one of the conventions in Source F came into force in 1990?</p> <p>Correct response – D</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---|
| 08 | 3 | <p>Name two international courts.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correctly identified court:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • European Court of Human Rights • International Criminal Court (ICC) <p>Also accept International Court of Justice (also known as the 'World Court') and Permanent Court of Arbitration as correct answers.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p> | 2 |
|----|---|---|---|

| 08 | 4 | <p>With reference to Source G, discuss how victims of conflict could be protected.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 376 1275 781"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 376 424 427">Level</th> <th data-bbox="429 376 539 427">Marks</th> <th data-bbox="544 376 1275 427">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 434 424 577">2</td> <td data-bbox="429 434 539 577">3–4</td> <td data-bbox="544 434 1275 577">Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 584 424 728">1</td> <td data-bbox="429 584 539 728">1–2</td> <td data-bbox="544 584 1275 728">Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 734 424 781">0</td> <td data-bbox="429 734 539 781">0</td> <td data-bbox="544 734 1275 781">Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The answer may include some of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection provided by International Humanitarian Law (IHL) to victims of conflict eg the Hague Convention and Geneva Conventions • The role of the International Criminal Court (ICC) in prosecuting war criminals • Minimising the role of arms dealers • Reduction in arms sales • UN peacekeeping forces • Diplomatic interventions. <p>AO2 = 4</p> | Level | Marks | Descriptor | 2 | 3–4 | Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context. | 1 | 1–2 | Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. 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 the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 1–2 | Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | Nothing to credit. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 09 | 1 | <p>Name the country where a sheriff hears a court case.</p> <p>Correct response – C</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|

| 09 | 2 | <p>‘The advantages of the jury system outweigh the disadvantages.’</p> <p>Examine this statement.</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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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>Points which may be included to argue that the jury system has more advantages than disadvantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public confidence in the criminal justice system as a result of being tried by your fellow citizens • Jury judgements being based on ‘fairness’ rather than precedent – jury equity • The secrecy of the jury room means that jurors can make decisions free from outside pressures • The selection of juries – qualifications and vetting – ensures jurors are | Level | Marks | Descriptor | 4 | 7–8 | Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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>competent to perform their role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jury service being an important duty performed by citizens helping to protect both the rights of the defendant and to ensure justice is done • Jury service ensures citizen participation in the legal system which helps to underpin Britain’s democratic society. <p>Points which may be included to argue that the jury system has more disadvantages than advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juries being capable of making perverse decisions as well as fair ones (where their verdict is based upon emotional, inflammatory or immaterial considerations, or an obvious prejudice with no attempt to be fair) • The secrecy of the jury room means that the jury does not have to justify their verdict • Juror competence – a lack of training and understanding of the law – can be a problem in complex trials (eg fraud trials) • Jurors are potentially vulnerable to ‘nobbling’ (the actual or attempted influence of jurors through intimidation or inducement) • Media coverage, especially in high profile cases, can sway jurors • Jurors can suffer from bias, especially racist or sexist assumptions about defendants or witnesses • The jury system places an additional cost upon the taxpayer. <p>AO3 = 8</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|----|---|--|---|
| 10 | 1 | <p>Define the term ‘aggravating circumstances’ when used in a criminal case.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for an accurate explanation of the term aggravating circumstances as a factor that makes a crime more serious.</p> <p>Also award 1 mark if term defined through an example.</p> <p>Maximum 1 mark</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p> | 1 |
|----|---|--|---|

| 10 | 2 | <p>‘UK law should be made by MPs, not by judges.’</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with this statement?</p> <p>In your answer you should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the role and powers of the judiciary • the roles and powers of Parliament/MPs • the legislative process. | 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|-------|---|-------|-------|------------|---|-----|--|---|-----|--|---|-----|---|---|-----|---|---|---|--------------------|--|
| | | <table border="1"> <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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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> | Level | Marks | Descriptor | 4 | 7–8 | Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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. | |
| Level | Marks | Descriptor | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | 7–8 | Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 debate. 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 which may include reasons why UK law should be made by MPs not judges:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MPs are the elected and accountable representatives of the citizens and therefore their decisions reflect the ‘will of the people’ • Judges are unelected and can’t be held to account for their decisions by citizens • MPs are more socially representative of contemporary British society than socially ‘elite’ judges • The legislative process in parliament ensures expert opinions are listened to when passing law – for example the House of Lords and relevant pressure groups and experts who appear before parliamentary committees • Parliamentary sovereignty means that laws can be changed, or replaced quickly to deal with crises or changing circumstances • The Scottish Parliament, elected by voters living in Scotland, has the power to pass legislation which reflects the specific needs and interests of citizens living in Scotland. <p>Points which may include reasons why UK law should be made by judges not MPs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Judges are legal experts with the necessary training and expertise in the legal profession to be effective law-makers • Recent judicial appointments are making the judiciary more socially representative • Judicial precedent ensures consistency and fairness in the decisions made by the justice system • Judicial neutrality and independence help to avoid legal decisions being made under political or media pressure • The current balance between laws made by parliament (legislation) and judges (common law) works well – ensuring the law reflects the needs and wishes of contemporary British society • Parliament can pass new legislation to nullify (replace) any common law resulting from decisions made by a judge it disapproves of. <p>AO3 = 8</p> | |
|--|--|--|