



---

# GCSE

# CITIZENSHIP STUDIES

8100/2 - Paper 2

Mark scheme

---

8100

June 2018

---

Version/Stage: 1.0 Final

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](http://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. 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**

<b>Q</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Marking guidance</b>	<b>Total marks</b>
01	1	What is meant by the term 'British values'?  Correct response – B  AO1 = 1	1
01	2	Explain the term 'presumption of innocence'.  Award one mark for an accurate definition of the term 'presumption of innocence' involving a suspect remaining innocent until proven guilty.  Award an additional mark for identifying the fact that this needs to be done in a court of law. Do not award marks for in the 'court of public opinion' or in the media.  AO1=2	2

01	3	<p>Compare <b>2</b> features of the situation in Turkey, described in <b>Source A</b>, with how democracy works in Britain.</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 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> <p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Turkey</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Britain</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A President.</td> <td>A Prime Minister.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Attack on freedom of speech.</td> <td>Right of free speech.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Media censored.</td> <td>A free press.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Judicial independence restricted.</td> <td>Judicial independence.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Changing the constitution.</td> <td>Parliamentary sovereignty.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Political opponents sacked.</td> <td>Choice of parties.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The candidates are required to compare <b>2</b> features of the situation in Turkey, described in <b>Source A</b>, with how democracy works in Britain.</p> <p>Award one mark for the correct identification of a comparable feature and an additional mark for a description of how this feature appears in Britain.</p> <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.	Turkey	Britain	A President.	A Prime Minister.	Attack on freedom of speech.	Right of free speech.	Media censored.	A free press.	Judicial independence restricted.	Judicial independence.	Changing the constitution.	Parliamentary sovereignty.	Political opponents sacked.	Choice of parties.	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.																											
Turkey	Britain																												
A President.	A Prime Minister.																												
Attack on freedom of speech.	Right of free speech.																												
Media censored.	A free press.																												
Judicial independence restricted.	Judicial independence.																												
Changing the constitution.	Parliamentary sovereignty.																												
Political opponents sacked.	Choice of parties.																												

---

02	1	Which of the following statements accurately defines the concept of 'Citizenship'?  Correct response – A  AO1 = 1	1
02	2	Identify <b>2</b> positive consequences of immigration on UK society.  Award one mark for a correctly identified positive consequence <b>such as</b> : <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Meet labour demand e.g. in agriculture &amp; high skill areas</li><li>• Supports multi-culturalism</li><li>• Enhances tolerance</li><li>• Contribution to the culture of the UK.</li></ul> AO1= 2	2

02	3	Describe <b>2</b> ways a UK citizen may have multiple identities <b>not</b> mentioned in <b>Source B</b> .	4												
		<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;">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.	
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.													
		<p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The source discusses national identity – therefore description of this is not creditworthy. This should lead to the candidate describing two alternative ways in which a UK citizen may have multiple identities. Examples of such multiple identities may include the following: <b>ethnicity; language; gender; region; religion; culture; disability/ability; class; and income.</b></p> <p>The candidates are required to describe <b>2</b> ways in which citizens may have multiple identities.</p> <p>Award one mark for the correct identification and an additional mark for the description.</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p>													

03	1	<p>What is meant by 'soft power'?</p> <p>Correct response – C</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
03	2	<p>Identify <b>1</b> of the aims of NATO.</p> <p>Award one mark for an accurate identification of one of the aims of NATO such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To provide a system of defence</li> <li>• To guarantee the freedom and security of its members</li> <li>• Promoting democratic values</li> <li>• Enabling members to consult and cooperate</li> <li>• Maintain peace</li> <li>• For members of NATO to spend 2% of their GDP on defence.</li> </ul> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
03	3	<p>Identify <b>1</b> positive and <b>1</b> negative impact of the UK leaving the EU.</p> <p>Award one mark for a correctly identified positive impact such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The restoration of 'Parliamentary sovereignty'</li> <li>• Freedom to arrange trade deals with other countries</li> <li>• Stricter control on immigration</li> <li>• Being economically better off</li> <li>• A reduction in 'democratic overload'</li> <li>• No Longer contributing to the EU's budget.</li> </ul> <p>Award one mark for a correctly identified potential negative impact such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of influence</li> <li>• Loss of workers' rights</li> <li>• Weakening of environmental protection laws</li> <li>• Increased threat to the territorial integrity of the UK – Scottish 'IndyRef2'</li> <li>• Brexit negotiations distract UK Government from 'running the country'</li> <li>• Economically worse off – increase in the cost of food, etc.</li> </ul> <p>NB:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Identification is sufficient for the award of one mark, no development or explanation is required.</li> <li>2) Accurate reference to positive and negative impacts upon EU member states of 'Brexit' should be credited.</li> </ol> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2



03	4	<p>Discuss <b>2</b> methods, <b>not</b> mentioned in <b>Source C</b>, which the UK government could use to help resolve international disputes and conflicts.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 342 1270 792"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 342 424 398">Level</th> <th data-bbox="424 342 539 398">Marks</th> <th data-bbox="539 342 1270 398">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 398 424 568">2</td> <td data-bbox="424 398 539 568">3–4</td> <td data-bbox="539 398 1270 568">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="309 568 424 739">1</td> <td data-bbox="424 568 539 739">1–2</td> <td data-bbox="539 568 1270 739">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="309 739 424 792">0</td> <td data-bbox="424 739 539 792">0</td> <td data-bbox="539 739 1270 792">Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the range of methods employed by the UK to resolve international disputes and conflicts. With regard to the source, the candidate needs to identify two methods not discussed in the source. The source discusses the use of force by the UK. Examples of such methods may include the following:</p> <p><b>Mediation</b> - the UK government has been involved in numerous mediation attempts to resolve disputes and conflicts by seeking a peaceful resolution or sponsoring international conferences which lead to a peaceful resolution.</p> <p><b>Sanctions</b> - the UK government operates a range of sanctions, from arms embargoes and trade control restrictions to defence export policies, against a number of countries and terrorist organisations. These sanctions are normally imposed as part of a collective action by international bodies such as the EU, NATO or the UN.</p> <p><b>Humanitarian aid</b> – the UK government provides non-military aid to countries suffering conflicts in order to alleviate the suffering of the civilian population. This aid takes the form of food, shelter and medical help.</p> <p>Award a maximum of two marks for each clear discussion of an alternative method to the use of force which the UK could use to assist in resolving international disputes and conflicts.</p> <p>Award a maximum of one mark for each limited discussion of an alternative method to the use of force which the UK could use to assist in resolving international disputes and conflicts.</p> <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.													

04	1	What is 'fake news'?	1
		Correct response – D	
		AO1 = 1	

04	2	<p>'The UK media is very effective at keeping UK citizens well informed about politics.'</p> <p>Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?</p>	8																		
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>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>3</td> <td>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>2</td> <td>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>1</td> <td>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>0</td> <td>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><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Points which may be raised in agreement with the statement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Newspapers are free from political interference in the UK and so the ‘freedom of the press’ means it can be effective in keeping UK citizens well informed</li> <li>• In the UK it is accepted that the media have the right to report on issues of public interest e.g. in 2009 the Daily Telegraph investigated “MPs’ expenses claim”</li> <li>• Social media and the internet has enhanced the power of the media as shown by the 2015 publication of the body of a dead refugee on a Turkish beach which led to a change of UK government policy within 24 hours</li> <li>• Publication of opinion polls can also be seen as an important way in which the media keeps citizens informed.</li> </ul> <p>Points which may be raised in disagreement with the statement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the age of ‘post-truth’ politics and ‘fake news’ the media is no longer trusted and therefore its ability to perform this role is compromised leading to citizens seeking their information from places such as Facebook</li> <li>• Newspapers are politically bias and this effects the way they report</li> <li>• The overlapping nature of the ‘ruling elites’, or the ‘establishment’, is a barrier to the media being effective in keeping UK citizens well informed</li> <li>• The priorities of powerful individuals/institutions prevent effective provision of information</li> <li>• The owners of media pursue their own agendas</li> <li>• Newspapers in particular no longer have the resources to carry out effectively their role of keeping UK citizens well informed</li> </ul> <p>AO3=8</p>	
--	---	--

05	1	<p>Name a UK-based pressure group.</p> <p>Award one mark for an accurate example of a UK-based pressure group which may include one of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• any <b>NAMED</b> Trade Union</li> <li>• NFU – National Farmers Union</li> <li>• BMA – British Medical Association</li> </ul> <p>NB: Accept NUT (National Union of Teachers) as an accurate answer.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	--	---

05	2	<p>‘Pressure groups strengthen democracy in the UK by providing citizens with a voice.’</p> <p>Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?</p> <p>In your answer you should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• opportunities and barriers to citizen participation in democracy</li> <li>• how citizens can try to bring about political change.</li> </ul>	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         </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
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><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Points which may be raised in agreement with the statement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More people belong to pressure groups than to political parties</li> <li>• Pressure groups speak up for the public on issues that politicians do not discuss</li> <li>• Pressure groups raise awareness about issues between elections</li> <li>• If pressure groups did not exist, politicians could ignore a large number of issues</li> <li>• Pressure groups can raise immediate issues with politicians</li> <li>• Citizens are able to bring about political change via their involvement with pressure groups</li> <li>• This involvement may take different forms: ‘chequebook’ membership; signing petitions; demonstrations; volunteering; etc.</li> </ul> <p>Points which may be raised in disagreement with the statement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pressure groups have too much influence, as they are concerned about a narrow issue</li> <li>• Politicians pay too much attention to pressure groups, all of which are unrepresentative</li> <li>• Pressure groups are themselves undemocratic and often use non-democratic methods</li> <li>• Some insider groups exert too much power and influence to the detriment of the whole population</li> <li>• Politicians are too concerned with immediate headlines and over-react to every protest.</li> </ul> <p>AO3 = 8</p>			
<b>TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION</b>			<b>40</b>

**Section B - Rights and Responsibilities**

<b>Q</b>	<b>Part</b>	<b>Marking guidance</b>	<b>Total marks</b>
06	1	Which of the following is an example of 'discrimination'?  Correct response – C  AO1 = 1	1
06	2	Which <b>2</b> of the following statements most accurately explain the term 'equality'?  Correct response – B and C.  AO1 = 2	2

06	3	<p>Discuss <b>2</b> ways, not mentioned in <b>Source D</b>, in which parents could challenge a school's admission policy.</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> <p>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td> <p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p> </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><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the ways in which the parents in Source D could have challenged the school's admission policy successfully. The candidate needs to identify from the source that the 'objectors' wrote to the school to object to the admissions policy – this could have been by letter or email. Therefore the alternative ways the candidate needs to discuss could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Seeking publicity via the media</b></li> <li>• <b>Organising a petition</b></li> <li>• <b>Taking the school to a tribunal</b></li> <li>• <b>Seeking support from the NUT</b></li> <li>• <b>Appealing to the school governors</b></li> <li>• <b>Seeking election as a school governor to change the school's admission policy</b></li> <li>• <b>If an academy they could appeal to the academy trust</b></li> <li>• <b>Lobbying the regional commissioner for schools</b></li> <li>• <b>Contacting an MP.</b></li> </ul> <p>Award a maximum of two marks for each clear discussion of a way parents could successfully challenge a school's admission policy.</p> <p>Award a maximum of one mark for each limited discussion of a way parents could successfully challenge a school's admission policy.</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	<p>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>	1	1–2	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>	0	0	Nothing to credit.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor													
2	3–4	<p>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>													
1	1–2	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>													
0	0	Nothing to credit.													

07	1	What does the term 'ECHR' stand for?  Correct response – B  AO1 = 1	1
07	2	Identify <b>two</b> functions of international law in conflict situations.  Award one mark for each correctly identified function such as:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• To protect victims of conflict e.g.<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prisoners of war</li><li>• Civilians</li><li>• Sick and wounded.</li></ul></li><li>• The rules of war – including the situations under which military action can be taken.</li><li>• To prosecute people guilty of 'war crimes'.</li></ul> AO1 = 2	2



07	3	<p>Consider the situation described in <b>Source E</b> and discuss <b>two</b> reasons why UK citizens do have their human rights protected.</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 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> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the reasons why the citizens of certain countries do not have their human rights protected and the citizens of other countries do have their human rights protected. The candidate needs to identify that the source discusses citizens in Syria and those living in IS (Islamic State) controlled areas as not having their human rights protected.</p> <p>This should lead to the candidate comparing these situations described in the source to that in the UK. This could include a discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Syrian citizens not having their human rights protected due to the civil war which the country has been fighting. In contrast the UK has enjoyed a prolonged period of peace since 1945.</li> <li>• Those areas which were controlled by IS in which many individuals did not have their human rights protected due to discrimination. In contrast in the UK human rights are enjoyed by UK citizens due to the rule of law and a history of civil liberties being 'enshrined' in British political culture.</li> <li>• If answer only mentions Human Rights Act (HRA) award one mark only.</li> </ul> <p>Award a maximum of two marks for each clear discussion of a reason why UK citizens have their human rights protected. Reference to source required to gain 2 marks for discussion of a reason.</p> <p>Award a maximum of one mark for each limited discussion of a reason why UK citizens have their human rights protected.</p> <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.													

08	1	<p>Which role in <b>Source F</b> can result in a fine of £1,000 if a citizen refuses to carry it out?</p> <p>Correct response – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
08	2	<p>Which role in <b>Source F</b> involves dealing with a complaint relating to an employment contract?</p> <p>Correct response – B</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
08	3	<p>Name <b>2</b> roles carried out by Police and Crime Commissioners.</p> <p>Award one mark for each correctly identified role such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To meet the public and listen to their views about policing</li> <li>• To produce a police and crime plan</li> <li>• Set out policing priorities</li> <li>• Control of the police budget</li> <li>• To appoint and dismiss the chief constable</li> <li>• To oversee the police.</li> </ul> <p>AO1= 2</p>	2

08	4	<p>Referring to <b>Source G</b>, consider <b>2</b> reasons why citizens may be <b>unsuccessful</b> in their fight against injustice.</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> <p>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td> <p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p> </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><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the reasons why UK citizens may be successful in fighting an injustice. With regard to the source, the candidate needs to identify why CAMRA were successful in fighting an injustice – this could include being a long established pressure group, having public support, a close working relationship with government (insider status) &amp; cross-party support. The candidate is then required to discuss reasons why citizens may be <b>unsuccessful</b> in this objective. The reasons could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not being well-organised</li> <li>• Promoting a divisive or controversial issue</li> <li>• Using tactics disapproved of by government</li> <li>• Due to other factors – such as limited resources (money, membership, etc.)</li> </ul> <p>Award a maximum of two marks for each clear discussion of a reason why citizens may be unsuccessful in their fight against an injustice. Reference to source G is required to gain 2 marks for a consideration of a reason.</p> <p>Award a maximum of one mark for each limited discussion of a reason why citizens may be unsuccessful in their fight against an injustice.</p> <p>AO2 = 4</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	<p>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>	1	1–2	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>	0	0	Nothing to credit.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor													
2	3–4	<p>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>													
1	1–2	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</p>													
0	0	Nothing to credit.													

09	1	What is 'identity theft'?	1
		Correct response – D	
		AO1 = 1	

09	2	<p>'Rehabilitation is the most effective way of dealing with criminals and their crimes.'</p> <p>Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?</p>	8																		
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Level</th> <th>Marks</th> <th>Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>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>3</td> <td>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>2</td> <td>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>1</td> <td>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>0</td> <td>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><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Points which may be raised in agreement with the statement could include rehabilitation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the most effective way to reduce recidivism (lower reoffending rates)</li> <li>• Enables offenders to make a positive contribution to society</li> <li>• Allows for restorative justice, which is beneficial to the victim of crime, society and the offender</li> <li>• Creates law abiding citizens</li> <li>• Is a cost effective way to tackle criminal behaviour</li> <li>• May be more effective than custodial sentences due to prisons potentially being a 'university of crime'.</li> </ul> <p>Points which may be raised in disagreement with the statement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The victims of crime and society in general, have a legitimate need for retribution</li> <li>• The need to protect the public may mean some dangerous criminals cannot be released</li> <li>• Punishment can act as both an individual and general deterrent</li> <li>• Offenders might pretend to want to change in order to gain access to rehabilitation programmes and the possibility of a reduced sentence</li> <li>• The behaviour management programmes around which rehabilitation may be based may only be effective in prison and not outside of prison.</li> </ul> <p>AO3 = 8</p>	
--	--	--

10	1	<p>Define the term 'judicial review'.</p> <p>Award one mark for an accurate definition of the term 'judicial review' where a <b>judge reviews the lawfulness of a decision or action</b> made by a public body or a court.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	---	---

10	2	<p>'The UK courts are a very effective means by which the citizen can hold those in power to account.'</p> <p>Considering a range of views to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?</p> <p>In your answer you should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how citizens working together can hold those in positions of power to account using the justice system</li> <li>• the relationship between the judiciary and government.</li> </ul>	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         </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
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																

		<p>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.</p>	
0	0	Nothing to credit.	
<p><b>Indicative content</b> Points which may be raised in agreement with the statement could include the courts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Via judicial review, may challenge government decisions, or law made by delegated legislation, which can be declared ultra vires (going beyond their legal powers)</li> <li>• May declare a law to be incompatible with the Human Rights Act (1998) and issue a certificate of non-compliance</li> <li>• May make a decision which is at variance with government policy in order to highlight inconsistencies or to prompt the government to legislate</li> <li>• Can be show by case studies (e.g. the Hillsborough disaster campaign, the ‘Bedroom Tax’ campaign and the case involving ‘Brexit’ and Article 50, brought by Gina Miller in 2016) to be effective in doing this.</li> </ul> <p>Points which may be raised in disagreement with the statement could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parliamentary sovereignty means that power ultimately lies with the politicians</li> <li>• The appointment process tends to produce ‘compliant’ judges</li> <li>• Judges tend to come from social elites who will produce judgements that defend the status quo</li> <li>• Judges can suffer from attacks from the media (e.g. The Daily Mail’s “Enemies of the People” November 2016 headline) which may weaken their credibility in the eyes of the public</li> <li>• Judges are reliant upon the Lord Chancellor (a prime ministerial appointee) to defend their judicial independence</li> <li>• Not all citizens have equal access to the court due to financial and cultural capital issues</li> <li>• Tribunals and Ombudsmen can prove to be more effective means to hold those in power to account for the average citizen – in terms of cost and time.</li> </ul> <p>AO3 = 8</p>			
<b>TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION</b>			<b>40</b>