



Oxford Cambridge and RSA

GCSE (9–1)

Citizenship Studies

J270/03: Our rights, our society, our world

General Certificate of Secondary Education

Mark Scheme for Autumn 2021

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

© OCR 2021

Annotations

Annotation	Meaning
✓ and ✗	For correct and incorrect responses
BOD	benefit of doubt
VG	vague
IRRL	irrelevant
REP	repetition
NAQ	not answering question
EG	example given
L1	Level 1
L2	Level 2
L3	Level 3
L4	Level 4

Highlighting is also available to highlight any particular points on the script.

Item	Response	Marks	Guidance
1a	<p>Articles 6 to 11 are related to legal process and therefore can relate to trials. Also accept answers which mean the same as these rights:</p> <p>Article 6: We should all have the same level of legal protection whoever we are, and wherever in the world we are.</p> <p>Article 7: The law is the same for everyone and must treat us all equally.</p> <p>Article 8: We should all have the right to legal support if we are treated unfairly.</p> <p>Article 9: Nobody should be arrested, put in prison, or sent away from our country unless there is good reason to do so.</p> <p>Article 10: Everyone accused of a crime has the right to a fair and public trial, and those that try us should be independent and not influenced by others.</p> <p>Article 11: Everyone accused of a crime has the right to be considered innocent until they have fairly been proven to be guilty.</p>	2	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>A valid point can be awarded a maximum of 1 mark. Give credit to a valid point wherever it appears in the response space. A maximum total of 2 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Do not credit any repetition of points.</p>

1b	<p>One mark for each valid point:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 50-70% of children living in impoverished communities in developed economies have communication disabilities ● The ratio of speech pathologists in Africa is thirty times lower than that in the USA, UK, Canada and Australia and so children with speech problems cannot communicate as easily (Accept Indian comparison but not separately) ● 758 million adults lack basic reading and writing skills and so cannot communicate fully ● 466 million people suffer from disabling hearing loss which suggests that they do not have access to remedial or alternative measures which would enable them to have freedom of expression. ● Countries in Africa and the Middle East actively persecute LGBT+ members and so do not have freedom of expression 	4	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Examiners must assess each of the points in turn.</p> <p>Each of the four points can be awarded a maximum of 1 mark if they are linked to some evidence.</p> <p>The answers indicate the minimum acceptable responses.</p> <p>Give credit to valid points wherever they appear in the response space.</p> <p>A maximum total of 4 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Responses must make a clear link between the facts from the stimulus and exercising the right to freedom of expression/opinion.</p> <p>Do not credit any repetition of points.</p>
1c	<p>Any four points that could be used as part of a reasoned, coherent case against the viewpoint that 'International agreements on human rights are effective in protecting civilians around the world'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Freedom of expression and democratic rights are restricted in many countries e.g. China or Iran. ● There is widespread use of the death penalty outside Europe e.g. many states in the USA ● Chemical weapons have been used against civilians by some regimes e.g. Syria in 2014 ● Women do not enjoy equal human rights in many parts of the world e.g. Saudi Arabia 	4	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Examiners must assess each of the points in turn.</p> <p>Each of the four points can be awarded a maximum of 1 mark.</p> <p>Give credit to valid points wherever they appear in the response space.</p> <p>A maximum total of 4 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Do not credit any repetition of points.</p> <p>Other valid points could be made but they must be developed beyond a simple point e.g. 'Human Rights Agreements do not protect civilians from terrorists' or 'Human Rights Agreements are not enforceable'</p> <p>Some of the key areas examiners need to be looking for are slavery; asylum; fair trial; education; equal rights for women; conflicts;</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some countries do not allow the right to free trial or allow people to be imprisoned without trial e.g. North Korea.• Many countries do not provide education for all of their population e.g. South Sudan <p>There are many other examples available.</p>		persecution; democracy – all of these areas will require an explanation/be qualified with an example.
--	---	--	---

Item	Response	Marks	Guidance
2a	<p>One of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Health tourism' costs only 0.3% of the BMA's budget which is very small. • Much of the £300 million cost is made up of costs for British migrants who are entitled to NHS treatment in any case. • Many of the 'health tourists' actually pay for their care and this is not counted in the £300 million 	1	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>The response must be a product of both Fig. 2 and reflect an understanding of the idea of misuse</p> <p>Only allow one of these three responses.</p>
2b	<p>Credit any sensible response but likely ones will tend to be similar to one of these</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A law saying that patients need to carry an NHS card to gain treatment • A requirement on any non-British citizens entering the UK to have comprehensive medical insurance; • A requirement of a valid medical certificate to show that a non-British citizen entering the UK has no pre-existing medical condition/is not coming to the UK for treatment • Require people to provide proof of UK citizenship/residency in order to gain NHS treatment 	1	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>The response must be a product of both Fig 2 and reflect an understanding of risk management.</p> <p>Any other credible action to be credited</p>
2c	<p>Any two reasons why some people in Britain would oppose restrictions on health tourism supported by Fig 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many health tourists "cannot be treated in their own country" and so morally we need to help them • Many health tourists "have no means to pay" and to deny medical care is denying them human rights (Asylum seekers have the right to free medical treatment) • Accept that health tourism does not cost the system much money 	2	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Examiners must assess each of the reasons in turn.</p> <p>Each of the two points can be awarded a maximum of 1 mark.</p> <p>Give credit to valid points wherever they appear in the response space.</p> <p>A maximum total of 2 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Do not credit any repetition of points.</p>

2d	<p>Any four points that could be used as part of a reasoned, coherent case against the viewpoint that '<i>Britain benefits from economic migrants</i>'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Economic migrants put pressure on public services like education or healthcare ● Economic migrants increase the pool of workers and so lead to fewer job opportunities, lower wages and poorer working conditions. ● Economic migrants encourage criminality e.g. via modern slavery as sex working or farm labouring ● Economic migrants put pressure on housing – there are already many people sleeping rough on the streets ● Migrant women have a higher fertility rate than women born in the UK which puts a burden on maternity care and education. ● Some criminals and terrorists adopt the guise of economic migrants to enter the UK. <p>Any other reasonable point which does not overlap with these.</p> <p>,</p>	4	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Examiners must assess each of the points in turn.</p> <p>Each of the four points can be awarded a maximum of 1 mark.</p> <p>Give credit to valid points wherever they appear in the response space.</p> <p>A maximum total of 4 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Points must be different from one another and must oppose the viewpoint that '<i>Britain benefits from economic migrants</i>'</p> <p>Do not credit any repetition of points.</p> <p>Accept valid answers that refer to current circumstances e.g. Brexit or Covid as long as they are not a repetition or development of a previous point.</p>
2e*	<p>This item is designed to assess the skills underpinning AO3b.</p> <p>Credit should be given for effective written advocacy.</p> <p>Indicators include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus on the argument throughout. ● Valid selection of strong supportive points opposing the viewpoint ● Valid selection of convincing examples. ● Clarity and concision. 	8	<p>Use annotation L1, L2, L3, L4 and EG next to examples.</p> <p>Also use VG, IRRL, NAQ and REP as appropriate.</p> <p>Do <u>not</u> use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks)</p> <p>A clear, coherent and convincing case following a sustained line of reasoning and directly challenging the proposition that "<i>the interests of UK citizens should come before those of asylum seekers</i>."</p>

<p>Points opposing the proposition include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 1951 Refugee Convention of the United Nations requires the UK to give political asylum and so this requires the UK to give people these rights despite any cost to the taxpayer • The numbers involved are relatively small. Only 20,000 people were given political asylum and so the costs to the British taxpayer are small compared to the benefit gained • Britain is a member of the G7 and a very wealthy economy. We have the means to accommodate asylum seekers with very little harm to our economy. • The UK has a reputation as a safe haven for political refugees; even Marx and Lenin came to the UK. Some pressure on resources such as housing or education is more than compensated for by maintaining Britain's position in the world • The UK has a moral duty to protect human rights of all people. Political safety takes precedence over the interests of UK citizens. • The question could be held to present a false dichotomy. Asylum seekers may benefit the UK. For example, 1200 refugees are qualified doctors and it costs £25,000 to support a refugee doctor to practice in the UK. To train a new doctor costs £250,000 • Limiting asylum seekers to benefit UK citizens might be short sighted. In the future, if citizens in the UK needed to apply for political asylum themselves, any undermining of this system in the UK may mean that they would find it hard to get asylum themselves. 		<p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a line of reasoning which is easy to follow and maintained throughout • at least four convincing, accurate and relevant points to explain the interests of UK citizens should not come before those of asylum seekers. • valid use of examples to substantiate at least two of the points made <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) A clear and largely coherent and convincing case directly opposing the proposition.</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a definite line of reasoning throughout most of the case • at least three convincing, accurate and relevant points to explain why 'the interests of UK citizens should not come before those of asylum seekers.' • valid use of examples to substantiate at least one of the points made <p>Level 2 (3- 4 marks) A case that opposes the viewpoint '<i>the interests of UK citizens should come before those of asylum seekers.</i>'</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a definite statement opposing the case • at least two relevant points to explain why the interests of UK citizens should <u>not</u> come before those of asylum seekers. • valid use of at least one relevant example <p>Candidates may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • link their example to one of the points made
---	--	--

			<p>Level 1 (1- 2 marks) A relevant point or example linked to the proposition. Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• at least one relevant point or example to explain why the interests of UK citizens should not come before those of asylum seekers. <p>Candidates may:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• use further limited points of tangential relevance• use a further limited example <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>
--	--	--	--

Item	Response	Marks	Guidance
3a	<p>This item is designed to assess candidates' ability to analyse and interpret information.</p> <p>Any two arguments from the information in Fig. 3.1 to show that the December 2020 trade deal was vital to the UK economy including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Nearly half of all UK exports – about £225 billion per year – go to EU countries ● Tariffs would have made UK exports more expensive. ● Tariffs would have meant that there was less demand for UK goods. ● UK businesses may have closed / moved / reduced staffing levels. ● Tariffs imposed by the EU (in retaliation) would have led to price increases in the UK (accept examples, e.g. fish). ● UK consumers would have had less money to spend. 	2	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>The response can be awarded a maximum of 2 marks. Give credit to the valid point wherever it appears in the response space.</p> <p>A maximum total of 2 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>The arguments listed must be derived from the information in Fig. 3.1.</p>
3b*	<p>This item is designed to assess the skills underpinning AO3. (Evaluate a range of evidence relating to citizenship issues, debates and actions [including different viewpoints] to make substantiated judgements.)</p> <p>Candidates should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● analyse the viewpoint accurately ● draw upon their own understanding of key citizenship concepts such as 'trade', sovereignty and 'representation'. ● select relevant evidence from Fig. 3.1 and 3.2. ● select relevant evidence from their studies ● reach a substantiated conclusion. 	8	<p>Use annotations L1, L2, L3 and L4 and EG next to examples. Also use VG, IRRL, NAQ and REP as appropriate. Do <u>not</u> use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>A maximum total of 8 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Level 4 (7–8 marks) An excellent, relevant, coherent, logically structured and substantiated response <u>for or against</u> the viewpoint, "The UK will gain more than it loses by leaving the EU."</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● an excellent deployment of relevant evidence including explicit reference to both sources

<p>Throughout their answer, candidates should demonstrate ability to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> evaluate evidence for the purpose of responding to the viewpoint make a substantiated judgement. <p>Reasons why the UK may be said to have gained more than it lost by leaving the EU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> gain greater control of coastal waters greater degree of sovereignty in law making greater degree of sovereignty in border control / immigration rules able to make trade deals with other countries <p>Reasons why the UK may be said to have lost more than it gained by leaving the EU:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the UK enjoyed tariff-free trade with the EU already but there will now be some impediments to the movement of goods across borders no say in the EU's policies / direction of travel UK professional qualifications not accepted Restrictions on freedom of work, residence, etc. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a sustained and convincing line of argument reference to at least three substantial points <p>Level 3 (5–6 marks) A good, coherent and relevant response <u>for or against</u> the viewpoint maintaining a sustained line of argument.</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a good deployment of relevant evidence including at least one point selected from the sources a convincing line of argument reference to at least two developed points <p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) A valid but basic case made <u>for or against</u> the viewpoint.</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a basic use of 2 relevant but not necessarily substantial points that may be derived from the sources a coherent and logical case <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) A limited response.</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a statement of valid points <u>for or against</u> the viewpoint. <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p> <p>Give credit to valid points wherever they appear in the response space. Do not credit any repetition of points.</p>
---	--	--

Item	Response	Marks	Guidance
4a	<p>Any two of the following countries</p> <p>China France Russian Federation (accept Russia) UK</p>	2	<p>Use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Examiners must assess each of the responses in turn.</p> <p>Each of the two responses can be awarded a maximum of 1 mark.</p> <p>Give credit to valid points wherever they appear in the response space.</p> <p>A maximum total of 2 marks can be awarded.</p> <p>Do not credit any repetition of responses.</p>
Item	Response	Marks	Guidance
4b*	<p>This item is designed to assess the skills underpinning both AO3a and AO3c.</p> <p>Candidates should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● analyse the viewpoint and stimulus sources accurately ● show an appreciation of the issue's complexity and present arguments on both sides of the case ● reach a substantiated conclusion <p>Throughout their answer, candidates should demonstrate ability to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● analyse the evidence from the stimulus sources and use evidence from their studies for the purpose of responding to the viewpoint ● evaluate the viewpoint and a range of evidence to make a substantiated judgement <p>Reasons for the problems in getting the United Nations to act might include but are not limited to:</p>	12 AO3a 4 marks AO3c 8 marks	<p>Use annotations L1, L2, L3, L4 and EG next to examples.</p> <p>Also use VG, IRRL, NAQ and REP as appropriate.</p> <p><u>Do not</u> use ✓ or ✗</p> <p>Examiners must assess each of the AOs in turn.</p> <p>It is acceptable for marks and levels to be different across the two AOs</p>
		AO3a	AO3c
		Level 4 (4 marks) The response incorporates a thorough and accurate analysis of a range of evidence including both the stimulus sources. The candidate's analysis reflects the complexity of the issue	Level 4 (7–8 marks) A coherent, relevant, logically structured and substantiated personal response to the viewpoint “ <i>The United Nations peacekeeping forces have not been effective in</i>

	<p>1. There are great political differences between the permanent members of the Security Council who each can veto action</p> <p>2. The Security Council can only act therefore where the interests of the permanent members are not affected as shown by the map. Thus, there has been no peacekeeping forces deployed in the Ukraine as this involves both Russia and the western states.</p> <p>3. The United States as the largest contributor may not keep up its payments unless its interests are taken account of.</p> <p>4. The difficulty of finding states to provide peace keeping forces</p> <p>5. The unwillingness of the states where the peacekeeping force is needed to accept troops from certain countries. Many former colonies do not want troops from the former imperial state such as Belgian troops in the DRC</p> <p>6. The UN will find it difficult to act where there is no civil authority to deal with e.g. with ISIS</p> <p>7. The UN will find it difficult to act unless all sides in a conflict are willing to accept peacekeeping forces</p> <p>Reasons for the problems faced by peacekeeping forces when they are in action could include but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Missions might not have sufficient forces to maintain their role 2 Mission commanders sometimes find it hard to obtain further support when they need it. This often needs the Security Council's approval 3 Peacekeeping forces have the right to use 		<p>The response will contain specific examples linked to the reasons for the UN peacekeeping forces being not effective in protecting civilians from conflict from Figs 4.1 and 4.2 and elsewhere.</p>	<p><i>protecting civilians from conflict.'</i></p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a thorough evaluation of a range of evidence including the stimulus sources. • an understanding of the issue's complexity • specific and accurate references to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasons for the problems in getting the United Nations to send forces ○ Reasons for the problems faced by peacekeeping forces when they are in action ○ The impact if the USA decides not to maintain its contributions • a substantiated conclusion
		<p>Level 3 (3 marks) The response incorporates a sound analysis of relevant evidence which includes reference to the stimulus documents.</p> <p>The response will contain some largely accurate examples linked to the reasons for and against the UK keeping up its payments</p>	<p>Level 3 (5–6marks) A valid, coherent and substantiated personal response to the viewpoint.</p> <p>Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A sound evaluation of a range of evidence including reference to one of the stimulus sources. • largely accurate references to all of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasons for the problems in getting the United Nations to send forces 	

	<p>weapons for self defence or to protect civilians, but this has not always worked as in the case of Dutch forces at Srebrenica who evacuated their compound and so allowed 350 Muslim men to be murdered by Serbian troops</p> <p>4 The cost of peacekeeping. The mission to South Sudan cost \$1 billion a year for 12,500 soldiers which failed to prevent the drift to civil war.</p> <p>5 There is a lack of control over peacekeeping forces which have led to sexual abuse, murder and extortion/theft. In Kosovo there were 800 cases of sexual abuse, 70 murders and 100 examples of theft and extortion.</p> <p>What may happen if the USA decides not to maintain its contribution would include but not be limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It would take away almost a third of the money for peacekeeping (\$1.7 billion of \$5.25 billion) 2. Other countries may follow the example of the USA arguing that the USA as the wealthiest country in the world should better afford this. 3. It would reduce the range of responses by the United Nations to deal with conflicts around the world and force them to use sanctions and other measures 4. The United Nations would be undermined as an international organization 5. Citizens around the world would have less protection and their human rights would be less likely to be respected. 		<p>to NATO drawn from Sources 6 and 7 <u>and</u> elsewhere.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasons for the problems faced by peacekeeping forces when they are in action ○ The impact if the USA decides not to maintain its contributions ● a substantiated conclusion
			<p>Level 2 (2 marks) The response incorporates a limited analysis of relevant evidence which includes reference to at least one of the stimulus sources.</p> <p>The response will contain some specific examples linked to the reasons for and against the UK keeping up its payments to NATO drawn from Sources 6 <u>or</u> 7, <u>or</u> elsewhere.</p>	<p>Level 2 (3–4 marks) A valid but limited personal response to the viewpoint. Features must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● a limited evaluation of relevant evidence drawn from the stimulus sources or elsewhere ● limited references to <u>two</u> of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasons for the problems in getting the United Nations to send peacekeeping forces ○ Reasons for the problems faced by peacekeeping forces when they are in action ○ The impact if the USA decides not to maintain its contributions ● a limited but specific response to the viewpoint.
			<p>AO3a</p> <p>Level 1 (1 mark) The response will contain some limited references to examples / evidence.</p>	<p>AO3c</p> <p>Level 1 (1–2 marks) A very basic personal response. Features must include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● implied understanding of the viewpoint in the question.

	<p>Answers could legitimately take the view that the USA might also be reluctant to provide forces rather than money for a variety of acceptable reasons such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As the USA has large armed forces, it would be hard to find other countries to contribute troops 2. Other countries might follow the USA's example – why put our country's troops at risk if the USA will not. <p>Other points to qualify the stimulus viewpoint in Figure 4.1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The "greater concern" comment is undermining the seriousness of those who are sent to provide protection being harmed themselves or harming other people. This would very seriously undermine the standing of the United Nations 2. The United States was not acting with the other permanent members of the Security Council in organizing the meeting. As a result, the views of permanent members, especially China and Russia who are hostile to the USA, are not being represented. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • limited but valid points or examples to illustrate <u>one</u> of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasons for the problems in getting the United Nations to send peacekeeping forces ○ Reasons for the problems faced by peacekeeping forces when they are in action ○ The impact if the USA decides not to maintain its contributions
			<p>AO3a</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>	<p>AO3c</p> <p>Level 0 (0 marks) No response or no response worthy of credit.</p>

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored