

**GCSE  
CITIZENSHIP STUDIES  
8100/1**

Paper 1

---

**Mark scheme**

June 2019

---

Version: 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 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](http://aqa.org.uk)

#### **Copyright information**

For confidentiality purposes acknowledgements of third-party copyright material are published in a separate booklet which is available for free download from [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk) after the live examination series.

Copyright © 2019 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 – Active citizenship**

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
01	1	<p><b>Identify one role played by a pressure group.</b></p> <p>Award one mark for identifying one role.</p> <p>Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• educating the public (and/or government) about issues</li> <li>• representing (or campaigning for) the interest of their members</li> <li>• enabling people to discuss/meet/develop ideas</li> <li>• raising funds for a specific Government</li> <li>• pressure on the Government</li> <li>• specific examples of actions.</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant answer.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
01	2	<p><b>Define the term ‘political party’.</b></p> <p>Responses might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a definition referring to a group of people who stand for election</li> <li>• group of people who share political interests</li> <li>• an example of a party that serves as a definition, e.g. the Labour Party is an organisation created to protect the interests of working class people.</li> </ul> <p>Do not award a mark for naming a political party.</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
01	3	<p><b>Citizens can hold people in positions of power to account.</b></p> <p><b>Explain one way this can be done.</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a valid way and 1 mark for developing an explanation by using evidence or an example.</p> <p>Responses might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• they can use their vote (1) to appoint/remove politicians from office(1)</li> <li>• they can ask their MP (1) to ask parliamentary questions of ministers on their behalf (1).</li> </ul> <p>Award marks for any other relevant answer.</p>	2

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

01	4	<p><b>Explain the term ‘lobbying’.</b></p> <p><b>Give one example to support your answer.</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for correct understanding of the term and 1 mark for an appropriate example.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lobbying is the attempt to persuade a politician to vote/act in a particular way</li> <li>• the example may relate to the student’s own citizenship activity or to relevant activities undertaken by the broader community, eg writing to an MP, delivering a petition, visit Parliament in person to talk to an MP to try to persuade them.</li> </ul> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

01	5	<p><b>Explain one role of charities.</b></p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a valid role and 1 mark for developing an explanation by adding detail, an example, or other evidence in support.</p> <p>Roles might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to raise money (1 mark) in order to alleviate and/or enhance the condition of a particular group of people (1 mark)</li> <li>• to raise awareness of the situation of a particular group of individuals (1 mark). For example, Shelter raises awareness of the plight of homeless people (1 mark)</li> <li>• to deliver a service (1 mark). For example, the British Heart Foundation worked with the Department of Health to distribute defibrillators (1 mark).</li> </ul> <p>NB: an example may relate to the student’s own citizenship activity or to relevant activities undertaken by a group operating in the broader community.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

01	6	<p><b>Examine why people wishing to bring about change in society may choose to start an online petition.</b></p> <p><b>In your response you should refer to Source A and examples from your own knowledge.</b></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>                     Well-chosen evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and own examples.                      Demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.                      The evidence is used to support arguments which are well developed and analysed.                      The arguments lead to a coherent conclusion.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td>                     Appropriate evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and from own examples                      Demonstrates good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.                      The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed or analysed.                      Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td>                     Some evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and from own examples.                      Demonstrates some, occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.                      Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.                      Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.                 </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 to the citizenship actions discussed in <b>Source A</b>.                      Little or no attempt is made to analyse the evidence presented or to provide own examples.                      Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.                 </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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• an online petition is relatively easy to start</li> <li>• online petition is relative cheap</li> <li>• effective to get a message across</li> <li>• successful online petitions represent an effective way of free media coverage</li> <li>• reach large numbers of people</li> <li>• they have a good track record</li> </ul>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	7–8	Well-chosen evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and own examples. Demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments which are well developed and analysed. The arguments lead to a coherent conclusion.	3	5–6	Appropriate evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and from own examples Demonstrates good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed or analysed. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.	2	3–4	Some evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and from own examples. Demonstrates some, occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.	1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions discussed in <b>Source A</b> . Little or no attempt is made to analyse the evidence presented or to provide own examples. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	8
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	7–8	Well-chosen evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and own examples. Demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments which are well developed and analysed. The arguments lead to a coherent conclusion.																			
3	5–6	Appropriate evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and from own examples Demonstrates good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed or analysed. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.																			
2	3–4	Some evidence is selected from <b>Source A</b> and from own examples. Demonstrates some, occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.																			
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions discussed in <b>Source A</b> . Little or no attempt is made to analyse the evidence presented or to provide own examples. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• each of the points made will incorporate the use of suitable examples</li> <li>• award marks for any other relevant points.</li> </ul> <p>For example, <b>Source A</b> shows how a group campaigning against the sale of animal fur in the UK was able to set out their ideas and gain considerable support. <b>Source A</b> also makes it clear that a petition receiving more than 100 000 signatures will often result in it being debated in parliament.</p> <p>AO2 = 4 AO3 = 4</p>	
--	--	--

02	1	<p><b>Explain one feature of the action plan for your investigation.</b></p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Limited (1 mark) One ‘feature’ may be identified/stated e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• undertaking research</li> <li>• making a list of options</li> <li>• discussing possibilities with others in the group</li> <li>• talking to people outside of school.</li> </ul> <p>Developed (2 marks) The ‘feature’ identified will not only be identified, but also explained e.g. the way in which an interview with an individual involved in the area of interest provided useful insights.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	---	---

02	2	<p><b>Discuss how you decided on the issue of your investigation.</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Level</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Marks</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td>Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.</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 response will contain the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the question or issue will be clearly identified</li> <li>• there will be an explicit discussion of how this question or issue was arrived at</li> <li>• there will be some sense of the stages or elements of that process, eg how the question or issue was reworked or refined.</li> </ul> <p>AO2 = 4</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.	1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor													
2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.													
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts and issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts and issues surrounding the citizenship action.													
0	0	Nothing to credit.													



02	3	<b>Evaluate the success of the type of action that you chose.</b>	6															
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 10%;">Level</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Marks</th> <th style="width: 80%;">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td>Comprehensive evaluation of the type of action chosen as part of the citizenship investigation task. Arguments regarding the effectiveness of the type of citizenship action are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td>Basic attempt to evaluate the type of action chosen as part of the citizenship investigation task. Some attempt is made to analyse and evaluate the success of the type of action chosen but the points made are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td>Little or no attempt to evaluate the success of the type of action chosen. There is little or no coherence in what is written.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Level	Marks	Descriptor	3	5–6	Comprehensive evaluation of the type of action chosen as part of the citizenship investigation task. Arguments regarding the effectiveness of the type of citizenship action are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.	2	3–4	Basic attempt to evaluate the type of action chosen as part of the citizenship investigation task. Some attempt is made to analyse and evaluate the success of the type of action chosen but the points made are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.	1	1–2	Little or no attempt to evaluate the success of the type of action chosen. There is little or no coherence in what is written.	0	0	Nothing to credit.
Level	Marks	Descriptor																
3	5–6	Comprehensive evaluation of the type of action chosen as part of the citizenship investigation task. Arguments regarding the effectiveness of the type of citizenship action are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.																
2	3–4	Basic attempt to evaluate the type of action chosen as part of the citizenship investigation task. Some attempt is made to analyse and evaluate the success of the type of action chosen but the points made are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.																
1	1–2	Little or no attempt to evaluate the success of the type of action chosen. There is little or no coherence in what is written.																
0	0	Nothing to credit.																
<p><b>AO1</b></p> <p>The response will identify and discuss the type of action undertaken as part of the overall citizenship investigation.</p> <p>This discussion may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a detailed description of the action undertaken</li> <li>• an attempt to consider the type of action planned and some sense of the process by which this action type was chosen.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO3</b></p> <p>This account should relate to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• how the type of action chosen was supposed to bring about the desired outcome</li> <li>• some evaluation of the action type through a consideration of ‘what went right’ and ‘what went wrong’</li> <li>• some attempt to make an overall judgement regarding the action type adopted</li> <li>• some discussion of the various other types of action that could have been employed.</li> </ul> <p>AO1 = 2 AO3 = 4</p>																		

02	4	<p><b>Think about the overall impact of your action. Analyse ways your citizenship action made a difference.</b></p> <p><b>Your answer should refer to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>overall goal(s)/aim(s) of your citizenship action</b></li> <li>• <b>how successful your action was</b></li> <li>• <b>the outcome achieved.</b></li> </ul>	12																		
		<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;">10–12</td> <td> <p>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrate excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions.</p> <p>Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action.</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7–9</td> <td> <p>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>The evidence is used to support arguments analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context.</p> <p>Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4–6</td> <td> <p>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context.</p> <p>Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–3</td> <td> <p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td 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	10–12	<p>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrate excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions.</p> <p>Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action.</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</p>	3	7–9	<p>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>The evidence is used to support arguments analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context.</p> <p>Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent.</p>	2	4–6	<p>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context.</p> <p>Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</p>	1	1–3	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</p>	0	0	Nothing to credit.	
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	10–12	<p>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrate excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions.</p> <p>Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action.</p> <p>The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</p>																			
3	7–9	<p>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>The evidence is used to support arguments analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context.</p> <p>Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent.</p>																			
2	4–6	<p>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions.</p> <p>Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.</p> <p>Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context.</p> <p>Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</p>																			
1	1–3	<p>Basic application of knowledge and understanding to the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.</p> <p>Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</p>																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			

	<p><b>AO2</b></p> <p>The response will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relate to the student’s own participation in the investigation</li> <li>• relate to the wider aims of the investigation to the action that it led to</li> <li>• include some description of the citizenship action taken</li> <li>• demonstrate an understanding of the meaning of ‘making a difference’ in the context of such citizenship actions.</li> </ul> <p><b>AO3</b></p> <p>The response will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• relate to the ‘Taking the Action’ section of their investigation, for example, not simply analysing the investigation as an exercise in academic research, but also assessing the efficacy of the action that it resulted in as part of that evaluative process</li> <li>• set out the ‘difference’ that the citizenship action was supposed to deliver and provide some sense of how it would do that e.g. explain what concrete benefit for the wider community the action was designed to effect</li> <li>• establish some criteria or evidence base for analysing the efficacy of the action undertaken</li> <li>• evaluate the action with a view to establishing whether or not it ‘made a difference’ in the context of citizenship</li> <li>• consider ways in which the action may have fallen short in delivering the desired ‘difference’.</li> </ul> <p>AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8</p>	
--	---	--

**TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION – 40**

**Section B – Politics and participation**

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
03	1	<p><b>Which statement is the correct definition of the term councillor?</b></p> <p><b>Shade in the one correct answer.</b></p> <p>Correct answer – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
03	2	<p><b>One reason for holding a referendum would be to encourage wider interest in politics.</b></p> <p><b>Identify two other reasons for holding a referendum.</b></p> <p>One mark for each appropriate role identified.</p> <p>The response may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to encourage political participation</li> <li>• to give voters the final say on an issue of constitutional importance</li> <li>• to provide a decision in those cases where politicians are so divided that they cannot reach an agreement</li> <li>• where a party has previously promised to hold a referendum in its general election manifesto</li> <li>• government avoiding having to make a decision.</li> </ul> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
03	3	<p><b>Describe two ways in which the UK Parliament is different from the European Parliament.</b></p> <p><b>Use Source B to help you.</b></p> <p>Two marks maximum for each clear application of understanding of the ways in which the nature of the UK Parliament differs from that of the EU Parliament.</p> <p>Award one mark for identifying a single difference and a second mark for development of each difference identified.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The source focuses on the composition and function of the European Parliament. The response should contain two ways in which the UK Parliament differs from its European counterpart. Answers that simply reverse the statements should not gain marks unless some explanation is</p>	4

	<p>offered. Award up to two marks for each of two differences identified.</p> <p>For example:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 376 1256 1079"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="309 376 1256 416">Difference (1 mark)</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 416 590 456">UK Parliament</th> <th data-bbox="590 416 914 456">European Parliament</th> <th data-bbox="914 416 1256 456">Development (1 mark)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 456 590 651">Parliament consists of two chambers (bicameral).</td> <td data-bbox="590 456 914 651">The EP has one chamber.</td> <td data-bbox="914 456 1256 651">The UK parliament comprises the House of Commons (650 MPs) and House of Lords (800 Lords).</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 651 590 808">The House of Commons is chaired by the 'Speaker'</td> <td data-bbox="590 651 914 808">The European Parliament is chaired by a 'President' elected by MEPs</td> <td data-bbox="914 651 1256 808">The Speaker is a neutral figure who has little power outside of the Commons</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 808 590 1079">Parliament has supreme law-making power.</td> <td data-bbox="590 808 914 1079">The EP cannot initiate legislation alone.</td> <td data-bbox="914 808 1256 1079">This is because the UK system is based on the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, where Parliament can make or unmake any law.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <ul data-bbox="309 1115 895 1149" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Award marks for any other relevant points.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="309 1182 421 1216">AO2 = 4</p>	Difference (1 mark)			UK Parliament	European Parliament	Development (1 mark)	Parliament consists of two chambers (bicameral).	The EP has one chamber.	The UK parliament comprises the House of Commons (650 MPs) and House of Lords (800 Lords).	The House of Commons is chaired by the 'Speaker'	The European Parliament is chaired by a 'President' elected by MEPs	The Speaker is a neutral figure who has little power outside of the Commons	Parliament has supreme law-making power.	The EP cannot initiate legislation alone.	This is because the UK system is based on the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, where Parliament can make or unmake any law.	
Difference (1 mark)																	
UK Parliament	European Parliament	Development (1 mark)															
Parliament consists of two chambers (bicameral).	The EP has one chamber.	The UK parliament comprises the House of Commons (650 MPs) and House of Lords (800 Lords).															
The House of Commons is chaired by the 'Speaker'	The European Parliament is chaired by a 'President' elected by MEPs	The Speaker is a neutral figure who has little power outside of the Commons															
Parliament has supreme law-making power.	The EP cannot initiate legislation alone.	This is because the UK system is based on the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty, where Parliament can make or unmake any law.															

04	1	<p><b>Which individual is responsible for party discipline in Parliament?</b></p> <p><b>Shade in the one correct answer.</b></p> <p>Correct answer – D</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
04	2	<p><b>First Past the Post is one electoral system used in elections in the UK.</b></p> <p><b>Name two other electoral systems used in the UK.</b></p> <p>One mark for each appropriate electoral system identified.</p> <p>The response may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Party List, Regional List, or List PR</li> <li>• Single Transferable Vote</li> <li>• Supplementary Vote</li> <li>• Additional Member System (AMS can be accepted)</li> <li>• Proportional Systems/Representation.</li> </ul> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2

04	3	<p><b>Referring to Source C, discuss two arguments that could be used to persuade Zoe to vote at general elections.</b></p> <p>2 marks maximum for each of two developed arguments that could be used to persuade Zoe to vote at general elections.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying each argument and 1 mark for development of each argument identified.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>Answers might refer to:</p> <p>Zoe should vote because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• elected politicians have power over Zoe's life</li> <li>• it might improve the lives of other people like her</li> <li>• might encourage Zoe to undertake other political activities</li> <li>• it enhances the democratic process</li> <li>• ensures greater numbers of citizens are represented in parliament</li> <li>• reduces impact/consequences of low voter turnout</li> <li>• previous campaigns for equal votes have enabled her to vote.</li> </ul> <p>Example answer: Zoe should vote because elected politicians have power over her life (1 mark). They may decide, when in government, to either reduce or increase the benefits she receives (1 mark). AO2 = 4</p>	4
----	---	---	---

05	1	<p><b>Identify two elections that use a non-proportional voting system.</b></p> <p><b>Shade two correct responses.</b></p> <p>Correct answer – A and F</p> <p>One mark each = 2 marks</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

05	2	<p><b>Identify two positions from the list below that are always held by MPs sitting in the House of Commons.</b></p> <p>Correct answer – D and E</p> <p>One mark each = 2 marks</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	---	---

05	3	<p><b>Consider two ways in which the position of the US President described in Source D is different from that of the UK Prime Minister.</b></p> <p>Two marks maximum for each clear application of understanding of the ways in which the situation in the US set out in the source differs from that in the UK.</p> <p>Award one mark for identifying a single difference and a second mark for development of each difference identified.</p> <p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>The source focuses on the position of the US President (POTUS). The response requires the application of knowledge about the position of the UK Prime Minister.</p> <p>For example:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">UK Prime Minister</th> <th style="text-align: left;">US President</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>In the UK the Monarch is Head of State</td> <td>POTUS is head of the executive and head of state</td> <td>This makes it more difficult for the Prime Minister to speak on behalf of the nation at certain times</td> </tr> <tr> <td>The PM is required to be a sitting Member of Parliament</td> <td>POTUS is not allowed to be a sitting member of Congress</td> <td>The PM is normally the leader of the biggest party in parliament, making it easier to pass</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	UK Prime Minister	US President		In the UK the Monarch is Head of State	POTUS is head of the executive and head of state	This makes it more difficult for the Prime Minister to speak on behalf of the nation at certain times	The PM is required to be a sitting Member of Parliament	POTUS is not allowed to be a sitting member of Congress	The PM is normally the leader of the biggest party in parliament, making it easier to pass	4
UK Prime Minister	US President											
In the UK the Monarch is Head of State	POTUS is head of the executive and head of state	This makes it more difficult for the Prime Minister to speak on behalf of the nation at certain times										
The PM is required to be a sitting Member of Parliament	POTUS is not allowed to be a sitting member of Congress	The PM is normally the leader of the biggest party in parliament, making it easier to pass										



				laws	
		A PM can continue in office for as long as their party keeps them as party leader	An individual can only be elected to serve two full four-year terms as POTUS	A prime minister potentially has more time to get things done eg Margaret Thatcher was PM for 11 years	
		AO2 = 4			

06	1	<p><b>A civil servant is employed to support the work of the government.</b></p> <p><b>Which of the following is a civil servant?</b></p> <p><b>Shade in the one correct answer.</b></p> <p>Correct answer – A</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	---	---

06	2	<p><b>‘The rights of UK citizens are better protected than the rights of citizens in non-democratic countries.’</b></p> <p><b>Evaluate this view.</b></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Level</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Marks</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">7–8</td> <td>                     Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue.                      Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided.                      The arguments put forward form a coherent argument.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td>                     Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue.                      The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.                      Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td>                     Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue.                      Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.                      The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints.                      Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td>                     Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue.                      Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered.                      Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.                      Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The arguments put forward form a coherent argument.	3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.	2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.	1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	8
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The arguments put forward form a coherent argument.																			
3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.																			
2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.																			
1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			

	<p><b>Indicative Content</b></p> <p>Analysis of evidence should evaluate the statement that the rights of UK citizens are better protected than those of citizens in a non-democratic country.</p> <p>Arguments in support of the proposition are likely to be based on analysis of examples and evidence about ways in which the rights of citizens in the UK are protected in a way that is not normally found in non-democratic countries.</p> <p>Rights of UK citizens are protected by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the rule of law</li> <li>• an independent judiciary</li> <li>• the protection given to the freedom of speech</li> <li>• the presence of a free press</li> <li>• freedom of conscience and religion</li> <li>• the right to peacefully protest</li> <li>• petition the government for redress of grievances</li> <li>• political rights such as the right to vote</li> <li>• the right to seek election to political office and the existence of free and fair elections.</li> </ul> <p>In non-democratic states citizen rights are undermined by following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one party states</li> <li>• no voting choice/absence of free elections</li> <li>• actions of the police or military</li> <li>• censorship</li> <li>• electoral malpractice and/or voter intimidation</li> <li>• denial of the due process of law.</li> </ul> <p>Answers may highlight some of the ways in which the rights of UK citizens can still be threatened.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the erosion of the rights of UK citizens since 9/11 and 7/7</li> <li>• rights can be taken away by parliament</li> <li>• where rights are protected by membership of organisations (such as the ECHR and the UNCRC).</li> </ul> <p>A link may be made with concepts such as democracy, representation and accountability.</p> <p>AO3 = 8</p>	
--	---	--

07	1	<p><b>How many people are there in the UK Cabinet?</b></p> <p><b>Shade in the one correct answer.</b></p> <p>Correct answer – B</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	--	---

07	2	<p><b>‘Using a more proportional electoral system at UK general elections will strengthen democracy.’</b></p> <p><b>To what extent do you agree with this statement?</b></p> <p><b>In your answer you should consider:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>democracy as a key value underpinning British society today</b></li> <li>• <b>the arguments for and against the system currently used</b></li> <li>• <b>advantages and disadvantages of more proportional systems.</b></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 issue.                      Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided.                      The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td>                     Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue.                      The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated.                      Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3–4</td> <td>                     Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue.                      Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected.                      The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints.                      Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1–2</td> <td>                     Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue.                      Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered.                      Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented.                      Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td style="text-align: center;">0</td> <td>Nothing to credit.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.	3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.	2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.	1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	7–8	Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are provided which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.																			
3	5–6	Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. The evidence is used to support arguments but these arguments are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Conclusions drawn from the arguments may not be completely coherent.																			
2	3–4	Basic analysis of a limited range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. The arguments represent only a limited range of viewpoints. Some attempt is made to integrate the arguments into concluding remarks.																			
1	1–2	Limited evidence presented and/or evidence presented is not directly related to the citizenship issue. Insufficient range of differing viewpoints considered. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.																			
0	0	Nothing to credit.																			

	<p><b>Indicative content</b></p> <p>In establishing ‘the extent’ to which they agree with the proposition, students will need to look at a range of views covering both sides of the debate surrounding whether or not the First Past the Post system currently used at UK General Elections should be replaced with a more proportional system.</p> <p>Points made in support of the statement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Democracy is about ‘people power’ and proportional systems more fairly reflect what the public want, because there is a closer correlation between the percentage of votes secured, and the proportion of seats won.</li> <li>• FPTP tends to reward parties for having concentrated strongholds of support. This is bad for democracy because it penalises parties whose support is more evenly spread across the country.</li> <li>• Proportional systems often result in more women and ethnic minority candidates being elected. This is good for democracy because it means that the legislature ‘looks like’ the nation.</li> <li>• FPTP only allows candidates to place a single cross in a single box. This limits democracy because people are not able to express their views effectively through the ballot box.</li> <li>• Most proportional systems offer greater voter choice, eg by allowing voters to cast two votes (one for a preferred candidates and one for their preferred party) or by ranking candidates in order of preference.</li> </ul> <p>Points made in opposition to the statement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The FPTP is part of our traditions and normally results in stable, single-party government.</li> <li>• Proportional systems often result in a less stable form of coalition government. Such instability has the potential to contribute to a rise in extremism, which can undermine democracy.</li> <li>• FPTP makes it harder for more extreme political parties to win seats in parliament. That is good for democracy as these parties are often intrinsically anti-democratic in their ideology.</li> <li>• Proportional systems can result in a range of extreme parties securing a handful of seats.</li> <li>• The single member constituencies used under FPTP allow for a strong link between the MP and their constituency. This is good for democracy because it means that voters can hold MPs accountable.</li> <li>• Proportional systems often use larger multi-member constituencies. This means that a citizen does not have an individual MP who they can turn to, and it is not possible for voters to hold an individual MP to account.</li> <li>• The FPTP system is easily understood and simple to operate. Voters can see where their vote has gone when they look at the final results. This clarity and ease of understanding enhances democracy.</li> <li>• Many proportional systems are mathematically complicated. Voters may not understand how the result is arrived at and this may undermine their confidence in democracy.</li> </ul>	
--	---	--

		AO3 = 8	
--	--	---------	--

**TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION – 40**