



**General Certificate of Education**

**CITIZENSHIP STUDIES 1101**

**CIST1      Identity, Rights and  
Responsibilities**

**Report on the Examination**

*2009 examination - June series*

**This Report on the Examination uses the [new numbering system](#)**

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

#### COPYRIGHT

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

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

*Dr Michael Cresswell*, Director General.

## Citizenship Studies

### AS Unit CIST1 Identity, Rights and Responsibilities

#### General Comments

This was the first examination of the new Citizenship Studies specification.

On the whole there were very few rubric errors. Also, candidates were able to answer all the questions on the paper in the time provided. Time allocated to each question was sometimes an issue, and candidates are reminded to read how many marks are available for each question and use time accordingly. Centres need to note the comments relating to specific questions and ensure these are incorporated into future teaching strategies.

The examination was split into two sections, 'Identity' and 'Rights and Responsibilities'. Each section has a compulsory source based question and a choice of two questions, from which one is answered.

#### Section A Identity

0	1
---	---

Most candidates coped well with this question. A large number gave thorough answers including relevant examples of different cultures and their attributes, which was required to gain full marks. Others gave rather tautological and repetitive variations of the phrase 'cultural difference' which gained fewer marks. Some candidates attempted to assess the advantages and disadvantages of having different cultures – this was not required, as only AO1 is rewarded in this question.

0	2
---	---

This question was answered reasonably well, although many candidates didn't pick up on the definition of multiculturalism from the extract which dealt with the *policy* of multiculturalism rather than referring to a multi-racial or multi-cultural society. Many candidates conflated controversy over multiculturalism with that over immigration. Those answers that concentrated on immigration did not score as well as those who dealt with the issue of culture.

0	3
---	---

This question was answered by the majority of candidates. This question, on the whole, was well answered. Candidates gave good explanatory answers, often linking points effectively. Some candidates successfully brought in theory and political explanations, cycles of poverty, discrimination, stereotyping and labelling. Stronger candidates identified a number of appropriate social groups such as the underclass, ethnic minority groups and women. Some candidates dealt with only one group, which often limited their marks. Weaker candidates showed confusion over the meaning of the term social groups, mentioning 'chavs' and 'goths'. These types of answers were less well rewarded.

0	4
---	---

Very few candidates attempted this question and when they did, it did not tend to be well answered. Those candidates that did attempt a response acknowledged that the concept of citizenship was problematic due to the fact that there was little agreement on what citizenship was. Some candidates debated the issue of place of birth versus adopting a nationality, some debated ethnicity and Britishness, some discussed the nature of actions and citizenship. On the whole candidates did not debate specific ideas about citizenship as was predicted in the mark scheme, or different theorists' views on Citizenship. Considering the nature of the question in relation to the specification, this question should not have caused difficulties.

**Section B Rights and Responsibilities****0 5**

This question was answered reasonably well, although too many candidates failed to read the question carefully. The question concerned human rights, although many candidates referred to British citizens' rights. Candidates should be reminded to read all questions thoroughly and give clear, developed points in line with the requirements of the question. In this case, the straightforward way of achieving full marks was to identify and give a full explanation of such human rights as the right to life, the right not to be tortured and the right to family life. Some candidates identified British rights, which were harder to give adequate explanations of and to score marks from.

**0 6**

This question did not cause too many difficulties for candidates. However, a large number of candidates referred vaguely to 'laws' and the 'government'. Reference was made to the Human Rights Act quite often, but that was in the extract. There was reasonably good knowledge of anti-discrimination laws and some candidates thought creatively about the question, mentioning Social Services, Trade Unions and organisations like the NSPCC. Such answers were well rewarded.

**0 7**

Candidates who chose this question fell into one of two categories. Candidates who had the knowledge of Alternative Dispute Resolutions did well and scored accordingly. Most candidates, however, failed to recognise the thrust or did not have sufficient knowledge to answer this question. Very general responses about avoiding fights or similar were common.

**0 8**

This was the more popular of the two optional questions. However, many candidates struggled with this question. Candidates tended to appreciate the issue of rights but were unable to link the duties of citizens specifically to rights. Some stronger candidates were able link such duties as voting, serving your country, etc with rights, but this was rare. More often, candidates stated what rights people had, or acknowledged that the rights of different citizens may conflict.