



GCSE

Citizenship Studies

8100/1 Paper 1

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

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

Q	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks				
01	1	<p>Identify one function of a magistrate.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A law officer who presides over court cases in their local community • Magistrates hear less serious criminal and civil cases • They also preside over preliminary hearings in more serious cases, before they are tried in higher courts • Decide sentences <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1				
01	2	<p>Define the term ‘digital democracy’.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition or example • A definition referring to how the internet is used as a way of allowing citizens to get involved in the political process • Examples of digital democracy (such as online campaigns and petitions) which serve as a definition <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1				
01	3	<p>Identify two differences between petitions and referendums.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for each correct answer up to a maximum of 2. Responses might include:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="309 1480 1273 1839"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 1480 791 1525">Petition</th> <th data-bbox="791 1480 1273 1525">Referendum</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 1525 791 1839"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of signatures calling for change • Petitions allow for wider participation • Government are under no obligation to act in response to a petition </td> <td data-bbox="791 1525 1273 1839"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A yes/no vote called by the government • Referendums normally allow for participation by registered voters only • Governments are expected to act in accordance with referendum outcomes </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	Petition	Referendum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of signatures calling for change • Petitions allow for wider participation • Government are under no obligation to act in response to a petition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A yes/no vote called by the government • Referendums normally allow for participation by registered voters only • Governments are expected to act in accordance with referendum outcomes 	2
Petition	Referendum						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of signatures calling for change • Petitions allow for wider participation • Government are under no obligation to act in response to a petition 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A yes/no vote called by the government • Referendums normally allow for participation by registered voters only • Governments are expected to act in accordance with referendum outcomes 						

01	4	<p>Using an example, explain the meaning of the term ‘demonstration’ in the context of active citizenship.</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"> • A demonstration is a street-based form of public protest • The example may relate to the student’s own citizenship activity or to relevant activities undertaken by the broader community • Historic and non UK examples will be awarded marks <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
01	5	<p>Explain one reason why people wishing to bring about change might choose to join a political party.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a valid reason and 1 mark for developing an explanation by using evidence or an example.</p> <p>Reasons might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hope to change party policy • A desire to get elected to political office, with a wish to work with other people to support a cause • A wish to join together with other like-minded individuals in order to pursue a common cause or causes <p>The reason may relate to the student’s own citizenship activity or to relevant activities undertaken by the broader community e.g. how some of those who wanted the UK to leave the EU, joined UKIP.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2

01	6	<p>Examine why people wishing to bring about change in society may choose to use the media.</p> <p>In your response you should refer to Source A and examples of other groups who have used the media.</p>	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> Well-chosen evidence is selected from Source A and own example(s). 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 Source A 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 Source A 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 Source A. 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>				Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	7–8	Well-chosen evidence is selected from Source A and own example(s). 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 Source A 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 Source A 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 Source A. 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.
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	7–8	Well-chosen evidence is selected from Source A and own example(s). 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 Source A 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 Source A 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 Source A. 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.																			
<p>Indicative Content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It allows groups to reach out to an audience far beyond their immediate membership • Groups with limited material and financial resources gain free media coverage by engaging in highly visual forms of physical protest • Media exposure allows groups to recruit more members • Positive media coverage can enhance the group's legitimacy in the eyes of the government • Answers at the top Level of response are likely to demonstrate an 																					

		<p>awareness of the way in which different groups may use the media in different ways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each of the points made will incorporate the use of suitable examples <p>For example, Source A shows protesters from the group Surfers Against Sewage achieving wider media coverage by staging a photo-opportunity outside of the Houses of Parliament. The group 38 Degrees benefits from the relatively low cost of online activism to engage with its 1.9 million members and encourage wider awareness and support for its campaigns. The RSPCA use their involvement in television programmes such as 'The Dog Rescuers' and 'Animal Rescue' to raise awareness of their activities, widen their membership, and encourage donations.</p> <p>AO2 = 4 AO3 = 4</p>	
--	--	--	--

02	1	<p>Explain one way your interactions with individuals or groups outside the classroom helped you with your investigation.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Limited (1 mark) Individuals or groups are identified, interactions may be described.</p> <p>Developed (2 marks) Individuals or groups are identified and interactions may be described – but there is also some attempt to show how such links helped with the investigation e.g. providing technical or material assistance.</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
----	---	--	---

02	2	<p>Discuss which part of your investigation process was the most difficult and why.</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>Indicative content</p> <p>The response will contain the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One area of difficulty will be clearly identified and explained • This area may relate to any part of the investigation, from initial research, through to interactions with external agencies, or the task or ‘end-goal’ at the heart of the citizenship action • There will be a clear attempt to show why this particular part of the investigation presented the greatest difficulties <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	<p>Evaluate the extent to which your investigation was an example of effective active citizenship.</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;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5–6</td> <td>Comprehensive summary of the active citizenship investigation process. Arguments regarding the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation 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 report and organise the account of the active citizenship investigation process. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation but the arguments 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 report or organise the account of the active citizenship investigation process. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation. 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> <p>AO1 This account will discuss the nature of the citizenship task and of the action taken as part of the investigation. There will be a clear account of the action which will involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was planned to happen • What actually took place <p>AO3 Answers may refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the aims or goals of the action enhance citizenship • The extent to which action positive citizenship outcomes • Awareness of ways the action could have delivered better citizenship outcomes • Evidence which supports the claims/outcomes <p>AO1 = 2 AO3 = 4</p>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	3	5–6	Comprehensive summary of the active citizenship investigation process. Arguments regarding the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.	2	3–4	Basic attempt to report and organise the account of the active citizenship investigation process. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.	1	1–2	Little or no attempt to report or organise the account of the active citizenship investigation process. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation. There is little or no coherence in what is written.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	6
Level	Marks	Descriptor																
3	5–6	Comprehensive summary of the active citizenship investigation process. Arguments regarding the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.																
2	3–4	Basic attempt to report and organise the account of the active citizenship investigation process. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.																
1	1–2	Little or no attempt to report or organise the account of the active citizenship investigation process. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the active citizenship investigation. There is little or no coherence in what is written.																
0	0	Nothing to credit.																

02	4	<p>Analyse the ways in which your research helped you to carry out your investigation.</p> <p>Your answer should refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The range and type of research you did • How your initial research helped you to choose this issue to investigate • How research helped you to identify your investigation aims • How you made sure your research was reliable • How your research helped you to develop your investigation <table border="1" data-bbox="309 651 1243 1973"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="309 651 416 685">Level</th> <th data-bbox="416 651 528 685">Marks</th> <th data-bbox="528 651 1243 685">Descriptor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="309 685 416 987">4</td> <td data-bbox="416 685 528 987">10–12</td> <td data-bbox="528 685 1243 987"> <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 data-bbox="309 987 416 1357">3</td> <td data-bbox="416 987 528 1357">7–9</td> <td data-bbox="528 987 1243 1357"> <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 data-bbox="309 1357 416 1693">2</td> <td data-bbox="416 1357 528 1693">4–6</td> <td data-bbox="528 1357 1243 1693"> <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 data-bbox="309 1693 416 1928">1</td> <td data-bbox="416 1693 528 1928">1–3</td> <td data-bbox="528 1693 1243 1928"> <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 data-bbox="309 1928 416 1973">0</td> <td data-bbox="416 1928 528 1973">0</td> <td data-bbox="528 1928 1243 1973">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.	12
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>AO2 The response will demonstrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The students own participation in the investigation • The research aspect of the investigation • Linkage between the research undertaken and planning the citizenship action <p>AO3 The response will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain the primary and/or secondary research carried out when planning the citizenship action e.g. specific reference(s) should be made to the kinds of resources that were used and the nature and extent of interaction with individuals outside of the immediate school environment as part of the research phase. • Analyse ways research helped to inform the choice of issue to investigate and ways research helped to identify the investigation aims e.g. specific reference(s) should be made to the way in which material discovered or the greater understanding gained during the research phase was used in the planning of the citizenship action. • Analyse ways the student ensured the research was reliable eg by making reference to the kinds of sources used, describing the method for deciding on the reliability and an evaluation of the reliability. • Demonstrate ways research enabled effective planning e.g. there should be some sense of the way in which the research undertaken in preparation for the citizenship action resulted in a more effective outcome than might have been the case without it. <p>AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8</p>	
	TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION	40

Section B – Politics and participation

Q	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
03	1	Identify the definition of the rule of law. Correct answer – C AO1 = 1	1
03	2	Identify 2 roles of a legislature. 1 mark for each appropriate role identified. The response may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Representation• Political participation• Scrutiny or oversight• Passing legislation• Debates AO1 = 2	2

03	3	<p>Using Source B, consider two ways in which the UK Cabinet is different from the US Cabinet.</p> <p>Two marks maximum for each of two clear applications of understanding of the nature of the Cabinet in the UK as against the nature of the US Cabinet.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a single difference and 1 mark for development of each difference identified.</p> <p>Indicative content The source focuses on the composition of the US Cabinet. The response should contain two ways in which the UK Cabinet differs from its US counterpart. Answers that simply reverse the statements should not gain marks unless some explanation is offered.</p> <p>Award up to 2 marks for each of two differences identified.</p> <p>For example:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="308 1037 1281 1473"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="308 1037 791 1077">UK</th> <th data-bbox="791 1037 1281 1077">USA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="308 1077 791 1473"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet has traditionally been seen as important • Cabinet members tend to be generalists • Cabinet members are just ordinary MPs • Some say that the Cabinet is still the main decision-making body in the UK system </td> <td data-bbox="791 1077 1281 1473"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet has no real power under the US Constitution • Cabinet consists almost entirely of policy experts </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>AO2 = 4</p>	UK	USA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet has traditionally been seen as important • Cabinet members tend to be generalists • Cabinet members are just ordinary MPs • Some say that the Cabinet is still the main decision-making body in the UK system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet has no real power under the US Constitution • Cabinet consists almost entirely of policy experts 	4
UK	USA						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet has traditionally been seen as important • Cabinet members tend to be generalists • Cabinet members are just ordinary MPs • Some say that the Cabinet is still the main decision-making body in the UK system 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cabinet has no real power under the US Constitution • Cabinet consists almost entirely of policy experts 						

04	1	<p>Identify the electoral system used in elections to the Scottish Parliament.</p> <p>Correct answer – C</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
04	2	<p>Name 2 areas of policy that the Scottish Government controls.</p> <p>1 mark for each appropriate area of policy identified</p> <p>The response may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Environment • Housing • Health and social services • Sport and arts • Tourism • Economic development • Taxation • Transport • Local government • Law Courts • Social work • Fisheries and Agriculture <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2

04	3	<p>Referring to Source C, give two arguments that could be used to persuade people to stand as candidates at local elections.</p> <p>2 marks maximum for each of two developed arguments that could be used to persuade people to put themselves forward as candidates at local elections.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying each argument and 1 mark for development of each argument identified.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The source focuses on the problems that resulted from the fact that no candidates stood for election in the Welsh ward of Yscir in the 2017 local elections. The response should use this information to identify arguments that could be used in order to encourage people to stand as candidates at local election.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People should stand at local elections because if no one stands, there is no election (1) The right to vote is rendered meaningless unless there are at least two candidates contesting an elected office (1) • People should stand because if they do not, there will be no one to represent the local area on the local council (1) This means that the decisions taken at the council may not take into consideration the views of people who are unrepresented (1) <p>AO2 = 4</p>	4
----	---	---	---

05	1	<p>Identify the two elections where voters can only vote for a single candidate.</p> <p>Correct answer – B and C</p> <p>One mark each = 2 marks</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
05	2	<p>Identify two positions from the list below that are elected directly by the public.</p> <p>Correct answer – A and C</p> <p>One mark each = 2 marks</p> <p>AO1 = 2</p>	2
05	3	<p>Consider two ways the constitutional position described in Source D is different from the UK.</p> <p>Two marks maximum for each clear application of understanding of the ways in which the US constitutional position set out in the source differs from that in the UK.</p> <p>Award 1 mark for identifying a single difference and 1 mark for development of each difference identified.</p> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>The source focuses on the Separation of Powers doctrine and some of the ways in which it is written into the US Constitution. The response requires the application of knowledge about the constitutional arrangements present in the UK.</p> <p>For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The US Constitution provides for a separation of powers, whereas the UK constitution does not (1). In the USA this separation is achieved by preventing any one person being a member of more than one branch of government (1) • In the USA there are separate elections for Congress and the Presidency, whereas in the UK the government is normally formed from the party that wins the General Election (1). The prime minister is not directly elected, the leader of the biggest party in the House of Commons normally generally takes on that role (1) <p>AO2 = 4</p>	4

06	1	<p>A constitution is a set of rules under which a state operates.</p> <p>Which of the following accurately describes the UK constitution?</p> <p>Correct answer – C</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	--	---

06	2	<p>Evaluate how far devolution has reduced the power of the Westminster Parliament.</p> <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;">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> <p>Indicative content</p> <p>Whilst the question requires a response that comes to a conclusion, evaluation demands that candidates look at a range of views covering both sides of the argument over the extent to which devolution has reduced the power of the Westminster Parliament.</p> <p>The indicative content below provides possible routes through the</p>	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.	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 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>question. It is not a requirement that responses contain all the elements identified below; other valid points should be credited fully.</p> <p>Points suggesting that devolution has significantly reduced the power of the Westminster Parliament:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since the 1997 General Election the Westminster Parliament has handed day-to-day control of many areas of policy to devolved institutions • In Scotland, devolved institutions were given control over areas such as education and healthcare • Northern Ireland is governed by the Assembly and a power-sharing executive • Devolution in England could also be seen to have reduced the power of the Westminster Parliament e.g. Combined Authorities and elected Mayors, elected for the first time in 2017, have taken on additional powers • Recent legislation means that the devolved institutions in Scotland and Wales cannot be abolished without a referendum in the country in question <p>Power of the Westminster Parliament has not been reduced because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It retains control over many of the most important areas of policy e.g. national economic policy, foreign policy, and constitutional reform • Devolved institutions are not in a position where they can break away from the UK without the approval of the Westminster Parliament • Most of the UK population lives in England and therefore Westminster controls most policy • The Westminster Parliament represents the United Kingdom <p>AO3 = 8</p>	
--	---	--

07	1	<p>The House of Commons contains one MP from each constituency or 'seat'.</p> <p>How many MPs are there in total?</p> <p>Correct answer – D</p> <p>AO1 = 1</p>	1
----	---	--	---

07	2	<p>'The voting age at UK General elections should be lowered from 18 years to 16 years.</p> <p>To what extent do you agree with this statement?</p> <p>In your answer you should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • who can and cannot vote in UK General elections now, and why • the ages at which people gain other significant rights in the UK 	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>Indicative content</p> <p>Whilst the question requires a response that comes to a conclusion about the assertion in the question, candidates are required to look at a range of views covering both sides of the debate surrounding whether or not the franchise should be extended to include those of 16 years and over. The indicative content below provides possible routes through the question. It is not a requirement that responses contain all the elements identified below; other valid points should be credited fully.</p> <p>Points made in support of the statement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a democracy age does not affect human rights • In the UK 16 year olds do things that could be seen as being more significant than voting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Engage in lawful sexual activity ○ Get married/start a family ○ Pay National Insurance ○ Work ○ Pay taxes • The right to vote is a basic human right and there is no logical reason to deny that right to a 16 year old, whilst extending it to an 18 year old • The right to vote was extended to 16 year olds at the time of the 2014 Scottish Independence Referendum, without any obvious problems or controversy. • Extending the franchise to 16 year olds would be a good way to make young people more engaged with the political process. <p>Points made in opposition to the statement may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why should 16 years olds be given the vote – but not 14 year olds or 12 year olds? • The age of criminal responsibility in England, Wales and Northern Ireland is 10 – and it is 8 in Scotland – but no one is suggesting lowering the voting age to 10 (or 8) • Other groups of UK citizens are also denied the opportunity to vote at UK General Elections. For example, those in prison are not eligible to vote even though the government that is elected will have control of the prisons where they are confined • Many 16 year olds are still in full time education and therefore not contributing to the country • Many 16 year olds are not sufficiently informed to make these kinds of decisions • Typically the turnout amongst the youngest voters tends to be very low indeed. Extending the franchise to 16 year olds runs the risk of depressing overall turnout figures <p>AO3 = 8</p>	
	TOTAL MARKS FOR THIS SECTION	40