
GCSE CITIZENSHIP STUDIES 8100/1

Paper 1

Mark scheme

June 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from [aqa.org.uk](https://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2024 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	Name one pressure group. Award 1 mark for a correctly identified pressure group. This could be local, national or global. For example: • global – Amnesty International, Greenpeace, The Red Cross • national – The Countryside Alliance, Shelter, Fathers 4 Justice • local – Friends of Levenshulme, Greetland Pressure Group, Frack Free Lancashire. Award marks for any other correct pressure group. AO1 = 1	1

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
01	2	What is meant by the term ‘charities’? Award 1 mark for a definition of the term which could be one of the following: • local, national or international organisations which are set up to help those in need (1) • organisations which raise money to assist others (1) • organisations registered with the Government and/or Charity Commission and subsequently receive some tax benefits. (1) Award 1 mark for any other relevant response. AO1 = 1	1

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
01	3	Citizens can have different roles in trials. Explain one difference between the role of a witness and that of a member of the jury. Award 1 mark for a correct difference and 1 mark for development. Responses might include: - witnesses are required to give evidence in a trial (1) whereas jury members are required to listen to the evidence presented in a trial (1) - witnesses attend the trial due to witnessing a crime (1) whereas jury members attend as a member of the community who is randomly selected (1) - jury members do not have to answer questions as witnesses have to (1), they are required to determine a verdict after listening to the evidence (1). Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
01	4	Using an example, explain one action a citizen can take to help change the law. Award 1 mark for correct action and 1 mark for an appropriate example. Actions may include: - electing representatives that can make and change laws (1). This can be by voting at local and national elections (1) - participating in direct democracy (1). This can be by voting in referendums (1) - campaigning for change (1) by joining a political party or pressure group (1) - standing for election (1) to become an MP to discuss laws in Parliament (1) - lobbying an MP (1) so that they can support a particular policy or campaign (1) - petitioning (1) so that citizens can put pressure on the government to enact change (1) - demonstrating (1) in order to show support for a desired change in the law (1). Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
01	5	Using an example, explain one method of improving the political participation of citizens. Award 1 mark for identifying a correct method and 1 mark for an appropriate example. Methods may include: • teaching young people about politics and voting (1). This could be at school through subjects such as Citizenship (1) • using digital technology to increase informed political participation of citizens (1) such as televising parliamentary sessions (1) • using digital democracy to increase political participation of citizens (1) through online petitions and replacing traditional voting methods (1) • politicians engaging with/being accessible to all categories of voters (1) by using social media (1). Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks																		
01	6	Examine the actions that could be taken to provide support for people in fuel poverty. In your response, you should refer to Source A and examples from your own knowledge. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>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>3</td><td>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>2</td><td>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>1</td><td>1–2</td><td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of 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>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> Indicative content The account will relate to the source with actions that could be taken to provide support such as:	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 of 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.	8
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 of 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.																			

The government and councils could:	Citizens could:	Voluntary groups and businesses could:
provide help with paying energy bills – Energy Cap and grants	set up/help to set up warm banks	consider setting up business premises as warm banks
ensure benefit rates are increased in line with current inflation	campaign/join a pressure group/form their own group to put pressure on government and energy companies to lower energy prices	offer practical advice on how to reduce bills and debt advice
provide funding to treat homes with mould and damp issues	share warm bank information and locations on social media	provide mental health support for those struggling or facing debts
plan for health services to cope with higher demand due to poor health	share warm bank information to celebrities and influencers and ask them to support them	energy providers should reduce prices and provide further support for those that are vulnerable to fuel poverty, such as a social tariff.
provide additional support to prevent people falling into hardship and poor health.	give/raise donations to provide financial support for those struggling.	
Example answer The government has put a cap on energy prices but this has not been enough to protect people from fuel poverty. Therefore, the government should increase welfare benefits for them. Citizens can join the campaigns from pressure groups who put pressure on the government and energy companies to resolve the crisis. Charities can also help by requesting more donations from the public and provide mental health support, financial advice and assistance to those who are struggling. Citizens can use social media to influence celebrities to encourage more businesses to set up as warm banks. For example, footballers, like Marcus Rashford, could persuade their football clubs to open their stadiums as warm banks. AO2 = 4 AO3 = 4		

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
02	1	Explain how you used secondary research to decide on your active citizenship topic. Award 1 mark for identifying an appropriate secondary research and 1 mark for developing an explanation as to why it helped decide on a topic. This might be a specific piece of secondary research or more general secondary research. Example answers I used a local newspaper article about homelessness (1). This helped me to realise there was a problem with people sleeping rough in my local area and I wanted to do something about it (1). I used Google search engine to look at how councils work (1). I used this to help me decide that I needed to get my local councillor on side to increase the number of bins (1). AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks												
02	2	Discuss how you carried out your initial research. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>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>1</td><td>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>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> Indicative content • There will be a consideration for the approach the candidate has taken to carry out research. For example, they may have used a search engine to find relevant materials to deepen their understanding of the issue they were interested in taking action on. • Some students may have undertaken primary research to support their initial research, for example they may have conducted a survey of their classmates to determine their views on a local or national issue. • Some may have carried out secondary research, such as gathering newspaper articles or using resources supplied by their teacher. • Some may make explicit references to research methods or strategies. AO2 = 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.	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.													

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks															
02	3	Summarise the impact of your citizenship action. Evaluate how effective your action was. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>5–6</td><td>Comprehensive summary of the impact of the citizenship action. For the evidence presented, arguments regarding the effectiveness of the action are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3–4</td><td>Basic attempt to summarise the impact of the citizenship action. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the action but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1–2</td><td>Little attempt to summarise the impact of the citizenship action. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the action. There is little or no coherence in what is written.</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> AO1 The account will focus on the impact of the action, rather than the action itself. • Students will summarise the impact they have made, this may also include a lack of impact. AO3 This account may relate to the following: • students will demonstrate their success criteria, ie how did they judge success • students will analyse the impact of their action and decide on how effective it was based on a sensible rationale • students will likely point to their outcome for the success of their action. AO1 = 2 AO3 = 4	Level	Marks	Descriptor	3	5–6	Comprehensive summary of the impact of the citizenship action. For the evidence presented, arguments regarding the effectiveness of the action are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.	2	3–4	Basic attempt to summarise the impact of the citizenship action. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the action but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.	1	1–2	Little attempt to summarise the impact of the citizenship action. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the action. 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 impact of the citizenship action. For the evidence presented, arguments regarding the effectiveness of the action are developed, justified, analysed and evaluated. The arguments are generally coherent.																
2	3–4	Basic attempt to summarise the impact of the citizenship action. Some attempts are made to analyse and evaluate the effectiveness of the action but the arguments are not fully justified and developed. The arguments are not always coherent.																
1	1–2	Little attempt to summarise the impact of the citizenship action. There is little or no analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the action. There is little or no coherence in what is written.																
0	0	Nothing to credit.																

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks																		
02	4	Analyse how effective your plan was for your citizenship action. Your answer should refer to: • how you planned your citizenship action • the steps you took to review and evaluate your citizenship action • how you used your plan to help you evaluate your action's success. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>10–12</td><td>Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions. Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action. The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>7–9</td><td>Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments and analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context. Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent.</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>4–6</td><td>Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context. Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1–3</td><td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation. Little or no attempt is made to analyse or evaluate the evidence presented. Little or no attempt is made to integrate the points made.</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	4	10–12	Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions. Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action. The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.	3	7–9	Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments and analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context. Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent.	2	4–6	Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context. Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.	1	1–3	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation. 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.	12
Level	Marks	Descriptor																			
4	10–12	Clear and precise analysis, supported by well-chosen evidence from the candidate's investigation, demonstrates excellent, relevant application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions. Analysis is developed, justified and evaluated within the context of citizenship action. The analysis and evaluation lead to a well-judged and coherent conclusion.																			
3	7–9	Appropriate evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating good, mostly relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. The evidence is used to support arguments and analyses but these analyses are not always completely developed, justified or evaluated. Analysis and evaluation may not all be relevant to the context. Conclusions drawn from the analysis and evaluation may not be completely coherent.																			
2	4–6	Some evidence is selected from the candidate's investigation, demonstrating some occasionally relevant application of knowledge and understanding of citizenship actions. Weak arguments are made which are not necessarily related to the evidence selected. Analysis and evaluation is not relevant to the context. Some attempt is made to integrate the analysis and evaluation into concluding remarks.																			
1	1–3	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the citizenship actions arising from the candidate's investigation. 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.																			

		AO2 The response will: • report on the overall planning, goal(s)/aim(s) of the investigation and a description of the action that it led to • show linkage between the goal(s)/aim(s) and the citizenship action taken. AO3 The response will: • set out the effectiveness of the citizenship action and consider what it was supposed to deliver (the plan), eg explain what concrete benefit for the wider community the action was designed to bring and then consider the overall success of this • establish some criteria or evidence base for analysing the efficacy of the action undertaken, eg review of the targets, feedback from others, relationship to original aims • analyse the ways the planning was carried out and evaluate the extent to which this made the action a success • evaluate the way the plan was used and analyse how the project developed because of the planning and reviewing of actions. AO2 = 4 AO3 = 8	
--	--	---	--

Section B – Politics and participation

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
03	1	Which of the following describes anarchy? A system of government run by... Correct answer: A (no one.) AO1 = 1	1

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
03	2	One feature of a democracy is regular elections. Identify two other features. Award 1 mark for a correct identification of a feature of a democracy, other than regular elections (x2). Responses could include: • an electoral system that allows all voters to participate • the use of secret ballots • the ability of citizens to stand for elections fairly • a choice of political parties and candidates • a government that is held accountable • the media can report freely on the work of the government • the judiciary is separate from the government • people have freedom of assembly • people have freedom of expression • corruption is not practised in public life. Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks																				
03	3	Referring to Source B, discuss the key differences between direct democracy and representative democracy. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3–4</td><td>Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1–2</td><td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> Indicative content The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge to Source B regarding the differences between direct and representative democracy. Responses might include: <table><tr><th>Direct democracy</th><th>Representative democracy</th></tr><tr><td> • Citizens participate in making decisions/given a direct say in policy decisions. </td><td> • Citizens elect representatives who use their judgement to make decisions regarding policy on their behalf. These representatives/politicians will be elected for a certain period of time until the next election. The elected representatives are held accountable for the decisions they make. </td></tr><tr><td> • Referendums allow citizens to have a direct say in policy decisions. </td><td> • Citizens can vote for a representative/politician to make policy decisions on their behalf. Elected representatives make and pass laws and decide on political issues in Parliament. They are considered the legislative body. </td></tr><tr><td> • Ballot papers in referendums require a simple positive or negative answer to a question such as ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or ‘leave’ or ‘remain’ on a single issue. </td><td> • Ballot papers require citizens to choose from a variety of representatives/parties. Citizens select representatives/parties who can pass laws on complex issues. </td></tr></table>	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.	1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	Direct democracy	Representative democracy	• Citizens participate in making decisions/given a direct say in policy decisions.	• Citizens elect representatives who use their judgement to make decisions regarding policy on their behalf. These representatives/politicians will be elected for a certain period of time until the next election. The elected representatives are held accountable for the decisions they make.	• Referendums allow citizens to have a direct say in policy decisions.	• Citizens can vote for a representative/politician to make policy decisions on their behalf. Elected representatives make and pass laws and decide on political issues in Parliament. They are considered the legislative body.	• Ballot papers in referendums require a simple positive or negative answer to a question such as ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or ‘leave’ or ‘remain’ on a single issue.	• Ballot papers require citizens to choose from a variety of representatives/parties. Citizens select representatives/parties who can pass laws on complex issues.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor																					
2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.																					
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of the issues. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.																					
0	0	Nothing to credit.																					
Direct democracy	Representative democracy																						
• Citizens participate in making decisions/given a direct say in policy decisions.	• Citizens elect representatives who use their judgement to make decisions regarding policy on their behalf. These representatives/politicians will be elected for a certain period of time until the next election. The elected representatives are held accountable for the decisions they make.																						
• Referendums allow citizens to have a direct say in policy decisions.	• Citizens can vote for a representative/politician to make policy decisions on their behalf. Elected representatives make and pass laws and decide on political issues in Parliament. They are considered the legislative body.																						
• Ballot papers in referendums require a simple positive or negative answer to a question such as ‘yes’ or ‘no’ or ‘leave’ or ‘remain’ on a single issue.	• Ballot papers require citizens to choose from a variety of representatives/parties. Citizens select representatives/parties who can pass laws on complex issues.																						

		- Referendums are legally non-binding. - Results from an election are legally binding; the candidates with most votes in a general election become Members of Parliament (MPs). These MPs pass legislation which becomes law.	
		Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO2 = 4	

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
04	1	Which of the following elections uses the Additional Member System (AMS)? Correct answer: B (Scottish Parliament) AO1 = 1	1

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
04	2	Identify two disadvantages of the Single Transferable Vote (STV) system. Award 1 mark for each correct answer (x2). Disadvantages of STV include: - results take longer to count - can delay the formation of government - can lead to too many parties electing candidates - some may vote for candidates in the order they appear on the ballot paper - large multi-member constituencies may result in a very long ballot paper - more likely to lead to coalition governments which can be unstable. Award marks for any other correct answers. AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks								
04	3	Discuss two outcomes of using a more proportional system of voting instead of FPTP. You should refer to Source C in your answer. <table><tr><th>Outcomes</th><th>Development</th></tr><tr><td> - Under FPTP, Labour wins all the seats. - Under STV, Labour wins only around half of the seats to become closely aligned to their vote share. </td><td> - FPTP results in safe seats. Voters feel their votes are wasted and this can lead to tactical voting. - Using a more proportional system means the result closely matches the votes for each party. Labour would still hold the majority but would have three opposition parties to hold them to account. </td></tr><tr><td> - Under FPTP, Conservatives, Lib Dems and the Green Party have not won any seats at all despite substantial vote share. - Under STV, Conservatives, Lib Dems and the Green Party win seats relatively close to their vote share. </td><td> - Under a proportional system, every vote helps to elect someone. - The result in a proportional system would closely match the votes for each party. </td></tr><tr><td> - Under FPTP, other parties have not won any seats at all despite some vote share. - However, under STV this would remain the same outcome on this occasion. </td><td> - Under FPTP, smaller parties are under-represented. - Under proportional systems smaller parties are able to win seats according to their vote share. </td></tr></table> Award 1 mark for correctly identifying an outcome and 1 mark for development of each outcome (x2). Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO2 = 4	Outcomes	Development	- Under FPTP, Labour wins all the seats. - Under STV, Labour wins only around half of the seats to become closely aligned to their vote share.	- FPTP results in safe seats. Voters feel their votes are wasted and this can lead to tactical voting. - Using a more proportional system means the result closely matches the votes for each party. Labour would still hold the majority but would have three opposition parties to hold them to account.	- Under FPTP, Conservatives, Lib Dems and the Green Party have not won any seats at all despite substantial vote share. - Under STV, Conservatives, Lib Dems and the Green Party win seats relatively close to their vote share.	- Under a proportional system, every vote helps to elect someone. - The result in a proportional system would closely match the votes for each party.	- Under FPTP, other parties have not won any seats at all despite some vote share. - However, under STV this would remain the same outcome on this occasion.	- Under FPTP, smaller parties are under-represented. - Under proportional systems smaller parties are able to win seats according to their vote share.	4
Outcomes	Development										
- Under FPTP, Labour wins all the seats. - Under STV, Labour wins only around half of the seats to become closely aligned to their vote share.	- FPTP results in safe seats. Voters feel their votes are wasted and this can lead to tactical voting. - Using a more proportional system means the result closely matches the votes for each party. Labour would still hold the majority but would have three opposition parties to hold them to account.										
- Under FPTP, Conservatives, Lib Dems and the Green Party have not won any seats at all despite substantial vote share. - Under STV, Conservatives, Lib Dems and the Green Party win seats relatively close to their vote share.	- Under a proportional system, every vote helps to elect someone. - The result in a proportional system would closely match the votes for each party.										
- Under FPTP, other parties have not won any seats at all despite some vote share. - However, under STV this would remain the same outcome on this occasion.	- Under FPTP, smaller parties are under-represented. - Under proportional systems smaller parties are able to win seats according to their vote share.										

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
05	1	Which two of the following are the largest political parties that contest UK general elections? Correct answers: A (Conservative Party) and C (Labour Party) AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
05	2	Which two of the following UK political parties are nationalist parties? Correct answers: E (Plaid Cymru) and F (SNP) AO1 = 2	2

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks												
05	3	Referring to Source D, discuss key differences between the views of Conservative and Labour Party members over the role of the state. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>3–4</td><td>Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>1–2</td><td>Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> Indicative content The candidate answer requires the application of knowledge regarding the key differences between the views of the Conservative and Labour Party members over the role of the state. The source shows the likely views of some Conservative Party members regarding the role of the state. The candidate’s answer may include the following points.	Level	Marks	Descriptor	2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.	1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.	0	0	Nothing to credit.	4
Level	Marks	Descriptor													
2	3–4	Good application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response clear and relevant to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.													
1	1–2	Basic application of knowledge and understanding of concepts. Response muddled and lacking relevance to the concepts surrounding the citizenship context.													
0	0	Nothing to credit.													

		<table><tr><th>Conservative Party member views</th><th>Labour Party member views</th></tr><tr><td> • Businesses do better when there is less government regulation and they pay less in taxes. That's the best way to create investment, wealth and jobs. </td><td> • Regulation of businesses is essential. Businesses should pay more tax on profits. We should strive for an equal society and the government should play a large part in people's lives in order to achieve this – big government. </td></tr><tr><td> • People should take more responsibility for their own health and welfare and not expect taxpayers to pay for every social problem. </td><td> • Government should provide more services to the less fortunate (such as health care) and increase taxes if necessary. High-income earners should pay a larger percentage of their income as taxes. </td></tr><tr><td> • The private sector can run public services more efficiently than the government can. </td><td> • Outsourcing of the NHS, local government and justice system should stop. The NHS, Royal Mail and utilities should be in public ownership. Public services should be run for the benefit of the public and not for the benefit of private enterprise and shareholders. </td></tr></table>	Conservative Party member views	Labour Party member views	• Businesses do better when there is less government regulation and they pay less in taxes. That's the best way to create investment, wealth and jobs.	• Regulation of businesses is essential. Businesses should pay more tax on profits. We should strive for an equal society and the government should play a large part in people's lives in order to achieve this – big government.	• People should take more responsibility for their own health and welfare and not expect taxpayers to pay for every social problem.	• Government should provide more services to the less fortunate (such as health care) and increase taxes if necessary. High-income earners should pay a larger percentage of their income as taxes.	• The private sector can run public services more efficiently than the government can.	• Outsourcing of the NHS, local government and justice system should stop. The NHS, Royal Mail and utilities should be in public ownership. Public services should be run for the benefit of the public and not for the benefit of private enterprise and shareholders.	
Conservative Party member views	Labour Party member views										
• Businesses do better when there is less government regulation and they pay less in taxes. That's the best way to create investment, wealth and jobs.	• Regulation of businesses is essential. Businesses should pay more tax on profits. We should strive for an equal society and the government should play a large part in people's lives in order to achieve this – big government.										
• People should take more responsibility for their own health and welfare and not expect taxpayers to pay for every social problem.	• Government should provide more services to the less fortunate (such as health care) and increase taxes if necessary. High-income earners should pay a larger percentage of their income as taxes.										
• The private sector can run public services more efficiently than the government can.	• Outsourcing of the NHS, local government and justice system should stop. The NHS, Royal Mail and utilities should be in public ownership. Public services should be run for the benefit of the public and not for the benefit of private enterprise and shareholders.										
Award marks for any other relevant answers.											
AO2 = 4											

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
06	1	Which of the following is a position in the UK Cabinet? Correct answer: A (Lord Chancellor) AO1 = 1	1

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks																		
06	2	‘In the UK, the Cabinet is as powerful as the Prime Minister.’ Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>7–8</td><td>Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are given which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>5–6</td><td>Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship 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>2</td><td>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>1</td><td>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>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> Indicative content Analysis of evidence and views should examine whether the Cabinet is as powerful as the Prime Minister in the UK. It is not a requirement that responses contain all the elements identified below. Answers may include: Arguments for the view that the Cabinet is as powerful as the Prime Minister in the UK: the Cabinet is the senior decision-making body in government. The PM is described as ‘primus inter pares’, (‘first among equals’). This implies that the Cabinet is a team of which the PM is a member and that both are equally important	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 given 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 given 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.																			

		- the PM and ministers have equal say in policy decisions. This is underpinned by collective responsibility - power is shared between the PM and Cabinet. Cabinet ministers make policy and have responsibility for their own departments - a key limitation on the PM's power comes from the party they represent; they can be removed by a dissatisfied party or Cabinet. Without majority support, their position is weakened significantly, and the governing party can replace them without consulting the electorate as was the case with Margaret Thatcher in 1990, Tony Blair in 2007 and Theresa May in 2019. More recently, in 2022, Boris Johnson and Liz Truss were critically weakened by Cabinet resignations. Arguments against the view that the Cabinet is as powerful as the Prime Minister in the UK: - the PM is more than 'primus inter pares', ('first among equals'). They have powers that ministers do not, such as the power of appointment and chair of the Cabinet. The PM has a lot of power over the Cabinet. The PM has the power to appoint, reshuffle or dismiss ministers - the PM can overrule ministers. This shows while ministers have power over the running of their own departments, the PM may interfere and order changes or take personal responsibility at times asserting his predominance over Cabinet ministers - the PM can use their power of 'collective responsibility' to silence any critics in the Cabinet, thus ensuring cohesion. Decisions made within Cabinet meetings chaired by the PM must have support of the ministers irrespective of agreement on such matters, and they are required to publicly support the PM's decision. Failure to do so can result in dismissal or resignation - some PM's such as Tony Blair have worked in a 'presidential' style where they lead on policy issues without consulting ministers and instead have used special advisers. Award marks for any other relevant answers. AO3 = 8	
--	--	--	--

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks
07	1	Which of the following does the UK government spend the most on? Correct answer: C (Health and Social Care) AO1 = 1	1

Qu	Part	Marking guidance	Total marks																		
07	2	‘A law should be passed to make the UK government spend more money on international aid.’ Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? In your answer you should consider: • how governments make decisions about the allocation of public funding • how laws can help governments to make fairer decisions. <table><tr><th>Level</th><th>Marks</th><th>Descriptor</th></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>7–8</td><td>Developed and sustained analysis of a wide range of evidence and views related to the citizenship issue. Developed and reasoned justifications are given which relate to the evidence provided. The justifications put forward form a coherent argument.</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>5–6</td><td>Analysis of a range of evidence and views related to the citizenship 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>2</td><td>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>1</td><td>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>0</td><td>0</td><td>Nothing to credit.</td></tr></table> Indicative content 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 question surrounding whether a law should be passed to make the UK government spend more money on international aid.	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 given 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 given 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.																			

		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. Points which may be included to argue for the statement that a law should be passed to make the UK government spend more money on international aid: • passing a law would compel the UK government to spend more on international aid as governments can otherwise fail to give an amount that would be deemed fair • it is a moral duty of governments around the world to provide aid to the countries that face humanitarian crises. The UK is considered a high-income country and therefore should be spending more to help those facing humanitarian crises around the world • the UK government, in 2020, decided to reduce international aid spending from 0.7% of its Gross National Income (GNI) to 0.5%. This decision was counterproductive as the number of people in need keeps growing due to unprecedented humanitarian challenges such as climate change and the war in Ukraine. If the government spends more money on international aid, then in the long term that reduces the pressures on other aspects of its budget, eg more aid in the countries where it's needed would result in fewer applications for refugee status • the UK government should help with humanitarian emergencies, such as the earthquakes and floods which affected Syria and Turkey in 2023. These resulted in around 50,000 deaths and left 26 million people in need of essential support • the annual aid budget if spent in the UK would not be sufficient to solve the problems the NHS and public services are facing in the UK. Therefore any reduction in the aid budget would produce limited domestic benefit but considerable cost to those countries currently supported through the UK's aid budget. Points which may be included to argue against the statement that a law should be passed to make the UK government spend more money on international aid: • the UK government, in 2020, has decided to reduce international aid spending from 0.7% of its GNI to 0.5%, due to the pandemic's effects on the UK's public finances and the economy • by spending 0.5% of its GNI, the UK government is already spending more on international aid than many other countries. The cut was only a temporary measure so there is no need for a law to be passed • it would be unfair on UK citizens as the UK is facing its own 'humanitarian crises'; many citizens in the country are suffering from poverty and ill health due to the cost of living crises. The energy crisis has meant that many businesses are affected and the NHS is under immense pressure due to increasing health problems from the cold • the government has attempted to cut public spending in the UK to help cut the deficit and improve public finances. Instead of spending more on overseas aid, the money needs to be spent in the UK	
--	--	--	--

		it is the role of NGO's to make appeals to provide funds for international aid and it is NGO's that are best placed and equipped to provide urgent help and relief. Award marks for any other relevant points. AO3 = 8	
--	--	--	--