

Example answers-

Think about the overall impact of your action. Analyse ways your citizenship action made a difference.

Your answer should refer to:

- overall goal(s)/aim(s) of your citizenship action
- how successful your action was
- the outcome achieved.

[12 marks]

For my action, we helped the local homeless people in our town of Wolverhampton.

Our aims were-

- 1/ Raise £50 to give to the homeless charity, Outreach \$ Wolverhampton.
- 2/ Feed 50% of Wolverhampton's homeless
- 3/ Raise awareness to pupils in our school.

We were successful with our first aim as we sold cakes at lunch time in our school. We managed to raise £76, which was given to the charity. A worker from the charity, Mrs Jones, explained that they would use the money to add to the rent that they have to pay for the hall where they provide food and shelter for the homeless. The rent is £100 per week, so we gave them over  $\frac{3}{4}$  of a week's rent.

In our second aim, we were not successful. There are 100 homeless people in Wolverhampton. We were not allowed to volunteer at the homeless charity as you had to be over 16 and we were only 15. Due to this, we were accompanied by our parents and we walked around Wolverhampton city centre and handed out food parcels to the 15 homeless people that we found. So we did not meet our target, however, we did do what we could to ensure that at least 15% of the homeless population were fed.

In our last aim, I feel we were successful. We gave out leaflets to 250 pupils in our school. We informed them of the numbers of homeless people, what a typical day is like (used information the charity gave us) and ways they can help. We could have done a before and after survey to gain their levels of understanding, but at least they were given the information.

Overall, our outcome was good. We displayed Citizenship skills of group work, advocacy, researching and planning and working with others. We made a positive contribution to our local community, by informing our pupils in school about the issue and raising money, so all students in the school were aware. We made a positive contribution to our area by helping the local homeless, showing our school to be active citizens and feeding people in need. We need to do more for the wider community. If we could share our work with other schools and had more time, we could have done bigger events, such as fundraising fayres and tried to make a difference on a wider scale.

'The rights of UK citizens are better protected than the rights of citizens in non-democratic countries.'

Evaluate this view.

[8 marks]

Some people may agree with this view as the UK is a democracy. This means that people have the power to change the government by voting for the party they wish to control the country. Therefore, they can vote out a government if they feel the rights of the people are not being protected properly. You can not do this in a non- democratic country, such as North Korea.

In the UK, we have the Human Rights Act. This puts all of human rights into UK law, so that if any of our rights are breached, it is therefore a legal matter and people can be sent to trial in a criminal court. This ensures our rights are protected.

Furthermore, our courts are led by the judiciary who are politically neutral. They are able to judge the situation from an unbiased position, again supporting the protection of our human rights. In non- democratic countries, this is not the case and non-democratic countries have a politically biased judiciary, who are linked to the government and therefore their rights are not protected.

However, some people may argue that our human rights are not always protected. For example, Stephen Lawrence was a black teenager who was killed in a racist attack. The police did not investigate it fully so the offenders were not sanctioned properly. His human rights were not protected properly.

Furthermore, some rights have been restricted, for example, since terrorist attacks have occurred and knife crime has increased, certain groups may have been targeted by the police and government policies.

Overall, even though there are some restrictions on human rights in democratic countries, they are protected at a much higher level than in places where democracy does not exist as the government is held accountable for their actions and can be voted out.

'Rehabilitation is the most effective way of dealing with criminals and their crimes.'  
Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?

Some people may agree with this statement as rehabilitation is the best way to reform a person's character. For example, if a person is committing crimes due to a **drug or alcohol addiction**, if you can provide rehabilitation so that the person is no longer addicted, they will no longer need to commit crime. This addresses the **purpose of reforming** the person. This is the best, long term solution to this criminal and their crimes.

Furthermore, it may be a **cheaper way to deal with criminals**. It costs an average of **£30,000** per year to keep someone in prison. With increasing pressure on prisons and less prison staff, the country cannot cope with these demands. If we can treat the person and their needs, the demand for prison spaces may be lower and therefore the demand for tax money to house these prisoners will hopefully lessen also.

However, some may argue that one of the purposes of punishment is to **gain retribution**. This is not achieved through rehabilitation, which can be argued is helping the criminal rather than the victim. **Vindication is not achieved either**, as the offender is not being 'punished' and may be viewed to have gained from their crime, rather than have a negative consequence.

Many people with addictions may have to wait for months or even years to get the services they require, yet convicted criminals could be given it for free. This seems to be unfair.

In summary, rehabilitations could be seen as a 'soft option' and it may not meet the wishes of victims, however, it does appear to be the only way to secure long term changes and reduction in crime. For that reason, I feel it is the best form of punishment for many criminals.

'Pressure groups strengthen democracy in the UK by providing citizens with a voice.'  
Considering a range of views, to what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement?  
In your answer you should consider:

- opportunities and barriers to citizen participation in democracy
- how citizens can try to bring about political change.

Some people may agree with this statement as pressure groups can speak for those who do not usually have a voice. For example, if you are unable to vote, if you are under 18, you are still able to join a pressure group and be an active part of society. The example of Greta Thunberg, who began protesting for climate change as a teenager and is followed by many pressure groups, means that young people can have an impact of politics. Also, if you live in an area where your local MP is from a party that you do not support and you feel your views are not represented under the current system of First Past the Post, your political views can be voiced on a wider scale- adding to and strengthening democracy.

Furthermore, pressure groups bring attention to issues that may be ignored by mainstream politics. They can gain huge support via social media and perhaps online petitions that politicians must respond to. For example, issues on animal rights or the environment have been brought to the attention of Parliament through the use of pressure groups- which again demonstrates a fair democratic society.

However, others may disagree as they may feel that pressure groups can be given too much attention. For example, Fathers 4 Justice displayed dangerous, illegal acts that did gain lots of media attention and caused a disturbance to Parliament. This was not only putting the public at risk, but also directed Parliament business away from the matters of the day. This in fact disrupts democracy, rather than strengthens it.

Furthermore, pressure groups themselves are undemocratic. They rarely have elections to determine power within them and often do not debate issues within their own organisation. For example, a pressure group will have only members who have that point of view- like Fathers 4 Justice. They do not have a different perspective to help even their arguments out and gain a fuller picture. Father 4 Justice may need to take into consideration the struggles of women throughout the years and the issues of domestic violence etc. if they are to formulate fully, comprehensive, balanced arguments. Therefore, their democracy is limited.

Even though there are issues with pressure groups as they are not fully democratic themselves, I still fully agree that they strengthen democracy within society as they provide a voice for those who individually may not be able to make a change.

## The President of the United States of America

The President of the USA (POTUS) is both the head of the executive branch of government and also the head of state. The US Constitution prevents the President from being a member of Congress (the legislature) at the same time.

The President is directly elected every four years, with Congress elected separately. Although it is almost impossible to remove a President once they are in office, no President is allowed to be elected to serve more than two four-year terms in office.

Consider **two** ways in which the position of the US President described in **Source D** is different from that of the UK Prime Minister.

**[4 marks]**

*1/ The POTUS differs from the UK PM as the POTUS is head of the executive and the head of state. In the UK, our PM is the head of the executive as he is the head of the government, however, our head of state is the Queen, even though her role is mostly ceremonial.*

*2/ In the USA, the POTUS is elected separately from congress. This differs to the UK, as we do not vote for our PM, but for our local MP via the first past the post system. The PM is the head of the winning party and we never directly vote for our PM.*

## Democracy in Turkey

Turkey's President Erdoğan has been criticised for harming democracy in Turkey.

His critics said he had:

- attacked freedom of speech by placing restrictions on the media and journalists
- attacked the independence of the judiciary, eg putting 'pressure' on judges to make rulings that are in the interests of the government
- reduced the limits on the President's power, eg using the failed coup of July 2016 as an excuse to change the constitution and sacking his opponents from their jobs in the army, judiciary and civil service.

Compare two features of the situation in Turkey, described in Source A, with how democracy works in Britain.

[4 marks]

*1/ One way this differs from democracy in the UK is about restrictions on the media. Turkey have has attacked freedom of speech by restricted journalists and the media. In the UK, we have a democracy which means our press if free from government interference and is not censored. This is part of our human rights.*

*2/ In Turkey, judges have been pressured into making decisions that are in the interests of the government. We do not have this in the UK. In our democracy, our judiciary are free from political bias due to the separation of powers.*

### **Universal Human Rights**

In practice many people do not have their human rights protected.

In Syria many people do not have their right to life protected.

The behaviour of Islamic State (IS) towards the Yazidi minority has also highlighted the continued existence of slavery.

Consider the situation described in **Source E** and discuss **two** reasons why UK citizens do have their human rights protected.

**[4 marks]**

*1/ One reason UK citizens have their human rights protected is the fact we have our right to life protected, unlike in Syria. Our human rights are written into our laws by the Human Rights Act and murder is punishable by a life sentence. We also do not have the death penalty.*

*2/ A further reason is that we live in a democracy, unlike in Syria where IS have power in some parts. They subjects some ethnic groups to slavery. Slavery is against our human rights and against the law in the UK and anyone found guilty of it will be prosecuted to the full extent in a criminal court. All ethnic groups should be treated equally due to the Equality Act of 2010.*