

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

June 2011

GCSE Citizenship Studies
5CS02/01

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

June 2011

Publications Code UG027618

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2011

5CSO2/01

The entry for this examination was significantly higher during the second year of this GCSE Citizenship Studies specification. There were pleasing examples of enquiries into local issues, and the vast majority of candidates made the effort to communicate with two 'people of power' in order to ascertain their views on the issue they had chosen.

Centre Administration

The following characteristics of good practice were identified:

- Controlled Assessment Candidate Record sheets were signed by both the teacher and the candidate; therefore they were authenticated appropriately to meet the requirements from Edexcel.
- Candidates were clear about the issue that they had chosen and explained their choice in section 1 of the task form.
- Candidate Record sheets was used to give the marks for the four sections of the task form (Issue, Advocacy and Representation, Participation in Action and Evaluation)
- There was evidence of internal standardisation from many centres-identifiable by a different colour ink and initials of those who were involved.
- Many candidates submitted very good evidence to support their work.
- A large majority of candidates were able to identify and use citizenship skills: communication, planning, discussion and negotiation.

There are a few concerns, identified below, for Centres to consider in order to increase the efficiency of the external moderation process:

- for the Controlled Assessment sample to arrive in good time for external moderation.
- full and accurate completion of the Candidate Record Sheet – showing the Candidate's full name and Candidate number, Centre Name and Number, title of the issue to be investigated and total mark.
- The sample to include substitutions for absent or withdrawn candidates, if applicable.
- Evidence of internal standardisation-even if the centre has a small cohort.
- Signed witness statements as evidence, but not incomplete (no identification as to what was being witnessed).

Centre Assessment

It was encouraging to see that a good number of centres had used the level descriptors in each of the four assessment criteria effectively. With many assessing this specification for the first time it was good to see that assessment was often at the right levels. As the Controlled Assessment is worth 60% of the candidate's total marks it is imperative that Centre Assessors apply the marking criteria both accurately and consistently. The Centre Assessor is responsible to ensure that internal standardisation takes place, and signs the OPTEMS to acknowledge that this has been carried out.

Some candidates opt to work in a group. Where this is the case, the Centre Assessor should give the level of achievement that reflects the individual input into the group effort and candidates should attach their own evidence in each

section. A list of acceptable types of evidence is available in the 'Teacher Support Book' on Edexcel website. Where there is little evidence, and the individual involvement is not explicit, the candidate is unlikely to gain marks beyond level 2.

Issues arising from ethical/moral problems, for example, racism in football, discrimination or disability, bullying and knife crime, must be firmly linked to at least one of the three Themes in Unit 1 of the Specification in order to fulfil the requirements of the Specification. Centre Assessors must remember that without any evidence the candidate's marks are limited.

The sections should be taken as a whole and not marked separately ie the assessor should not mark a) and b) and then add together to get a section total.

The following observations of lenient assessment in each section of the task form are as follows:

Section 1

Centre Assessors are reminded that the issue is to be primarily addressed from a local perspective of the candidate's choice. Where the candidate does not discuss this from a local perspective, nor do they give a personal view, credit should be limited. This section was generally being leniently awarded and was highlighted by a number of moderators. Just saying 'local and national' without any explanation does not gain credit.

Section 2

Candidates were frequently awarded level 4 marks when there was no interview, an interview but no evidence and/or no analysis. The people 'interviewed' were contacted to seek permission to put up a display or do a power point presentation. This is not the purpose of the interview; rather to find out the views of two people on the issue in question. Some assessors had given top marks for candidates who had not displayed any skill in advocacy or representation.

Section 3

Candidates were awarded marks for pure description of the activity. This is not required in this specification – and responses should be written in paragraphs, not bullet points.

Section 4

Many Centre Assessors did not take note of the quality of written communication which is assessed in this section.

Candidate Performance

Candidates had used a variety of prompt sheets available in publications or devised by the centres. These were very useful in directing the candidate to the specific requirement of the task. Where there were brief responses or indeed sections not completed, it is either a sign that the candidates were unsure as to what to write or that there were timing issues. Should a candidate be absent on the date that the Controlled Assessment is written, it can be re-arranged at a later

date, as the candidate is clearly penalised for not completing the forms and a large percentage of the marks are unavailable to them.

It was encouraging to see so many good, well organised folders where the candidates had clearly enjoyed their citizenship activity and gained a lot of skills and experiences. There was a lot of excellent work carried out most sincerely by many candidates.

It is worth bringing to attention the fact that Controlled Assessment is different from coursework in that the candidates do not have to describe in full the roles and responsibilities of each group member but rather explain why the issue was chosen.

Choice of Issue

Moderators witnessed a good variety of local issues – How to reduce knife crime/litter/recycle and seek more local facilities. Diversity in the community. Other issues were more from a national perspective – discrimination or disability and the media and its representation of candidates or from a global perspective – fair trade, global warming

Some issues were more akin to PSHE than Citizenship and should be linked to legislation or rights if undertaken. Examples of such activities are: health issues – eating disorders, teenage pregnancy/sexual health and fundraising.

The local context was not always very effectively covered and a significant number of candidates tended to describe their activity, rather than to research the issue and say why it is important. Candidates need to explain in detail why their issue is relevant locally and nationally and explore the links with at least one citizenship theme, using relevant examples. The responses ranged from those who described their group and roles to those who clearly stated why it was so important with well-developed links with citizenship themes, and a strong personal point of view.

Ultimately the Specification and its marking criteria were designed for issues to be viewed locally and nationally, and possibly have a global perspective that can be discussed. Candidates who extended their enquiry to these different perspectives gained the higher marks. However, candidates performed rather less well when the links with the Citizenship themes from Unit 1 were not explicitly explained.

Advocacy and Representation

The Specification requires candidates to communicate with two 'People of Power'. Those chosen should not only have specific knowledge of the issue, but also be able to take subsequent action. Clearly any in the peer group can not be interviewed unless they are specifically involved in the nature of the enquiry, for example, a Member of the Youth Parliament, if the issue is regarding candidates and their involvement in political matters. Moderators evidenced that candidates who successfully carried out two interviews, and submitted evidence, e.g. a Witness statement, script, DVD, and analysed their information and fully discussed in 2b the reasons for different viewpoints on the issue were able to achieve the higher marks. Centres are advised to ensure sufficient time is allowed for effective communication with these people and to stress the importance of

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publication.orders@edexcel.com

Order Code UG027618 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

