

Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCSE in
Citizenship Studies (5CS04/01)

Unit 4: Citizenship Campaign

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2016

Publications Code 5CS04_01_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

This Unit is now an established part of the full course GCSE Citizenship Studies which has proved to be welcomed by centres as it is accessible to candidates of all abilities; the entry has stabilised. There was an ever-widening range of issues which formed the basis of the campaign for this task, but many have used more PSHE issues which are that much harder to make a firm link with Citizenship other than 'raising awareness' which is the Unit 2 brief.

Overall, the standard was good and, in some cases, very good and even excellent. It was noted that many candidates wrote with a genuine enthusiasm and passion for their campaign and demonstrated a real, and deserved, sense of achievement. The centres where candidates achieved the top band of marks had ensured that candidates were well advised, briefed, guided and supported to identify appropriate issues and produce campaigns which were relevant to Citizenship.

Quality of written communication, which is part of the assessment criteria in Section 3, was a challenge for some candidates but the overall standard was at least satisfactory and sometimes demonstrated both accuracy and a degree of fluency.

Centre Administration

For the vast majority of centres, the administration posed few problems in that the Examinations Officer had used the 'What to send the Moderator' checklist and sent the right documentation. However, the quality of administration from some centres was inefficient and moderators had to ask for further work (usually the Highest and Lowest candidate's work), or for mark amendments to be made where they found that the mark on the work was different to either the OPTEMS or there was an error in the arithmetic. The most common administrative problems that arose included:

- Candidate Record Form
- Centres must include a (downloadable) Candidate Record Form for each candidate.
- Candidates should complete their centre name, centre number and candidate number on the form
- Candidates should provide a brief description of the campaign and their own role on the Candidate Record Form if they worked in a group.
- Candidates and teachers must sign the updated form to verify that it is the candidate's own work and for permission to use their work for training purposes.
- Internal moderation can be identified on this front cover sheet by a second signature or the use of a different colour ink.

NB: It is not good practice to convert the raw score to a grade and then write this on the form; there are a number of issues which may well affect this and if candidates consider that they have achieved this level, will feel let down if they do not achieve it:

- Performed less well in the written examination
- Inaccurate mark identified by arithmetical error, or wrongly assessed and given an inaccurate level of achievement.

OPTEMS/Edexcel Online printout

- Recorded marks on the Candidate Record Form of individual candidate response forms sometimes differed from marks recorded on either the OPTEMS or Edexcel Online printouts, or sometimes not transferred accurately from the candidate's work; it is important that these match, and if the Moderator sends as E6 to inform the centre, then it must be actioned immediately as this could cause problems or delays in the external moderation process or at awarding stage.
- Marks on the OPTEMS were sometimes unreadable, or not even recorded; moderators need to be able to know what mark has been awarded by the centre-both the ellipse and the mark column need to be completed for each candidate.
- '0', rather than 'X', was shown on the OPTEMS for candidates who were absent or withdrawn. Zero ('0') should only be used for candidates who have submitted work that is judged to be worth no marks by centres and this, as well as the lowest scoring candidate's work, should be sent to the external moderator.

What to send to the Moderator

In order to help centres to send the correct items and administrative paperwork to the moderator, a checklist is available on www.edexcel.com. Well-organised centres send this with the items checked off.

It is important to send the sample to the correct moderator. Most moderators do not moderate both units and where this occurred there were delays in the correct moderator receiving the work. Edexcel will notify you of the correct Moderator on the OPTEMS, so now that both units have to be submitted in the same year, it is imperative that centres/exam officers do make this check.

Samples

- All Candidate Record Forms should be checked that all information has been entered accurately for ease of identification and use by the Moderator when completing their administration.
- All totals should be checked as it is rather more difficult to make the appropriate changes at a later date.
- Centres should include a replacement piece of work for and absent or withdrawn asterisked candidates so that the correct sample size is still sent to the moderator.
- Centres must include the work of the highest and lowest scoring candidate as part of the sample even if these were not part of the sample selected. External moderation cannot be undertaken until the work of these candidates has been received. Again, if the Moderator has sent an E6, it should be actioned immediately.

The Controlled Assessments need to be checked that all work from each candidate is submitted-it may be that the candidate's evidence is not labelled and is not sent with the work.

Choice of tasks

Centres are reminded that the controlled assessment task chosen for Unit 4 must not be from the same range and content area as the task chosen for the Unit 2 controlled assessment. However, the task can be chosen from any of the other 9 range and content areas that make up the specification.

The task must be clearly identifiable as a citizenship task rather than something which is closer to PSHE. This was not always the case and the candidates concerned found some parts of the response form very difficult to complete because there simply wasn't enough citizenship in the task they had chosen. In terms of marks, this often meant that candidates could not access the full range of marks and centres should give advice to students about choice of task.

The task must be clearly recognisable as a 'campaign'. This did not always happen, particularly if fundraising was involved. Fundraising in itself needs to be related explicitly to a campaign - which some candidates managed to do very effectively. If in doubt about whether a task will be appropriate, centres are advised to use Edexcel's free 'Ask the Expert' service for advice and guidance from a senior moderator.

Many different campaign issues were used, taking full advantage of the flexibility offered in the controlled assessment units. Commonly used, and appropriate campaign tasks in summer 2016, were similar to those used in previous years. These included:

The most common:

- Voting/General election/EU referendum
- Road safety/public transport/speed reduction
- Environmental issues such as improving the environment, greater sustainability and better recycling facilities; fair trade, deforestation
- Raising awareness about youth crime; post 16 education/careers/apprenticeships
- Child labour; child soldiers; child trafficking/child abuse
- Protecting rights of particular groups; global-North Korea and Gambia
- Promoting greater ethnic diversity, campaigning against racism in sport.
- Political issues: immigration/Syria/terrorism

Unusual campaign choices, but effectively completed, were on the issue of the right to a hot school lunch, sugar tax, eco-friendly schools and time-table changes to include PE and Art for all students.

It is important to note that, whereas the media is one of the nine range and content areas of the specification difficulties might arise if the task does not relate clearly to Citizenship. For example, campaigns linking the media with rights to privacy or political issues might work well, but campaigns linking the media with fashion, beauty or size zero are unlikely to have the same degree of success.

Issues relating to PSHE do not fully meet the assessment criteria: animal issues, health issues or forced marriage/gender issues and candidates should consider how or if these should be pursued as a campaign for this Specification. Mostly they can only raise awareness or fund raise in support of it.

Assessment Objectives

AO1: Recall, selection and communication of knowledge and understanding of citizenship concepts, issues and technology.

AO2: Application of skills, knowledge and understanding when planning, taking and evaluating citizenship actions.

AO3: Analysis and evaluation of issues and evidence including different viewpoints to construct reasoned arguments and drawing of conclusions.

Centres should seek to ensure that, as far as possible, candidates should have appropriate preparation in some key skills related to the assessment objectives.

These include:

- (a) Planning and research
- (b) Setting campaign objectives
- (c) Identifying campaign methods
- (d) Engaging with people in a position of power and authority
- (e) Seeking the views of others
- (f) Analysis
- (g) Gathering and using different forms of evidence
- (h) Evaluation

Evidence

Providing evidence was rarely a problem for the overwhelming majority of candidates (there is no maximum but it should be appropriate, and identifying the individual candidate's work) however:

- Evidence needed to be used more selectively. Often there was too much included in bulky appendices to be effective. Moderators do not need to see every questionnaire returned or all the material downloaded. A list of websites visited, with just one item is sufficient, with explanation of how it supported the campaign.
- The best place for evidence is often at the end of each section, with the main focus on Section 2 of the response form. However, section 2b should not only include a list of the evidence submitted, but some explanation as to the action it is supporting. Indication of personal participation should also be given.
- It is acceptable to place all evidence in an appendix at the end but these needs to be clearly labelled and cross-referenced to the section concerned.
- There were a number of candidates who did not submit sufficient evidence to support their work, or did not use it to explain their involvement in the action, and some was generic so did not always suggest that it was supporting the candidate's work.

Centre-based citizenship

Some centres support citizenship on a whole school basis and this is seen by a range of activities with a varying number of staff involved. Candidates are raising awareness of citizenship issues by peer teaching successfully, school assemblies and posters. There were a number of successful charity and fund raising activities, which were a credit to the students. In such cases, participation in citizenship activities has made a difference.

Centres where there was only one citizenship teacher, or the teacher was not a specialist, often found the unit most difficult, and assessment of the candidate's work required more familiarity than their experience afforded. If possible, there should be another teacher/exams officer who can check through the actual marks and recording

of marks to alleviate the possibility of errors. Nonetheless, great efforts to support the candidates during their campaigns.

Use of the task response form

Centres need to be reminded that use of the task response form is compulsory but students should feel free to use additional pages if they run out of spare in a particular section. Additional sheets should always be clearly labelled. This was not always done in previous years, and each page needs to be identifiable.

The 'writing up' of the response sheets can be done by hand or they can be word processed. Timing may have been an issue for some students. Although three hours of 'writing up time' is allowed, the final section (Section 3) in some cases tended to be quite brief.

Annotation of the response sheets by centre staff, though not compulsory, was often quite detailed, making it clear to the external moderator why particular marks were awarded. Such annotations are always helpful to the external moderator.

There were a number of submissions that were not clipped together, or the candidate had used a variety of papers/sizes and it was difficult for external moderation to be carried out efficiently (time-wise) as the moderator had to sort it out first. All work, task form, evidence, CD's must be clearly labelled

Section 1: Development of a campaign strategy (10 A02 marks; 5 A03 marks)

In 1(a), the best responses described how, or explained why, a particular campaign issue was chosen. Candidates then identified some clear objectives and went on to show how these objectives would address citizenship issues. Those students who chose issues more closely related to PSHE found this more difficult and the difficulty re-appeared during the evaluation stage in Section 3.

Most candidates found 1(b) relatively straightforward, often making clear connections between the campaign methods they had chosen and ways in which the methods would help to achieve outcomes.

Most candidates met the requirements of 1(c) and included 'a brief plan of campaign'. Sometimes the plans were just too brief; they can be presented in tabulated form. Diagrammatic plans were often the simplest and most effective way of conveying the information required. However, just to attach a pre-written plan (often prepared by the group, is insufficient.) The Centre Assessor may like to refer to the GCSE Citizenship page of the Edexcel website does offer helpful examples of planning covering different levels of achievement.

Planning responses for 1c, should be written in the future tense-it is a plan to work to, not a report on what was done. Invariable this was the case, and suggests that the writing up of the task form was completed after the campaign had started. Centres may wish to review their arrangements for this so that candidates can fully meet the higher bands of the marking criteria. Therefore the planning, 'brief plan' in the directive, was interpreted widely from being four or five class decisions to spider grams from a group, leading to detailed steps for each member. Many did not address the consideration of time (weekly/per lesson) and some completely omitted any references to resources.

Section 2: Participate in the campaign (AO2 20 marks)

In 2(a), the right choice of campaign task was crucial and, as in Section 1, those who had chosen more PSHE-related themes found it difficult to relate them to ways in which citizenship issues were addressed. Others did not describe their own participation in a campaign in sufficient detail.

In 2(b) the highest marks were awarded to those candidates who did exactly as the framework suggested. They included appropriate evidence which showed how objectives might have been met; how there was communication with others - including influencing "those in a position of power"; the views of others on the campaign and strategy. Evidence was used selectively and the significance of the evidence was explained. This is very much the route to take for success in 2(b).

Clearly many found the communication with appropriate people whose views they could analyse and negotiate with to move their campaign forward, quite a challenge. It was not always clear who contacted these people and who did the negotiating in the group work. This is where evidence is required to personalise the campaign. However, the more able candidates were able to liaise with people of power over specific things they wanted to change, which then provided a platform for level four answers in Section 3. Well done to those who contacted a number of people and fully analysed the views of these and others connected to the campaign.

Weaker candidates either had little evidence or attached lots of evidence, usually incorporated in a bulky appendix, mostly without explanation, and not always clearly labelled. This then required interpretation and, in some cases, sorting into some sort of coherent order. In most cases the evidence did not support their actions. As in previous years, the most common area of weakness tended to be in Section 2(b).

Some candidates did little or nothing to interpret and utilise the evidence they had gathered. In the most extreme cases, which were necessarily uncommon, candidates did no more than list the evidence they had gathered. Neither did they contact or find out the views from People of Power and analyse the views held by different people.

Where this is the case, the marks must reflect the candidate's lack of response.

Another important point to note, especially in Section 2, is the need for all students to make clear their individual role in the campaign. Though they are not required to do so, most candidates work in groups. The 'we' aspect of their work offers one perspective but it is equally, if not more, important, to demonstrate the 'I' aspect of the work as well.

Section 3: Evaluation of the outcome of campaign actions (5 AO1marks; 10 AO3 marks) AND Quality of Written Communication

A number of candidates mentioned the lack of time to complete the campaign, or the task form. This inevitably will have an impact on their overall assessment of this section. Some candidates were unable to comment on the impact of their campaign for a variety of reasons, and their responses were rather brief. Centres can support the candidates to develop the skill of evaluation so that they can evaluate their action, evidence and outcomes more fully. The following comments were noted during the external moderation:

In 3(a) lower scoring answers described campaign outcomes or tried to evaluate the role of individuals. Higher scoring answers made sure that they focused on explaining why things had gone to plan - or not.

Section 3(b) took candidates back to the beginning of their work. Those who had not set very clear objectives found that they could only write in general terms and gained few marks. Those who had established clear objectives were able to write, sometimes

in detail, about whether or not objectives were met and there were high marks for clear and convincing explanations. It is quite acceptable to present this information in tabulated form. Although there must be sufficient writing to assess the quality of written communication. Candidates should not use tabular format for this section as it does not allow for the full assessment of the Quality of Written Communication. In 3(c), it was encouraging to read that most candidates did feel that their campaign had made a positive impact, even if this was - inevitably in most cases - rather small scale. There should be some discussion as to how/if their campaign could impact the wider world. Candidates, themselves, again wrote very positively about their own feelings at the end of the campaign.

Applying the assessment criteria

As with administration, the accuracy of the application of the assessment criteria varied considerably from centre to centre. Most centres, particularly those which had gained experience from the beginning back in 2011, were reasonably accurate and this was reassuring especially now that this qualification has moved forward and is no longer a new qualification. A few were too severe on their candidates and rather more were sometimes insufficiently accurate and consistent, and very generous. There is an Enhanced Controlled Assessment Booklet to help with the application of this marking criteria for the Controlled Assessment. Please visit www.edexcel.com for these support documents.

If more than one teacher is involved, it is essential that centres show that a robust system of internal moderation has been used. This was not always the case and, if even only one teacher of several is not marking to a common standard, the consequences on final centre marks can be very significant. It is essential that the second marker initials the work so that the external moderator is aware that the requirement of internal moderation has been fulfilled.

Usually, the best way to achieve accuracy is to read the assessment criteria in conjunction with the requirements of the response sheet and then to find a level where the descriptors best fit the work of the candidate. A mark within the level can then be determined.

It is emphasised that exemplars of Unit 4 work, with moderator commentaries, are available for centres on the GCSE Citizenship section of the Edexcel website. Online training and support courses will also take place during the academic year, and centre staff are advised to consult the training section of the Edexcel website for further information.

Looking to the Future

This two-year course requires the Controlled Assessments for Unit 2 and Unit 4 to be submitted at the end of the course. Therefore Centres need to be mindful of the choice of issue that it is chosen from a different range and content area as described in the Specification in order to meet the requirements for the examination.

The Specification meets the National Curriculum Framework set out in the Government Guidelines.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

