

Moderators' Report/  
Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel GCSE in Citizenship  
Studies (5CS02)

Paper 1: Participating in Society

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2014

Publications Code UG038413\*

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## **General Comments**

This specification is now well-established but had a changing entry; some centres have chosen to do the full course, and others have not submitted this year. The vast majority of centres were able to deliver the course successfully and candidates had been able to choose appropriate issues for investigation and subsequent action. There was evidence of much hard work, and the candidates are to be commended for their efforts.

Moderators noticed that there was improved research and presentation of work by candidates; as well as literacy skills in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

Not all submissions were on the official Edexcel task form, which can lead to disorganised submissions and may disadvantage the candidate if they have not got the official wording for the question. No centre is permitted to change the questions under any circumstances.

Candidate's work should be individually identifiable, and not in group folders where the moderator then has to search for the correct candidate's work. The Candidate Record Form should be completed in full. It needs to be identifiable by moderators and senior examiners.

Generally there was a wide variation in the amount of guidance and support that a centre offered to candidates. Most used some of the teacher support documents or devised their own. It is imperative that candidates use these as 'notes' and are not submitting them as their response for the question.

### **Especially noticeable were:**

- The number of candidates who persevered against the odds/unplanned events, that would inevitably mean an impact their work
- Instances of no response from the people of power, yet undeterred, they either used their back-up plan, or contacted suitable alternatives
- Instances where group efforts were extremely co-operative
- The success rates of raising awareness, fund raising or changing the situation for the better eg bullying in schools
- Those who were mentioned in school newsletters or the local press.

### **Examples of good practice from candidates included:**

- Clear indication of the issue to be researched and appropriate evidence submitted.
- Very good evidence of the participation in action, well referenced or labelled for identification,
- Many who could identify and use citizenship skills of planning, communication discussion and negotiation.

- Many demonstrated good evaluative skills, when analysing and reflecting on the whole process, including peer evaluation and questionnaires with sound analysis
- Clear links with Citizenship
- Enthusiasm, honesty and over-coming shyness were characteristics of a lot of candidates

### **Centre Administration**

The use of the 'What to send the moderator' seemed to have been welcomed by some centres, although there were instances of some inefficiency. Those who included this and annotated it showed extremely good organisation and was appreciated by the moderator. This is available on [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) and it is advisable that teachers use it, and in doing so avoid the additional burden of receiving an E6 from the external moderator. Any items not sent, and therefore requested will cause undue delay to the external moderating process.

#### **The examples of good practice by centres included:**

- Use of the updated Controlled Assessment Candidate Record sheets that could be signed by both the teacher and the candidate, providing the authentication required to meet the requirements set out by Edexcel in the Specification. The updated form is available from [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) and replaces the separate authentication form. This also ensures easy identification of the candidate's work.
- The candidate record sheet used to record the marks for the four sections of the task form (issue; advocacy and representation; participation in action; evaluation).
- Evidence of internal standardisation which is so essential when there are a number of teachers delivering the course. This is best indicated by teacher's initials or a different coloured ink.

However, there were a few areas which are identified below for Centres to consider for future moderation. This will ensure that the external moderation can proceed without any undue delays:

- Ensure the Controlled Assessment Sample arrives by the deadline and preferably in advance of the deadline.
- Full and accurate completion of the Candidate Record Sheet is required showing the candidate full name and candidate number, the centre name and number, title of the issue to be investigated and the total mark (which should be checked to ensure it has been correctly added up), and signed by both the teacher and candidate.

- The sample must include the highest and lowest scoring candidate work and any absent or withdrawn candidates whose work was requested for external moderation should be substituted.
- When an E6 is sent by the external moderator to request the highest/lowest candidate's work, or additional work, the response should be returned as soon as possible in order to ensure that there is no further delay in the process.
- Make sure there is clear indication where internal standardisation has taken place, at the least get the internal marking checked by another teacher if it is a small cohort.
- Witness Statements/Testimony Form should be fully completed to show exactly what was being witnessed and signed by the witness.
- Any CDs or DVDs sent as evidence need to be checked to ensure that the recording can be played. Clear labelling is required so that it is identifiable.
- When the centre is entering candidates for both Units 2 and 4, they should check if the sample is to be sent to one moderator or two different moderators.

### **Assessment of candidates' work**

It was clear that centres had used the level descriptors quite accurately where many marks awarded for each section matched the marking criteria, or fell in the right level. It is hoped that the exemplars and the booklet available for Teacher Support on the website have been useful to teachers, as well as other support documents which are available on [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

As the Controlled Assessment is worth 60% of the marks of the short course it is imperative that centres apply the marking criteria both accurately and consistently. For this reason it is also important that candidates are given opportunity to complete the task form if, for some reason, they were unable to do so on a specified date. It is also felt that teachers need to prepare the candidates for the Controlled Assessment so that the candidates are aware of the expectations and how to approach the research, interviews and action. These will probably be new skills and less able students will need some guidance as to how to carry out such activities.

Moderators reported that generally there was a lack of evidence to support the interviews and actions. Overall there was good use made of the marking criteria by many centres, resulting in assessment at the required levels. Annotations are always welcome, and helpful for moderators to understand how the marks awarded by the Centre Assessor have been given.

Internal moderation often highlights where teachers in the same centre have not applied marking criteria to the same standard and it is best for this to be before centre marks are submitted and the centre sample is sent for moderation. When

the teacher signs the OPTEMS, it is to verify that this has been carried out. Moderators reported that there was an increase in centres clearly indicating these actions. Not only this, the quality of the moderation was very good and where centres submitted the notes of their centre's meeting, they showed the links with the assessment criteria too.

Some candidates opt to work in a group. Where this is the case, the teacher should assess the level of the individual candidate's work, and not the group as a whole. Each candidate should submit evidence of their own contribution for each section. Evidence can be annotated to ensure that the individual's input is identifiable. A list of appropriate types of evidence is available in the Teacher Support Book which is available on the GCSE Citizenship page of the Edexcel website. Where there is little evidence, and the individual involvement is not explicit, the candidate is unlikely to gain marks beyond level 2. Candidates may need guidance as to whether their chosen issue is appropriate for the Controlled Assessment. Many centres use the 'Ask the Expert' service so as to guide their candidates.

Choice of issues:

- Issues which were well done included:
- poverty
- homelessness
- voting age
- bus fares
- knife crime
- impact of the media
- gender inequality
- society-discrimination, cohesion and human rights.

Issues arising from ethical or moral situations (for example healthy eating, gay adoption, gay rights, teen pregnancy or body image) must be firmly linked with one of the three Themes from Unit 1 of the Specification in order to fulfil the requirements of the Specification. The range and content area should also be easily identifiable in order to be acceptable for entry in this specification.

Where the centre undertakes the same issue, there is a danger of insufficient opportunity available to all candidates to fully explore, advocate and participate in the tasks.

Although a number of candidates participated in the Youth Philanthropy Initiative, care needs to be taken when completing the task forms that appropriate responses are set out; there is a tendency not to personalise or specialise for the Controlled Assessment. Indeed the opportunity to participate in these activities is worthwhile and an invaluable experience for the young people, and one that can be encouraged. Others, such as child abuse, need to be done with due care and sensitivity, and may well have obstacles such as confidentiality that hinder adequate responses on the task form.

The sections should be taken as a whole and not marked separately i.e. the assessor should not mark (a) and (b) and then add them together for a total for a section. There were a handful of teachers who had marked in this way, and there may be a different level attained at the end of external moderation.

The following observations on the Centre's marking have been made during the scrutiny of candidate's work.

### **Section 1**

Where candidates had not considered an issue within the local community, they had chosen one that is a topic that concerns them in some way, and sought to raise awareness of it through their action. Hence candidates have taken the local link to mean raising awareness locally, but a number of candidates were unable to explain why their issue was important locally. For full marks candidates must describe the link from a local perspective, give their own personal view and explain how the issue is linked to a Citizenship Theme from Unit 1. Candidates are not penalised for discussing links with more than one theme. Candidates should not be penalised for only linking their issue with one of the themes, as this was asked in the question.

A number of centres were awarding marks where candidates had just included the words 'national' and 'local' without explanation, however, credit cannot be given without an explanation. There was a wide variation of responses relating to the links with citizenship themes. Some were just one sentence, without any explanation or analysis, others included comments from more than one theme (quite acceptable), but just one sentence from each does not fully meet the criteria; candidates should explain **Section 2** how this issue fully links to the theme/s.

Candidates were frequently awarded marks in level 4 where there was either no interview, or a reported interview but no evidence of such, or any analysis, or a mix of all of these observations. There were more candidates this year who experienced lack of replies from invitations to interview. Centres ought to consider the reasons for this:

- > have appropriate people been contacted? They are less likely to receive replies from Obama and David Cameron than a teacher or other local representative.
- > how was the invitation worded? -if it was just along the lines of 'please tell me what you think of ....' it probably won't have a response.
- > was the person actually in a position to reply? Centres really need to give a little guidance as to appropriate people to contact.

When replies were received there was often very little analysis of the views held and even less comparison with their own view (which was not always made evident). Many candidates did approach staff in their school, including Senior Managers. In some cases this was very effective, but others were inadequate - little more than requests to put up posters or something else in school which required permission. This missed the point of trying to find out the views of others and compare such with their own view.

There were also a few instances where credit was given for the action which was also the interview so in effect crediting twice in Sections 2 and 3. Another misinterpretation is where the candidate contacts (usually by email) to ask permission for use of a display board, assembly or to carry out the action-to

identify some of the misconceptions. The key words of the question are 'to find out the views' of the person contacted.

Often where candidates had described fully how and when they interviewed rather than the actual views obtained through questioning, this was over marked by centres as there was no analysis that could be credited. Some candidates had contacted and interviewed more than two people and submitted views from a wide variety of people. Generally these were well recognised by the centre. Centres should remind candidates that there is a requirement of evidence to support these interviews: copies of emails, transcripts of questions and answers or CD's are appropriate and acceptable.

However, a number of centres arranged for all candidates to cover the same issue which is quite acceptable but, where the centre arranged for the person to attend a question and answer session, it was difficult to assess the individual candidate's contribution.

### **Section 3**

Some candidates were awarded marks for a description of the activity. Credit should be given for the description of negotiation and how the evidence demonstrated the citizenship skills, and the impact that is anticipated from the participation in the action. It should also be noted that responses should be written in paragraphs, rather than bullet points. A Witness Testimony Form, fully completed and personalised, would be a good way to inform the assessors as to the performance of the candidate. Where there is a generic Witness Testimony Form, it does not inform of an individual candidate's performance. All it witnesses is the fact that the candidates have taken part in an activity.

More able candidates clearly described their actions and often outlined the actions of the others in the group and the negotiating skills in allocation of tasks. However, in other cases, it was rather more difficult to ascertain exactly what contribution the candidate made.

### **Section 4**

It was rather surprising how many centre assessors did not accurately credit Quality of Written Communication which should be assessed in this section. It was also noted that credit was rightly given to candidates who had extended their action to social networking which would give a national perspective or even international perspective to their investigation, and proved to be well documented in this section. More able candidates described their personal view at the end of their action and evaluate their own performance.

### **Candidate Performance**

There were a variety of work sheets from support publications, or devised by the centres themselves, used to give direction to candidates to the specific requirements of the task. However, these should not be used in place of the task form.

Candidates are to be commended for their number of interviewees, and number of differing views discussed in section 2 that went beyond the remit of the requirements.

Those candidates who were not awarded higher marks are those who did not sufficiently analyse the views from various people or who did not to explain their personal input and compare the views with their own.

Where there were brief responses or incomplete sections this could have been as a result of candidates being unsure of what is expected, timing issues or that the candidate was absent for part of the controlled assessment. It is perfectly acceptable to reschedule to allow them the full time for their write up so as not to penalise the candidate if they miss part of the time allowed. It was encouraging to see so many well-organised pieces of work, with appendices referenced, and the acknowledgement that this citizenship activity had afforded new opportunities and development of skills, as well as character-building. Not only had these young people clearly enjoyed their involvement but a number expressed a wish to continue after the examination.

### **Choice of Issue**

There were a good variety of local issues, these included:

Linked to theme 1:

Bullying (the most common issue this year)  
How to reduce knife/gun crime/litter/recycle  
Seeking improvement in local facilities  
Diversity/community cohesion

Linked to theme 2:

Discrimination or disability  
The media and its portrayal of young/old people  
Lowering the voting age

Linked to theme 3:

From a global perspective actions for awareness/fundraising for fair-trade/cancer charities  
Global warming/wind farms/sustainability

A number of issues, often of interest to candidates, were not quite suitable for Citizenship, but could be well done if linked with rights and responsibility or legislation. These topics included health issues of obesity, eating disorders, teenage pregnancy or fundraising for cancer charities. Topics around animal issues are rather hard to link to citizenship as animal rights are not included in the Specification. Cruelty to animals, animal testing and animal welfare were among those less suited to this unit.

Where the choice of issue is clearly linked with the local community it was much easier for candidates to respond to the task form effectively. Candidates should make sure they explain the reason for their choice rather than describe the roles and responsibilities of the group, and explore the links with citizenship and stating their personal view of this issue. There should also be references to the research carried out.

Ultimately the issues to be viewed should be either local or national and where possible global. Candidates who extended their enquiry to these different perspectives tended to gain the higher marks. However, candidates performed

rather less well when the links with citizenship themes were not explicitly explained.

### **Advocacy and Representation**

The specification requires candidates to communicate with two 'People of Power'. These should be people who have knowledge of, work in or are concerned with the chosen issue. These do not generally include parents, siblings, friends or neighbours unless they have an interest in, or work that is based on this issue.

Those chosen should have specific knowledge of the issue and be able to take action as a direct response to the candidate's power of persuasion. Clearly someone in the peer group cannot be chosen to be interviewed as they will not have the power to put any proposed changes or improvements into practice. However, a member of the Youth Parliament might be suitable if the issue is one of lowering the voting age to sixteen, or if the adult person has not responded, a peer may be suitable so that the candidate can demonstrate another view.

Many candidates successfully carried out two interviews, submitted evidence (in the form of DVDs, Witness Statement scripts, or questions) and analysed these views with a discussion of differing views. These candidates were able to achieve the higher level of marks.

### **The Way Forward**

Centres should ensure that candidates have sufficient time allocated for effective communication with the people of power and have a back-up plan. Arrangements should be made when candidates are absent from writing up sessions.

The Centre Assessor should draw attention to the requirements:

- i) The importance of discussion of their own personal view
- ii) It must be evident as to what the individual candidate actually did if this was part of group work.
- iii) Successful communication is where the candidate has expressed the reason for their concern and suggested a way in which this could change.
- iv) A contingency plan is advised for use in instances where there is no replies.

Support documents and training details are available on : [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com)

## **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>





