

Principal Moderator Feedback

Summer 2010

Applied GCSE

Applied GCSE

Information and Communication Technology (5333)

Unit 3 - ICT and Society

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/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated ICT telephone line: 0844 372 2186

Summer 2010

Publications Code UG023477

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General Comments

June 2009 is the sixth moderation session for this unit. It is pleasing to see that the quality of response continues to stabilise and improve. Whilst a few candidates did not apply the necessary skills in the vocational context despite research and investigation, the majority had produced good quality evidence of their ability to apply their knowledge of ICT. There is sound evidence of a good understanding of the specification and its delivery, both on the part of the teachers and the candidates themselves.

This unit is about ICT in Society and requires students to look at how ICT is used in the wider world by adults, those with special or particular needs and communities as well as themselves. The unit requires an understanding of the legislation surrounding the use of ICT, how does it protect people and what must they do to comply with the law. Substantial descriptions of the ICT used are essential if students are to progress beyond explanatory to evaluative statements.

When case studies had been used rather than inviting visiting speakers or allowing candidates to interview their chosen person, candidates had been able improve the quality of their evidence. Centres, in general, continue to make sound use of the Unit Marking Guides, which when coupled with detailed page number annotations and an indication of any professional judgment applied, have greatly aided the moderation process. There has also been an increase within the portfolios of signposting of the evidence by the candidates.

A few centres still seem to have little awareness of the grade descriptors found in the specification. These give a general indication of the required standard at grades A, C and F. The skills, knowledge and understanding for this award must be applied in a vocationally related context. This calls for involvement with ICT beyond the educational environment. Candidates are expected to show knowledge of ICT terms and definitions; explore, develop and interpret information; use ICT to share, exchange and present work; reflect on how they have used ICT and the impact of ICT in the wider world. Where centres did not do so well, it is because they have underestimated the demands of the qualification and the GCSE Double award equivalence across grades A*-G.

Evidence Requirements

For Evidence Requirement A, candidates should explain how they use ICT for personal, social and work-related purposes both at home and at school. The explanatory statement must be based on a description that is detailed enough for the reader to have a clear idea of how the ICT might be used, its capabilities and be linked to the candidate's own needs.

For Evidence Requirement B, candidates are required to clearly identify the impact of ICT on an adult in employment, and the effects on their working style. Two or more categories of technology should be identified (e.g. Internet, communication, entertainment, mobile ICT (laptop, iPod), etc.) with explanatory statements based on a clear description of the technology for personal, social, work related and effects on working style.

For Evidence Requirement C, candidates must consider the impact of ICT on a person with special/particular needs. They should identify the technology used and give explanatory statements of their use, linked to those needs.

In Evidence Requirement D, the local community must be clearly identified with some background given to clarify the context. At least two categories of technology need to be explained in detail, and in terms of how they meet the needs of the community.

Evidence Requirement E concerns legislation. This does not need to be submitted as a separate strand, so students could include reference to relevant legislation within each of the preceding four evidence requirements. However, the most successful portfolios separated the legislation from the remainder of the evidence. In order to access the top of mark band 2, candidates must link at least one item of legislation to each of the individuals and groups within Evidence Requirement A through to Evidence Requirement D.

Evidence Requirement A

This strand was well addressed with many candidates gaining their highest marks on this component. Candidates often produced a table to show the technologies they used personally, socially and in their school work. The candidates who scored highly selected 3 or 4 technologies, each from a different category and produced clear, detailed explanations and in many cases good evaluative statements. Those who did not achieve high marks tended to only analyse one category of technology and did not include evaluative comments. Candidates appear to have benefited from being given some guidance on structuring their work prior to starting the work. Where candidates had written in the third person, it was sometimes difficult to determine if they had actually used the technology.

Candidates who did not reach the higher mark bands usually did so because they had not produced descriptions of the technology used, or because they did not cover their personal, social or work related uses of ICT. Also because, in many cases, they did not say how the technology met their own needs. Several candidates also lost marks because they chose inappropriate technologies such as alarm clocks or hair straighteners.

Evidence Requirement B

Candidates did not always select an appropriate working adult or identify an individual and so were placed in the lowest mark band. The candidates who interviewed a person known to them (a friend or parent) generally gave the best evaluations of how technologies met the adult's needs, particularly for personal and social use. Where candidates interviewed a person of their own choice they gained far more of a insight into the adult's perception of ICT and its effect on their working style and were able to write a full and reasoned report. Candidates who used a member of their school staff as the working adult did not generally score well as it was obvious they had been given brief descriptions of the technologies used and had not always had the opportunity to fully evaluate the effect of the technologies on their working style. Candidates often identified working style very briefly and with little evaluation.

There were very few cases this series, where the candidates did not specify an actual adult, writing about adults in general. Candidates who did not link a specified adult with technology used by them did not move out of the lowest mark band.

Candidates that lost marks for this strand failed to include enough detail about the individual and why they used ICT day to day. Some candidates did not refer to home use, and investigated only the working environment which meant they could only achieve marks in the lower mark bands.

Evidence Requirement C

This is still weakest area of the coursework for many candidates. At times it was obvious that they had not actually studied an individual or spoken to them. However, there were examples of pleasing work where candidates had used a member of their family, a friend or a member of their school as their identified person. The candidates achieving the highest marks in this strand were those who selected someone from their local community who they could interview and receive detailed feedback on how the technologies used met their needs. It was pleasing to see that some candidates had been told about specific technologies by their identified person and had then used the internet to gather more information on the technology and had used it in their descriptions and evaluations.

There were far fewer candidates using case studies. Centres must ensure that the technology studied is assistive technology and not simply the standard technology used by anyone. The focus must be on technology designed specifically to help someone with special or particular needs - visual impairment, limited mobility, hearing impairment etc.

Evidence Requirement D

Evidence Requirement D seemed to be covered better this year as candidates had identified their community and selected technologies that impacted on the whole community (traffic lights, ATMs and speed cameras). Overall, candidates did much better at describing the technologies used by the community and measuring how far they met community needs. However, some candidates were not linking these very well to their own community, not saying where the technologies were placed in the community and why they were there.

Candidates who did not score well did not select appropriate technologies and therefore could not evaluate how these technologies met the needs of the whole community. Many of the candidates need to develop their evaluative skills. Those who did score well identified the community needs and then went on to describe and evaluate the way the technologies met those needs. Where candidates were briefed on the definition of a community and were encouraged to go out and look around the community, the evidence was well presented and meaningful.

A small number of candidates described technologies that were not available to the whole community, such as a burglar alarm on a shop, or described technologies that met the needs of an organisation within the community, (eg. a bar code reader in a supermarket) but not the needs of the community as a whole.

Evidence Requirement E

The responses for Evidence Requirement E has improved from the previous series. Candidates that did not achieve high marks in this strand this was did not relate the legislation identified to the people/places studied in the previous components. However there were some good explanations of the legislations and links from some candidates.

Most candidates gained the top of the lowest mark band for describing 4 items of legislation, but then failed to relate the legislation to the people/places they had studied previously and so could not gain higher marks. Some candidates gave too general a link to the people studied and did not relate the legislation specifically to their named adult or person with special/particular needs. However there were far fewer candidates doing this than there has been in previous series.

Candidates were much more careful this year in not choosing legislation that was not connected with ICT (e.g. the Disability Discrimination Act) but there were a few cases where candidates described the Health and Safety at Work Act but failed to link this to the use of ICT equipment.

Statistics

Unit Results

Grade	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Raw boundary mark	58	57	52	45	38	31	24	18	12
Uniform boundary mark	100	90	80	70	60	50	40	30	20

Qualification Results

Grade	A*A*	A*A	AA	AB	BB	BC	CC	CD	DD	DE	EE	EF	FF	FG	GG
Uniform Mark Boundaries	270	255	240	225	210	195	180	165	150	135	120	105	90	75	60

Notes

Maximum marks (Raw): The marks corresponding to the sum total of the marks available

Boundary mark: The minimum mark required required by a candidate to achieve a given grade

Grade boundaries may vary from year to year and from subject to subject depending on the demands of the question paper.

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

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UG023477 Summer 2010

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

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH