



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel GCSE  
In Citizenship (1CS0)  
Paper 02

## **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)

November 2021

Publications Code 1CS0\_02\_2111\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021





## **1CS0 02 Autumn 2021 Examiners' Report**

### **Introduction**

As with the Autumn 2020 series, this exam series was unusual, and was sat outside the normal examination window. Considering all the difficulties faced by centres and candidates the exam was approached by the vast majority with dedication and preparation

However, after every examination series we look back and reflect on what went well and garner evidence of sound learning but at the same time we also consider areas where candidates appeared to struggle and un-pick and understand their difficulties. We look back on the wider experience in the hope that we approach future series with greater confidence and clarity.

Furthermore, it is important to note that the numbers who sat the exam was much smaller than the normal summer sitting. As such the report aims to probe the demands of the question and the need to develop skills in the light of this.

One core area that remains a concern is that candidates are still undertaking actions that are not related to citizenship. Such candidates found this many of the Section A questions very challenging, as their own experiences of taking action were more suitable for PSHE than citizenship or were not related to taking action. Examples of such unsuitable actions included picking up nitrous oxide canisters and simple statements that did not identify the action taken, such as human rights or Black Lives Matters.

A further issue arose for candidates when answering Section A questions where the action chosen was unlikely to be able to achieve a benefit or change for a particular community or wider society. Candidates with actions such as this found it difficult to analyse and evaluate if their aims had been met or partially met, or in some cases what their aims were. Despite the advice given in the previous examiners' report, there are still examples of such actions included as noted above.

The following guidance should be considered by centres when planning how to manage the Citizenship action with their candidates.

Remember that the six stages of the action outlined in Theme E can all be the basis of questions on Paper 2 Section A, so the choice of action must enable all or any of the stages to be exemplified and evaluated in the context of their activity by candidates in the examination.

Rather than large generic topics where the chance of achieving success is, at best, remote, it would be better for candidates to work on objectives which do have a better prospect of being successful, as long as they do also clearly link to themes as the specification requires. Choosing a specific aim or goal which candidates have a reasonable chance of achieving is important because there has to be a realistic basis for assessing the success of the Citizenship action in terms of outcome achieved.

Centres should carefully consider the points in the Specification and the Getting Started booklet, particularly in relation to Theme E. It would probably be best for candidates not to commence their action until they had gained sufficient understanding of the themes, so as to be able to identify meaningful links between the specification themes (eg - diversity, democracy, power, justice, accountability, equality, participation) and the action.

Whether candidates go down the awareness-raising/opinion-changing route or the social/community activity pathway, the goal must be clearly defined and realistically achievable and in some way measurable; it is also essential that the links to themes and citizenship concepts should be explicit and at the heart of the chosen project.

Chosen candidate actions require a specific goal and participants need to be able to demonstrate that they have achieved it (or not). If the goal was only partially achieved, candidates will need to be able to explain why this was the case; this must link back to chosen specification themes. Although the specification makes it clear candidates will be not penalised if an action didn't go to plan, this would not necessarily excuse an unsuccessful activity which was poorly conceived and ill matched to resources available such as commitment, time, funding, skills or expertise.

As long as specification themes are clearly and explicitly linked to the action, the focus could be within the school - perhaps relating to themes of democracy and participation - uniform, sports offered, timetable, homework patterns, menus offered, charitable projects undertaken, etc. Alternatively the target could be within the community, identifying problems, publicising them and trying to get local councils or other bodies or voluntary organisations to remedy them - road safety/pedestrian crossings, leisure facilities/opening times, times/routes of local bus services/location of bus stops, openness of council meetings to the public, locations of local courts, opening times and services police stations or other public bodies, issues involving the elderly, safety issues such as installing sprinklers in blocks of flats, etc. Seeking to engage with local media or to persuade a local council or individual councillors to support a cause could all be part of an excellent plan.

If the action chosen by candidates seeks to change opinions or to undertake an awareness raising action over bigger issues such as types of government or punishment or human practices or activities in different parts of the world, they will need to establish a clear baseline of how much their audience knew or what they believed at the start and end of the action. Much realism will be required in clearly stating the goal in terms that can be measured, tested and evidenced with confidence.

The easiest way to be sure a possible action meets all the requirements is to test it against these six questions and to be confident that the answer to all the questions is an unmistakable **YES**. Even if there is a single **NO**, it would be best to amend the proposed action and eliminate the **NO**. The six questions are:

- 1) Does the proposed action have a clear goal (whether in terms of **awareness raising** or **social/community** action)?
- 2) Is the topic listed in one of the four **themes** on the specification or very closely related to such a theme?
- 3) Is the proposed action likely to **make an impact** or **difference** locally, nationally or globally?
- 4) Does the team have sufficient **time** or other resources to carry out such an action?
- 5) Will the proposed topic link closely to the **concepts and terms** which apply to the theme on which the proposed action will be based?
- 6) Will it be possible to **measure** in a **precise and reliable way** how successful or unsuccessful the action has been in terms of achieving its goal?

### **1a**

This question asked candidates to explicitly explain how the action they chose to undertake was related to the Citizenship themes in the specification. This did not require candidates to simply describe their action; a specific link between the subject content and the action was expected instead. This should be explicitly linked to their own experiences of planning and conducting a citizenship action.

### **1b**

Candidates required an understanding of what primary research involved for this question, but rather than giving a definition of what primary research was, candidates should have explained why primary research plays a significant role in the planning of a citizenship action. This needed to be more than a list of primary research carried out, as the command word here was 'explain',

indicating that candidates should develop a reason rather than simply identify what was done in the planning stages. This should be explicitly linked to their own experiences of planning and conducting a Citizenship action.

### **1c**

This question demonstrated the importance of thoroughly understanding the key concepts in the specification. Collaborating with others is a central theme of taking action, and candidates should be able to discuss why this is so important throughout the process of taking action, and also why it may cause problems. This would then allow them to address the issues raised in this question of why collaborating with others may be beneficial but also problematic. This should be explicitly linked to their own experiences of planning and conducting a citizenship action.

### **1d**

Candidates were asked to reflect on their own experiences of planning and taking action in this question. This focused on section E6, critically evaluate their learning and the impact of the action- after completing the planned action, candidates should have focused on what went well- and more importantly why certain plans or parts of the action were successful- and what proved more problematic- again, thinking about the reasons why the action may not have proceeded as originally planned. This reflection should also include what candidates could have done differently in all stages of the campaign to ensure success or to avoid or resolve the difficulties they faced.

Candidates need to be thoroughly prepared to evaluate their own experiences, and this should be explicitly linked to their own experiences of planning and conducting a citizenship action.

Candidates should also take the time to read the questions carefully to ensure they focus on any given factor for discussion and also to avoid missing out on marks by answering the question based on an excluded factor- here, candidates were directed to consider issue apart from careful research that they may choose to change in a future action.

### **1e**

This question asked candidates to reflect on the key reasons why a citizenship action may succeed, but were explicitly asked to focus on the size of the team and the evidence from secondary sources used. This required candidates to consider how each of these factors may have contributed to the success of the action, but also to consider how each factor may also have had a negative



impact on the planning or conducting of the citizenship action. Candidates could also discuss other factors that may have contributed more to the success of the action. This should be explicitly linked to their own experiences of planning and conducting a citizenship action.

Centres are reminded that a balanced answer is the key to progressing beyond Level 2 on this question.

### **2a**

Candidates were required to make explicit use of the source booklet here. The ways of raising awareness related to upskirting had to be drawn from the source to be given credit, and in order to gain full marks, candidates needed to add development to the way identified rather than simply state what was done to raise awareness.

Answers that were not drawn from the source material were not credited.

### **2b**

This question required candidates to identify two reasons why a government may choose to support a campaign. These reasons did not have to be drawn from the source, and could be general reasons. There was no requirement to draw the reasons from the source material, but any valid links to the source would have been credited.

### **2c**

This question directs candidates to explicitly use the source material for their response. This question stem asks candidates to use the source material to identify why the view given in the question may be challenged- therefore, consider and explain why the view may not have been fully accurate or had problems in what was stated. In this case, the view stated that everyone agreed on how important the campaign was, so candidates should have identified reasons from the source, with some development added, that suggested that the issue of upskirting was not something that everyone agreed with.

Only one developed reason was required for this question.

### **2d**

Candidates were asked to identify reasons why a campaigner such as Gina Martin may have tried to gain the support of an MP as a strategy for their campaign. Simply listing reasons would only merit a low level 2 award, as candidates are asked to make an “effective and sustained comment” which

required development of the reasons identified. While there is no explicit requirement for a set number of points to be made in responses, candidates would need to include more than one developed reason to reach level 3 as the requirement for the top level is “detailed knowledge”.

### **3-5**

These were the multiple-choice questions. Candidates require a working understanding of each topic on Theme D to be successful in these questions.

### **6**

Candidates were asked to identify two benefits of membership of the United Nations for the UK. Candidates should be prepared to write more than a simple single word for such answers as the benefit they identify may not always be obvious from a simple word such as ‘army’ or ‘help’.

### **7**

This question required candidates to understand what is meant by sanctions and so demonstrates the importance of understanding the key concepts in the specification. The sanction identified then needed to be linked to an appropriate example, again demonstrating the need to be prepared thoroughly for each part of Theme D.

### **8**

Candidates were required to identify reasons why the media’s role of investigating the actions of those in power is important. This required candidates to go beyond identifying how the media investigate and instead focus on why it is important to do so. Candidates needed to identify two reasons, with development, to access full marks.

### **9**

This question stem requires candidates to be able to discuss two of the named organisations in section D7 of the specification. Candidates should be able to discuss all of the named organisations and be fully aware of the similarities and differences between them to avoid inaccuracies in their responses.

Here the direction was clear to discuss the Commonwealth and the World Trade Organisation.

Candidates needed to explicitly explain the role of each organisation rather than lump them both together into one general response in order to progress beyond low level 2.

## **10**

This question requires a balanced response. Candidates are clearly directed to write about both supporting and opposing arguments, and cannot progress beyond level 2 if they only focus on one side of the argument.

Candidates are directed to focus on the view given in the statement. Here, they were asked to discuss whether or not trade unions can effectively protect the rights of people in the workplace. The most effective responses presented arguments on both sides and included examples from trade unions that they have studied to access the top level.

## **11**

As with question 10, this question requires a balanced response. Candidates are clearly directed to write about both the view given and also other viewpoints, and cannot progress beyond level 2 if they only focus on one side of the argument. The key difference between questions 10 and 11 is the requirement to include an overall judgement about the viewpoint- this is a requirement to access beyond level 1.

The key focus of this question was about how to improve voter engagement. The candidates were given two factors to consider in their arguments, with the view posited that social media and digital democracy are the only way to improve voter engagement. To access the top levels, arguments should have been presented, with evidence, to support his view, along with arguments that could be against this view and/or argue that other factors are just as or more important, with evidence.

The key discriminator between the levels was the range of arguments, the evidence given to substantiate those arguments, and how well the overall judgement is sustained throughout the answer given.

### **Key points paper summary**

- Candidates need to be able to refer explicitly to their own experiences of taking action throughout Section A
- Candidates should be reminded to link their responses in Section A to their own action to avoid losing marks for generic responses
- The extended response in Section A should be clearly structured around candidates' own experiences of taking action
- The Section B source will be based on an example of campaigning- candidates will be expected to apply their own knowledge and understanding of the issues related to taking action to the questions in this

section, rather than being expected to know about the particular campaign in the source

- Candidates need to be able to explain the roles and functions of all the international organisations named in Theme D, and should be prepared to discuss them individually in Question 9 in particular, as this will always be based on two of those named international organisations
- Candidates are not required to come to a reasoned conclusion in Question 10
- Progression through the levels on Question 11 will be dependent on the attempts to offer a balanced answer, the reasoning given, the degree of evidence included and the strength of the conclusion reached