



# Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

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)

Summer 2022

Publications Code 1CS0\_02\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## **Introduction**

### **Section A**

The most common issue on this paper arose for candidates whose choice of action was not related to citizenship. These candidates found this, and 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 should the death penalty be brought back, the struggles of Kenyan education, improve internet speeds in X local area, how drugs and alcohol affect people, the risks of abortion and ending famine.

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' reports, there are still examples of such actions included such as the problem of police power, 'is freedom of speech dying?', 'what are superpower nations, and should they be allowed?' and 'Save Syria'.

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 have gained sufficient understanding of the themes, so as to be able to identify meaningful links between the specification themes (e.g. - 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 GCSE Citizenship 1CS0 02 3 offered, timetable, homework patterns, menus offered, charitable projects undertaken. 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. 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?

**Question 1a**

Many responses to this question were very general and not always clearly related to the candidate's own experience of taking action e.g. 'we did research on the internet. This meant that a significant minority of students were unable to access the marks on this question. There were also a number of responses where candidates simply stated a reason with no development, for example, 'we read a BBC article'. Centres are reminded that 'explain' questions require more than a brief response such as 'we did secondary research using the internet'.

**Question 1b**

Many responses to this question were generic rather than related to candidates' experiences of taking action. In order to access marks, candidates are required to link how some types of evidence or viewpoints could affect the organisation of a citizenship action rather than making simple statements such as "more evidence is more persuasive", which largely paraphrases the question without really adding anything specifically related to citizenship action. Many responses were also very vague- making simple assertions such as 'statistics are more persuasive', or 'talking more is persuasive', with no clear link to the type of evidence or viewpoint or how it related to organising an action.

The best responses came from candidates who specifically referred to the different evidence or viewpoints they considered and how this helped with organising their action on their chosen issue in terms of why or how it was persuasive e.g. how a certain type of evidence or a certain viewpoint helped them select their issue or their activity.

**Question 1c**

The majority of candidates were able to answer this well, with a number of points explained related to conflict caused by differing views, or not having sufficient work to do in a large team.

Where candidates lost marks, it was because they failed to develop the reason given- so made simple statements like 'there were too many ideas' without any development. Alternatively, they identified 2 separate reasons with no development e.g. 'there will be too many ideas and some people will be lazy'.

Centres are reminded that 'Explain' questions require reasons plus development to reach full marks.

**Question 1d**

The majority of candidates were able to identify one method of evaluation, most often using a questionnaire or a survey after the action to check if they had achieved their goal, although a common issue with making general responses was demonstrated by the minority of candidates who simply stated that they carried out a questionnaire. Such responses would not gain

any credit unless they were explicitly related to how this helped candidates measure if they had achieved their goals.

Candidates should be reminded that questions using the command word 'explain' require some development to access full marks. A number of candidates found their marks were limited by relying on simple statements about the method of evaluation rather than adding development about what this told them about their success. Candidates should also be reminded that the development will need to be two distinct points rather than giving the same development twice e.g. 'we surveyed the students who attended our assembly to find out what they had learned about X' and 'we asked the teachers who watched the assembly what they had learned about X'.

Finally, candidates should be reminded to read the wording of the questions very carefully to establish what they are being required to write about- a number of candidates here focused solely on the methods they used in their action, rather than the methods of evaluation- and so gained no credit.

### **Question 1e**

This question required candidates to evaluate a given viewpoint based on their own citizenship action. However, many candidates responded to the viewpoint in a more general way, with few- if any- references to their own experiences of taking action. Responses with no reference at all to their own experiences of taking action are limited to a maximum of 6 marks.

A number of candidates simply gave generic answers about the most important factor causing failure, such as communication or working in a team rather than addressing the question on the significance of a lack of planning, which limited marks to level 2 because of the lack of understanding demonstrated in regards to the key question focus.

The most common issue with this question was the lack of substantiation for the arguments made. Centres are reminded that Section A of this examination requires candidates to be able to reference their own experiences of taking action, which was missing from many responses to this question.

### **Section B**

Centres are reminded that candidates are required to apply their own knowledge and understanding of taking action to comment on other's actions in relation to the topics outlined in Theme D of the specification. Centres should consider how well their candidates understand how to apply their own knowledge and understanding of taking action to different campaigns.

### **Question 2a**

A well answered question by the majority of candidates. Many were able to make use of the source material to identify two methods used by the campaign in Source A, and could link them explicitly to how they influenced the government.

Candidates who lost marks here either quoted the source with no development or made simple points such as 'raised money' without clearly relating the point to how it influenced the government.

### **Question 2b**

A good variety of answers were made by candidates who had clearly engaged in discussions about different campaign methods. There were some common mistakes, however, with some candidates relying solely on methods in the source- which were excluded by the question- or by making very general responses such as 'protest' or 'TV'. Responses need to be more specific than this to gain credit.

### **Question 2c**

Candidates seemed to find this question very challenging, with large numbers of responses given failing to refer to the source material as directed by the question. Many of the responses seen were very general, with basic references to Marcus Rashford, but not linking this to the source, or referring to Rashford's social media following- which, again, is not referenced in the source and so not relevant here.

There was also a significant degree of misinterpretation, with a number of candidates answering the question as if it were asking them why the viewpoint was mistaken rather than accurate. Candidates should be reminded that this question will not always ask about why a viewpoint is mistaken but may also be about why a viewpoint may be argued to be accurate.

### **Question 2d**

This question was often answered in very general terms about why campaigns may not be successful rather than why celebrity support does not always lead to success. This limited marks to level 1 at most. There was also a degree of repetition by many candidates, with points about being unpopular or being disliked. A sizeable number of candidates also answered the question by focusing on how celebrity support can help a campaign succeed- which is not required by the question.

## **Section C**

### **Question 6**

This question was generally very poorly answered, with the majority of candidates demonstrating no understanding of what non-governmental organisations are. Such responses often made very general points about raising awareness or raising money- such responses would gain no credit unless specifically linked to a campaign or fundraising endeavour by a particular NGO e.g., Water Aid collecting donations and building water pumps in country X to supply fresh water to communities.

### **Question 7**

The majority of candidates were able to identify two ways in which citizenship participation in politics in the UK was limited, most commonly with responses related to lack of education or apathy.

However, a sizeable minority of candidates failed to consider the excluding part of the question- other than legal restrictions- and so gave two legal limitations instead, such as under 18s cannot vote, and neither can prisoners. Such responses would gain no credit.

### **Question 8**

This question was very poorly answered. The majority of candidates were unfamiliar with the press regulator and so made general comments about the law and the press, such as laws related to libel or national security.

A very common mistake was stating that the press regulator reads everything before it can be published- this is incorrect. The press regulators deal with complaints raised with them and have no role in censoring the media.

Another common mistake was to make points related to media regulation, with references to the BBC and Ofcom rather than focusing on the press regulator.

Centres are reminded to teach the full range of bullet points listed on the specification to avoid disadvantaging candidates.

### **Question 9**

Many candidates were able to how the work of the Commonwealth affects the UK well. However, many such responses were then limited to level 2 as there was little, if any, reference to the how the work of the World Trade Organisation affects the UK.

Candidates should be reminded that it is a requirement of this question to be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding of both the organisations named in the question to progress beyond level 2.

Many candidates were similarly limited to a level 2 mark because their response was generic rather than specific to the organisations in the question, e.g. "They help with trade".

Knowledge and understanding of the work of the World Trade Organisation was much less detailed. The majority of candidates were only able to identify the that it helps with trade- and often confused this with issues related to fair trade rather than the World Trade Organisation.

Centres are reminded that Theme D6 of the specification requires candidates to study the role of the World Trade Organisation, the UK's relations with the World Trade Organisation, and the benefits and commitments arising from membership of the World Trade Organisation.



### **Question 10**

Centres should remind candidates that a balanced answer is required for this question - many clearly knowledgeable candidates lost half the marks available on this question by only including positives or negatives.

Arguments must be made on both sides of the viewpoint given in this question to progress beyond level 2.

Centres should also remind candidates that - unlike the other extended-response questions- there is no requirement to include a conclusion for this question. A significant number of candidates wasted time including quite lengthy conclusions that did not add to their progression through the levels.

With regards to the knowledge and understanding demonstrated for this question, the majority of candidates were able to present arguments related to how the use of force can help prevent international conflict, often with excellent examples from recent events such as the Russia/Ukraine conflict.

There were also some impressive explanations of how other methods can help prevent/resolve international conflict, such as sanctions, mediation or the role of international organisations such as NATO and the UN.

The main discriminator between the levels for such responses was the degree of evidence accompanying such arguments. One limitation for candidates was the lack of evidence - most responses were quite generic and offered no examples of the use of force or other methods that can help prevent international conflict, which would be required for a level 4 award.

### **Question 11**

The responses to this question were very mixed. A number of candidates had clearly run out of time, as there were many blank or single paragraph answers given. Centres should endeavour to allow candidates the opportunity to practice answers to the paper in timed conditions to ensure candidates are fully prepared for the demands of this examination.

The biggest issue on this question, however, was the significant number of candidates who misunderstood what the question required. Many candidates wrote responses about justice in terms of describing the role of the police and the courts, rather than tackling how local community action can tackle injustice. It appeared that many candidates did not understand what injustice means beyond miscarriages of justice. Such responses would remain in level 1.

Most candidates who did directly address the question tended to focus on one aspect – what local communities can do to take action **or** other methods of taking action- and so lacked a balanced response, so limiting their marks to level 2. Many such responses were also very descriptive, rather than an argument related to how the candidate agreed/disagreed with the premise in the question.

There were, however, many well-structured and balanced responses to this question where candidates were able to give coherent and reasoned arguments. Top level answers were also able to substantiate their arguments with reference to specific examples of local community action tackling **or** failing to tackle injustice, or other examples of examples from other methods that have tackled/failed to tackle injustice, and come to a reasoned conclusion to access level 4 marks.

### **Paper Summary**

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- 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 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

