

# Examiners' Report Summer 2007

GCSE

## GCSE Citizenship Studies (3280)

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 Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.org.uk](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Summer 2007

Publications Code UG 019030

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2007

## Contents

|    |                                   |    |
|----|-----------------------------------|----|
| 1. | 3280/01 - Report on Written Paper | 1  |
| 2. | 3280/02 - Report on Coursework    | 7  |
| 3. | Statistics                        | 13 |



## **3280/01: Written Paper**

### **Introduction**

The comments on individual questions in this report should be read in conjunction with the published mark scheme. This report should be seen as a guide to help centres in the preparation of candidates for future exams, particularly in how to use source material and in the importance of reading carefully the requirements of the question.

Candidates should be aware that in those questions where there are sources to be read and the question asks for a response containing information given in the passage (sometimes just by the simple means of identifying correct words or terms) marks cannot be awarded for answers that are not taken from the passage. This year this was particularly the case for 3(a) and 3(b), 5(b) and 5(c).

### **Section A**

As in previous years most candidates were able to reflect accurately and clearly on their coursework activity. Those who undertook work experience for their Citizenship activity were not disadvantaged by this question but often failed to do justice to what work experience had taught them. Further comments about the Citizenship activities undertaken by candidates are contained elsewhere in this report.

#### **Question 1(a)**

Reference to work experience without saying what job or type of work could not be awarded any marks. A minority of less able candidates wrote answers such as “making a presentation”, without being clear what it was about, or “consumer rights” without being clear that this was a study in order to achieve some undefined purpose.

#### **Question 1(b)**

Again, the vast majority of candidates were able to explain accurately and clearly what role or responsibility they had, but a vague response such as “to help others” did not merit any marks.

#### **Question 1(c)(i)**

Most candidates were able to identify and articulate two different aims, although some did not sufficiently distinguish between the two aims in order to gain two marks. In most cases, where work experience was substituted or used for a Citizenship activity it proved very difficult to gain two marks. For example, it cannot be accepted that an aim of a Citizenship activity is to learn more about a particular place of work for oneself. Zero marks were awarded for answers such as “to learn what it’s like to be at work” or “to have a good time” (eg in a fundraising activity, although it was a legitimate aim to organise an activity so that others could have fun, eg a tea party for the residents of the local old people’s home or a sports activities day for year 7). It is not an aim of a Citizenship activity to develop teamwork or communication skills - such characteristics and qualities are essential to enable the activity to take place effectively.

**Question 1(c)(ii)**

Weaker candidates gave answers such as “we evaluated it”. The question was seeking responses on how the activity could be evaluated so it was possible to answer this question effectively by simply referring to a key point in the evaluation section of the coursework activity response sheets. Credit was given for such answers as “we raised the money we planned to”, or “we raised more money than expected”, or “the old people thanked us for giving them a wonderful time”.

**Question 1(d)(i)**

The question asked for ways in which candidates communicated with others (either fellow team members or work colleagues if they had substituted work experience for their activity). Holding meetings is not the same as communicating, since communicating involves talking (face to face or by telephone) or writing (by letter or email). Writing a letter to the Headteacher asking for permission to undertake a particular activity may be essential communication to allow the activity to take place but it does not ensure success.

It was evident from the answers to both (d)(i) and (d)(ii) that candidates who had planned their own activity with fellow students had communicated effectively and most were able to identify the strength of being able to share lots of ideas and give everybody the opportunity to have their say or of emailing being quick, easy and effective. The corresponding weaknesses were respectively that quieter students did not feel able to say anything or that some did not have easy access to computers.

**Question 1(e)**

Credit was given to candidates who were able to show how they had been responsible but only if it could be effectively demonstrated in the context of a legitimate Citizenship activity. Therefore, candidates who undertook work experience as a substitute for their activity often found difficulty in achieving marks, but if such responses involved some development of “helping the customers” in a retail work experience they were credited. Weaker candidates tended to repeat in part (e) what they had already written in part (a), (b) or (c)(i).

As is evident from elsewhere in this report, centres must understand that a Citizenship activity is not an exercise in self improvement but one that should be undertaken to help others. Thus candidates whose activity contained that latter focus were more likely to gain marks not only in part (e) but also in (c)(i) and (c)(ii).

**Question 1(f)**

In this question, as in previous years, plenty of scope and opportunity were given to candidates to write about a feature or features of their activity. Answers do not need to be restricted to the bullet points - the guidance in the question is “...you could consider the following points and other information of your own”. The response to this advice is variable, with the more able candidates tending to write more fully and going beyond the bullet points. Weaker candidates often found difficulty in relating the bullet points to their activity and in writing meaningfully about their activity, tending to write more in general terms about the advantages and disadvantages or benefits and problems of working in a team often unrelated to their activity. Comments such as “you get more sharing of ideas in a team and produce more work” and “but some people don’t do much” can apply to any subject or class activity and are not exclusive to a Citizenship activity.

Centres may find it helpful to ensure their candidates understand the levels mark scheme for this question. To achieve level 3, candidates must not only present arguments for and against, supported by relevant evidence, but present it in a structured and reasoned way. To achieve level 4, candidates must reach a conclusion, not just state one or give their opinion. Very often candidates wrote far more than was necessary, not by going into too much detail but by giving too many generalities, being repetitive and giving a lack of detail.

## **Section B**

### **Question 2(a)**

Source A included a picture of a factory or other manufacturing plant emitting a lot of smoke. Such activities may lead to global warming, but are not in themselves global warming as suggested by a few candidates. The majority of candidates were easily able to achieve one mark for this question.

### **Question 2(c)**

The references to the Arctic, Hurricane Katrina and drought in Spain and Portugal distracted some candidates. The problems needing to be solved are those of climate change caused by global warming, caused in turn by rising CO<sub>2</sub> emissions which have an international dimension. The pollution caused in one country does not stop at its border, so answers referring to this and a clear statement that a world wide problem can only be addressed by countries acting together gained two marks. Some candidates thought that the unavailability or affordability of the required technology in some countries would prevent all countries addressing the issue.

### **Question 3**

Careful reading of the passage and the questions were essential to ensure success in 3(a) and 3(b).

Part 3(a) asked about why businesses would welcome the trams and a significant number of candidates provided answers which were better suited to part (b). Less able candidates clearly had difficulty in distinguishing between the impact or effect on business and on the environment.

In part (b) the question asked candidates to “briefly explain...”. Some candidates wrote either too little or too much in response. However, most candidates correctly identified and explained at least two possible correct answers.

### **Question 4(d)**

This question was about protest and why a group of people, in this case lorry drivers, think that such methods of action described in the passage might contribute to the achievement of their aims. It had nothing to do with driving slowly to conserve fuel as was mentioned by a substantial minority of candidates. This is another question where careful reading of the source could have helped candidates gain marks.

### **Question 4(e)**

Only around half of candidates answered this correctly. “Friends of the Earth” was italicised in the passage, but Greenpeace was also allowed.

#### **Question 4(f)**

Most candidates wrote at least one correct reason, and it was encouraging to note a high level of awareness of this issue in their answers. However, as in other questions, weaker candidates were let down by unclear or confused expression.

#### **Question 5**

To answer parts (b) and (c) correctly candidates were required to select each of the two different sets of bullet points. Answers needed more than just the selection of a few words from the passage. In part (b) candidates were asked to “briefly explain” and in part (c) to “suggest...”.

Less able candidates confused their answers, and in some cases did not refer to the bullet points from the source. Careful reading, thinking and writing were necessary to gain full marks. Some candidates confused their responses to parts (c) and (d).

### **Section C**

#### **Question 6(e)**

Under half of the candidates were able to state accurately two human rights guaranteed to UK citizens. Freedom in itself is not a human right, since it must be linked to a freedom from or a freedom to something. A significant minority of candidates linked this question to legal rights, or more specifically to the consumer or employment rights mentioned in the other parts of Question 6.

#### **Question 6(f)**

The question concerned a difficult concept, principally seeking the reasons used by the government to incorporate the UK Convention on Human Rights into UK law as a separate Act. Many candidates just guessed answers, the more imaginative suggesting that it had something to do with entry into the EU, which could not gain any marks.

#### **Question 7(e)**

Candidates again appeared not to understand that this question concerns the issue of balance, control, impartiality and bias (a very similar question having been set on the 2006 exam paper). Of those candidates offering a coherent response, the vast majority thought it had something to do with newspapers giving opinions and TV telling the truth. Less coherent answers referred to the power of newspaper owners or that political parties or MPs owned newspapers, or that the government owned the radio and TV stations.

#### **Question 8**

There was a very high number of poorly expressed answers to both 8(a)(i) and 8(a)(ii). Candidates responses to part (a)(i) expressed in one way or another the point that food prices are subsidised to LEDCs because they otherwise cannot afford enough food and people might starve or die. Part (a)(ii) was misunderstood by the vast majority of candidates.

#### **Question 8(c)**

This question was answered correctly by only just over half of the candidates. There was little variety of correct answers, the vast majority understanding clearly that the main reason was cheap labour in one form or another.



### **Questions 9, 10 and 11**

Question 9 was the most popular with approximately 64% of candidates choosing to answer this question. 11% chose to respond to Question 10 and 25% answered Question 11.

Although the vast majority of candidates still favour Question 9 on an aspect of the Human Rights theme, the difference was clearly less marked this year than in previous years. The question from the Power, Politics and the Media theme remained the least popular.

These questions give candidates the opportunity, via extended writing, to present evidence and arguments on a theme that they have studied. The bullet points are offered as a guide. The levels mark scheme has been developed over the years since the first exam in 2003, in order to increase the opportunity for candidates to achieve marks. To score the highest marks, candidates need to present a coherent response using evidence to present both sides of an argument and drawing their writing to a conclusion (as opposed to just stating one or giving an opinion).

#### **Question 9**

Candidates could bring in their own experiences when answering this question, where relevant, however, they did not always make this explicit. Many candidates expressed their knowledge and understanding well in terms of such matters as family, religion, food and ethnicity. It is reassuring to see there is a growing understanding of the significance of a multicultural society in Britain.

#### **Question 10**

This was less well answered than the other two essay questions. It was not just an essay about pressure groups, but about the effective methods of 'getting your opinion across'. All but the most able candidates were uninformed about the different channels of communication open to them if they wished to do this. There were many hints in the bullet points. The majority of candidates who selected this question seemed unable to develop the bullet points. Examples of pressure group activities were rare as were examples from candidates' own experiences of putting forward their opinion to try to influence the outcome of an issue.

#### **Question 11**

This was probably the most challenging of the three essay questions. Many candidates became confused between trade and aid, often mistaking aid with loans and occasionally referring to aid being given to MEDCs. There were, however, some well structured and coherent answers from the most able candidates who showed a clear understanding of the issues, referring to long term and short term factors and economic development which is of mutual benefit to both LEDCs and MEDCs.



## 3280/02: Coursework

### Centre Administration

For the third successive year there was a significant increase in entry for Citizenship Studies. Most centres performed administrative tasks efficiently and the following characteristics of good practice were identified:

- deadlines for the despatch of coursework were adhered to
- work submitted by candidates and their teachers was properly authenticated to meet Edexcel and QCA requirements
- candidates provided a brief introductory description of both their activity and their own role in the activity
- the OPTEMS were completed correctly, matching the scores awarded to the work of individual candidates on their response forms
- centres sent sufficient samples (substituting candidates with an identical mark for a candidate who might have withdrawn) and included the work of both the highest and the lowest scoring candidates
- use of the latest (revised 2006) response sheet which contained a grid to record the mark for each of the four assessment areas (Planning, Activity Log, Communication and Evaluation) together with the total mark
- use of helpful annotation (although this is not compulsory)
- inclusion of clear evidence of internal standardisation where this was appropriate.

Unfortunately, a minority of centres did not meet administrative requirements. The following is advice for centres who have difficulty with the administration of the coursework component:

- OPTEMS sheets should be completed accurately
- marks for the four individual assessment areas should be broken down
- response sheets must be signed by both teachers and candidates
- the deadline for submission of coursework can be found on the examination timetable for each series
- the work of the highest and lowest scoring candidates should be included where it is not already part of the pre-selected sample
- where a number of teacher assessors are marking the work, internal standardisation should take place prior to the work being submitted to Edexcel
- responses to requests made by moderators should be as swift as possible to aid the moderation process.

### Centre Assessment

More centres are becoming familiar with the assessment process and most use the five level descriptors in each of the four assessment categories effectively. There is no doubt that, as Citizenship Studies becomes more established in the curriculum, some excellent departments are emerging which provide high quality leadership and guidance and a genuine sense of enthusiasm, involvement and commitment. These centres offer both support and inspiration to students.

Such centres show clearly how internal standardisation has taken place and frequently annotate the work of their students to show how a particular mark was determined. This is immensely helpful to external moderators in the way that it helps to provide a context for the work of individual candidates to be judged.

However, it is still the case with some centres that work sent to the moderator varies greatly from the levels descriptors and there is often no evidence presented to the moderator of how the mark was arrived at.

Where work experience is used as the basis for Citizenship Studies coursework, it is frequently the case that the submissions are based on either a diary or an essay outlining the candidate's experiences during their work placement. Many of these placements have, at best, only the most tenuous link with Citizenship Studies and most are, inevitably an individual activity which will not meet higher mark descriptors because there is little or no involvement of others. It must be emphasised that Citizenship Studies is a discrete subject in its own right and not an appendage of work experience.

Sports activities can be legitimate tasks for Citizenship Studies coursework and there were good examples in 2007 of their use in fund raising, working with younger pupils or anti-racist activities. They are less successful if their primary purpose is not the assessment of an activity securely based in Citizenship Studies or if the focus is on personal fitness.

### **Candidate Performance**

Even though numbers increased significantly in 2007, the overall level of performance was very similar to that of previous years. Moderators see work which covers the complete spectrum of ability and it is recognised that many young people go to great lengths to produce coursework which represents a high personal level of achievement. However, a small minority submitted work which was really carelessly presented and badly organised, often leaving the external moderator with the task of trying to find relevant parts.

### **Choice of Activity**

Although a handful of centres prescribe a coursework topic for all candidates, almost all offer at least some element of choice and this freedom and sense of ownership is usually greatly valued by candidates. Most choices are appropriate and typically involve raising money for charity, environmental work in both schools and the community, a whole range of mentoring schemes involving work with younger pupils and, increasingly, activities showing global awareness.

It was noted, in 2007, that candidates who do not use the response forms provided by Edexcel sometimes tend not to score as highly as those who do. Use of these forms is not compulsory but they do provide guidance for candidates in each of the four sections. Use should be made of the most recently revised (2006) response forms.

Where work experience is successful there is a clear emphasis on an area which allows interaction of young people (perhaps also involving adults) and which offers a clear focus on a citizenship activity. Occasionally, this might cover key aspects of health and safety at work but some of the best and most successful examples are

those in which Year 10 or 11 pupils prepare work experience booklets and presentations for younger pupils.

Centres are also advised to consult the current national curriculum programme of study for Key Stage 4. Direct links between this and individual choice of citizenship activity are not yet compulsory but are, nevertheless, very much advised. In addition, practically-based INSET for teachers of Citizenship Studies will again be delivered by senior examining personnel during the 2007-08 Autumn and Spring terms at venues in the north, the midlands and in London. If in doubt about the nature of an activity, centres are invited to contact Edexcel for further advice. Customer services can be contacted via 0870 240 9800.

### **Planning the Activity**

Although some plans seem to be written very much after the event, most candidates give a clear and successful indication of plans involving both their own work and the contribution of others. In this sense, it must be emphasised that the contribution of others, and work with others in a group, is an essential part of this specification.

There are still some candidates who undertake their activity almost solely on an individual basis and this kind of approach cannot satisfy all the assessment criteria. Similarly, if choosing work experience, high marks will not be gained if most of the planning is done by others.

### **Activity Log**

Completion of this part of the Response Form continues to improve. Diary entries now contain more detail and there is often much more analysis of the diary in terms of examining the progress of the activity. There are now more recognisable attempts to make explicit links between the chosen activity and appropriate Citizenship characteristics although this still continues to be an area of relative weakness.

Some candidates are very clear about why their activity represents distinctive areas of Citizenship. Others did this as something of an afterthought. In many cases the links are mainly implicit and, in a few cases, it is very difficult to make links at all because the chosen activity is difficult to recognise as one that reflects any form of Citizenship.

It is vital that the second part of the Activity Log form is used to produce an analysis which demonstrates clearly how Citizenship is reflected in the activity and that this is made fully explicit. Potentially good work may well not realise its full mark potential if these links are not made although, in 2007, some centres are clearly giving their candidates excellent support in this section.

## **Communication**

The gathering, inclusion and description of evidence is now very good with digital photographic support and powerpoint presentations often increasingly common. Unfortunately, not all centres realise that their students need to go beyond a description of how the evidence was gathered and used, and there are a few centres who allow their candidates to submit work without any supporting evidence even though a minimum of two pieces are strongly advisable.

Increasingly, too many centres are allowing their candidates to include vast amounts of evidence on an unselective basis and awarding very high marks for this and the briefest of descriptions. Even where some analysis of the significance of evidence is incorporated this is rarely sufficient to offer the sort of interpretation of evidence, and reasoned judgments based on its value and quality that will meet the requirements of Level Descriptors 4 and 5 in this section. Centres are advised to make sure that their candidates are familiar with the requirements set out in the Level 3-5 descriptors for the Communication Section.

## **Evaluation**

Weaker candidates often re-write the planning section of their coursework or describe what they have done but most responses do give some indication of the ability of candidates to reflect on their participation in a Citizenship activity. The main weakness continues to be excessive brevity and, in particular, this section should be used to demonstrate the ability of respondents both to work with others and to appreciate their viewpoints. (Here, again, candidates undertaking individual activities are at a considerable disadvantage.)

Many hint at the role of others but need to offer more detailed evidence of constructive critical awareness, not least to show how a range of group decisions (where several people make an input) might contribute to the activity's outcome or what happens when decisions have to be changed.

Similarly, this is the place to discuss and highlight unexpected outcomes. An important part of the learning process is that activities do not always go to plan - or necessarily work at all. This might be because of poor planning, bad weather, over-ambitious hopes, unexpected illness, the inability or unwillingness of some group members to contribute to the joint effort, disagreement within the group, failure of external agencies to respond or unforeseen health and safety issues.

## Conclusion

It is rewarding to see just how many young people approach their coursework positively, enthusiastically and often selflessly. There is often great pride in reaching a successful outcome and this is demonstrated by pupils of all abilities, many surpassing their original goals.

Success also comes to young people of many different personalities. Extroverts may possess natural leadership qualities but it is not unusual for introverts, who gain in confidence, to emerge from the shadows. Much is learnt about how difficult it is to organise a successful activity and the highs and lows of success and failure. Many who do succeed are often exceedingly modest about their achievements and sometimes appear genuinely surprised by what they have achieved.

The subject continues to grow in both popularity and status. As in 2006, there remain administrative and internal assessment issues to be resolved but many Citizenship departments achieve a great deal, sometimes on very limited resources and having to work in isolation.

So many of the experiences are of incalculable value to young people in the Key Stage 4 age group and they help to provide many successful opportunities for active participation in a variety of things for young people. They, their teachers and their many adult supporters in the community are to be congratulated on what has been achieved. Hopefully this will be recognised as Citizenship Studies develops.





## Statistics

### Overall Subject Grade Boundaries

| Grade                            | Max. Mark | A* | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | U |
|----------------------------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Overall subject grade boundaries | 100       | 81 | 71 | 61 | 52 | 44 | 37 | 30 | 23 | 0 |

### 3280/01: Written Paper

| Grade                    | Max. Mark | A* | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G  | U |
|--------------------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| 3280/01 grade boundaries | 80        | 66 | 57 | 48 | 40 | 36 | 32 | 28 | 22 | 0 |

### 3280/02: Coursework

| Grade                    | Max. Mark | A* | A  | B  | C  | D  | E  | F  | G | U |
|--------------------------|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|
| 3280/02 grade boundaries | 40        | 37 | 32 | 27 | 23 | 18 | 14 | 10 | 6 | 0 |





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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UG 019030 Summer 2007

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/ask) or on 0870 240 9800

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