

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2010

IGCSE

IGCSE Economics (4350) Paper 04

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 + 44 1204 770 696, 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 Business and Economics telephone line: 0844 372 2187

(If you are calling from outside the UK please dial + 44 1204 770 696 and state that you would like to speak to the Business and Economics subject specialist).

Summer 2010

Publications Code UG024220

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

PE Report On Examination Paper 4350/04

General Comments

Only a few centres undertook course work in this session. In the majority of cases the quality of coursework was high and of a consistent standard. The following comments, some critical of the course work, were not necessarily the norm but offer guidance to candidates in the final session where coursework may be undertaken. It is very important that centres apply the assessment criteria effectively and accurately if candidates are to maximise marks.

It is key that the question or hypothesis used by candidates is accessible. In this year's coursework the questions chosen were clear and precise, leading them to effective primary research.

Knowledge/Understanding

Less successful coursework tended to be 'book-based' or too descriptive. In these cases there was insufficient application or analysis and limited use of economic theory. In some cases a conclusion was not evident and only a limited attempt at evaluation. On the other hand many of the good candidates demonstrated high order skills and the very best showed not only a complete command of the subject matter but an ability to elicit sound and often perceptive conclusions based on the evidence provided. Some very impressive efforts.

Application

With the better candidates significant use was made of economic terminology which was applied precisely to the question/hypothesis posed. Definitions of key terms was clear understanding. The weaker responses were almost universally descriptive in approach, often losing sight of the economic approach to their argument. This may at times be the result of a poorly constructed research question/hypothesis. The majority of candidates this year based their responses on both primary and secondary data. It was pleasing to see the effort and persistence of candidates in collecting data and using it in an informative and interesting manner in developing their arguments. There was some impressive work here for which candidates should be congratulated. Less successful candidates tended to base their argument on text book rather than research based arguments. This year there were considerably fewer signs of this approach.

Interpretations and Analysis

There was some excellent analysis by many candidates. They showed an ability to use the collective research material in a relevant, informative and often perceptive manner. Use of economic theory and concepts was impressive at this level. The better candidates supported their argument with good diagrammatic analysis. Candidates would be advised not to use analysis not in the specification as often a lack of real understanding becomes evident.

Evaluation

Most candidates attempted some form of evaluation but only the best candidates had complete command of this higher order skill. In these cases there was some outstanding evidence of clear thinking and reasoned judgement. Weaker candidates sometimes failed to offer a conclusion of any kind, while others drew conclusions not always based on the evidence collected.

Grade Boundaries - June 2010

Statistics

Option 2 - Foundation tier paper (1F) and coursework (04)

Grade	C	D	E	F	G
Grade Boundaries	56	49	43	37	31

Option 4 - Higher tier paper (2H) and coursework (04)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E
Grade Boundaries	86	75	64	54	50	48

Further copies of this publication are available from
International Regional Offices at www.edexcel.com/international

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.com/ask or on + 44 1204 770 696

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