Pearson

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2017

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
in Global Citizenship (4GL0/01)

edexcel

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 or 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.

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

Summer 2017
Publications Code 4GL0_01_1706_ER

General Comments
Once again, an excellent standard was reached by the highest-scoring candidates. Many candidates were well-versed in the ideas and issues which the Sources focused on, and were able to write at length about the United Nations, technology and economic development. Both essays proved accessible to candidates with very few answers misinterpreting the question. The most popular essay by some margin was 4(b) which dealt with migration.

The single greatest hurdle faced by many less able candidates was - once again - the striking inability to follow instructions. In question 1 especially, candidates were asked frequently to explain one idea or one fact. The word 'one' was, on each occasion, printed in a bold font to highlight its importance. Examiners reported that the majority of candidates did not follow this instruction, resulting in only one or two marks being scored out of a possible three or four for many question items.

Question 1 (a)
Many candidates struggled to score full marks, the reason being that they provided an answer which bore little relationship to any of the important principles and concepts that underpin this qualification. Candidates who explained that, for instance, their study of 'beach litter' was important because it linked with global sustainability goals were far more likely to score full marks than those who asserted that beach litter is an important issue because it makes the beach look dirty.

Question 1 (b)
A significant number of candidates confused the focus of the question with the outcome of their action. They appeared unfamiliar with the way in which section A is structured. Early parts of question 1 will always deal with the preparation and research phase, not the outcomes or evaluation of the action. The focus of this question was the impact of the chosen global issue on local citizens (thereby perhaps providing an impetus for the candidate to have chosen his or her particular global course of action). Some very good answers explained that hygiene and sanitation issues were particularly important because of the way they affected women in the student's home country. This therefore made hygiene and sanitation an appropriate focus for the community action. In contrast, candidates who explained the impact of their completed action on local citizens were unable to gain any marks.

Question 1 (c)
Many candidates provided a brief account of two ways rather than an explanation of **one** way. A large number of candidates were unable to provide any explanation beyond an account of how they 'used the internet to find out more'. For the reward of full marks, such answers needed to include some detail of the web sites that were visited or the particular types of data that were collected. Some candidates explained a more interesting or unusual way in which they collected information, for instance by interviewing family members or persons of influence within local communities. The best answers once again were able to provide some

detail of the particular foci for the questions that were asked as part of this primary data collection exercise.

Question 1 (d)
This question was well handled by many candidates who typically scored between three and five marks. The question provided plenty of opportunities for candidates to write about important global citizenship themes such as rights, responsibilities, sustainability and community cohesion. Many candidates explained how their greater understanding of other cultures or environments had been fostered by the local community action, which was pleasing to read about.

Question 1 (e)
The majority of candidates asserted that if the community action had been carried out on a bigger scale it would have been more effective. In most cases an answer such as this only scored one of two possible marks. Some detail was needed for exactly *how* this bigger scale might have been achieved, and why it might be wished for (other than because 'bigger is better' presumably). For example, some candidates who had communicated their ideas to a secondary school community proceeded to explain that the action might have been more effective if they had communicated the ideas to primary schools too, because this would have introduced important ideas to children at a much earlier age (and could therefore be a more effective way of affecting social change).

Question 1 (f)
The majority of answers to this question were descriptive rather than explanatory. Most candidates listed the actions they had undertaken and the contexts in which communication was carried out. In most cases, this was sufficient to score around half marks. Relatively fewer candidates were able to explain more rigorously how they communicated their ideas. The very best answers included a rationale for why particular modes of communication were used (and what the strengths of these particular approaches had been), thereby providing *explanation* rather than merely description. This meant that these answers were far more likely to be seen as reflecting the band 3 criterion of a 'clear explanation'.

Question 2 (c)
Most candidates were able to score half marks by asserting that some of the regions were too poor for most people to be able to afford to use computers, or these were countries where internet use might be restricted by government. Fewer candidates were able to develop their answers in ways that scored all 4 marks. This could have been done by using evidence and examples, or by developing the idea of relative poverty (for instance by explaining that there may be other priorities for domestic spending in some of the world's poorer regions).

Question 2 (d)
Although some good answers were seen (typically making reference to a gross domestic product growth or industrialisation over time), it was clear that many candidates lacked sufficient knowledge and understanding of this

key concept underpinning their course. Very weak answers such as 'it is when people start to have more money' were too common.

Question 2 (e)
A minority of excellent answers were provided, some of which provided detailed evidence in support, for example by making reference to new start-up online service providers in emerging economies such as Kenya, Nigeria and India. The strongest answers tended to deal with two different economic sectors also; for example, by looking at one way in which technology supports the sale of tourist services to overseas customers, and then looking also at ways in which new technology might allow businesses to procure parts and machinery they need online from other countries at competitive prices. There were many possible approaches to answering this question and it provided a good opportunity for stronger candidates to apply their knowledge and understanding of technology and development. Unfortunately, too many candidates appeared ill-prepared to apply their knowledge and understanding in a meaningful way and failed to do more than assert that the internet 'can help businesses grow' (without actually saying how, or identifying any particular types of business).

Question 2 (f)
Most candidates answered his question competently. The most popular scenarios were younger people being excluded due to their lack of maturity, and women being excluded in patriarchal societies.

Question 2 (g)
The majority of candidates were able to obtain a middle band mark for this question. Clearly, it is an area of the specification which is well taught in the majority of cases (and which candidates feel comfortable writing about). The most popular themes included the idea that everyone needs to participate in order to feel that they can 'have a say' in how they are governed; moreover, for an elected government to be truly representative of the people it is important that the majority of people participate in voting. The best answers developed these themes further by making reference to citizenship concepts such as rights, responsibilities and democracy. A few proceeded to explain why a lack of participation in elections can undermine democracy by allowing people with undemocratic views to take control of the political system. Contemporary examples were sometimes offered in support of this sophisticated argument.

Question 3 (b)
This question was poorly answered with very few candidates apparently understanding the question. The main message of source C was that U.N. peacekeeping is a vast logistical undertaking that simply cannot be supported without the participation of a large number of global partners. For full marks, candidates needed to acknowledge this and use evidence from Source C to support their explanation.

Question 3 (c)
This question was also poorly answered with large numbers of candidates unable to name another valid international grouping. Many simply substituted ‘European’ and ‘African’ with the name of another continent and

guessed hopefully – but wrongly – that the 'Asian Union' or 'American Union' might be another valid international grouping. A minority correctly identified one of the other international groupings of countries included in the specification, such as NAFTA. Several correctly identified NATO (which appeared in the source).

Question 3 (d)
Only a minority of candidates gained both marks. Few were able to use their own knowledge to explain another valid peacekeeping operation, or to explain another important U.N. action such as the establishment of the sustainable development goals. It was surprising to see candidates perform quite so poorly given the central importance of the United Nations to the study of global citizenship.

Question 3 (e)(i)
Most candidates were able to correctly identify one article of the UDHR, and a minority were able to add sufficient description to score two marks.

Question 3 (e)(ii)
Most candidates competently described one way in which the entitlements set out in Article 2 were being met in their own country. A wide range of human rights and anti-discriminatory legislation was credited for various different local contexts.

Question 3 (f)
Most candidates provided two sufficiently distinct ways to gain full credit. The most common approach was to offer a statement about international aid and another statement about trading or foreign investment.

Question 3 (g)
For those candidates in possession of very little knowledge of their own, it was possible to gain two or three marks by selectively making use of information from sources C and D, which the majority managed to do. Candidates reaching the upper bands were also required to discuss ideas which drew on their own global citizenship learning. Popular themes included the way in which the United Nations carries out its functions through subsidiary agencies such as the WHO, and other organisations under the U.N. umbrella such as the World Bank. Credit was also given for the discussion of important U.N. initiatives such as the Millennium Development Goals, or climate change agreements. The best answers managed to synthesise a number of different themes, often covering social, economic and environmental domains.

Question 4 (a)
Most candidates were able to craft an effective discussion of the statement, even if they were able to do little more than consider the work of one charity or campaigning organisation prior to asserting that the U.N. is ultimately most important on account of the scale it operates on. The best answers thought critically about what was meant by the word 'fairer' and provided multiple examples of NGOs working towards more equitable outcomes for different groups of people in located contexts. Another

hallmark of high scoring answers tended to be discussion of other players and stakeholders with an important role to play, such as nation states.

Question 4 (b)

This was by far the most popular of the two essays. Most candidates were well equipped to discuss a case study of international migration, including its costs and benefits. Weaker answers tended to discuss only the impact for the sending and receiving states and glossed over the idea of a global community entirely; they were apparently content that discussion of one sending and one receiving country was sufficient to constitute consideration of a 'global community' (albeit one consisting of two countries only). Stronger answers were more expansive, and were able to discuss the broader global effects of cultural diffusion, internationalism and global-mindedness that may result from the truly global 'churn' of people, languages, norms and beliefs.

Summary

Candidates who obtained one of the lower pass grades on this paper often showed little evidence of proper teaching and learning about global citizenship. It was disappointing to see the work of weaker candidates who were unable to provide detailed evidence and understanding of places, concepts and issues in support of their arguments and explanations. In contrast, candidates achieving the higher grades more typically displayed good understanding of the assessment objectives for the examination and produced well evidenced and discursive essays. They supported their responses to the short answer questions with detailed examples and made consistent use of citizenship ideas and concepts.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom