



GCSE (9-1)

Citizenship Studies

J270

OCR Report to Centres June 2018

About this Examiner Report to Centres

This report on the 2018 Summer assessments aims to highlight:

- areas where students were more successful
- main areas where students may need additional support and some reflection
- points of advice for future examinations

It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

The report also includes links and brief information on:

- A reminder of our **post-results services** including **reviews of results**
- Link to **grade boundaries**
- **Further support that you can expect from OCR**, such as our Active Results service and CPD programme

Reviews of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected you may wish to consider one of our reviews of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If University places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications: <http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/stage-5-post-results-services/enquiries-about-results/service-2-priority-service-2-2a-2b/>

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other assessments, can be found on the [OCR website](#).

Further support from OCR



Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/getting-started/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessors or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>

CONTENTS

**General Certificate of Secondary Education (9-1)
Citizenship Studies
(J270)**

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

| Content | Page |
|--|-------------|
| J270/01 Citizenship in Perspective | 4 |
| J270/02 Citizenship in Action | 11 |
| J270/03 Our Rights, Our Society, Our World | 18 |

J270/01 Citizenship in Perspective

General Comments:

Most candidates completed the whole examination and were able to tackle the different types of question contained in the paper.

There were significant differences between centres in the extent to which candidates:

- knew and understood key citizenship concepts and terms
- were able to give valid examples based on their knowledge.

Candidates performed well as long as they had studied the specification content in depth and had experience of applying their knowledge and understanding to citizenship questions, viewpoints and issues. Such candidates tended to respond well to questions across the paper.

There was no evidence that candidates had been able to ‘game the paper’ by selecting responses containing linguistic or other clues for ‘correctness’. Neither was there any evidence of candidates operating statistical systems to gain more marks than their level of knowledge might justify.

Candidates would have been able to improve their performance in this paper by using more effective examination techniques as follows:

- Reading all questions and options carefully prior considering their response.
- Re-reading the paper to amend their responses as necessary.
- Writing their response clearly and unambiguously. (Examiners sometimes found it difficult to judge whether a candidate had written a ‘D’, ‘B’ or even an ‘A’. In such cases, examiners were unable to award a mark.)
- Identifying their choice of option or options for each question clearly, especially where they had changed their mind. (Examiners sometimes found it difficult to judge which choice or choices a candidate wished to be marked. Where there was ambiguity concerning a candidate’s response, examiners were unable to give credit.)

Comments on Individual Questions:

SECTION A

This section contained questions based on the first section of the specification – ‘Rights, the law and the legal system in England and Wales’.

1. Candidates were asked to identify a legal right from four options. Many candidates confused rights with responsibilities. This was reflected by their incorrect choice of ‘making sure your children get an education if you are a parent’. Around 25% chose the correct option – ‘having a contract if you are an employee’.
2. Candidates were asked to identify three rights included in the Magna Carta. The correct responses were:
 - C - trial by fellow citizens
 - E - equal legal rights for all citizens
 - G - prompt trials

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

A minority of candidates chose options linked to the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, such as options F and H, but over 80% were able to identify at least one correct option linked to the Magna Carta.

3. Over 80% of candidates were able to identify the main reason people join a trade union – ‘unions negotiate fairer pay and conditions’.
4. This question required candidates to assess the accuracy of two separate statements:
 - ‘The age of criminal responsibility is twelve years-of-age in England.’
 - ‘The European Court of Human Rights decides the age of criminal responsibility for all European countries.’

They were also asked to decide whether the second statement was a correct explanation for the first. Just over half of candidates answered correctly that both statements were false.

5. Candidates were asked why the United Kingdom government sometimes restricts the right to freedom of expression. A significant minority chose incorrectly selecting option D – ‘to support citizens who have been offended’ – not understanding that free speech allows citizens to criticise other people’s beliefs even if this causes offence. Just under half of candidates selected the correct option – ‘to safeguard national security’.
6. Unusually, examiners accepted two different responses to this question. Options A and D were both considered to be correct in that magistrates can be said to help ‘prepare cases for a higher court’ as well as to decide ‘guilt or innocence’. Almost 80% of candidates chose one of these options as well as showing an accurate understanding of a solicitor’s main role.
7. Almost all candidates were able to identify at least one issue usually dealt with by using criminal law. Many candidates showed knowledge of two such issues and almost 30% of selected three issues correctly as follows:
 - C – ‘dangerous driving’
 - D – ‘tax evasion’
 - I – ‘smuggling’

A significant minority identified, ‘cases of discrimination under the Equality Act’ incorrectly as matters for criminal law but candidates should know that such matters are currently dealt with using civil law.

8. As anticipated, this proved to be a challenging question with just under 30% of candidates opting for ‘laws made by judges over hundreds of years’ as the correct definition of ‘common law’.

9a / b These linked questions required candidates to analyse and interpret text-based source material, and apply their citizenship knowledge and understanding within this unfamiliar context. Around 30% of candidates were able to use apply their knowledge of police powers correctly by choosing option B - police have the right to make a partial search without parental permission in the case of a 15-year-old suspect. Many assumed incorrectly that the suspect’s age exempted him from being searched without parental permission. Candidates were more successful on the second part of the question. Just over half were correct in stating that an 18-year-old would usually be ‘advised about her rights and cautioned’ following her arrest and would not additionally be allowed to either contact her friends or to have a parent or ‘appropriate adult’ with her at any interview.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

These linked questions show scope for greater precision in candidates' knowledge of police and suspects' rights.

10. Candidates were asked to describe how a youth court is different from an adult court by selecting one, two or three characteristics from the following list:
- Defendants are called by their first names.
 - Parents can be charged with offences during the hearing.
 - Members of the public cannot attend the court unless they have permission.

Around 30% identified the first and third of these descriptors correctly as being characteristic of a youth court.

11. This question sought to test candidates' knowledge of legal principles by asking which principle would most likely be at risk if jurors researched a defendant's background before reaching their verdict. Just over half chose 'innocent until proved guilty' as the correct response with many others opting incorrectly for 'the rule of law' or 'punishment should fit the crime'.

- 12a / b These linked questions required candidates to analyse and interpret statistical source material, and to apply their citizenship knowledge and understanding within this unfamiliar context. For question 12a, less than 40% of candidates applied their citizenship knowledge correctly to identify factors that explained the trends shown in the stimulus material. The correct options were:

- Communications technology has improved.
- There have been improvements in home and vehicle security.

Candidates were more successful on question 9b where they were asked to determine the strategy most likely to reduce the types of criminal behaviour featured in the source material. The correct response was, 'help people overcome mental health, drug and alcohol problems' but a significant minority thought that 'increasing the length of prison sentences' would be the best option despite contrary evidence that should have featured in their studies.

SECTION B

This section contained questions based on the second section of the specification – 'Democracy and government'.

- 13a / b / c Candidates were shown a partially-labelled photograph of the commons' chamber at the state opening of parliament. This was used as a stimulus for three linked questions. For question 13a, candidates' attention was drawn to a section of seating in commons chamber. They were asked to identify its use. While over 60% of candidates identified the seating correctly as 'opposition benches', examiners did expect a greater proportion to be aware of this especially given the 'government benches' label on the opposite side of the chamber. Question 13b was thought to be more challenging, as it, required Black Rod to be correctly identified but around 45% chose the correct option. A popular, incorrect response - the 'Sergeant at Arms' – was selected perhaps because the man in question was carrying a mace. Question 13c asked what would happen immediately after the event in the photograph. Only around 40% of candidates opted correctly for, 'the monarch makes a speech setting out their government's policies'.

14. Candidates were asked why the ancient Greeks replaced their direct or 'classical' democracy with representative democracy. Many candidates stated rather incongruously

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

that, 'direct democracy led to decisions that were unpopular' thus demonstrating a limited conceptual understanding of both direct democracy and representative democracy. Less than 40% chose the correct response – 'Representatives could develop the expertise needed to make better decisions'.

15. This question asked why UK democracy needs a prime minister when it also has a sovereign or monarch. Candidates seemed uncertain about the different roles of monarch and prime minister. A significant minority thought that prime ministers were directly elected and spoke up for citizens. They chose option B incorrectly. Around 25% opted for the correct response, 'the prime minister can speak for most elected representatives in parliament'.

16. The question, 'Why don't more trade union leaders support the Conservative Party?' also caused uncertainty. Around 40% of candidates understood that, 'the trade unions founded the Labour Party and can influence its policies' and so chose option B correctly. The remaining candidates were almost equally divided between the three incorrect options demonstrating a limited understanding of UK political party policy and affiliation.

17. This question asked candidates to choose the pair of characteristics providing the most appropriate description of the civil service's role. The correct pair of characteristics was:

- advises ministers on policy
- makes sure policy is put into practice.

Around 30% chose correctly suggesting a widespread lack of knowledge about what civil servants do and about their relationship with government ministers.

18. Candidates were asked to consider the circumstances in which a UK government would be most likely to cut income tax. An encouraging 40% of candidates identified, 'if it wants to encourage business growth' as the correct response but others suggested that tax cuts would be most likely to occur if a government wished to spend more on care for older people. This showed a worrying lack of understanding about the relationship between public spending and taxation.

19. Question 19 asked candidates to select one, two or three options to describe the likely effects of cutting immigration to the UK. The available options were:

- Demand for housing will fall.
- The government will receive less money through taxation.
- Some businesses will not be able to recruit suitable staff.

Around 60% of candidates were correct in selecting all three options.

20. Candidates were told that, "One political party believes that the government spends too much on welfare and should encourage people to work". They were then asked to select those policies that would be most likely to appear in that party's manifesto. The available options were:

- Minimum guaranteed incomes for all families.
- Businesses to pay a living wage by law.
- Government-funded nursery places for young children.

The first option would be an unlikely addition to the party's manifesto, as the proposal would provide families with an income whether they worked or not. However, the second and third proposal would encourage people to work. Around 40% of candidates reached this correct conclusion. There's scope for future candidates to be clearer about the different approaches to public policy by the UK's main political parties.

21. This question required candidates to assess the accuracy of two separate statements:

- ‘Democratic governments place strict controls on the media’
- ‘Democracies rely on the media to expose wrong-doing and injustice’

They were also asked to decide whether the second statement was a correct explanation for the first. Just over 40% of candidates answered correctly that, while the first statement was false, the second was true. Poor performance on this question suggests widespread uncertainty amongst candidates about the relationship between democratic governments and the media.

22. Candidates were asked why the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) avoids taking sides in politics. Many candidates suggested wrongly that this is a consequence of all UK media organisations having a legal obligation to be impartial. Nevertheless, just over half correctly selected option D – ‘Bias would undermine public trust and confidence’.

23a / b / c Candidates were shown a text-based extract describing a case in which a citizen, Gina Miller, challenged the government in the High Court to force it to consult parliament over aspects of leaving the European Union. This extract was used as a stimulus for three linked questions.

For question 23a, candidates were asked to identify two reasons, from a choice of six, why the High Court heard this case and backed Gina Miller. The correct reasons were:

- B – ‘The court upheld the principle of parliamentary sovereignty.’
- D – ‘The court had a constitutional duty to scrutinise this government decision’.

While option B was a popular choice, less than 10% of candidates also chose D. Many preferred option E, ‘The government did not have the authority to take the UK out of the EU’ even though the referendum had given the government such authority.

Question 23b asked why the prime minister received widespread support for her position. Just over 20% of candidates identified, ‘People did not trust judges because they seemed to be ignoring the referendum’ correctly as the most valid response in this context. It was concerning that many candidates thought judges in the UK are appointed by politicians and so wrongly selected option B.

Candidates were on firmer ground with question 23c. When asked where the government could take its appeal in a case like this, just over 40% identified the ‘Supreme Court’ as the correct choice.

SECTION C

This section contained questions based on the third and final section of the specification – ‘The UK and the wider world’.

24. This question was answered very well. Candidates were required to assess the accuracy of two separate statements:

- ‘The UK is a multi-cultural society’
- ‘People from all over the world have come to settle in the UK bringing their cultural traditions with them.’

They were also asked to decide whether the second statement was a correct explanation of the first. Almost 90% of candidates answered correctly that both statements were true and that the second statement was a correct explanation for the first.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

25. Candidates were asked why most immigrants have come to the UK in the last twenty years. Candidates should perhaps be expected to know that, in the last twenty years, most UK immigrants have come from the European Union to find work but only around 40% opted for this correct answer. Significant minorities suggested incorrectly that most immigrants come to the UK either to seek refuge or to claim benefits.
26. Here candidates were asked to identify the rights asylum seekers have following their arrival in the UK. They were offered three options:
- Paid work as soon as possible after arrival.
 - Freedom of religion and the responsibility to show respect to other people's faiths.
 - Free health care from the National Health Service.
- Around 70% of candidates gained the one mark available by identifying the second and third of these options as being correct. A minority thought incorrectly that asylum seekers have a right to paid work.
27. Further confusion over migration was evidenced in responses to this question. When candidates were asked to identify the main reasons for emigration from the UK in the last twenty years, less than half opted for the two correct answers – 'overseas job offers for skilled workers' and 'older people seeking warmer weather and less expensive way of life'.
28. This question was not answered well. Many candidates seemed unclear about the term 'Commonwealth' and, as a consequence, were unable to identify any of its member states. Some chose four members of the European Union. Conversely, those candidates who had studied this section of the specification in appropriate breadth and depth were able to pick up marks with relative ease. Such candidates were in the minority, though, with just over 30% gaining three or four marks.
- The correct answers were: Jamaica, Canada, Australia and Pakistan.
29. This question was designed to be demanding and so it proved. Candidates were asked to identify the best indicator of success for the World Trade Organisation (WTO). The WTO has been consistent and clear about its main success indicator - improvements in people's quality of life – but only 20% of candidates were aware of the organisation's mission. Many chose option A - an increase in average world wealth – failing to appreciate that this goal could be met simply by making the richest members of the world's population even richer.
30. This question was also intended to stretch the more able candidates and did so. Around 10% of candidates identified the Council of Europe correctly as being the international organisation that promotes human rights and justice for all European citizens. Far more popular but incorrect responses were the 'European Union' and the 'European Court of Justice' but the EU does not work on behalf of all European citizens and the European Court of Justice is not concerned with citizens' human rights.
31. Candidates were asked why UK non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are often more effective than governments at providing aid to those who need it. Just under half answered correctly by identifying the first and third of the options below as valid reasons:
- NGOs have experience and expertise to support people's particular needs.
 - NGOs make sure the UK public will support their plans before organising aid.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

- If necessary, NGOs can change their plans quickly during a crisis or emergency.

The second option above is incorrect because NGOs' values usually require them to offer support on strictly humanitarian grounds irrespective of public opinion.

32a / b

Candidates were shown a text-based extract describing an act of vandalism directed at a Polish Community Centre in London. The extract was used as a stimulus for two linked questions.

Question 32a was answered well with around 80% of candidates correctly identifying 'tolerance and respect for diversity' as being the British value most at risk in the scenario described in the extract.

Question 32b caused far more uncertainty. Candidates were asked which two strategies, from a choice of six options, would be most likely to create greater cohesion in the borough where the community centre was attacked. While around 80% of candidates correctly identified one valid strategy, ('Create a clear vision about what it should be like to live in [the community]' was the most popular choice.), far fewer opted for the second correct strategy – 'build strong leadership to bring different ethnic groups together'. Many preferred, option D – 'organise high-profile community events' failing to recognise that such events rely on strong leadership if they are to be sustainable.

33a / b

This final question asked candidates to apply their knowledge and understanding to a text-based extract about conflict in Syria. The extract was used as a stimulus for two linked questions.

Question 33a asked candidates to identify the law that could be used to protect everyone involved in the Syria conflict. Around 40% selected 'International Humanitarian Law' correctly. The 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights' was a popular but incorrect alternative. The Universal Declaration is not a law in the same sense as International Humanitarian Law although both have similar aspirations.

Question 33b used a technique common to some of the other questions on the paper.

Candidates were required to assess the accuracy of two separate statements:

- 'The United Nations (UN) cannot help in this type of conflict'
- 'The UN cannot help once NATO countries become involved'

They were also asked to decide whether the second statement was a correct explanation for the first. Just over half of candidates answered correctly that both statements were false.

J270/02 Citizenship in Action

General Comments:

Most candidates completed the examination. Many used the additional answer space to extend their responses.

There were significant differences between centres in the extent to which candidates had been prepared for the examination. Candidates performed well when they had studied the specification content in depth and had experience of applying their knowledge and understanding to citizenship questions, viewpoints and issues. Such candidates tended to respond well to questions across the paper, using examples with confidence and appreciating the complexities of such citizenship issues as censorship and media regulation in question 2, or the power and scope of government in question 7.

There were also clear differences between centres in the preparedness of candidates to comment meaningfully on their own experience of citizenship action for question 10 or to apply their knowledge and understanding of citizenship action to help them tackle questions 8 and 9. Many candidates were able to describe highly effective action where they had worked with others to make a significant impact on their school or wider community. Examples of such action included: projects to improve community cohesion; campaigns against bullying; and awareness-raising linked to issues such as religious observance and mental health. These projects were usually well-planned, carefully evaluated and enabled candidates to make direct contact with key decision-makers either in their school or in the wider community. (All of this is consistent with the specification requirements.) On the other hand, a minority of candidates were able only to describe limited examples of citizenship action where they had worked in isolation or with one partner on minor fund-raising or awareness-raising initiatives. This made it difficult for them to apply relevant knowledge and understanding of citizenship action to the questions in Section D of the examination.

Candidates would have been able to improve their performance in this paper by using more effective examination techniques as follows:

- Reading all questions carefully. (Many candidates lost marks by misinterpreting question 9a and failing to answer question 10.)
- Making sure time is spent analysing and interpreting the stimulus material referred to in a question. (Many candidates made little use of the evidence referred to in question 5d.)
- Being careful to make two separate, distinct points and avoiding repetition when being asked to give two reasons, two advantages, etc. (Many candidates provided only one advantage of using referendums for decision-making in question 3b.)
- Making sure that they are fully aware of the implications of different command words – particularly the different requirements of questions requiring statements, descriptions, explanations and evaluations. (Many candidates did not explain why the police might offer advice and support in question 9c. Instead they described the advice and support the police might offer.)
- Writing comprehensive descriptions, explanations and evaluations which are supported by several points or pieces of evidence. (In question 7, many candidates made only point to support their opposition to the viewpoint that the UK government, ‘can do what it likes’.)
- Referring to valid examples from their studies. (In question 4b, few candidates provided examples of good democratic practice from their studies even though the question invited them to do so.)

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

- Using any framework provided in the question to help them organise their response. (In question 10, most candidates ignored the framework provided, preferring to describe their citizenship action, after which many ran out of time and did not address the question asked. By following the framework, they would have avoided this problem.)

Comments on Individual Questions:

SECTION A

Questions in this section gave candidates the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and understanding of the specification content, and to apply this knowledge and understanding in unfamiliar contexts.

1. Candidates were asked to read an account of the problems being experienced by Alan, a young employee, and to apply their citizenship knowledge and understanding to this simple scenario. There were four parts to this question (a, b, c and d).
 - (a) Relatively few candidates were able to identify two specific types of deduction the government may take from Alan's wages. 'Council tax', 'rent' and 'utility charges' were among the popular but incorrect responses. Around 40% of candidates mentioned 'income tax', 'national insurance' or 'student loan repayments' but only 10% gained two marks.
 - (b) On the other hand, candidates showed a very good knowledge of the ways in which national governments spend the money deducted from people's wages. Many candidates mentioned the National Health Service while another understandably popular response was 'education' or 'schools'. Almost 70% of candidates achieved both marks on this question.
 - (c) This question proved quite challenging. Although many candidates recognised that the lack of an employment contract placed Alan in a 'risky' position, relatively few were able to go further to mention the risks of unfair dismissal, discrimination, payment below the 'living wage' or lack of representation. Consequently, while well over half gained one mark on this question, only a small minority achieved full marks.
 - (d) Here, candidates were asked to state one organisation, group or representative that Alan should consult over the issues described in the scenario, and to explain the reasons for their choice. Most candidates stated one organisation, group or representative. Popular, correct responses included: trade union, MP, local council, and solicitor, lawyer, or 'Citizens Advice'. Most candidates then explained their choice generally in terms of either Alan's needs or the role of their chosen organisation, group or representative. Few did both and so most candidates were unable to achieve full marks.
2. Candidates were asked to read an extract for the website of pressure group 'Index on Censorship' and to apply their citizenship knowledge and understanding to the simple scenario. There were four parts to this question (a, b, c and d).
 - (a) The extract stated that one of the methods 'Index on Censorship' uses to achieve its aims is to 'raise awareness about the value of free speech'. The question asked candidates to state 'two further methods' that could be used. A significant minority of candidates did not focus on 'further methods' but mentioned the need to 'raise awareness'. No credit was given for such responses. Popular, valid responses included: lobbying, petitioning, protesting and joining with other like-minded groups. Only around 20% of candidates were able to cite two valid methods in addition to 'awareness-raising'.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

(b) This question asked candidates for two reasons why people might support 'Index on Censorship's' aims. Some candidates quoted a statement of the pressure group's aims from the extract without explaining why people might support these aims. Nevertheless, most candidates gained at least one mark on this question by mentioning, for example, that free speech is: a human right; necessary for democracy to work effectively; or essential to counter tyranny and expose wrong-doing.

As with question 2a, it's important that candidates read both the question and stimulus carefully before answering.

(c) Candidates were asked to explain why censorship takes place in the UK. While most were able to state a reason or give an example, relatively few gained top marks by developed their response to show a good understanding of the different circumstances when censorship might occur. A significant minority of candidates misunderstood the term 'censorship' to claim that it was a device to encourage free speech while other used examples from outside the UK. No credit was given for such responses.

(d) Candidates were asked to give two reasons why the UK government has had difficulty regulating the media. Many used their knowledge and experience of social media to state correctly that sheer scale makes effective regulation very difficult. Few candidates were able to move beyond such a response to mention, for example, the dilemmas faced by the UK government in this area of policy where rights are so clearly in potential conflict.

3. This question had three parts (a, b and c) and focussed on the referendum as a method of decision-making in the UK.

(a) Almost 80% of candidates stated a correct example of a national decision made by referendum in the UK. Understandably, most cited the decision over EU membership. A minority of respondents claimed, incorrectly, that the prime minister is chosen using a referendum.

(b) Candidates showed a good understanding of the advantages of the referendum as a method of decision-making. Popular and valid advantages cited included: giving people a 'voice', achieving a clear decision and increasing political engagement. While most candidates gave one valid advantage, some repeated their point in the hope of gaining an additional mark. Their faith in the examiners' generosity was misplaced. Two separate and distinct points were required for candidates to gain both available marks but only around 30% did so.

(c) This question asked candidates to state two disadvantages of the referendum for decision-making in the UK. A significant minority, around 10%, of candidates used their knowledge of direct democracy to offer two valid responses. Popular, valid responses included the electorate's limited understanding of the issues, possible manipulation of public opinion, and the likelihood of conflict and division in the event of a close outcome. Most candidates did not go further than one valid response while many others were unable to develop their response beyond generalisations about the outcome was 'wrong' in some way. The latter gained no marks.

4. Candidates were asked to read a commentary about government and politics in a fictional country known as 'Democia'. The two questions that followed required candidates to interpret the information contained in the commentary through the application of their knowledge and understanding of democracy

(a) This proved to be a challenging question with only around 20% of candidates identifying the type of democracy in 'Democia' as a 'representative democracy'. Invalid but popular responses included: 'democratic democracy', 'direct democracy', 'indirect democracy' and 'dictatorship'.

(b) Candidates were more successful with this question. Most stated at least one reason why democracy might be at risk in 'Democia'. Over half gave a response that showed at

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

least a satisfactory conceptual understanding of democracy. Popular, valid responses included: low voter engagement, the need for voters to first register, the successful presidential candidate not achieving most of the votes cast and the president's practice of selecting an unelected executive. Fewer candidates expressed concern about the single legislative chamber, the method of appointing senior judges and the use of direct democracy at only a regional level. Many candidates were satisfied once they had made a single point and seemed not to realise that a satisfactory explanation of why democracy might be at risk would require further evidence. Very few candidates included examples of good practice in their responses even though the question asked for this and at least one such example was required for full marks. Nevertheless, there were some outstanding responses that referred to the independent judiciary in the UK and the use of direct democracy for national decision-making in both the UK and Switzerland.

SECTION B

Questions in this section required candidates to write valid responses by analysing and interpreting information from source material as well as by drawing on their own knowledge and understanding.

5. This question was designed to assess candidates' ability to analyse and interpret statistical information in a citizenship context, and to test their knowledge and understanding of key citizenship concepts. The question was divided into five parts (a, b, c, d and e).
 - (a) Candidates were directed to information from tables 5.1 and 5.2 to help them to identify a reason why Plaid Cymru might be against the idea that each UK constituency should have the same number of electors. Relatively few candidates referred to the tables and many preferred to respond using erroneous generalisations about 'fairness' and 'equality'. Only a small minority of candidates pointed out either that Wales would have fewer constituencies if all UK constituencies were the same size or that Plaid Cymru, holding some of the smallest constituencies, might end up with fewer MPs. Either of these points could be used to justify Plaid's opposition to equal constituencies.
 - (b) This question was answered more successfully. Many candidates referred to table 5.3 to point out correctly that the Conservatives won only 36.9% of the overall vote in the 2015 election. However, some responses lacked this precision and merely stated that, 'They had more MPs'. Since it was impossible to judge whether candidates were referring to the government or opposition with such an imprecise statement, it was not possible to award a mark.
 - (c) A significant minority of candidates found it difficult to use table 5.3 to deduce which two political parties might have most reason to support a change to the voting system. Around 65% of candidates were able to identify either UKIP or the Green Party correctly in this context. Far fewer candidates chose both correct responses.
 - (d) This question asked candidates to use all three tables to explain how far each person's vote was of 'equal worth' in the 2015 election. Again, many candidates opted not to use evidence from the tables and, instead, resorted to vague, unsupported generalisations in their quest for marks. They were unsuccessful. Most of those candidates who used the available evidence, focussed solely on table 5.3 to explain how people voting for parties such as UKIP and the Green Party were under-represented and that their vote was not of 'equal worth'. Less than 10% of candidates used evidence from tables 5.1 or 5.2 appropriately to consider the implications unequal constituency size for debates about the value of people's votes.
 - (e) This question asked candidates to evaluate the viewpoint that, UK democracy's most important value is 'equal opportunity'. Candidates were asked to consider other UK values as part of their response. Most candidates knew how to write evaluatively and construct a coherent argument but many were hampered by knowing too little about

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

'UK values'. The majority understood 'equal opportunity' as a concept but were uncertain about its importance for democracy. Unless they were also able to discuss other UK values, candidates were limited to two marks from the eight available. A minority of candidates produced excellent responses by explaining the importance of equal opportunity while also discussing the significance of 'tolerance and respect for diversity', the 'rule of law' and 'free speech'. If such candidates also reached a valid and substantiated conclusion, they would usually be credited a very high mark.

6. As with question 5, this question asked candidates to analyse and interpret simple graphical information within a citizenship context. The question was divided into two parts (a and b).
- (a) This question asked candidates to explain why governments in the UK would be concerned about statistical information presented in two charts. The first chart showed the UK in the 'middle' position for science test results out of seven of the world's richest countries. The second chart showed that science scores have been declining for England, Scotland and Wales since 2012. Most candidates mentioned information from one chart, but many did not then explain why UK governments would be concerned. This limited most candidates' marks to one or two out of the four available. The minority of good responses mentioned information from both charts and explained government concerns in terms of: declining educational standards, future shortages of skilled scientists or a decline in international competitiveness. Very few candidates mentioned that governments in Scotland and Wales might have the most to be concerned about.
- (b) This question asked how the information from the two charts might affect public spending and taxation. Most candidates understood the terms 'public spending' and 'taxation' although some thought, incorrectly, that 'public spending' referred to people's personal spending power rather than to government expenditure. Most candidates were able to state that taxation would be likely to increase as a consequence of the government attempting to improve educational standards. Many went on to describe the likely impact on public spending saying that it would also increase. Candidates scoring the highest marks described how the government might prioritise expenditure on science education to the detriment of budgets for other services. The very best responses suggested that if scores continued to fall, then future tax revenues might decrease due to long-term economic decline.

SECTION C

7. This 'synoptic' question asked candidates to draw on knowledge and understanding from across the specification's content to evaluate the viewpoint that, 'A UK government can do what it likes'.
- Most candidates made valid points in response. Many candidates mentioned the power of the electorate to constrain government action or explored citizens' rights to free speech or equal legal treatment. Rather fewer candidates discussed the sovereignty of parliament and the separation of powers but of those that did so usually scored at least half marks. Candidates tended to be less sure about how international agreements constrained UK government action but there were valid references to international human rights law and the influence of the European Union in this context.
- A significant minority of candidates ignored the prompts in the question and so did not provide a sufficiently broad response. Typically, such candidates were credited less than half marks. Others paraphrased the prompts contained in the question in the hope of gaining credit but marks were only credited for points that were clearly the candidate's own.

SECTION D

Questions in this section required candidates to write valid responses by applying their knowledge, understanding and personal experience of citizenship action largely within unfamiliar contexts.

8. Question 8 was based on a scenario about how best to organise a small-scale community event. Candidates were asked to: critique a web page publicising the event; consider issues of public safety and personal rights; and to describe how organisers could engage local businesses, schools and voluntary groups. The question was divided into four parts (a, b, c and d).
- (a) Candidates were shown a web page and asked to explain why it might not help event organisers to achieve their aims. A significant minority of candidates attempted to answer the question without any reference to the web page preferring to make general criticisms of the event itself rather than the way in which it was being promoted. Nevertheless, most candidates made valid criticisms of the web page design or pointed out that there was insufficient information about which charity was being supported. Many candidates made only one point rather than writing a more convincing explanation incorporating a range of evidence from the source. Consequently, only around 20% of candidates were able to gain more than half marks. The best of these responses offered a convincing critique of the webpage using at least three separate and valid points taken from their analysis of the source.
 - (b) This question asked simply for a statement of how organisers might keep people safe at the event. Around 80% of candidates made a valid response with most recommending some sort of barrier to protect people from the water.
 - (c) This question asked candidates how they might safeguard or promote people's 'freedoms and equalities' at the event. There was widespread uncertainty over the term 'freedoms and equalities' with many candidates making vague and / or inappropriate recommendations about putting up posters or making speeches. Those candidates who understood the term and appreciated the context, made appropriate points about the importance of: providing access for people with special mobility needs; anticipating people's dietary requirements; and making everyone welcome. They were rewarded with a mark.
 - (d) Candidates were then asked how they might engage local businesses, schools and voluntary groups to make the event a success. There were many generalised responses that did too little to differentiate between the needs and aspirations of these potential partners. Such responses often included only a simple statement about 'telling' everyone about the event, sending them posters or offering discounts. Good responses explored specific ways to engage school children and their teachers, and then made different points about how to attract support from businesses and voluntary groups. Examples included: offering businesses sponsorship and sales opportunities; asking voluntary groups to help with stewarding and promoting 'partners' through social media.
9. Question 9 asked candidates to apply knowledge and experience from their citizenship course to a campaign to build a skate park. Stimulus information was provided. The question was divided into four parts (a, b, c and d).
- (a) Candidates were asked to state two examples of information held by central or local government (apart from the 'Living Area Deprivation Data' provided in one of the sources) that could be used to support the case for a skate park. Many candidates misinterpreted the question, mistakenly thinking that they had been asked to state the advantages of building a skate park. Most of those candidates

- who interpreted the question correctly gave one appropriate example - crime figures and population statistics were the most popular responses. Only a minority gave two valid responses.
- (b) This question asked candidates to state two examples of elected representatives or voluntary sector workers who might be able to support the skate park campaign. Some candidates gave examples of workers outside the voluntary sector such as police officers. No marks were credited for such examples. The majority offered appropriate examples with popular options including: MPs, local councillors, the mayor, voluntary youth workers and scout leaders. As with question 9a, many candidates gave a single valid example rather than the two required. Nevertheless, around 30% of candidates scored full marks on this question.
- (c) Candidates were asked to explain why the police might offer advice and support for the skate park campaign. Good responses considered the police's duty to protect public safety and reduce crime, going on to explain how support for the skate park would be consistent with these duties by giving specific examples. Less strong responses made a limited statement about crime reduction or public safety without developing the idea within the context of the scenario. Nevertheless, around 70% of candidates achieved at least half marks on this question.
- (d) This question asked candidates to draw upon their own knowledge and experience of citizenship action to describe how they would encourage local residents to support the skate park campaign. The best descriptions recognised that local residents might be resistant to the proposal and outlined a comprehensive strategy not only to win residents over but also to engage them as active supporters. Around 25% of candidates gave such strong responses. Most candidates limited their descriptions to one straightforward point. These points often included 'talking to' local residents about reductions in crime or anti-social behaviour, or referred to distributing leaflets or posters. Such responses would typically be credited either one or two marks, out of a possible four, depending on the level of detail.
10. This final question asked candidates to describe how they evaluated their own action and what they learnt from this evaluation. Most candidates did not answer the question, preferring to simply describe their citizenship action and to make some limited points about how this might have been developed or extended. It was clear that many candidates had not engaged in a process of evaluation and, if they had, it was conducted quickly at the end of their action rather than as an ongoing process.
- Candidates who described their project and commented on areas of possible improvement were able to gain up to half marks. The minority of candidates who addressed the question to discuss the nature and impact of their evaluation invariably scored more than half marks.

J270/03 Our Rights, Our Society, Our World

General Comments:

Most candidates completed the examination and many used the additional answer space to continue their response. However, it must be mentioned that this was the final examination for many candidates and it was taken on a Friday afternoon on a very hot summer day.

- While there were some good responses showing detailed knowledge and understanding many responses were vague and did not demonstrate that candidates had studied the specification.
- In general, where sources were made available to trigger a response from the candidates it was pleasing to see that the sources were referred to in the response and often evaluated by the candidates. However, this was not the case in question 4b, the final question. In this specification the command words used in relation to a given Assessment Objectives are; state, explain, evaluate and analyse. Many candidates in question 4b, did not **analyse**, or even make reference to, the evidence from the stimulus sources. This was an essential element of the question, carrying a full 12 marks, nearly 25% of the total.
- There appeared to be a larger number of candidates opting for NR – no response on the long answer questions. There was a distinct increase in the number of candidates leaving a question blank and making no attempt to answer.
- Many responses for the extended questions, 2e, 3b and 4b were just based on personal opinion rather than specific knowledge and understanding.
- Some candidates decided to write out the statement at the beginning of their response to questions 2e, 3b and 4b. In a one hour paper this did use up valuable time.
- Examiners reported that handwriting was an issue with a number of candidates and this did disadvantage some candidates.
- Key prompts in questions were in bold and some students did not respond to these prompts. For example, question 1 asked for **additional** responses to the source and many students took examples **from** the source.
- It was clear from the responses that many candidates had a sound knowledge and understanding of the term Community Cohesion. Centres had prepared the candidates well for this aspect of the specification.
- Candidates showed a sound knowledge and understanding of Equality and Fairness with good examples of the laws that protect citizens in the UK, namely, The Equality Act 2010 and Human Rights Act 1998.

Candidates would have been able to improve their performance in this paper by focussing on the following examination techniques:

- Using the time allowed for this paper, one hour, was essential to maximise performance. Three questions, 2e, 3b and 4b carried a total of 28 marks, over 50% of the maximum mark. It was clear that some candidates did not manage their time.
- Reading the question through several times to fully understand what is expected is a key point. Some candidates lost marks by not doing this. For example, in question 2e, candidates were asked to make a reasoned case to **support** a viewpoint. Some candidates used this question to focus on the negative aspects of immigration.
- Make sure that candidates fully understand what is expected when command words are used.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

- When a question states, “in your answer you should consider”, this is an advisory statement to enable candidates to maximise their response to the viewpoint. In question 4b, candidates were asked to consider 4 key areas, including their own viewpoint. There is clear evidence to suggest that the candidates who followed this advisory statement achieved the higher levels. Their responses had structure as they followed the bullet points through one by one.
- Very few candidates took the time to outline an action plan for their response to the extended questions. Those candidates who made simple notes or trigger points did achieve well. For example, in question 2e, some candidates listed in the margins of the paper the key points they wanted to make – religion, equality, fairness, laws, rights, NHS, etc..... This was deemed good practice to enable the candidate to establish a planned response.

Comments on Individual Questions:

- 1a1 Generally, this question was answered accurately indicating a sound knowledge and understanding. However, some students gave responses from the sources which, indicates that the question was not interpreted correctly, as it clearly states **one additional legal right**. A number of candidates put ‘to drive’ for legal right at 18 and this can be done at 17. Other responses to joining the Army, leaving home and getting a job were not qualified or developed and were therefore not credited marks.
- 1a2
- 1b Candidates offered some very vague responses. For example, old enough; 16 year olds are mature; they can make decisions; are responsible. These responses were not qualified and therefore no marks were credited. Good responses included reference to 16 year olds voting in Scottish referendum, studying citizenship in school and impact on their future with qualification.
- 1c This question asked candidates to study an advert for a membership organisation and state a one human right protected by the organisation. Many candidates responded correctly with education and legal support, but a good number chose rights not indicated on the document.
- 1d Candidates were asked name the type of organisation advertised in the source. Very few students answered this correctly. Many did not recognise this as a trade union and thought it was linked to civil claims law firms, insurance and exclusive members discount club, to name a few examples.
- 1e The number of employment tribunal cases have increased considerably in recent times. Candidates were asked to respond to a viewpoint that a new £1200 charge was a positive or a negative action. Those who understood the question responded well and gave four clear points. Many had arguments the wrong way round; others didn’t understand about employment tribunals and some repeated the same point in a different way. The main responses FOR included, time wasting and false cases, with some candidates referencing more money for the government as a key point. In the AGAINST section candidates identified that not everyone could afford the new fees and that this was not fair or denied access to justice.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

- 2a This question focussed on a well-established community project in London, the Jackson Lane Project. The question demanded a sound understanding and interruption of the source material. Many candidates made good use of the source material and were able to identify an economic benefit from the project. Some candidates did not refer to an economic benefit but included a social benefit. This supports the notion of reading the question through to understand what is expected.
- 2b In this question most candidates could identify a valid answer linked to a lack of funding or not getting enough participants to enrol. However, there were a noticeable number of no responses.
- 2c Candidates were good at identifying the community benefits of this project and why the local council supported it. Good responses included, crime reduction, improved quality of life, improved chances of employment, made new friends, reduce anti-social behaviour. However, many lost marks due to the vagueness of responses such as ‘help’, ‘gets money’, without a more thoughtful addition of who or how?
- 2d This question focussed on the role of schools and Local Authorities promoting a sense of community cohesion. Strangely, this proved to be the most challenging question for candidates. It was clear that candidates understood what community cohesion was but far too many comments were vague and generic and it was not always clear whether candidates were referring to what the school does or what the Local Authority does. Simple responses, such as, safety in the community, they do activities, work with outside agencies, were too vague to gain a mark.

Candidates were required to give specific examples of what schools and Local Authorities do to promote community cohesion and not just state a broad theme.

- 2e This 8 mark question had 4 levels and there was a progression to achieve the level 4. As a general statement the responses were variable with some students giving sound reasons why the UK is a place where people are treated fairly. At the higher levels there were some very well written responses linking to British values and with a clear link to relevant legislation as opposed to the more generic ‘rule of law’ or ‘everyone gets treated the same in court’. Level 4, 7 or 8 mark responses were rare, but some did exist with candidates making reference to the Equality Act and the Human Rights Act and the role of law to ensure fair treatment.

Candidates at Levels 2 and 3 were able to identify a minimum of two examples of how people are treated fairly, with the higher level candidates describing in detail how access to services (NHS, Social Services, Education), religious freedoms, fairness in the workplace and the role of media were all sound indicators of being treated fairly in the UK. Some candidates discussed how people in the UK were respected and shown tolerance but not how they are treated fairly. These points were not credited.

From the outset the question asked for a reasoned case to **support** the viewpoint and a small number of candidates chose to ignore the request and used the platform to discuss the pros and cons of immigration and the impact on the UK society.

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

- 3a Candidates were asked to analyse and interpret information from a labour force survey. Two marks were credited for identifying two of the three highly skilled occupations. This question was answered very well. However, a small number of candidates gave incorrect responses by identifying the two highest percentage occupations (factory and maintenance of equipment). It was clear that some candidates did not read the question or understand the term highly skilled occupations.
- 3b This question asked candidates to make a reasoned case for supporting immigration in terms of both social and economic benefits to the UK. The advisory note gave the candidates clues to where the marks were going to be credited. Your response should include reference to impact on UK society, economy and your own opinion, for or against. Without doubt, the vast majority of candidates grasped the concept of immigrants enriching community with different cultures and filling jobs that UK workers don't want to do. Many candidates spent time explaining what immigration is and describing the benefits to the immigrants once they arrive in the UK. This response did not get credited.

To achieve the level 4 candidates were expected to reference the source, identify and describe in detail 3 examples that covered both the economic and the society aspects of immigration. Responses included broadening of our cultural experiences, the diversity of foods, religious beliefs, impact on labour force, more tax revenue, fill the skills gap, more money in the economy.

Possibly because of a time factor, a proportion of candidates spent too long on supporting one aspect of the viewpoint and did not mention the other. This significantly reduced their chances of achieving a higher level. For example, to achieve level 3, 6 marks, candidates were expected to describe, in detail, **both** society and economic issues. This is where the advisory note at the start of the question **must** be followed to achieve the higher levels.

- 4a This question asked for two international organisations to which the UK belongs. Candidates had a sound knowledge and understanding of the organisations and in general this was very well answered. A few gave UDHR or charities. On a lighter note, some responses did include the EU – for now!
- 4b To achieve the higher levels in this question candidates had to explain the origins of the Commonwealth, define the aims of the organisation and then make a comparison to other international organisations that the UK belong to and evaluate their impact. In addition, candidates were expected to express their own opinion in a conclusion. The advisory note at the start of the question made it clear what the examiner was expecting to find in the response.

Many centres had prepared their candidates for this type of extend question. The high achievers followed the given structure choosing numerous examples from the 15 key aims of the Commonwealth, evaluating the successes and then comparing the successes with other international organisations, namely the UN and the EU. Some candidates struggled with the demands of the question as they did not have specific knowledge about the Commonwealth. Very few were able to give detailed examples of what the Commonwealth had done/not done other than what was

OCR Report to Centres – June 2018

given in the source material. There were good responses about the impact of other international organisations and candidates had a clear understanding of the roles of the UN and the EU.

About OCR

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body. We provide qualifications which engage people of all ages and abilities at school, college, in work or through part-time learning programmes.

As a not-for-profit organisation, OCR's core purpose is to develop and deliver general and vocational qualifications which equip learners with the knowledge and skills they need for their future, helping them achieve their full potential.

© OCR 2018

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)

The Triangle Building
Shaftesbury Road
Cambridge
CB2 8EA

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office:
The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2018

