

GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

History A (1334/3334)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark  
Scheme Publication code: UG 018002

Summer 2006

advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report

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 2006

Publications Code UG 018002

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

# Contents

---

Paper 1: Outline Studies.....	01
Paper 2: Depth Studies.....	15
Paper 3: Coursework.....	19
Statistics.....	23



## Paper 1: Outline Studies

---

### General Comments

Performance overall continues to improve and it is clear that candidates are well prepared for the demands of this paper.

As has been pointed out in previous reports, the scaffolding continues to be well received by the candidates. It is worth quoting from the 2005 Report:

*'The "peg" are used effectively as a sound guide to sequencing the response - indeed, candidates do need to realise that in a question covering a given period, the scaffolding presents them with a plan. Examiners did report that more candidates were prepared to broaden the responses beyond the scaffolding.'*

However, this year it was noticeable in Question10 that the scaffolding asked for general areas of change and not specific events. Candidates did not always move to the higher levels because they tended to offer rather generalised responses. (See below for further comment in the Outline Study 5).

Examiners did report that chronology did seem to be something of an issue this year, more especially the leaders of the USA and the USSR. Other issues arising from this year's paper have been dealt with in the relevant Outline Study but they tended to be the perennial examination problems.

The report for 2005 covered common issues/problems and it would be worth re-visiting these comments.

## A1: The Road to War; Europe 1870-1914

### Question 1

- (a)(i) This was not always well answered as few candidates knew the location or significance of the canal.
- (a)(ii) Generally sound answers. Most knew it was an agreement rather than an alliance although few gave details of the agreement.
- (a)(iii) There were some sound answers although a number confused this with 1911.
- (a)(iv) A few very focused answers which explained the naval race, 1911 Moroccan Crisis and Belgium. A number, however, restricted their answers to either the naval race or the Panther.
- (b)(i) The first two were the most popular. The Franco-Prussian War was generally well done although some gave unnecessary details on the causes and events rather than why it increased tension. A number commented on the significance of the Anglo-Russian Entente for the alliance system. Candidates were less confident on the Balkan Wars and often strayed into the murder at Sarajevo.
- (b)(ii) Candidates were often able to give details of the various alliances but did not always focus on the idea of change.

### Question 2

By far the more popular question in this Outline Study. The full range of responses was produced.

- (a)(i) Generally sound answers with a number of candidates focusing well on the Treaty of San Stefano and the reactions of Britain and Austria-Hungary.
- (a)(ii) This question worked well with candidates showing very good knowledge of the key terms and the role of Bismarck.
- (a)(iii) Many candidates gave generalised answers or confused this with the events leading to the Congress of Berlin.
- (a)(iv) This elicited some good responses and the better responses were able to give reasons for both wars.
- (b)(i) Generally well answered. Candidates displayed very good knowledge especially of the Treaty of Frankfurt and the Dreikaiserbund, focusing clearly on their importance.
- (b)(ii) Scaffolding worked effectively and produced some excellent answers. Candidates were generally able to write well developed paragraphs on each of the four points.

## A2: Nationalism and Independence in India, c.1900-49

### Question 3

- (a)(i) Candidates were able to focus clearly here and offer a sharp definition of the term.
- (a)(ii) Most candidates were able to reach two and appreciated the causal nature of the question.
- (a)(iii) The 'Dyarchy' posed few problems for candidates and recall was very secure here.
- (a)(iv) Some candidates ignored the question's focus of causation and produced a detailed description of the massacre. As a result some candidates did not move beyond Level 2.
- (b)(i) Candidates often struggled to move beyond Level 2 whichever option was selected. Responses to the RTCs were more suited to 4 (a)(iii) and the Government of India Act often became a list of terms; responses to the Muslim League were on outline of its actions in the 1940s.
- (b)(ii) Candidates were able to develop the scaffolding though some did drift to a narrative response.

### Question 4

- (a)(i) Candidates provided some excellent answers to this question and many reached Level 2.
- (a)(ii) The Salt Marches were very well known and responses were replete with detail of Gandhi's work and impact.
- (a)(iii) Many candidates confused the conferences - sequence, membership and hence the reasons for failure.
- (a)(iv) Candidates often knew the details of the act but could not always adduce reasons why there was internal opposition to it.
- (b)(i) The scaffolding points were readily recognised and developed to some purpose. There was a sound knowledge of each and their inter-relation was frequently in evidence.
- (b)(ii) Jinnah and Quit-India were two popular choices and answers were generally good, focusing quite clearly on the key word 'importance'.

### A3: The Emergence of Modern China, 1911-76

#### Question 5

- (a)(i) This presented few difficulties to the candidates and answers were well rounded and replete with graphic information, in almost all cases well contextualised in the situation of the time.
- (a)(ii) As in (a)(i) many answers were graphic in style, though in the weaker instances there was a tendency to elaborate on points made in the earlier answer and a failure to tease out wider implications such as their stultifying effect on progress and the failure of China to assert itself viably in international relations; a few candidates gave an interestingly robust defence of the warlords, on the grounds that if they were not there the whole situation would have been even more chaotic.
- (a)(iii) Here, the effect of the first two answers sometimes spilled over into responses and the dire circumstances were allowed to ipso facto to produce the birth of the Communist Party. Others explored this more deeply by indicating the practical formation of the party, Soviet influence and how its ideals specifically met the circumstances of China in 1921.
- (a)(iv) Answers were not always well balanced throughout the six years; peasant support was seen as significant here, and in other answers, but the precise appeal was not always well rendered.
- (b)(i) There were a number of well focused answers to (b)(i), with Communist social and military policies taken in tandem and usefully contrasted with declining fortunes and declining external support for the GMD. Some went back before 1946 for no very good purpose and others over-worked the 'peasant' connection to the neglect of strategic and military considerations. If there is a weakness, in particular in this area, it is an absence of clear knowledge on the geography and the strategies of the 1946-49 warfare.
- (b)(ii) Responses were not always sharply focused and often candidates did not develop the scaffolding points with precision. Education received little attention from many. A number neglected to observe that the question ended as the Cultural Revolution starts and wandered into irrelevance as a result.

#### Question 6

- (a)(i) Almost all recognised what the Northern Expedition was and only a few confused it with the Long March.
- (a)(ii) Here the 'why' focus did on occasion drift after an initially useful start, into the methods rather than the reasons for attack; as with (a)(iii) in Q5, there was a failure fully to exploit the ideology of Communism and the ways in which that clashed with the objectives of the GMD.
- (a)(iii) There were many rounded answers here, focused essentially on peasant support and guerrilla strategies and ending in most, though not all cases, with purposeful reference to the significance of the Long March in Communist survival.



- (a)(iv) The best starting point in this question was clearly the impact of the Long March, yet a number went into detail of the march itself which, with suitable angling, best fitted the previous question. The period before 1941 was often better covered than the 1941-45 period, which usually had very little attention; weaker candidates neglected the Japanese presence and the resultant warfare of these years altogether.
- (b)(i) Most kept fairly rigidly to the scaffolding points, and most developed them even if not very fully; both agriculture and industry in these years required greater attention than was usually given them if they were to get beyond mere generality.
- (b)(ii) Responses were rather successful, with some quite detailed accounts of the Cultural Revolution and a good focus on the impact of the lives of the Chinese, though there was less attention on the early 1970s than on the late 1960s.

## A4: The Rise and Fall of the Communist State: The Soviet Union, 1928-91

### Question 7

- (a)(i) There was no shortage of material on offer here, some indicating that Stalin's legacy was so appalling that it just had to be changed, while others detected sharper political considerations on the part of Khrushchev, related both to Soviet internal and external affairs.
- (a)(ii) The practicalities of this question were well addressed, with numerous instances adduced of the policy in practice.
- (a)(iii) Most were able to get at instances of industrial change, with greater strength residing in the organisational changes than in the change in the content of industry in these years; thus the Seven Year Plan was alluded to, but it was not always fleshed out in sufficient detail for it to form a realistic part of Soviet industry in the Khrushchev years.  
Some candidates did write at length about agriculture and could not be awarded marks.
- (a)(iv) Often answers began with a survey of what the agricultural policies were and then moved to a discussion of the reasons behind their failure. The reasons were, in the main, well developed and offered sound scope.
- (b)(i) The 'Cult of Personality' often attracted full responses, widely ranging and well focused on 'cult', the other two options were less successfully attempted. There was an absence of solid content to both of them and a tendency to blur the boundaries between them, often allowing the 'Show Trials' to be little more than an example of totalitarianism and not a distinctly approached programme in its own right. In the 'Purges', examples were frequently scarce.
- (b)(ii) Most candidates employed the scaffolding suggestions with fair purpose and certainly with accurate recognition, but as with the economic references in (a)(iii) there was often an absence of sustained information about what was achieved in practical terms by the Five Year Plans and what were the distinguishing features of this type of economic policy.

### Question 8

Some candidates both in this and some other questions on this later period of Soviet history seem to imply by their answers that Gorbachev succeeded Khrushchev or even Stalin. While it is not inappropriate that Brezhnev et al do not figure prominently in candidates' studies, there should be a clearer chronological awareness of Soviet leaders from 1953-91.

- (a)(i) Few had much difficulty in advancing a viable answer to this question. The underlying theme of the rottenness of Soviet government over a number of years was clearly stressed.
- (a)(ii) *Glasnost* was well recognised and often quite effectively developed by reference to domestic and foreign issues.

- (a)(iii) *Perestroika* was certainly understood, but some candidates found it less easy to posit the policy in the economy of the USSR in the 1980s; some did develop themes more appropriate to the Khrushchev era than the Gorbachev years and only a few moved effectively into the notion of a capitalist economy away from the planned economy.
- (a)(iv) Few failed to provide the adage 'too little to late'. Many went beyond that and addressed the particular ways in which the earlier defined policies ran up against debilitating practical circumstances that rendered them doomed to ultimate failure.
- (b)(i) There was recognition of the scaffolding points and a fair development of the in many cases, but again there was a lack of real engagement with what was involved in practical ways in the imposed policy of collectivisation. Such features as peasant dispossession, framed statistics, famine links with the developing urban areas were often either missed or not given sufficient weight. The starting point of the NEP could have been more securely developed in order to highlight the contrast with what followed.
- (b)(ii) The three options were evenly attempted. It was good to see many viewing education as a two-edged sword, both imposing the regime's propaganda, but also advancing the technological underlay for the pursuit of the planned economy; answers on women often gave a distinctly Soviet view rather than a Western one (though some did blandly develop answers on those lines).

## A5: A Divided Union? The USA, 1941-80

### Question 9

- (a)(i) It was a pity that so many answers focused exclusively on civil rights as the main, often the sole, reason for the introduction of Kennedy's policy. The 'New Frontier' is wider than this and while some made reference to the contrasting stagnation of the Eisenhower years, few really developed a sense of idealism that was the essential foundation of Kennedy's approach. Some did offer a parallel to Roosevelt's 'New Deal'.
- (a)(ii) Candidates did recognise this as Johnson's policy, but beyond that responses were of very mixed quality. Some pursued the theme with bland generality and little development. The better ones did detect specific instances of legislation, moving beyond the Civil Rights Act, and gave descriptions of legislation that indicated an understanding of what was involved.
- (a)(iii) Few failed to include Vietnam and the more astute candidates took the answer further with often quite precise reference to internal opposition from right and left and with some reference to financial circumstances.
- (a)(iv) Answers usually kept within the bounds of the dates given and generally developed the theme of change from peaceful to violent protest; in quite a number of cases the degree of support, in the latter especially, was impressive in detail.
- (b)(i) There was often a failure to observe that the question ended in 1960 and thus such features as King's speech and the Civil Rights Act were not relevant. There was a lot to go on in the two decades that the question did cover and it was a pity that more candidates did not use the scaffolding points as the basis of a developed answer. But, while there were certainly many well rounded and well informed answers to this question, too often material was thin, blurred or confused. On the Second World War, there was a tendency to dilate on wartime disadvantages to the comparative neglect of what was achieved in the 1940s, who achieved it and how they went about doing so. There is still some confusion between the Brown v Topeka case and the intervention of Eisenhower at Little Rock. The role of the Supreme Court (even its position in the US constitution) was not well explained. Altogether, while answers covered the ground, they often failed to do so with the assurance or support that might lift them to the top of Level 3 or into Level 4.
- (b)(ii) Here, the theme of protest was with justice continued from (b)(i), but in some cases it was left at that and at times the degree of alignment between the protest movements and student activity was over-emphasised. The better responses were able to show clear change and development over the period discussing the emergence of protest arising out of civil rights to SDS to Vietnam and the challenging counter-culture.

### Question 10

- (a)(i) Most candidates were able to make a solid attempt here, indicating concern about the perception of communist expansion as a cause of fear in the USA.
- (a)(ii) Responses did vary for this question and some included McCarthy as the prime instigator and, moreover, the focus of the question was often not fully addressed.

Hiss' position was often neglected or inflated, though the pumpkin patch did feature in certain answers.

- (a)(iii) While McCarthy as a colourful and abrasive character was often well-sketched in answers to (a)(iii), many neglected to indicate his role in HUAC, the essential source of the authority he wielded.
- (a)(iv) The circumstances of McCarthy's demise were generally well known with the army playing a rightfully prominent role, and some candidates developed journalistic opposition with usefully based knowledge.
- (b)(i) This question received some of the weakest responses. Too often answers were loosely linked to the scaffolding points and at times sought to develop them in such highly generalised ways that it was not possible to move beyond Level 1. Specific references are needed in these answers, purposefully angled to the question's requirements. Candidates often responded in the following manner - 'employment opportunities ....were increased...'; 'education was improved'; 'improved civil rights ....were enacted'; 'medical care was widened'. There were, of course, better answers, moving into Level 4, where the candidate both named and developed specific legislation and approach.
- (b)(ii) The commonest fault here was to recount the Watergate narrative, with minimal or no reference to why it was important for US politics. Better candidates did tease out the issue of trust, as evinced negatively and positively in the 1970s, and also indicated, with varying degrees of precision, the post-Watergate legislation that sought to resolve some of the concerns of these years. There is nothing wrong with a basic, pointed narrative merely to set the scene, but too many let the narrative take over.

## A6: Superpower Relations, 1945-90

### Question 11

- (a)(i) Many candidates interpreted the word 'satellite' literally rather than metaphorically. As a consequence some rather strange responses were offered, incapable of scoring any marks at all. Others did see this in the correct metaphorical sense and in some cases produced well supported answers on the basic relationship of the USSR with its satellite states.
- (a)(ii) Most candidates alluded to the dangerous proximity of the missiles on Cuba to the USA, and were able to offer Cold War background making a developed response.
- (a)(iii) Most were able to discuss the 'hot-line' and move to the Test Ban Treaty and finally to Non-Proliferation. Some were able to include Vietnam and Czechoslovakia to add balance to their answers.
- (a)(iv) Responses saw the main element of improving relations in the more relaxed policies of the USSR and the more ready liaisons with the USA. However, on occasions there were rather general answers and the result was an impression of international bonhomie that was not underpinned by specific detail.
- (b)(i) The scaffolding was developed to some purpose. Some candidates continue to confuse the 'Blockade' with the 'Wall' and there are some who assert that 1948 was a crisis caused by too many refugees seeking the West from the East rather than tension between the Superpowers over the status of West Berlin. The last scaffolding point was often rather thinly interpreted, most seeing it as synonymous with NATO and neglecting comparable alliances elsewhere (though in some centres Brussels and SEATO did occasionally appear).
- (b)(ii) There was a tendency to neglect the essential focus on 'changing relations' and instead to recount the episodes with some references to this issue, but often itself not weighty enough. There was a tendency among a number who attempted the SALT option to ignore the dates, which clearly linked it to SALT I not SALT II.

### Question 12

- (a)(i) Definitions were adequately developed in response to the term, with a number indicating the origin of the doctrine in circumstances in Greece; some tended to anticipate the subject matter of the following question.
- (a)(ii) The Marshall Plan was usually well known, though again some confusion with the more military focused Truman Doctrine was found. Better answers did develop the theme of commercial US advantage that was a consequence of the Plan.
- (a)(iii) Here, the essence of most responses resided in a definition of the collective responsibility and hence strength of NATO, often to the comparative neglect of its roots in the outcome (rather than a blow by blow description of the course) of the Berlin Blockade.

- (a)(iv) Answers were sometimes marred by two defects, in most cases a looseness of material leading to the uprising and a tendency to recount the uprising itself (which was not requested in the question). Some responses were able to discuss Soviet policy post-1945 and add the impact of Khrushchev's speech.
- (b)(i) Perhaps the juxtaposition of the 'Blockade' and the 'Wall' led to much less confusion. The requirement of 'changing relations' was often not well developed, more especially on the 'Wall', where background material of the early 1960s could have been deployed to indicate how its construction impacted on relations. Answers to Yalta were often quite good, and many candidates perceived and developed practically the fuller harmony here than at Potsdam shortly after.
- (b)(ii) All features in the scaffolding were recognised, yet once again there was room for much fuller support throughout. Details of relations in Reagan's first term were often absent.

## A7: Conflict and the Quest for Peace in the Middle East, 1948-95

### Question 13

- (a)(i) Answers varied between a general observation that peacekeeping was a UN role, to reference to earlier involvement in the partition and hence in peacekeeping when that had failed.
- (a)(ii) The circumstances of the nationalisation of the Suez Canal and the impact this had on British and French approaches was recognised. Some went further discussing the wider concerns of the two countries as well as the Israeli approaches that encouraged the Anglo-French involvement.
- (a)(iii) Similarly, most recognised the concerns of the USA and the USSR and the different angles from which each came. The oil issue was given due attention in many answers.
- (a)(iv) Most saw the main thrust of the invasions, yet the responses were not always well developed in detail.
- (b)(i) The scaffolding was relied upon fairly strongly. The roles of Al-Fatah and the PLO were not always defined or exemplified very sharply, nor was the activity of Yasser Arafat. Answers emerged which were focused and modestly informed, but not always strong.
- (b)(ii) Answers were a little thin in places and it would appear that information on this more recent aspect of Middle East history is not well known.

### Question 14

- (a)(i) This question presented few difficulties and there was a usefully balanced response between Israeli prowess and Arab weaknesses.
- (a)(ii) There were sound responses that touched on a variety of causes, with comment on changed Egyptian circumstances, Israeli concerns and the interests of France and Great Britain.
- (a)(iii) Answers were not always as developed as in (a)(ii) though many did see the concerns of the USSR and the consequent anxieties of the USA at the policies of its allies in 1956.
- (a)(iv) There is inevitably a minority who confuse the 1973 with the 1967 war, possibly because both began with a sudden attack. Here the sudden attack by the Arabs was seen as the answer to the question, with some minimal further points on development. Such an approach is likely to secure only a low level mark.
- (b)(i) Sudden attack tended to dominate, though many answers were not quite so limited. Most did see that this was a causal question and adduced a variety of points, military, economic and external to explain the Israeli successes that year.



- (b)(i) The strength in answers to (b)(ii) tended to lie in the Camp David Agreements and thereafter, answers were much weaker in content and direction. Few integrated the *Intifada* effectively into the question's theme, nor were the effects of the Gulf War adequately focused on the question. Material on the Oslo talks was minimal. Once again, the impression gained from answers here is that recent events in the Middle East are not so well known.



## Paper 2: Depth Studies

---

### General comments

The question paper seemed to present a fair challenge to the candidates. It elicited the full range of responses. There were few rubric offences although timing remains an issue with some candidates struggling to complete part (d) of their second question.

Some candidates sensibly planned their answers, especially to parts (c) and (d) and there was a strong correlation between planning and high marks. On the other hand, some produced over long plans and failed to complete the last question.

In addition, candidates need to be more aware of the individual mark tariffs. For example, some wrote far lengthier answers for the utility question (c), (worth 8 marks), than their responses to (d), which carries 12 marks.

Although candidates need to understand and apply nature, origins and purpose in evaluating sources, it is only necessary for sub-question (c). Far too many answers to the other sub-questions placed a heavy and unnecessary emphasis on these particular source skills. For example, candidates went through the nature, origins and purpose of the source for part (a), for which they receive on credit, and then began to look for inferences.

Finally there are still many formularic type answers especially for (c) and (d) which stifle initiative. In (c) candidates sometimes mechanically go through the origins, nature and purpose of each source without directly relating them to the idea of utility. For (d) they trawl through each source in turn explaining whether it agrees or disagrees with the interpretation. Many who do this are capable of more focussed and imaginative answers.

### Sub-question (a)

Most candidates are now making inferences, in some cases multiple inferences, and judgements and displaying sound comprehension of the source. Many achieved a good Level 2 mark. A substantial minority of candidates continue to provide unnecessary lengthy comments on the provenance of the source. There were especially strong answers to B1, B2, B4, B5 and B6. The better answers usually begin with 'This source suggests'. A small number of candidates either summarise the source or copy it out word for word.

### Sub-question (b)

Candidates who understood the mechanics of cross-referencing scored well on this question and reached Level 3. They directly compared and contrasted C with A and C with B, using evidence from each source to back up their comparison, and then came to a reasoned conclusion about the extent of corroboration. Indeed, candidates who began with an analysis of Source C, generally produced better cross referencing answers.

There were especially strong answers to B1, B3, B6 and B7. For B1 many explained the differences between A and C and the strong similarities between Sources B and C but also some similarities between C and A in the opposition to Lenin's plan. In B6 candidates explained strong similarities between C and A and C and B but a number also spotted the more subtle difference in the tone of the last few lines of the song which contrasted well to A and B.

Nevertheless cross-referencing still causes difficulties to surprisingly many candidates. Even strong candidates gave lengthy descriptions of each source in turn before beginning to cross-reference. Some simply described each source and then made a broad brush statement such as 'Source C supports Sources A and B'. Others compared Source A and B and were given no credit. Again, a number of candidates made lengthy and generally irrelevant comments on the provenance of the sources.

It should be stressed that candidates do not have to identify similarities and differences to reach Level 3. They do, however, have to make some judgement on the extent of support between the three sources.

### Sub-question (c)

On the whole candidates seemed to show a greater understanding of the issue of utility with the best answers focusing immediately on utility and making strong reference to the nature, origins, purpose and content of the source and evaluating utility in the context in which the source was produced. Such candidates made maximum use of provenance and generally produced a balanced evaluation, explaining the value and limitations of each source in relation to the question set.

For example, there were some very perceptive comments on the value and limitations of the propaganda poster, Source E in B2, the newspaper article, the prayer, Source E in B4, the photograph, Source D in B5 and the poster, Source D in B7.

Again, however, there are weaknesses. A substantial number of candidates lose site of utility and become bogged down in summarising the contents of each source and comment on the significance of the event described in the source, rather than the source itself. Reliability rather than utility remains the thrust of a number of answers. Not enough candidates make effective use of nature, origins and purpose with reference to utility. When applied, it was often mechanistic with learnt responses such as 'photos cannot lie', 'it was written by an eyewitness and must be useful' or generalised comments about primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are invariably seen as far more valuable than their secondary counterparts.

For example, the photographs, Source D for B4, B6 and B7 were useful because 'the camera can never lie' or were of no use because 'it was only a moment in time'. Candidates often failed to comment on key aspects of the provenance of the sources such as Source E in B4, a radio broadcast, Source D in B6, Desmond Tutu and an ex Vietcong guerrilla for E in B7.

A substantial minority of candidates still confuse reliability with utility. Indeed candidates cannot score above top Level 1/3 if the whole thrust of the answer is reliability. In addition some still believe propaganda sources e.g. Sources D in B1 and B4, are of no use.

### Sub-question (d)

A wide variety of responses to this question. Some candidates successfully integrated own knowledge with confident use of the sources to make balanced judgements. On the other hand, at the other extreme, there was the usual trawl through the sources often with little direct relevance to the question set.

A number of responses relied exclusively on the sources or own knowledge and could not be credited higher than half marks. Reliance on the sources is understandable. What is surprising, is those candidates who display excellent own knowledge and yet make no reference at all, even implicitly, to any of the sources!

Candidates need to use the sources to stimulate their own knowledge. Indeed the stronger answers often begin with Source F and use this to stimulate own knowledge. For B2, source F suggested machine guns and unimaginative commanders while in B3 the panic selling of 1929. In B1, source F made a brief reference to the importance of Trotsky in the Bolshevik Revolution. Candidates could have used this to give a much greater explanation of his role. Source F for Nazi Germany provided a lead in to the use of terror whilst in B5 the role of the RAF and Churchill.

Centres should note that to reach Level 3 candidates do not have to integrate the sources with own knowledge or give a balanced answer. Developed explanations which show confident use of the sources together with precisely own knowledge, agreeing or disagreeing with the interpretation, satisfy the criteria for Level 3. However, to reach Level 4 there needs to be a direct focus on the key issues of the interpretation and a balanced, sustained argument.



## Paper 3: Coursework

---

### Introduction

Overall, moderators experienced very few problems in the moderation process and it is clear that the great majority of teachers take the setting, supervision and marking of coursework very conscientiously. There remain some difficulties in administration and all teachers are requested to follow the administrative procedures set out below.

Teachers are reminded that candidates must complete two coursework units on different topics. The topics must not overlap the content of the examined components. Each assignment must be targeted at a different assessment objective. One assignment must be set on AO1 and one on AOs 2 and 3.

### Marking

Candidates' work must be marked and the levels achieved should be indicated in the margin. A total mark must be given at the end of the assignment.

Marks for Spelling a Grammar should not be awarded. Quality of Written Communication should be taken into account when assessing the work targeted at Objective 1. This should be one factor in deciding the final mark to be awarded for that assignment.

### OPTEMs Marksheets

The OPTeMS marksheets will have three copies.

- The top copy should have been sent to Edexcel by the Examinations Officer in the envelopes provided. Under no circumstances should the top copy of the OPTeMS be sent to the moderator with the sample
- The yellow copy should have been sent to the moderator.
- The green copy should be retained by the centre.

Centres are requested to take care when entering marks on the marksheets. Each sheet should be dealt with separately on a hard surface and not on top of the other sheets. There were a number of instances in 2004 where moderators were unable to read the marks because of over printing.

Centres are also requested that the completion of marksheets should be undertaken by one teacher and not passed to different members of the department. On several occasions there were errors on the marksheets which were not spotted by the centre. Centres are reminded that arithmetical mistakes, or other errors on marksheets can result in marks for all candidates in the centre being altered by the regression process. Centres are therefore requested to check all additions and entries, as this is not the responsibility of moderators.

### Coursework Authentication sheets

The decision to request that all coursework be authenticated as the unaided work of candidates was not made by Edexcel, but by the Joint Council. They will be requested for every candidate in every session henceforth and centres are asked to ensure that they are included with the sample.

### The Sample

The following steps should then be taken once marking and internal moderation has been completed and the OPTEMS form has been received in April.

- The work of candidates indicated with an asterisk should be selected for the sample, along with the highest and lowest scoring candidates. The lowest scoring candidate should be selected irrespective of whether all work and questions have been completed.
- Front-sheets should be completed for the candidates selected for the sample. A copy of the front-sheet will be found at the back of the specification and should be photocopied as appropriate. The front-sheet must be signed by the supervising teacher.
- Front-sheets should be fastened to the front of each candidate's work. Both assignments for each candidate should be fastened together. Centres should not send separate batches of the two assignments.
- Coursework Authentication Sheets must also be included.
- Centres are requested to avoid the use as far as possible of plastic files, ring binders or any other form of binding. The two assignments and the front-sheet should be fastened together with a paper clip or a staple.
- The specification also contains the Coursework Pro-forma to inform the moderator of the circumstances under which coursework has been completed.
- Along with the sampled work, centres should also send copies of the assignments used and the markschemes.
- If candidates' work has been lost, misplaced or is unavailable for any reason, Edexcel must be informed as soon as possible. A copy of the letter received confirming notification of the missing work should be included with the sample. Additional samples should be included to replace the missing work.
- Moderators are not allowed to accept explanations of missing work from centres unless they accompanied by evidence that Edexcel has been informed.
- Centres should also include with the sample the classwork notes of one candidate. This is a requirement of the Code of Practice. Moderators will not inspect or comment on the classwork notes, which may not be marked.
- The yellow copy of the OPTEMs must also be included with the sample.
- The sample should be posted to arrive with the moderator by the date specified by Edexcel. This will normally be the end of the first week in May.



## Specific issues

### **1: Possible reasons for marks being adjusted during moderation**

The most likely reasons for disagreement remain the failure to carry out effective internal standardisation and misinterpretation of the demands for Levels 3 and 4 in the markscheme.

#### **i) Lack of internal standardisation**

This is rare but can have significant consequences. Centres are required to ensure that all teachers mark to the same standard. One teacher (or several teachers) should be responsible for sampling the work of students from all teaching groups and comparing the standards set by different teachers. If necessary, adjustments to the marks awarded by different teachers should be made.

There are a number of different ways of doing this.

- i) Sampling
- ii) Marking of different assignments by different teachers
- iii) Marking of each others coursework assignments
- iv) One teacher marking all of the assignments

It is important to remember that if one teacher marks more generously than the others, all the candidates in that centre will suffer because all marks will be adjusted downwards.

In extreme cases, all of the work from a centre will be requested and remarked accordingly.

#### **ii) Incorrect application of higher levels**

In AO1, candidates must produce a developed explanation if Level 3 is to be awarded and similarly a sustained argument for Level 4 to be awarded. In a 'causation' question, developed explanation means that a sequence of factors/events has been produced and that a candidate has explained how one led to another. It is not sufficient merely to get factors/events in the correct order. Sustained argument means that a candidate has assessed and identified the main factors and has then supported that decision throughout the answer. In neither case is it possible to award a level because part of an answer appears to meet the descriptor. The level awarded should reflect that which has been sustained.

In a 'change' question, Level 3 will involve an explanation of the factors/events that led to change taking place. Level 4 will require an assessment of the situation beforehand and an explicit comparison with the situation after change has taken place. Assignments that describe events should be awarded Level 2.

In AOs 2 and 3, it is not sufficient to refer to the provenance (nature, origin and purpose) or comment on possible limitations for an answer to awarded Level 3. A candidate must make positive use of the provenance for that level to be reached. That will involve explaining how the evidence of the source helps in the understanding of the past.

Level 4 should be awarded when the answer is focused clearly upon the question set and the candidate has integrated sources and own knowledge in the response.

## **2: Word limit**

In recent years, concern was expressed about the number of assignments that are going beyond the 1500 word limit. In some cases, candidates write many thousands of words and inevitably are able to cover issues more effectively than those that attempt to conform to the limit in the specification. Accordingly, all teachers are asked to ensure that candidates conform more closely to the word limit and that they refrain from presenting lengthy descriptive passages that do little or nothing to improve the quality of an answer.

It is clear that some centres encourage candidates to disregard the word limit and write excessively. In practice, it is acceptable for assignments to exceed the word limit by up to one thousand words. Beyond that, moderators have to consider whether assignments that have been produced under such conditions are genuinely of better quality than assignments in which there has been a real effort to keep to the word limit.

In particular, teachers are reminded that Levels 3 and 4 in the markschemes require students to 'select' material and not to include everything that may be 'relevant'. Level 2 requires candidates to be 'relevant'.

## **3: Help given to candidates**

Unfortunately there was a small number of instances of unfair assistance to candidates by teachers. In these, it was obvious that teachers had collected in drafts of assignments, marked them, made comments as to how they could be improved and had then returned the work to candidates. This infringes the regulations for the completion of History GCSE coursework. Details of the degree of help that students can be given is set out in the Teachers' Guide. All teachers are requested to read the Guide and observe the parameters therein.

## **4: Use of sub-headings**

Some candidates have begun to use sub-headings to help them organise their work. There is no Edexcel policy regarding this practice but teachers should be aware that it makes the achievement of higher levels more difficult. Developed explanation (Level 3) requires sequencing and linking of factors/events and sustained argument (Level 4) requires the identification of key factors. Neither of these qualities are likely to be achieved if an assignment is punctuated by a series of sub-headings.

## Statistics

---

### 1334 Overall Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	75	65	55	46	38	30	22	14	0

### 1334 Paper 1 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 1 grade boundaries	90	54	35	14

### 1334 Paper 2 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 2 grade boundaries	60	42	30	16

### 1334 Paper 3 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 3 grade boundaries	100	73	54	25

### 3334 (Short Course) Overall Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	73	63	53	43	34	26	18	10	0

### 3334 Paper 1 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 1 grade boundaries	90	54	35	14

### 3334 Paper 2 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 2 grade boundaries	50	36	27	12



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 018002 Summer 2006

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