

Examiners' Report Summer 2009

GCSE

GCSE History (1334/3334)

Contents

1.	Paper 01 Principal Examiner Report	3
2.	Paper 02 Principal Examiner Report	12
3.	Paper 03 Principal Moderator Report	15
4.	Statistics	19

1334 Modern World History 2009

Paper One Report

General comments

- This is the third year of e-pen marking for Paper One with a dedicated examination booklet. It is pleasing to note that the number of issues with the examination booklet was greatly reduced this year. Any candidate who did respond in the incorrect place was not disadvantaged.
- Performance overall continues to improve and it is clear that candidates are well prepared for the demands of this paper. The following report looks at each sub-question and in most cases tends to highlight those areas where candidates experienced issues.
- Some examiners did report that there were a number of candidates who had had insufficient time to complete the paper.

A1: The Road to War; Europe 1870-1914

Question 1

(a)(i) Many understood Bismarck's wish to isolate France, but the broader issues of the League were frequently overlooked.

(a)(ii) Understanding of the rift between Austria and Russia was evident as was the continuing fear of France.

(a)(iii) The introduction of Italy was well known but many were unable to discuss the key features at length.

(a)(iv) The changes were discussed at length, candidates seeing the dynamic of William II. Some candidates, however, did move beyond 1900.

(b)(i) Responses tended to be of two varieties - one which gave a narrative of the crises and one which did focus on the demands of the question. In the latter, answers were detailed and sharp, readily moving to Level 3.

(b)(ii) As in (b)(i), there were those who gave only a narrative of events in the Balkans during the specified period. Those who were able to use the scaffold and focus on 'why' were able to score highly.

Question 2

(a)(i) Though some were able to discuss the event, many did not see why there was a crisis.

(a)(ii) The notion of the ending of isolation was understood but some assumed these were military agreements and did not always see the reasons behind the agreement with Russia.

(a)(iii) This was answered quite well - the major issues were included and the outcomes made clear.

(a)(iv) Most were able to discuss the naval race but few developed the broader issues.

(b)(i) Knowledge of the two wars was sound and most were able to move to the crisis following the assassination.

(b)(ii) Soundly answered. The alliances are well known and candidates were able to analyse the changing landscape.

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

Question 3

(a)(i) While many did show good knowledge of what the Cripps' Mission proposed and were able to set this in an explained Indian context, many confused the content of this mission with others seeking solutions to the Indian question at this time.

(a)(ii) was rather more securely attempted, but many saw the campaign in terms of Gandhi's earlier idealism and maintenance of non-violence and did not suggest anything of the violence that accompanied this particular campaign of the early 1940s.

(a)(iii) Chandra Bose was well known and there was a more than usual achievement of L3 here; almost all knew his essential role in the sub-continent, but some were uncertain of the play of practical events in this connection.

(a)(iv) While many did give a broadly based response, replete with references British-focused and globally-focused as well as being rooted in events in the sub-continent, others were inclined to give a rather narrow and uncertain view of the latter alone and missed the broad scope of this question.

(b)(i) and (ii)

Of the two parts in (b), (i) was rather less securely attempted than ii. Candidates in (ii) had the scaffolding points to assist them, while many in (i) seemed much to need a similar set of points to permit adequate scope to their answers. Most did concentrate on the years given, but the pre-1914 years got rather scant attention and more security was needed on the details of government policies leading to change in 1909 and 1918 as well as to other less significant governmental initiatives of these years. There was firmer factual security in (ii), though many did not hold well the focus on 'why'. Amritsar is well known and there was a tendency for some to develop narrative detail here to the extent that imbalance was created in the answer.

Question 4

(a)(i) While many recognised the issues involved in the salt marches, there was uncertainty on the part of others and a tendency for the uncertain merely to comment on Gandhi's known approaches on non-violence and not to see this in a firm enough context.

(a)(ii) and (iii) Both received mixed responses, though only a few were able to achieve L3 for the security and angling of their answers, while a fair number of candidates were unable to define the scope of the work of the RTCs and others had very little idea of what the objectives of the Muslim League were and hence unable to say how it developed.

(a)(iv) Of all the parts in (a), the last one was the least well attempted, almost invariably as a consequence of paucity of knowledge of the terms on the 1935 Act. This is a serious defect, highlighted by the generally superior knowledge of

the 1909 and 1918 proposals, essentially much less significant than this virtual blue-print for independence.

(b)(i) and (ii)

Weaker candidates tended not to observe the focus of either (i) or (ii) in (b) and to produce general accounts of events in the years given with only loose attention to 'ways' in (i) and 'why' in (ii). (b)(i) tended also to be rather thin on the 1920s, running out of material after Rowlatt and Amritsar had been considered; the Simon Commission appeared not to be at all well known. Material was rather better balanced in ii and facts more securely held, but the lack of 'why' focus was pronounced in some cases which for the post-war years tended to narrate the mechanics of independence rather than focus on why opposition was developing.

A3: The Emergence of Modern China, 1911-76

Question 5

(a)(i) This was generally well known, with the reasoning for it adequately set in pre-revolutionary attitudes.

(a)(ii) This tended to be more securely attempted than (iii), with candidates giving a suitable mix of positive and negative reasons for the Hundred Flowers Campaign and setting it in the context of a troubled revolutionary society. Knowledge of the Cultural Revolution was often itself sound in (iii), but precise linkage of that to ways in which it strengthened Mao's leadership was too often vaguely put or ignored. Knowledge of the Cultural Revolution per se was given greater play in (iv) and, while achievement was inevitably varied, there were some well-rounded and informed responses here.

(b)(i) Responses were rather undirected here. Almost all candidates recognised the war lords as a malign set of local rulers, but references to them were often in general terms and there was virtually no practical exemplification of their activities, but rather general examples, themselves useful but not entirely convincing as the basis of a sharp answer.

(b)(ii) Answers were more securely supported in (b)(ii), but balance between the various features of the years 1934-49 was not well held, with a tendency for the Long March to get a disproportionate amount of attention, while (as has been noted before) the crucial events of the Civil War were sketchily attempted, as often also the war against Japan.

Question 6

(a)(i) This presented no major problems to most candidates, who recognised the event and were often able to give useful supportive detail.

(a)(ii) In (ii) also, there was good basic recognition of what was involved in the 1927 massacres, but a failure often to proceed to a sharper view of the political situation that formed the background to them.

(a)(iii) The Long March - myth and reality - is well known by most candidates and attention was often quite competently developed on why it was a success for the CCP.

(a)(iv) As has been noted above, the civil war continues to be less well known in its practical circumstances and details than it deserves and while there were many competent answers to (iv), too many did not go as far as they should.

(b)(i) Knowledge of the Cultural Revolution could also have gone further in some of the answers. Almost all were able to focus on why it caused disruption, but answers were generally not well sustained by precise references, suitably angled to the question.

(b)(ii) In (ii) also there was often a basic competence in what the policies were - though there was paucity of material on the political infighting in the CCP - but a failure sharply to develop these with precise supportive references.

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

Question 7

(a)(i). Almost all candidates recognised the concept in (a)(i), though answers showed very varied degrees of practical support by showing the process in action.

(a)(ii) Similarly, answers to (ii) often had good focus and helpful support, though many could have been stronger in exemplifying the reasoning underlying the changes that Khrushchev made, while a number drifted into irrelevance here on agriculture.

(a)(iii) Relevance of time was a problem for some in, with some wandering on to the work Gorbachev did subsequently while an unfortunate minority of candidates possessed of a highly faulty sense of the sequence of time imagined that Gorbachev took over directly from Khrushchev, totally missing the significance of features in the 20+ years interval.

(a)(iv) The policies were well recognised, but comment on them did not go very far, limited too often to 'too little too late' and the inevitable folly of permitting criticism.

(b)(i), While many in (b)(i) recognised the virgin lands as central to an answer here and developed this area with fair though not always sharp support, there was greater uncertainty on Khrushchev's policies towards collective farming and private land plots (inaccurately cited as a Khrushchev initiative), some going so far as to suggest that he abandoned collective farming.

(b)(ii) There were generally good responses, taking advantage of the wide spread of years and assisted by the scaffolding; but achievement here in L4 was limited and almost all areas - and particularly perhaps the purges - warranted rather sharper practical support.

Question 8

(a)(i) A distinct minority failed to recognise the term, some even failing to recognise the political significance of the word 'socialism' and producing as a consequence aberrant responses; development could have been stronger among those who did recognise the concept.

(a)(ii) There was also failure on the part of a minority to recognise NEP, some asserting that it was the policy of collectivisation; however, many were able to detect its incompatibility with Stalin's approaches and to develop well focused if not always well sustained answers.

(a)(iii) There were generally good responses, the better answers tackling the ethos of the planned economy as shown in the first plan as well as practical aspects of its work.

(a)(iv) In (iv), while a minority failed to recognise this movement at all, many did do so, but tended to describe the movement rather than angle their material to the question's causal theme; but development here was often not strong and few got to L3.

(b)(i) In (b)(i) greater strength was shown on descriptive detail of purges and show trials than on the ways in which this was important for Stalin's leadership; while much of the material inevitably had an implicit link, it was only the stronger candidates who were able to effect this by the angling of their answers.

(b)(ii) Many candidates in (b)(ii) appeared to be assisted by the scaffolding into producing broadly ranged answers, often with usefully supported responses in both internal and external issues that led to the Soviet collapse.

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

Question 9

(a)(i) This question produced highly varied responses, It was disappointing that not more candidates saw the idealism of the term and its historic roots in US history; civil rights was a part of it, but too many suggested that was all.

(a)(ii) Failure to define well in (a)(i) often led to confusion in (a)(ii), but many did set their responses here in a well considered view of the politics of the early 1960s and evoked a range of opponents with viable views on the policies the president pursued.

(a)(iii) Answers to (iii) were often well informed with a variety of references in social history, though some tended not to observe the 1960s time frame

(a)(iv) Some responses were weak here, with many answers limited to the legislation of 1964/5 alone and the simple fact that LBJ followed from JFK; candidates in general need to be better informed about the legislation of the Great Society, its width and its detail.

(b)(i) The fault of many in (b)(i) was to narrate the events of the Watergate affair rather than angle them on why they led to the resignation of Nixon; knowledge of Watergate was often good, but confusion is still too much in evidence in this area, especially over the original incursion and the later issue of the White House tapes.

(b)(ii) Many took advantage in (b)(ii) of both the broad scope and the scaffolding content to develop informed and often well focused answers to bii, in which a sense of change emerged often quite well. The legal moves on the part of campaigners failed to get the attention that it deserved, though the cf. civil rights/Black Power was often well held.

Question 10

(a)(i) There was a range of responses for this question, some even asserting the laws represented the freeing of African Americans from restrictions; a number, however, did posit the laws in a useful southern context.

(a)(ii) In (a)(ii), answers were too often rather general on the Second World War in this connection, limiting themselves to opportunities to fight and work; while the 'Double V' received some attention, there was an overall paucity in references to practical features of wartime and immediately post-war advance.

(a)(iii) The Montgomery Bus Boycott is well known, though there is sometimes uncertainty about the episode that sparked it; a number needed, however, to fit the boycott more firmly into the context of the developing civil rights movement.

(a)(iv) The time frame of the 1960s was not always well observed, often with recovering of the Montgomery boycott, and others could have gone further into the activities of MLK's supporters, such as freedom riders and sit-ins as well as being more positive on MLK's own approaches.

(b)(i) Again the time frame was troublesome to some in (b)(i), though a degree of modest casting back to the Second World War was acceptable background; but causal references were not strongly made, nor was practical support very strong either so that rather few had sufficiently well supported answers to warrant L4.

(b)(ii) A number of candidates in (b)(ii) got enmeshed in events outside Europe, apparently failing to detect that the focus in this question was on 'ways' and there was also a specific internal reference to the USA. There continues to be quite widespread misconception about such persons as the Hollywood Ten, Hiss and the Rosenbergs that they were persecuted by McCarthy, who himself needed a sharper focus on the early years of the 1950s and rather fuller attention to what he actually did. There were few well disciplined or well developed answers to this question as a consequence of these quite widespread defects in answers.

A6: Superpower Relations, 1945-90

Question 11

In (a)(i) and (a)(ii) many candidates blurred the boundaries between Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan, though better candidates did see the distinction between a strategic commitment and an economic programme with a strong

political underlay. Again it was only the better candidates who put (i) in its Greek context and teased out with effective detail the political dimension of (ii).

(a)(iii) Answers to (iii) tended to be overwhelmed with comment on the Berlin Blockade to the neglect of a broader view of advancing communism and the structure and nature of NATO in meeting that.

(a)(iv) Answers to (iv) often discussed agencies such as Comecon, Cominform, Warsaw Pact that linked the satellites and to an extent controlled them, but neglected to develop the political machinations of such things as rigged elections and puppet dictators that were perhaps the more immediate reason for Soviet control.

(b)(i) Most candidates were aware of the context of the Hungarian rising and the role of Nagy at least in outline, but many did not get much further than this, the role of other politicians and the variable approach of Khrushchev to the policy initiatives of Nagy were not well shown. Altogether, answers could have been more sharply focused, better developed and better informed on this episode.

(b)(ii) Here, most candidates did see a changing scenario over the decade, with earlier reticence giving way to later rapprochement. But here also there was uncertainty in practical references to the points at issue both earlier and later and few candidates specified the various encounters and their outcomes between the two leaders, especially in the late 1980s.

Question 12

(a)(i) At each exam there continues to be confusion between the 1948 Blockade and the 1961 Wall and it was thus this time also, hence while many did give accurate and informed responses, many spoke of earlier issues and there was often serious uncertainty whether Stalin or Khrushchev was in charge of the USSR in 1961.

(a)(ii) Responses varied here. Many were aware of the human rights issues and saw the acceptance of the 1945 boundary settlement. There were those who could write only generally. Some saw Carter as the US president at Helsinki.

(a)(iii) The change was for the worse and not for the better; some anticipated the latter and introduced Gorbachev into their answers here.

(a)(iv) Most did see a benign role for the new Soviet leader in the late 1980s, but answers were sometimes too generalised and failed to focus sharply or with developed information on his role in international relations.

(b)(i) The Cuban Missiles Crisis is generally well known, more so than the Hungarian uprising in the preceding question. Weaker candidates tend to equate the events at the Bay of Pigs with those of October 1962 and there was confusion about U2 planes being shot down, some confusing this with the Gary Powers episode two years earlier; the actual play of practical diplomacy in the thirteen days could have been sharper in many cases.

(b)(ii) There were often comprehensive and balanced answers, but a number were too heavily developed on Yalta and Potsdam, often to the neglect in these areas of how these conferences were significant in increasing great power tension. Answers often needed to focus more on the question's theme rather than narrate various events in the 1945-49 period.

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

Question 13

(a)(i) This was usually understood, though not always well developed.

(a)(ii) Here, the role of Britain and France did not always receive as much attention as it deserved and some confused 1956 with other wars - a trap candidates must always guard against in this area.

(a)(iii) This generally produced only basic answers, with rarely good development, while (a)(iv) was usually competent, though with more certainty on its earlier than its later stages.

(b)(i) This presented no problems to most candidates and many answers were well informed; few confused this war with another. However, (b)(ii) produced insecure answers. It appears that the strength of most candidates lies in the earlier and not the later parts of this topic.

Question 14

In (a)(i) and (a)(ii) candidates tended to produce rather similar responses.

(a)(iii) Though many could discuss the imperative of securing a homeland for the Palestinians, most did not introduce other features.

(a)(iv) Most could see the invasions of Israel and the expulsion of the PLO, though in some cases detail was sparse.

In (b), there was marked difference in achievement, with (b)(i) much less well informed than (b)(ii), which tended to get good practical support, generally competent balance and a fair focus throughout on the 'why' of the question

1334 Modern World History

Paper 2 Report

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 write in too much detail on the first three questions and do not have time to produce a developed response to (d).

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 no 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 B2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. 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 or continue to take the source at face value.

Sub-question (b)

This is the most improved question with many candidates, who understood the mechanics of cross-referencing, scoring well on this question and an increasing number able to judge the extent of support to reach 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. In addition a greater

number of candidates made explicit judgements about the extent of support between the sources.

There were especially strong answers to B1, B3 and B5. For B5 many candidates commented on the strong differences between C and A in their attitude to the Munich Peace Conference and the similarities between Source C and the photograph, Source B. Similarly for B2, the strong similarities between all three sources.

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 interrogating the sources and 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. The best answers put the sources in context. This was especially true of B1, B2 and B4 where candidates made quite sophisticated judgements about the sources.

B3 was especially well answered with candidates making effective use of the provenance of sources D and E in E and relating these to utility and limitations. There was some very good contextual knowledge applied to the utility of Sources D and E for B4.

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 B1 and Source E for 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 D, B2 and Source E, in B5, both official photographs, and memoirs of Albert Speer for B4 Source D.

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. Source D in B3 and Source D in 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 suggests the military and territorial terms whilst Source F for B6 provides much stimulus for features of apartheid.

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.

1334 Modern World History 2009

Coursework Report

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. The work of most candidates was clearly marked, carefully assessed against the mark schemes and therefore, reflected student ability. However, 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 and 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 mark sheets. 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 2008 where moderators were unable to read the marks because of over printing. Centres are also requested that the completion of mark sheets should be undertaken by one teacher and not passed to different members of the department. On several occasions there were errors on the mark sheets which were not spotted by the centre. Centres are reminded that arithmetical mistakes, or other errors on mark sheets 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.

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 mark scheme.

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 be 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 mark schemes 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.

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. As in previous years a few centres did not attach this sheet to the work of each candidate in the sample and moderators wasted time chasing this up.

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 mark schemes.

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 class work notes of one candidate. This is a requirement of the Code of Practice. Moderators will not inspect or comment on the class work 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.

Statistics

1334 Overall Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	75	66	57	48	40	32	24	16	0

1334 Paper 1 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 1 grade boundaries	90	54	38	15

1334 Paper 2 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 2 grade boundaries	60	43	31	18

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	68	60	52	45	36	28	20	12	0

3334 Paper 1 Grade Boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 1 grade boundaries	90	54	38	17

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

Order Code UA UG021435 Summer 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at 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