



Examiners' Report January 2013

GCSE History 5HB03 3C



ALWAYS LEARNING

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at <u>www.edexcel.com</u> or <u>www.btec.co.uk</u> for our BTEC qualifications.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at <u>www.edexcel.com/contactus</u>.

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification that require the help of a subject specialist, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson.

Their contact details can be found on this link: <u>www.edexcel.com/teachingservices</u>.

You can also use our online Ask the Expert service at <u>www.edexcel.com/ask</u>. You will need an Edexcel username and password to access this service. See the ResultsPlus section below on how to get these details if you don't have them already.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your candidates' exam results.

- See candidates' scores for every exam question
- Understand how your candidates' performance compares with class and Edexcel national averages
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where candidates may need to develop their learning further

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit <u>www.edexcel.com/resultsplus</u>.

Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes using Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your candidates at: www.pearson.com/uk.

January 2013

Publications Code UG034688

All the material in this publication is copyright © Pearson Education Limited 2013

Introduction

This was the seventh series of this Schools History Project Source Enquiry The Impact of War on Britain c1914–c1950. The focus of the enquiry was how far propaganda was the most important factor in persuading people to support the war effort. Most candidates were able to produce responses that were worthy of some credit and many produced answers that were well argued, developed and supported by additional recalled knowledge (ARK) and use of the sources provided. There was continuing evidence that more candidates were able to access all five questions. Few responses produced answers that were not worth at least some marks.

The sources appear to have worked well, particularly the World War I posters in Q2 and Q3. There appeared to be no problem with understanding these sources for the majority of candidates.

As in all previous series, high Level 4 marks on Q5 were more difficult to achieve than top levels in Q1–Q4. In this series, there were three additional marks in Q5 for SPaG. Failure to answer Q5 therefore cost candidates a potential 19 marks. This alone should encourage candidates to ensure that they allocate their time in proportion to the mark tariff available for individual questions.

The focus on German attacks on Britain caused few candidates problems but ARK was conspicuous by its absence in some candidates' responses.

There was evidence that centres are responding to advice given in examination reports. Encouragingly, there were far fewer blank responses to questions. There were also fewer answers to Q4 written on the last page allocated for responses to Q3.

Most candidates produced reasonable answers to Q1 and Q2 but many failed to crossreference in Q3 and simply trawled through each source using simple matching. Fewer were able to deploy understanding of differences in content alongside comment on support provided by the nature and provenance of each source.

Q4 produced many answers that were good on content but made little or no reference to a source's nature, origin or purpose. Moreover, many comments on utility focused on simplistic learned responses. There were fewer, although still too many, responses that see all primary sources as being reliable and useful and all secondary sources as being made up and therefore of little real value. A surprising number of candidates continue to have a negative view of historians and history books and to put more faith in the veracity on all counts of people who were there at the time.

ARK was often thin or non-existent in answers to Q5. Candidates need to learn to distinguish between the world wars, and too many candidates used irrelevant knowledge on Churchill's speeches, rationing, evacuation, the Blitz and the Nazis.

Timing was generally less of a problem for candidates than in earlier series. Some candidates, however, produced answers that were overlong in response to Q1 and Q2, which left them with difficulties in completing developed answers to Q3–Q5.

Most candidates were able to reach at least a basic Level 3 and most gained 5 or 6 marks for their answers to this question. A few only provided detail from the source (Level 1), some made inferences without using the source (Level 2), but most were able to infer something about the importance of propaganda in the war or that it turned people against the Germans. Other answers made valid inferences but did not support them by explaining which elements of the source formed the basis for this inference.

Only a very few candidates remained at Level 1, with their answers simply selecting relevant information straight from the text without making any inferences, such as saying that there was deliberate propaganda against the Germans.

Some candidates made good inferences, writing about the huge impact propaganda would have made on people's morale and determination and how it animated people to fight back. However, some failed to make any reference to the source, thus achieving only Level 2.

Most candidates achieved Level 3 by commenting on how propaganda was used to influence people against the Germans, referring to the 'deliberate propaganda' and the fact that it was working, eg when Bond talks about how it 'turned the Germans into absolute swine'. Some of these were quite simple, weak inferences, stating that you could not escape the propaganda, scoring 4 marks. Some made more sophisticated comments on how organised the government was by using 'quickly'... 'every artist', thus achieving the top score of 6 marks.

- Candidates should start by making an inference and then support it directly from the source. This should be followed by an explanation of the implications of this inference.
- Candidates need to remember that more than one inference is needed for full marks.

1 Study Source A.

What can you learn from Source A about propaganda during the First World War?

Source A shows that propoganda, during the first world war, 'had an enourmous effect 'on everyone. The main propoganda aim was to make the Germans look very evil so that the war became justified to the British public. A lot of the time, shock tactics were used in order to do this; 'These newspapers had gruesome details' from Source A we can learn that propoganda had a massive effect on the war effort because it made the British public think that the war was neccisary and the German 'swine' needed to be destroyed.

Source A îs reliable but îs based on memorys so ît may be exaggerated or distorted.



This is a concise answer that makes several inferences and supports them with reference to the source. It is a solid Level 3 response.



Make inferences – do not just describe what the source shows.

(6)

All candidates attempted this question, with most achieving at least Level 2. Very few candidates achieved only a Level 1, where they simply selected information from the source or made a comment on the message. A small number then went on to explain the message in detail, using their own knowledge and opinion rather than focusing on the question and working with the source.

A large number of candidates focused on the style of the poster, commenting on the black-and-white contrast, the statistics, the bold writing, the capitals and the rhetorical phrases, and how these would draw in the reader and make people feel like they were being addressed personally. Some candidates, however, simply did this without then commenting on its purpose of encouraging men to enlist. They wrote about the guilt and the pity but missed the message, scoring a maximum of Level 2.

Equally, those who wrote about the content – the girl, the women mentioned and about pulling at the heartstrings – without referring to the actual message, again scored a maximum of Level 2. Many, however, did make a valid comment on the message contained in the appeal to men to enlist. Some did not directly mention the fact that it was a recruitment poster; others picked up more readily that this was the sole purpose of the poster. Many candidates achieving Level 3 commented on both the style and content of the poster.

- Candidates should be reminded to analyse the individual details in a source but link them to the overall impression created. In many ways, this is a more developed version of Q1.
- Candidates need to infer an overall impression and identify the parts of the source that create that impression. They also need to analyse the way that language and treatment of these details combine to produce that effect.
- Candidates need to have a clear idea of the difference between an impression and a message and ensure that they address the correct aspect in answering the question set.

2 Study Source B.

How does the artist get the message across in this poster? Explain your answer, using Source B.

(8)

The artist of the government produced poster in source B uses a variety of different points and techniques to get his message across on the German Narys attack on scanborough.

Firstly the artist has used a massive image of the destruction Caused by the attack in the centre of the poskr. The artist has used the image here so that it would catch the eye of anyone around the poster and thus encourage them to view is. Within the picture outside the crumpled remains of a house is a little gill and a baby. The artist has used this to get across to the people the impact the attack has had and how close it was to taking two young and innocent lives.

Not only has the artist used the image but he has also used big letters around the picture to inform viewers excactly what the pictures about. The top line is addressed to the "Men of Britian!" and asks them the question "Will you stand this?". The artist has used this question to encourage the "Men of Britian" to think about the situation and what has happend and too get them angry at the Germans.

The Writing at the bottom of the poster informs the viewer of the actual details of what had happend such as the fact "78 women and children were killed" This again is aimed at me male

readers to get them angry at what had happend. This brings uson to the main image that the writer is trying to get across and that is the MESSage that the Men Viewing the poster Should "enlist now" By Using all the other kinniques such as the image and the detailed description of What has happend to provoke men of Britian into a Splik - second descision to join up and fight against the people Who had done mis



This is a solid Level 3 response that focuses on the message to get men to enlist and explains how the artist attempted to achieve this.



Make use of selection, style and design of content to explain how the artist gets the message across.

Most answers to this question achieved at least Level 2. Some candidates seemed to struggle with the focus of the question, mentioning the use of propaganda for Source A, but not for Source C or D. Some seemed to misunderstand the question altogether and answered whether the sources created hatred, rather than whether they showed that propaganda was used to create hatred. Some mistook the dead person for a dead soldier, or even a shot-down German pilot, and misunderstood the meaning of Source C altogether.

Very few candidates simply phrased the content of each source in their own words, without referring to the question's focus. Most candidates picked up that Sources A and C agreed with the statement, pointing out how this showed the widespread use of propaganda, and added the fact that Source D partly agreed and partly disagreed. However, many candidates simply went through each source in turn, making valid points but without reaching a conclusion or addressing the issue of extent; and as a result, they scored no more than Level 2.

Cross-referencing was quite weak generally and, where cross-referencing was evident, it was usually done on content. Few commented on the nature of the sources – Sources A and D were opinions of individuals; Source C was a government-produced poster – or made cross-references about the nature of the sources.

Candidates achieving Level 3 were usually more sophisticated on Source C, noting that, although we know it was a propaganda poster and can assume that it was seen by many, we do not know how effective it was at causing hatred. Equally, these answers were detailed on Source D, writing about implied propaganda causing people to feel delighted and connected with the term 'swine' from Source A and with 'But they're Germans, they're the enemy, not human beings.'

- Candidates should avoid treating sources individually as this rarely allows them to go beyond Level 2.
- Candidates are more successful when they look at the overall package of evidence from the sources in this question.
- Candidates also need to address the skill of cross-referencing so that more responses can achieve Level 3.

3 Study Sources A, C and D.

How far do Sources A, C and D suggest that propaganda created a feeling of hatred towards the Germans? Explain your answer, using these sources.

(10)

Source A strongly suggests that propaganda created a feeling of hatred towards the Germans as it says there were two centre pages full of propaganda attacking Germans: This suggests that Propaganda attacking Germans was common, and offen used to get British men to sign up for the wat. It also says how mis was done in a deliberate way and 'had an enormous effect on us all. from this we can infer that the government were sending out a regative view of The Germans and blowing Them out of-proportion for propaganda and That it did siceed in changing he minds of people as it the way German effected evenpre. were being represented source c is similar to this and reinforces the idea's in source A as you angy man in & uniform lifting his fist to a german aircraft dropping bombs. Below him you see a

dead person on the floor with a mourning wife and child beside the body. This again shows the anger he british people/ soldiers had for the german's in most instead of helping/mourning the person himself he is to bury being angry at the Germans. This Suggests hart be rage at the herman's was a big thing, and many people thought the same way. This poster however was made by the government as phopaganda so may not be an estimely reliable account of people's opinions at mile. Source D however differs from both sources Age and C as it shows a young British person, although accepting the Germen's are he enemy, feeling sympathy toward Them being killed. I was apalled to see the hind, good hearted British people doncing about in the streets at the sight of 60 people being burned alive' This suggests net actually there were Still some people where oldit have been harned by for the German Like the propaganda wanted to get across, as this is an opinion of someone who was actually here at the time, and so shows propaganda was not always and successful in creating hatred for Germans. However the source does also say that but they said

But they're Germans, they're the eveny, not human beings. This suggests that although some exceptions, generally the public opinio good one twards Germane was not and propaganda probably ed. 2 plan opinion we \$ disago maybe poplaanda x a $\bigcirc d$ Jough German α by the M GOV DOP an actual ion on what Intor mai The Germanis Of propaganda and POST mis opinion.



This response is a clear Level 3 that cross-references between all three sources and combines both content and nature to evaluate the effectiveness of propaganda.



Cross-reference the sources rather than treating them individually. Make sure you use both content and nature of the sources in your answer.

The majority of candidates who attempted this question achieved at least Level 2. Some candidates made generalised comments based on the amount of detail or on assumed authorship. Typical of these responses were those that simply commented that Source E was a secondary source while Source F was a primary source and therefore Source F was a better source to use. Many of the weaker responses did not answer the question, but simply stated which source they thought was best to use, with simplistic support.

Most candidates achieved Level 2 by making a judgement based usually on the content of the sources, describing the information presented in detail and explaining it by making use of the sources. Some focused on the authorship, making quite simple observations, such as Source E is an overview, whereas Source F is the opinion of one person only, therefore Source E is better. Some stated that Source F was not a common or popular view so it was not as useful (representative). Opinions here were divided – some candidates commented that Source E was better as it was written with hindsight and was therefore well researched and also not censored. Others commented that Source F was better as it was a speech from a Member of Parliament made at the time, assuming that it would have remained unaltered.

Many of the candidates that went into this level of deliberation showed some crossreferencing at some stage of their answers, which pushed their response into Level 3. Some also made some effective comments on the purpose of the sources and used this to explore their reliability. Unfortunately, some candidates seem to have run out of time, making excellent observations on both nature and content, yet finishing the answer having focused on one source only, limiting the mark they could achieve.

- Candidates should go beyond describing the content of sources, which they often do well, to examine the value of a source's nature.
- After they have dealt with the content of a particular source, candidates should probably stay with the same source and comment on its reliability and utility. Glib generalisations about primary sources being better than secondary sources or that 'photographs never lie' should be avoided.
- Candidates should ensure that the focus of their response is specific to the historical investigation specified in the question.

Study Sources E and F. Which of Government's attitudes to Zeppelin raids? Explain your answer, using Sources E and F. (10)In my opinion, Source E is most useful Firstly a history book which as it. would mean it's well researched and factual unlike Source F, which is a speech made by a member of government which could have been used to boost morale. It's valuable to a historian as it talks about the uncertanities the government felt during the reppetin raids and the actions they took en order to minimize damage: "The Government could not decide if they should highlight Zeppelin raids... The Defence of the Realm Act had included restrictions on the press...' The restrictions on the press suggest the government's insecurity as well as the measures they took in order to not destroy public morale. This information would be valuable as it informs the historians about the Government's initial reactions However, Source F is important as well as it talks about gives the historian an idea about

(Question 4 continued) the views of the members of govern -ments as well as informs about the attitude the opvernment had towards Germans: we are wrong to say that Germans ... acting like uncivilised people." This suggests that the Government did not regard Gurmans an as animals: Also, the historian can learn on how the Government justified the attack as it States: 'London is detended by guns... main centre For the production of munition. However, unlike Source E, Source & does not directly give information about the Government's attitudes towards the seppetin but just gives justifications on why the Germans attacked London, thus in my opinion, proving not to be very valuable to a historian. However the fact Also the fact that it is one member & makes Pt unreliable as the Source is blased. Overall. | believe Source & E &s most valuable to a historian investigating the government's attitudes as it shows the actions taken by the government during the Suppelin raid and is more reliable.



This response looks at what both of the sources show and examines how its nature can determine its value. It achieved a Level 3 mark.



Make sure you focus on the question set, making use of both sources for content and nature.

Most candidates attempted this question, mainly achieving a high Level 2 or Level 3. Some candidates even achieved Level 4 by maintaining a sustained argument. Many answers simply focused on hatred caused by propaganda rather than focusing on the question set – whether propaganda persuaded people to support the war effort. Most candidates read 'supported the war effort' to mean simply men enlisting; some interpreted it further and mentioned the efforts of women, too.

The very few candidates who achieved only Level 1 (usually the top end) lacked linkage to the question. Many candidates achieved a good Level 3 by considering the extent to which propaganda increased people's determination. Candidates achieving this level often pointed out that although Source B was a propaganda poster aimed at gaining support for the war effort, the impact of it is not known.

Candidates generally quoted Source A, citing that propaganda was everywhere and the fact that Germans were referred to as 'swine' as supporting the statement to a large extent, as everybody at the time would read the newspapers to gain information. Some candidates used Source G to show that there were other factors. Some mixed their own knowledge into this, referring to the 'white feather campaign' or 'pals' battalions'. Those candidates who showed a sustained and sophisticated engagement with the topic, a clear focus on the question and a precise selection of only relevant information achieved Level 4.

A large number of candidates used some of their own knowledge. However, at times it was completely incorrect, mentioning rationing (not brought in until the end of WWI) and evacuation (only used in WWII). Some candidates used information from the sources (mainly Source G) and classed it as 'own knowledge' with no other 'own knowledge' being evident. Some stated the fact that conscription, which was finally introduced in 1916, showed that propaganda was not effective and the required number of soldiers could not be sustained.

Analysing the question, planning a response, reviewing the sources and adding in their own knowledge at appropriate points are all important steps towards success. A well-planned, succinct answer, covering $1\frac{1}{2}$ sides could attain Level 4 whereas a long, descriptive answer, using the same material, would remain at Level 2.

- Candidates need to leave themselves sufficient time to approach this question properly.
- Candidates **must** recognise that they need to use sources and their own knowledge for Q5.
- Candidates need to make sure they understand the hypothesis before they make a judgement on its accuracy.

*5 Study Sources A, B and G and use your own knowledge.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in this question.

'The role played by propaganda during the First World War was the most important factor in persuading people to support the war effort.'

How far do you agree with this statement? Use your own knowledge, Sources A, B and G and any other sources you find helpful to explain your answer.

(16)

believe that, astathoragen propaganda played a contributed to personale people to support role and effort," other factors were also equilad the war important in getting the public to support the war effort. Source A is an example of how propaganda persande people to join the war effort as the propaganda was in every national, and every local newspaper' creating a subliminal impact that the Germani were 'absolute swine' This would have personded people to support the war effort as they would want to contribute towards stopping it and destroying the 'evil's Source B is also suggestive that propaganda persaude people to support the war effort neiped as it shows two young children outside the rubble of a house, listing the numbers of women are children wounded or killed. This would have made people eager to assist with the war effort for two reasons; they would relate with the possibility of it happening to their

family and they would feel a sense of duty to protect the country's vulnerable people Source G suggests that propaganda was only a parhay factor in one person's decision, admitting that the irunours actors of atrocities' stirred him, but the other was a desire to be noticed by women and do something that would be percieved as 'brave' Common perception the young men was that joining the Armed Forces was an opportunity for a 'holiday', and the hardships that came with the war were often unexpected amongst those who had joined as their pals were going' and women were very keen on the war, Another example of propaganda that personded people to support the war effort was the White Feather Campaign. The White Feather was recognised as a symbol of cowardice, and those whe did not join up were viewed as cowards. This resulted in prophe joining the Armed Forces due to a desire net to appear weak or frightened To ton conclude, I think propagande played an important role in personding people to join the war effort as it made them consider what would happen if the German's weren't stopped,

or it made them feel by not joining up, they were a 'coward'. However, 1 do thinks the reality niave approach towards the yed a part in young men joining their contribution to the war effort examiner comment This is a solid Level 4 response that produces a sustained argument, making effective use of both sources and additional recalled knowledge (ARK). Result s a lis examiner tip Ensure that you leave enough time to do justice to a question that is now worth 19 marks. Make sure you use both sources and your own knowledge of the topic.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx



Further copies of this publication are available from Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467 Fax 01623 450481 Email <u>publication.orders@edexcel.com</u> Order Code UG034688 January 2013

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828 with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE



Llywodraeth Cymru Welsh Government

