

Examiners' Report

June 2013

GCSE History 5HB01 1C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2013

Publications Code UG036201

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

Introduction

This examination was taken by a small number of candidates and many answers showed good knowledge and also good examination technique. Where these were combined, there was a number of excellent answers. However, good knowledge alone, which is not shaped to answer the specific question, will usually be limited to a mark in Level 2. Where candidates have good technique, or good understanding of the issue but cannot support their comments with accurate and relevant detail, answers are likely to remain at level 1.

This is a *Study in Development* and covers approximately 600 years, therefore a sense of chronology is vital. Candidates need to be aware of the different periods in the specification so that they understand the nature of medieval warfare and do not talk about the use of guns, tanks or trenches. Many candidates seemed to have limited knowledge of events in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. They also needed to understand that 'the 19th century' refers to the period 1801-1900 (and does not cover the First World War). There was often good knowledge of modern warfare but it tended to be based on the Vietnam War. The importance of a good understanding of chronology has been made constantly in Principal Examiners' Reports, because these mistakes frequently result in candidates receiving no marks for an answer that has no relevant details.

Questions are likely to focus on change and continuity within the key themes in the core specification: the nature of warfare, the experiences of combatants and the various factors involved in change and continuity. However, questions may also be set on key individuals or events, so teachers should check the specification carefully and ensure that candidates have enough knowledge to answer questions thematically or in depth.

The stimulus material provided in Q3 and Q4, and in part (b) of Q5 and Q6, is intended to prompt candidates to cover the whole period in the question or to look at all aspects of the topic. If the stimulus material is included in the answer, it has to be used: there are no marks for repeating the information in a different way or for offering comments without supporting detail.

The rationale for an individual detail offered in a bullet point may be to point out that:

- not everything was the same
- the pace of change might have varied
- there were several causes or effects
- there were both positive and negative aspects.

However, it is not compulsory to use this material and if candidates do not see the relevance of it, they should not attempt to incorporate it into their answer. Better answers tried to construct a coherent response, rather than jumping from one bullet point to another.

The difference between Level 1 and Level 2 is that at Level 2, statements are developed. Either further detail is provided or the explanation of a comment is rooted in an accurate context, rather than being generalised. Many answers at Level 1 will make a relevant comment, or list relevant examples, but with little explanation or supporting details. Sometimes, the inclusion of such support would raise an answer to Level 3.

Many candidates want to write an introduction. This often takes the form of stating that they will answer the question, or of making unsupported claims that a development had 'a massive impact' or that something was important 'to an extent'. Candidates should be aware that they do not gain marks for these comments until they are supported with accurate and relevant details. It is understandable that teachers encourage an introduction as a way of focusing on the specific question, but an introduction that lasts over half a side is a waste of time.

The key to high-scoring answers is to analyse the question, rather than simply to provide information on the topic. A question about 'impact' is asking for an explanation of the effects of something – what changed and why was that important? A question asking how two periods were different, or who the most important person was, needs the comparison to be explicit. Too often, candidates produced a good answer to a different question, presumably one they had prepared in class; in most cases this resulted in low marks.

Different aspects of a topic are often treated separately at Level 3 but at Level 4, there should be a sense of a logical and structured argument. Planning is a crucial element here, either on paper or in the mind. A concise, well-planned answer will often score more highly than a long, detailed but unfocused answer.

Part (b) of Q5 and Q6 calls for sustained analysis and often requires evaluation for Level 4. This is more than simply repeating what has already been said or offering an opinion, such as declaring that the impact was 'massive' or things are 'somewhat different'. The judgement and criteria used need to be explicit, showing why differences are greater in extent, or more significant than similarities. Candidates should also show that one person's actions had a more long-lasting or wide-ranging impact than those of another.

Question 1

Most candidates were able easily to make an inference about change in the way the army provided food for the troops. The most common comments were about improved amounts of food or a better range of food, taken from Source B, whereas in Source A, soldiers complained about not being issued with bread. In Source B, there were also comments about food being provided in ready-prepared, convenient pouches, whereas in Source A, the soldiers had raw ingredients such as wheat and cattle but no facilities to cook meals.

However, the question required candidates to use the sources in combination and make an inference about change. Answers that simply juxtaposed comments about Source A and then Source B and stated that there had been a change, remained at Level 1. For the full four marks, the comment must make clear the nature or extent of change that is being inferred and show how the two sources supported that inference. Candidates sometimes failed to use both sources in their answer, or did not explain the change that was being inferred.

As always, in a large number of the scripts where candidates had taken extra paper, this was used for Q1. In most cases, this made no difference to their marks because candidates tended to use extra paper to add details from their own knowledge. The answer-booklet is designed with lines on only half of the page, and that is more space than candidates are expected to need.

1 What can you learn from Sources A and B about changes in the way the army provides food for the troops?

Explain your answer, using these sources.

(4)

In Source A they barely got any food, they had no bread for nine days but they were given wheat but they couldn't cook it. The soldiers in 1813 were ~~hardly~~ hardly fed. In Source B the soldiers are being fed daily and making sure they stay healthy.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This candidate has understood the change that has occurred in the provisioning of the troops but that change has not been identified in the answer. The answer only explains each source and therefore stays at Level 1.

Level 1



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Good answers tend to start with an explanation of the change that has been inferred and then support it with references to each of the sources.

- 1 What can you learn from Sources A and B about changes in the way the army provides food for the troops?

Explain your answer, using these sources.

(4)

Rationing and provision of food in 2009 had greatly improved since 1813. We can see this since in source A Private Wheeler describes the lack of food that was provided, whereas in source B, the picture clearly shows healthy looking soldiers eating rations. Also, we can infer that the transportation of rations has improved, since in 1813, cattle was taken with them for food, and in 2009, everything was provided in ration packs. This implies soldiers are getting better varieties of food, and more often than they were in 1813.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is a very clear identification of change here - that more food was provided and that it was better transported.

These inferences are supported with explicit references to both sources and therefore this answer is Level 2.

Level 2

Question 2

The option on Henry V was more popular than the option on Haig and was generally better-known.

Although some candidates confused the details of Agincourt with Hastings, Naseby or Waterloo, the majority of candidates were confident on this topic. Nearly all answers explained the importance of longbow archers, who were able to cover a greater range than crossbows and shoot at a much faster rate. Many answers included specific details about the rate of fire and the speed at which these arrows can travel.

More importantly, most answers also explained how the tactic of 'galling' provoked the French to attack in an undisciplined rush. It funnelled them into a narrow space, where they could be attacked by the archers from the side. Then, the bodies of fallen knights and horses would delay their attack, providing additional opportunities for the archers.

Good answers considered other aspects of Henry's strategy and tactics, such as placing the archers among the trees at the side (although some students thought this meant the archers had actually climbed the trees). Flanking attacks and the use of archers in hand-to-hand fighting, once the battle was underway, were also mentioned.

Some candidates explained how Henry's strategy in dealing with Harfleur impacted on this battle or how he used stakes in the ground to defend against a cavalry charge. Some answers challenged the importance of his strategy and identified an element of luck in the way the rain, and the French knights exercising their horses, made the ground muddy, which impeded their later charge.

In view of the fact that both the Battle of the Somme and Haig are named in the specification, candidates' knowledge was limited. Far too many did not know the details of Haig's strategy in this battle and simply described trench warfare. They also seemed to assume this battle lasted a single day.

Most candidates mentioned the preliminary bombardment and walking across No-man's Land but few could go beyond that. Good answers could explain how Haig's strategy of a bombardment to destroy German dug-outs and flatten the barbed wire, followed by a steady advance, was undermined by the high proportion of faulty shells and the quality of German dug-outs. Some candidates also pointed out that poor visibility affected the role of planes, and that tanks were used ineffectively.

A number of students described Haig's insistence on a walking advance and that he refused to adopt other tactics used by Rawlinson or the French tactic of 'rushing'. Often, he was condemned as too stupid or too arrogant to understand what was happening.

However, a small number of excellent answers discussed Haig's overall strategy. They understood the rationale for attrition and the context of the need to relieve the pressure on the French at Verdun. These students explained that Haig had been forced to go ahead with this battle despite changed circumstances. They observed that in the long term, Haig's tactics could be described as successful because the Germans had higher casualties, which they could ill-afford to lose and he forced the Germans to abandon their attack on Verdun.

2 The boxes below show two military commanders.

Choose **one** and explain how successful his strategy was in that battle.

(9)

Henry V in the Battle of Agincourt, 1415.

Haig in the Battle of the Somme, 1916.

In the battle of Agincourt Henry ~~the~~ V used successful strategies to win this battle. The first big strategy he took was here he set up his defence. Henry V's army was outnumbered, so to compensate for this he placed his men in a narrow corridor between two woods. The French cavalry could not go through the woods, meaning they were forced to go in between.

The largest factor which helped ~~the~~ Henry V win the battle was his longbow men and here he placed them. The long-bow men were placed in both sides of the woods and opened fire on the French army when they charged. The French cavalry attacked first and were destroyed by Henry's longbowmen.

After this the French infantry charged in. The infantry were slowed by the fallen bodies and the muddy floor. This made

them easy targets for the longbowmen. The front of the infantry tried to retreat whilst the back pushed forward. This tight squash meant that the French couldn't use their swords. During the confusion Henry ordered his archers & longbowmen to drop their bows and attack with their swords. The French infantry were consequently massacred. ~~Then~~ Henry's leadership had allowed for the British to overcome the larger army.

As well as his smart leadership Henry was helped by the weather and ~~French~~ the French mistakes. The ground on the battle field was muddy as the day before it had been raining. This slowed the French attack. Also the French cavalry practised ~~out~~ on the muddy ground, making it worse. ~~The~~ Also the French army should not have sent in their infantry whilst the ground was scatted with bodies and the ground was muddy.

Therefore the battle of Agincourt was won slightly by luck, but ultimately by Henry V and his smart strategy.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer is Level 3 because it explains several ways in which Henry V's strategy contributed to his victory at the Battle of Agincourt.

Level 3

2 The boxes below show two military commanders.

Choose **one** and explain how successful his strategy was in that battle.

(9)

Henry V in the Battle of Agincourt, 1415.

Haig in the Battle of the Somme, 1916. ✓

The battle of the Somme was one of the first examples of ~~the~~ new industry produced weapons being used on the battlefield. For instance the use of machine guns and heavy artillery fire changed the battlefield by making it larger and almost impossible for infantry to attack directly. This led to the battle of the Somme being a defensive battle.

Commander Haig used trench warfare as his primary ~~the~~ method of weakening enemy forces. A strategy ~~called~~ called attrition was used, which meant that Haig ordered his troops to use artillery fire constantly to wear down the enemy in ~~positions~~ their trenches. The method of using constant artillery fire was not very effective, but then Commander Haig gathered troops and sent them over the trenches to combat enemy forces. This strategy resulted of hundreds of thousands of troops being

killed by enemy fire and could be considered to be an example of a bad strategy in battle. However using attrition and going over the trenches was the only method which led to the war to progress and was helpful in reducing pressure on Verdun.

~~General~~ Commander Haig's strategy eventually overcame the enemy and the British won. It can be said that Commander Haig's strategy led to the death of around 600,000 men, the strategy of using attrition was the only way of breaking through enemy forces and was therefore successful.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is relatively little specific detail about the battle or Haig's strategy here, and the policy of attrition is not fully-explained.

Nevertheless, this answer does understand the overall context of this battle and assesses Haig's success in terms of the casualty rate and also the long-term strategy, so it reaches Level 3.

Level 3

Question 3

The number of candidates choosing Q3 and Q4 was fairly even.

Many answers were descriptive and failed to respond to the emphasis in the question on change. There were good descriptions of a medieval army, recognising that knights trained through events such as tournaments and jousts, whilst adult males were expected to practise archery in daily life, in order to provide a reserve force of trained archers.

It was also understood that mercenaries were expected to be trained soldiers but that there was little expectation of training or cohesion within the army overall. This was because many were only involved for 45 days and there was no provision of standard weapons.

Most candidates identified a change during the seventeenth century. Many based this on the bullet-point about the use of muskets, explaining that muskets required the soldiers to undergo training in the series of steps involved in firing and reloading. Some candidates also mentioned musketeers' training to co-ordinate with pikemen.

A number of answers made the good point that although the use of muskets required training, this could be done fairly quickly and easily, instead of the life-long training needed to use the longbow effectively. Other answers described the discipline imposed by Oliver Cromwell on his New Model Army and explained the changes to training with the establishment of a standing army.

However, few answers included an explanation of changes in training during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Although many candidates referred to Wellington's description of his army as 'the scum of the earth' (often simply calling them 'scum') they did not appreciate that:

- regular drilling helped to develop skill with standardised weapons
- drilling instilled discipline and obedience in such men
- training in set manoeuvres was necessary in a large army.

Common errors were:

- misunderstanding the question and thinking that training referred to being physically fit
- providing answers outside the time-scale such as training in the Roman army or modern army
- writing more generally about welfare and medical care.

Answers also tended to be a series of paragraphs, each on a separate change, rather than a coherent explanation of change over time.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 3

Question 4

In the 15th century armies consisted of feudal levies and mercenaries who brought their own equipment and did not have uniforms. Since there was no mass production of weapons, drills could not be properly taught so training mainly ~~just~~ consisted of mercenaries ~~teaching~~ teaching each other what they knew. Although by the 17th century, Cromwell introduced basic uniforms and discipline and training to his Ironsides, paving the way for future training and disciplinary techniques. These really only came along when firearms were introduced to the battlefield since they needed training and discipline to be used effectively.

Serious training ~~came~~ arrived in the 18th century with the start of mass production of weapons which allowed every soldier to have decent-quality model weapons which allowed training to become more

Advanced with techniques such as firing by rank and arranging soldiers into infantry squares. But these disciplines could only come into being with the introduction of the regimental system which by giving soldiers a sense of regimental pride, allowed very advanced training to be taught other than the basic 'charge' and 'retreat' used in the medieval ages.

In conclusion military training advanced with first of all the introduction of the firearm, then Cromwell's uniforms and discipline, then finally the mass production of weapons and uniforms as well as the regimental system.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer makes a number of valid points and the candidate seems to have understood the point of the question.

However, the comments made are not developed with much supporting detail. The answer treats each point separately, with little sense of overall change until the final paragraph, so it is Level 2.

Level 2

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 3

Question 4

In the middle ages, an army was often made up of mercenaries and peasants, who were often ~~not~~ undisciplined, and brought their own equipment. This made for cheap and large armies, but often it meant they were uncoordinated, as their level of skill was dictated by their own training (Longbow men, for example, were often ~~not~~ made to train by their parents, and took a long time to train up.)

This changed in the 17th century, in which firearms had come into military circulation: they required little training for. It was around this time Cromwell began to implement discipline into his armies: He would teach them drills, and then punish those who didn't comply. This saw the birth of a more disciplined army, something nobody had done until the events of the English

civil war.

By the 18th century discipline had become common place in the military.

Regimentation followed soon after, and revolutionized the functionality and coordination of the army.

It was also around this time that fire arms were making cavalry obsolete, as guns and artillery were further developing, ~~and~~ leading to a bigger focus on gunmen in the army. Drills were also common place.

Wellington once described British troops as the 'Scum of the earth', because they were often criminals and drunks who saw the army as an ideal choice over execution.

As such, punishments were harsher:

Floggings and beatings were common place for people who misbehaved, and as a result, the men were far better disciplined, allowing them to ~~for~~ form formations like the 'thin red line'.

In the later 19th century, after the events of the Crimean War, officers were no longer able to buy their commissions, and a better quality of leadership was the result. Soldiers were better trained, and officers were selected due to their skills.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer is Level 3 because it has a sense of on-going change in training throughout the whole of the period in the question.

It also locates each example securely in context.

Level 3

Question 4

Answers here also tended to be descriptive. Many candidates wrote about the use of new technology or about new tactics, describing the use of muskets or the use of 'infantry squares' at Waterloo. However, they could not move into Level 3 until the link between these two aspects was made explicit.

This was most commonly done by explaining that musketeers needed protection whilst they reloaded and therefore were usually drawn up in lines, mingled with pikemen. Some answers explained why a line formation was better than a column and related this to the use of volley fire. A number explained how the 'infantry squares' at Waterloo was a good use of tactics because they broke up a cavalry charge and could fire in all directions.

However, few candidates made good use of the last bullet point. This was a reminder that defensive tactics needed to be adapted in the face of the development of heavy artillery. Some candidates seemed to think that the use of trenches was an offensive tactic.

Most answers were based on the bullet points, although some used the example of the *Charge of the Light Brigade* to explain that the development of gunpowder and heavy artillery made the use of cavalry redundant. Answers also tended to be a series of paragraphs, each on a separate change, rather than a coherent explanation of change over time.

'Prepared' answers on the role of technology usually included developments in transport and communications. Only a very few answers related these to changes in strategy and tactics, by explaining that reinforcements were readily available and therefore large scale attacks could be sustained. There was also a number of answers that included examples from the twentieth century – these could not be credited.

Far too often, the answer was a description of new technology, accompanied by general comments that technology led to changes in tactics and strategy. The understanding that this question was about the link between such changes tended to be the discriminator between Levels 2 and 3.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Technology caused massive change in the way battles were fought.

For example, in ^{the} 1600's, muskets were in full use. This had changed warfare in several ways. For example, instead of battles being mainly melee with 'fire support' from rear positioned archers, firing lines (a new tactic) were formed at the front of battle fields, alongside melee 'protection' weapons, to prevent musketeers from being overwhelmed by cavalry. This new weapon also caused a decline in cavalry due to their being easily killed by muskets.

However, muskets did actually help improve cavalry before their 'demise', as with the invention of pre-loadable flintlock muskets, cavalry (or dragoons) could now carry pre-loaded pistols to give them a bit more of an edge in battle, as seen in the English Civil War. This was introduced so that cavalry could now attack ~~with~~ at a limited range, rather than just in melee, to give them a chance against musketeers.

By the ~~17~~ 1800's, rifling in rifles (no longer muskets)

enabled for even longer range warfare, which also more than 'killed' the ~~use~~ use of cavalry as now rifles could fire hundreds of metres/yards and be accurate, instead of relatively medium range of muskets. This was a step towards trench warfare, as a method of protecting troops from fire was needed.

However, by the 1850's, heavy artillery was 'back' and more destructive than before due to the ~~Industrial~~ ^{Industrial} revolution. This made trench warfare necessary, as otherwise troops would be slaughtered either by cannon fire, rifle fire or newly invented 'machine gun-cannon fire', or 'Gatling Guns' as they were referred to. This created a new type of warfare, a war of attrition, where the armies attack each other from afar in trenches in order to ~~wear~~ wear one another down into surrender. This method was used in ~~the~~ throughout the Crimean war and post 1850 into WW1. These changes were necessary to protect the troops.

In summary, changes to tactics were brought about to either counter, or protect troops from new and destructive technology.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response has a very clear focus on the question.

The links between changes in technology and tactics, such as the use of dragoons or the development of trench-warfare, are well-explained.

The answer also distinguishes between offensive and defensive tactics.

Level 3

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 3

Question 4

Technology was a main factor that led to the changes in strategy and Tactics in the period 1600-1900.

Changes in technology was things such as weaponry. Along with 1600's, weapons such as Muskets were used. The first use of Muskets was the 'Matchlock Musket' in the Battle of Naseby. These Muskets had their advantages and disadvantages. Muskets took a long time to reload so they were fired in the method of 'Volley Fires'. This is a strategy they used in War to give other soldiers time to reload in time before the soldiers behind need to reload. The Muskets had it's disadvantages such as it didn't work as well in conditions such as rain because it could not ignite flame to react the gunpowder. This is why a strategy such as 'Volley Fire' was used.

Moving on, the weaponry also advanced as well as tactics. As the weapon got better such as 'gases, shelling' etc, it ~~caused more~~ afflicted more injuries to the soldiers and the loss of troops would lose them the battle with a very bad loss.

During Waterloo, Wellington changed his tactics to making his troops lie under a ridge or hide in some sort of trench to avoid getting hit by bombs etc. The bombardment would just sail right above their heads. This was a strategy used by the Duke of Wellington to reduce the deaths of his troops with the advanced weaponry / technology they had.

As cannons became much more of use, Wellington used them in a new tactic of infantry squares, placing them on the corners of the infantry squares to succeed in a higher rate of kills. This method and strategy of infantry squares was more effective than infantry lines and also the use of cannons in the infantry squares used at Waterloo.

The introduction of new fire arms such as the 'Rifle' had advantages in which it had a longer and better range so enemies could be killed from a large distance. This also changed the layout of the strategy and tactics used by the leaders to make this new technology more effective. Troops with Rifles were spread further apart to increase the killing rate of their enemy and

make the most of it's advantages. The strategy and tactics had to change to get and gain maximum advantage of the technology

This had to be done in order to suit the technology's need during the time period of 1600-1900.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer makes some good points and includes some good detail.

There is little sense of a chronological overview: for example no context is given for the discussion of the rifle.

The description of the musket is good but the link with changes in tactics is not explained - 'a strategy such as volley fire was used'.

This means that the answer remains at Level 2 because it provides information but does not show how that information answers this question.

Level 2

Question 5

Question 5(a)

A small number of candidates answered this question. It was pleasing to see a greater knowledge of the Siege of Acre than the previous time a question was set on Richard I. Practically all candidates mentioned his offer of gold as a reward for soldiers who managed to remove a stone from the walls.

Many candidates also mentioned a ship's mast being used as a battering ram, siege towers, trebuchets and mines being used in attempts to breach the walls and the problems caused by the defenders' use of 'Greek Fire'. Some also explained Richard's problem of cutting off supplies, because Acre is on the coast, and his use of a naval blockade. However, a number of answers were just a general account of siege warfare.

To access Level 3, the answer needed to move from description of events to an explanation that linked Richard's problems with their solutions. Many identified the problems in very general terms, focusing on low morale, low food supplies and disease. There was little understanding that a crusade was different from feudal war, and therefore candidates tended to assert that Richard's soldiers all began to go home after 45 days.

The best answers could explain the problems involved in attacking a well-defended city with high walls, and showed that siege towers and scaling ladders were countered by Greek Fire. They then went on to explain Richard's solution of two siege engines to fracture the walls and a reward for those who removed stones from the walls.

Question 5(b)

The tactics of the Roman army and the events of Boudicca's revolt are favourite topics, which candidates know well. Many are also very confident on the events of the Battle of Hastings.

However, candidates did not always respond to the focus of the question.

A number described Roman tactics against Boudicca, followed by a description of Norman tactics at Hastings but only made any comparison at the end. Those who did this three paragraph approach were likely remain in Level 2 or at best low Level 3. Candidates who recognised the focus of the question and arranged their answer to identify similarities and differences, were much more likely to reach Levels 3 and 4.

At Level 3, candidates were confident on the differences but often did not discuss similarities. The best answers identified both similarities and differences, and then weighed the extent of the difference in order to reach a judgment. At this level, there were specific and accurate details about both the Roman and Norman tactics.

Unfortunately, a number of candidates either became confused or had insecure knowledge of the Battle of Hastings.

- Too many asserted that the Normans used longbows and explained why the range and speed of the longbow archer gave the Normans an advantage
- Many described the 'Norman shield wall'
- A few claimed that the Normans used muskets

Good answers found similarities in the use of 'ranged' weapons (spears and bows) and the formation of the army, including archers and cavalry. Differences usually focused on the:

- Roman use of formation in close-combat, whilst the Normans fought as individuals
- fact that Romans attacked from the sides and the rear whilst the terrain forced the Normans into a frontal attack.

There was also the assumption that the 'feigned retreat' was a tactic in regular use by the Normans.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number: Question 5 Question 6

(a) Richard I had to deal with many problems during the siege of Acre. Firstly he lacked effective means of invading the castle because the defenders' resolve was strong. The defenders shipped in supplies through rivers which went round the back. This meant Richard I was unable to starve out the ~~enemy~~^{enemy} effectively because they were being reinforced. This meant the defenders believed they could keep Richard out whilst being able to still eat and have plenty of supplies to keep the city working.

Another issue Richard I faced was that battering rams could be set on fire by flaming arrows and pouring boiling oil on attackers made it difficult to breach the castle's defences. Siege towers could also be set alight before they reached the walls and ladders could only send one man up at a time on top of the walls.

Finally Richard also faced the problem of being far away from home. In the holy lands reinforcements and supplies were scarce and the

((a) continued) strategy of starving out the defenders had the opposite effect in some instances with Richard's army already weakened.

Overall, I believe the resolve of the defenders was Richard's biggest obstacle because their efforts lead to both of the other two problems, and made it very difficult for Richard to deal with the problem. Richard used his siege equipment to incredible effect by using his superior tactics and numbers to overcome these odds and once within the walls easily took out the defenders.

This will have inspired his troops to believe in victory no matter what the odds of success. This army was clearly already a ^{very} massive well-trained force that was better equipped than the defenders army.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer has good coverage of Richard's problems but only briefly covers his solutions. This uneven coverage of the question limits the answer to low Level 3.

Level 3



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Where a question contains two elements - Richard's problems and how he dealt with them - the answer should provide balanced coverage of both.

(b) The tactics used by the Romans change throughout the battles.

On the one hand tactics changed from ~~the~~ Boudicca's revolt to the battle of Hastings as spears were carried by legionaries. Each legionary carried two spears during Boudicca's revolt as they were a key weapon amongst the Celts as a spear was a throwing weapon ~~which~~ which pierced the enemies with a fatal hit, this is when face to face battles ~~starting~~ started declining from battles. This shows change as spears were not a weapon used in the battle of Hastings and shows that tactics have changed from one battle to another.

Another way to show tactics changed within this period of time is that archers were a key weapon and tactic amongst the battle of Hastings, however, they were not used in Boudicca's revolt. In the battle of Hastings 2,000 archers were used carrying longbows that could fire arrows over 200 metres and pierce shields.

((b) continued) And armour killing most enemies during charge. By using this weapon it meant more deaths on the opposition side and more survivors on William of Normandy's side. As these arrows shot by trained specialists could fire up to 15 arrows a minute. This shows tactics changed as the Normans key weapon and most successful weapon to use was the longbow and archers as the first move. Whereas the Romans didn't have archers during Boudicca's revolt.

On the other hand, tactics did not change as cavalry was a main role in both battles. Cavalry was used in both battles to attack & retreating & men or carry out a surprise attack from the sides or rear like the Romans did in Boudicca's revolt. Horses were also used to trap and capture the other side as horses cover a lot more ground in a short space of time. William of Normandy also used his horses to carry out a sneak attack or 'fake retreat' on his opponents as it led them straight

((b) continued) INTO his trap. This shows tactics stayed the same as both battles used the role of cavalry for the same reason.

Overall, I think that tactics changed as spears and archers were not used in both battles showing that the popularity of using that tactic/weapon decreased and other more sufficient tactics took over. However, cavalry shows it didn't change over the period of time as they were used in both battle showing us that they were a big key role in battles.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer makes some valid points and includes accurate detail but it is not focused on the question.

The answer assesses change and continuity from the Battle of Watling Street to the Battle of Hastings. Despite the overlap between identifying change and identifying difference, the conclusion misses the focus of the question that was set, which keeps this at Level 3.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar are reasonably correct but there are some errors.

Level 3

+ 2 SPaG



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Candidates should always ensure they stay focused on the specific question that was set and that they do not digress into a prepared answer.

(b) On the one hand the Roman's tactics in Boudicca's Revolt and Normans in the Battle of Hastings were quite similar. This is because the Normans and the Romans both used a cavalry charge as their main attack, this meant that they both had similar ideas to how to confront the opponent, and shows that men on horseback were seen to have an advantage by both the Romans and the Normans.

Another reason they were similar is that the Romans attacked the Celts from the sides and the rear, this shows that the Romans were trying to send the ~~front~~ Celts forward, and ~~drive~~ ^{drive} them in the opposite direction. This is similar to the Norman tactic of the feigned retreat as they too were hoping to lead the enemy ^{inwards} ~~away~~ this time rather than away from them but the principal was still the same, therefore similar tactics were used by the Romans and Normans.

On the other hand, the Roman's tactics in Boudicca's Revolt and Normans in the Battle of Hastings were different. Aside from cavalry, William of Normandy had 2000 archers, whereas the Roman ^{infantry} ~~army~~ were equipped with long, sharp spears. This shows their tactics

((b) continued) were different because the Normans were aiming to target the enemy from at least ~~100~~ one hundred metres, however the Romans with their spears would need to be quite close for their weapons to be of any use. This shows that their tactics were different as when William of Normandy envisaged fighting from a distance, the Romans were fully prepared for close hand to hand combat.

Another reason that their tactics were different was because the Romans used their shields in unity. They used the wedge formation to trap the Celts and prevent them being able to swing their weapons making them useless and easily ~~killed~~ ^{killed}. However, the Normans shields were used only to protect individual soldiers, and were used as a line of defence rather than attack. This is different to the Romans who figured out to ~~attack~~ a way to attack the enemy by using their shields in a formation, whereas the Normans only thought to use cavalry as their main attack.

((b) continued) Overall, I think their tactics were mainly different. This is because, although their both their armies mainly consisted of cavalry, they used ~~their~~ it was not the cavalry that made a significant input in the outcome of the battle, but instead, the other tactics used such as the feigned retreat and the wedge formation. William's biggest success was managing to break Harold's shield wall by using the feigned retreat and the Romans biggest success was their use of the shield to create the wedge formation and the horned shield.

This would mean that their tactics were mainly different as they each had a different style of fighting. The Romans let the Celtic tribes come to them before slaughtering them and the Normans led them away before butchering them, so although the outcome of the battle were similar, different battle tactics were used to get ~~there~~ there.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer is well-organised, identifying similarities and then differences, before evaluating the nature or extent of the differences in order to reach a conclusion. It is Level 4.

Although there are occasional errors, the general standard of spelling, punctuation and grammar is good and the language and sentence structure are mature.

Level 4

+ 3 SPaG



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

An essay that is planned and has a structured organisation is likely to reach Level 3 or 4, as long as there is enough supporting detail.

Question 6

Question 6(a)

This was a more popular choice: a small number of candidates chose to write about the causes of war and they generally produced a high standard of answer.

The Boston Tea Party was well-known and usually described accurately but many candidates included a range of other key events. Although these events were in the 1760s, the context of the end of the Seven Years' War was often well-explained. Candidates showed why American colonists adopted a stance of 'No taxation without representation' and why the *Stamp Act* was imposed. A number of answers also mentioned the prohibition on expansion past the Allegheny Mountains. These events were used to explain why the Boston Tea Party happened and why it was such a definitive event.

Many answers also mentioned the *Intolerable Acts* and some included the Boston Massacre.

Question 6(b)

The causes of the First World War were generally well-known but some candidates did not link their knowledge with the reasons why Britain entered the war. Good candidates could explain that the Treaty of London obligated Britain to intervene when the Germans invaded Belgium, but less-able candidates found it difficult to make use of this bullet-point. Candidates should be reminded that the use of the stimulus material is not compulsory.

Britain's rivalry with Germany was well-known but far too many answers asserted that Germany launched the *Dreadnought*. Meanwhile, too few answers gave additional examples of this rivalry in terms of empire, the economy and weapons.

Many candidates could give a good explanation of the alliance system and the events following the assassination of Franz Ferdinand but did not focus on explaining why this led to Britain's involvement in the war. However, there was a number of very impressive answers at Level 4, which gave a well-planned analysis of the reasons why Britain entered the war, supported by precise and wide-ranging knowledge.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5

Question 6

(a) The American war of Independence was the war that saw American colonists trying to break free of British rule. There were many events, both long and short term that led to the war.

During the 1770s, a term arose in the colonies 'no taxation without representation', this came as a result of the stamp act, which taxed stamps and media such as newspapers. The American people ~~wanted~~ had no representation within Parliament, so they believed they should be exempt from this, they couldn't be taxed unless they were represented.

Britain told the colonists that they wanted to be paid for the protection that was provided, the colonists had nothing to fear, so they didn't want to pay for protection they didn't need. The colonists were told not to expand the colonies westward, as it would cause problems with the natives, and make trade to Britain a longer, harder process.

((a) continued) A tax was placed upon tea within America, which prompted the colonists to dump all the tea in Boston into the harbor in protest. This became known as the 'Boston Tea Party' and led to a group of laws known as the 'intolerable acts', which prohibited many of the things needed to live a comfortable, happy life, such as closing Boston's harbor, which stopped exports and made the people of Boston lose lots of money.

~~The~~ In 1776, the 'Declaration of Independence' was written, this is the backbone of America's constitution, and was the trigger that started the war of independence. It was written by America's founding fathers and ultimately led to the America that the world knows today.

(b) The first world war was triggered by events in Bosnia, the Austrian Archduke Franz Ferdinand was killed by the Black Hand Gang, in retaliation, Austria invaded Serbia. Russia, an enemy of Austria, ~~attacked~~ announced that they would fight to liberate Serbia. Austria was ~~also~~ allied with Germany in the Triple Alliance, as Germany joined in too, it planned to invade France, an ally of Russia, by going through Belgium. Britain had agreed to help Belgium if it was ever invaded so Britain joined in the war, the invasion of ~~the~~ Belgium was the trigger.

Prior to this, Britain had signed an agreement with France and Russia, forming a group called the 'Triple Entente'. This group was formed to protect each of the countries from the 'Triple Alliance'.

There was already bad blood between both Britain and Germany, at the time, Britain had a huge empire. Germany wanted an empire and the only way to get their 'place in the sun' as they called it, was to take ~~at~~ land from somewhere else. Germany was a relatively new country, while Britain's empire had been expanding

((b) continued)

for around 150 years, as Britain ~~was~~ owned such a huge empire it was the logical choice for Germany to want part of it, in Britain's mind at least. So Britain lived in fear of German attacks.

In addition to this, the British navy was the largest and strongest in the world, it was considered unbeatable. Over a period of time the Germans began to build up their own navy, as Britain was the strongest naval power in the world, it seemed obvious that this was to attack Britain's navy. Also, Germany attacked Belgium which isn't far from Britain's southern coast. ~~if~~ They could, have been considering an attack by sea.

As well as building up the navy in Germany, there was also a new type of ship made in competition between both nations. The Dreadnought was ~~an~~ an unmatched power at the time he first set sail in 1907. His German warship was matched by an equally strong British one, as the Dreadnought made the rest of the navy obsolete. Whoever had more

Dreadnought was the most powerful navy in the world.

The invasion of Belgium was the trigger for Britain's entrance into World War I. It caused this as in 1839, Britain had signed the 'Treaty of London' which made Britain swear to protect Belgium. However, Britain would have entered the war inevitably anyway, it was part of the triple Entente, and was scared of Germany anyway, war was inevitable for Britain, it was just a matter of time.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Part (a) has a good sense of context, showing how some events in the 1760s led up to the Boston Tea Party and the Intolerable Acts in the 1770s.

Level 3

In part (b), there is good coverage of Anglo-German rivalry, the arms race, the alliance system, Britain's commitment to Belgium and events following the assassination of Franz Ferdinand.

The final section evaluates the relative importance of these factors, making a judgement about the key reason why Britain entered the war.

Level 4

Spelling, punctuation and grammar are generally correct. Language and sentence structure are well-developed.

+ 3 SPaG

Paper Summary

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

Poor handwriting is an increasing problem and this is not simply on the final question. When marks are being awarded for spelling, punctuation and grammar, it is important that examiners can identify capital letters, commas, full stops and apostrophes, and correct spelling.

Spelling was often reasonably accurate although certain basic terms such as 'cavalry' and 'soldiers' were constantly misspelled. 'Definitely' was often misspelt as 'defiantly' and candidates should be made aware that 'ammo' is not a proper word.

Basic punctuation was usually accurate but apostrophes were frequently placed incorrectly and there were some very long sentences that lacked punctuation. A surprising number of candidates did not use capital letters for names; this was noticeable in all questions when the names of individuals or battles were not capitalised and in Q5 and Q6, when nationalities were often written in the lower case.

The most common grammar mistakes were 'must of' and 'he done' but there were also many casual and vernacular expressions such as 'majorly'.

It is also worth noting that simple language, used accurately, is much more effective than attempts to impress the examiner through vocabulary or metaphors.

Conclusion

Examiners commented on the impressive answers seen, demonstrating good understanding of the concepts involved and supported by precise and wide-ranging knowledge. Many candidates had clearly been very well-taught, both in terms of knowledge and in terms of examination skills. Other candidates had grasped certain key ideas or details but could not develop them in a way that answered the question.

The performance of candidates in this examination has highlighted the importance of the following:

- Clear understanding of chronology and of the key features of the period
- Recognition of differing rates of change or the parallel aspects of change and continuity
- Secure knowledge of events or individuals named in the specification
- Answering the specific question asked
- Analysing the question and planning a structured response

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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