

GCSE

Edexcel GCSE

History C (1336/3336)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication code: UG 016645

Summer 2005

advancing learning, changing lives

Examiners' Report

Edexcel GCSE
History C (1336/3336)

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2005

Publications Code: UG 016645

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2005

Contents

	Page no.
1. 1336 Paper 1 - Enquiry in Depth	1
2. A1 Britain c. 1815 - c.1850	3
3. B1 The American West c.1840 - c.1895	5
4. 3336 - Short Course (Question 8)	7
5. C1 Germany, c.1919 - c.1945	9
6. 3336 Short Course (Question 12)	13
7. P1 - Medicine	15
8. Q1 - Crime, Punishment and Protest	17
9. 21 - Medicine	19
10. 22 - Crime, Punishment and Protest	23
11. 1336/03 - Coursework	27
12. GCSE History Syllabus C Statistics - Summer 2005	31

1336 Paper 1 - Enquiry in Depth

General Comments

As always there was a varied response which included some excellent scripts. Candidates have become more familiar with the requirements of this syllabus and, on the whole, use the support provided and their time well. However, greater familiarity brings with it the danger of learnt responses. This year it was apparent that in some cases students are prepared for certain types of question for specific parts of the depth studies. When asked a variation on that, most are unable to cope, and try to answer the question they expected. This was apparent in A1 (Q1b), B1 (Q1ci), and C1 (Q3).

In all the options there remains a weakness over sequencing events and recognising distinct periods within the time studied. In A1 there was widespread confusion over the movement for parliamentary reform **before** 1832 and the movement for reform **after** 1832. In B1 many candidates were insecure on the sequence of events in the cattle industry. In C1 they were unclear of the differences in policy and activity of the Nazis **before** Hitler gained power and **after** he gained power.

Also, there are some administrative procedures which are not being followed and which delay the marking process. Centres are much better in copying scripts of students who answer both sections in one booklet, but this year there were a lot of misplaced scripts with the odd development study among the depth studies and vice versa. Redirecting these takes time. It would be a great help if all centres asked candidates to write the numbers of the questions they answer on the front of each booklet.

A1 Britain c. 1815 - c.1850

This option produced a wider range of scripts this year. Many candidates write well constructed answers, although there are a percentage who have clearly prepared a set of stock answers which they cannot successfully remodel to the requirements of the questions set here. Weaker candidates struggle with the terminology and dates. Some questions required knowledge of the 'mechanics' of change (1b and 2) which are clearly identified in the specification. However, these are poorly known by a significant number of candidates.

Question 1 (a)

- All candidates could access at least one source for information and the majority could reach L2 by explaining source A. Few candidates gained L3 as comments on Chartism were not tied to the sources.
- Candidates were confident in handling the charts in source A and recognised that the Chartists appealed to the greater number who remained disenfranchised.
- Source B presented problems. It was generally understood to express the wish of the Chartists to be equal to the rich. Very few drew inferences about an improved standard of living. A disappointing number were able to make the link to poverty and food prices.
- In general, source C was paraphrased. It could be linked to A and those gaining full marks concentrated on the wish for a right to have a say in government which would then lead to better conditions (source B)

Question 1 (b)

- Those who were secure in their knowledge of the Reform Act were able to score highly. The redistribution of candidates was explained well with a fair number stressing the representation of industry as important. A few drew on the information given in Source A to show the limits of change and the consequent growth of Chartism.
- Some answers provided examples of candidates who have prepared a different question- 'why did the electoral system need to be changed ' and then tried to answer this question with the same material. They could reach L2 but no higher.
- There were also candidates who confused the Reform Act with the Charter or the Poor Law Act. A worrying number believe that the secret ballot was introduced in 1832.

Question 1 (c i)

- This was markedly the less popular choice in (c).
- There is widespread knowledge of the conflict between moral and physical Chartists and this formed the basis of most answers. Support for physical action is offered more frequently than the peaceful methods. The petitions were not analysed apart from the forged names included.
- The consequences of the methods offered were well known.
- The strength of the government was only analysed by the strongest candidates.
- There is uncertainty as to the start of Chartism and examples were drawn from pre 1832. Frequent mention was made of Peterloo and the Swing Riots as Chartist actions.

Question 1 (c ii)

- This was the more popular option. It is a well prepared topic which enabled many candidates to show impressive knowledge in a well crafted essay, exploring a range of reasons for failure. The knowledge used included that used in Q1 (c i) but also covered the fluctuation of support, lack of middle class support, money, and the role of media and railways.
- Because candidates had confidence to answer this question, they sometimes wrote at excessive length at the expense of the essay question. It is possible to make points with more brevity as this example shows: *Unfortunately, one group had a violent tendency. They were the undoers of the Charter. Their infamy discouraged middle class support - so no money. It also meant that whenever the Chartists grouped together for a demonstration the Government would send in troops to keep the peace and sometimes arrest the leaders. Arresting the leaders meant the Chartists were leaderless for most of the time, so nothing would get done.*

Question 2

- This was only answered by a minority of candidates and very few answers could show accurate knowledge of the building of railways despite the fact that the specification for this unit includes 'the role of George Stephenson; Isambard Kingdom Brunel.'
- Some answers were based on an awareness of the work for which Brunel or Stephenson were responsible and could describe the Battle of the Gauges. Better answers compared the importance of both engineers, of the navvies and the contractors but lacked secure support.
- The scaffolding given was not well used. The London - Bristol line was not always recognised as the Great Western and the broad and narrow gauge were often wrongly attributed.
- Overall a disappointing response. Railways are a popular topic but reasons and results are better known. Own knowledge is poor on the facts of building.

Question 3

- By far the more popular of the essay questions.
- There was a wide range of responses including some L4 answers.
- The problems of establishing the system in the north were widely known, although they were described with varying degrees of success. The reasons for its acceptance in the south were often implicit or tentative.
- Once again, the specific terms of the PLAA were not widely known. Those candidates who were confident of its content could achieve a sound L2. Once the principles of uniformity and less eligibility were established the candidate could begin to consider these and move up into L3.
- There were some strong candidates who considered the geographical or political problems experienced. The bullet point on the Andover Scandal encouraged some to consider the inadequacies of the Poor Law Commissioners in dealing with national system and with each other.
- Middle of the range answers could draw on their knowledge of the Old system and of workhouses.

It was disappointing that a significant minority did not know the terms of the Act and had a contemporary understanding of 'less eligibility' as meaning that fewer people were able to receive relief.

B1 The American West c.1840 - c.1895

There was a wide range of responses showing improvement in the ability to structure answers. Knowledge was an issue, however, which affected the ability of some candidates to perform well.

Question 1 (a)

- Generally answered well with the sources suitable for comparing or combining. A pleasing number noted the contrasts between A(fighters, guns)and C (law abiding),and the differences between A(enjoyment) and B(hard lonely work)
- Almost all candidates could reach L2 by drawing inferences from A and/or B. A common inference was that A gave the stereotypical image of a cowboy, and this could easily be supported.
- Source C presented some problems. Some thought it showed that 'cowboys got away with it' but some were analytical, suggesting that the introduction of gun laws inferred previously high levels of violence.
- It is noticeable that candidates are increasingly using the sources as a stimulus for own knowledge or are debating their reliability. Neither is required and will not earn marks. The target for this question is comprehension and inference.

Question 1 (b)

- This was either answered very well or very poorly suggesting variations in the coverage of this part of the syllabus.
- Those who scored well could identify the end of the Civil War, the numbers of cattle in Texas and the specific markets with knowledge of the demand from soldiers, Indian reservations and the railway workers as well as from the eastern cities. Abilene was also named by many.
- There was confusion of the cattle men with McCoy being the most popular. He was credited with all successful decisions.
- There was also great confusion about the geography of the USA with cattle going in all directions. Some weak candidates misread the question and had cattle being driven to Texas.
- Problems of terminology were apparent in this answer with inexact uses of cattle/buffalo, cowboy and rancher. There was no universal understanding of the term 'Cattle Drives' which some candidates clearly visualise as laid surfaces.

Question 1 (c i)

- It has been usual to have a question on settlement in this option. It is worrying therefore that on this occasion it was not always understood. It suggests that settlement of the Plains is only considered in terms of homesteaders, and thus weaker candidates were unable to look at settlement from the viewpoint of another group.
- Few candidates detailed the decision to move onto the Plains, preferring to consider the effects of the Cattle Drives on those already there.
- Some answers tried to focus on conflict with the Indian tribes and it would appear that they read 'the Plains' in the question as 'the Plains Indians'.
- More candidates knew of the conflict with the homesteaders and the eventual need for barbed wire.
- The best answers considered the precedent set by the cattle ranchers and the number of people thus drawn to the Plains with particular emphasis on the growth of cattle towns (and railways).
- The contribution of John Iliff is not well known.

Question 1 (cii)

- This question generally produced better answers than (c i), and those who had knowledge of this topic scored highly.
- There were candidates who 'told the story' of cattle ranching here starting with the cattle drives.
- Others produced unbalanced answers devoting their time to the 'boom' period.
- However, many reached L3 by demonstrating changes. Of these the technological reasons were more often cited - barbed wire, wind pumps, railways and refrigeration. However, there were some answers which were specific on the bad winters, new breeds and changing tastes.

Question 2

- This was the more popular choice of essay by a long way. It produced many L3 but fewer L4 answers., This is because candidates were not making a judgement on the basis of 'how important'
- There was widespread understanding of the 'traditional life' of the Indians and good knowledge was demonstrated of Indian attitudes to land and buffalo.
- Those who looked beyond the railways considered other factors such as the government, broken treaties, and manifest destiny. Strongest candidates were able to argue that the railroad speeded up changes that were already taking place due to government policy towards the Indians. This put the railway into a good time context. They talked of '*many life changing events involving the Plains Indians before the trans continental railway was completed in 1869*', or '*the railway was important in that it acted as a catalyst for change.*'
- Candidates who used and expanded on the bullet points were able to reach top L2.
- At the lower end candidates either wrote about the advantages of railways to the plains or outlined the conflict with the Indians - reworking last year's questions.
- There were a worrying number of answers which stated that the railway was a great benefit to the Indians as it allowed them to travel and trade. These were applying a learnt response on the benefits of the railway from another study.
- Some thought that a buffalo 'hide' was a type of live animal which led to misunderstanding of the statement.

Question 3

- Fewer candidates chose this question and fewer still had relevant knowledge, indicating that the weaker candidates were attracted to the topic.
- Many answers could not beyond a description of 'a woman' work on the plains. There was uncertainty in some answers as to whether white women or Indian women were being described.
- Answers were general, making heavy use of the stimulus provided, and lacked supporting detail. Therefore few achieved beyond L2.
- Many candidates assumed married women were able to earn some money for their families on the Plains by going out to work. They are unaware that teachers would be single women.
- However, there were some centres where candidates were familiar with the topic and produced good answers concentrating on the 'civilising' effect of women - showing a good sense of life in the Plains and in the mining towns before and after the arrival of women.

Eg '*Women were the ones who wanted law, order and community where they lived. These women soon got their way when schools, churches and other central buildings were built. This began the recruitment of women teachers in 1845 which attracted more women to the west, as many jobs were available and teaching was a 'woman's job'.*

3336 Short Course (Question 8)

- This question was the second choice - chosen by slightly more candidates than Q7. (Almost all answered Q6)
- Those who chose this had good knowledge of Brigham Young and could include relevant detail.
- The bullet points were well used by many to hold to the question.
- Some weaker candidates concentrated on the early history of the Mormons or the move west.
- Few, however, responded to the 'how important' by making a judgement against other factors.

C1 Germany, c.1919 - c.1945

With the exception of Question 1 (a) (please see below), the exam worked well for most candidates, & the wide range in the quality of their answers suggests that differentiation was successfully achieved.

Question 1 (a)

Responses to this question presented various difficulties:

- Though some students were able to score Level 2; 4 marks, using the Sources to comprehend & infer, many candidates used the Sources to explain the reactions of the German people to the Weimar Government, rather than to the Treaty of Versailles - it was to the latter that the question was directed.
- On the other hand, some candidates included a great deal of their own knowledge, especially details of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles - an error that might have been avoided if they had read *all* the questions before beginning to write, & thus realised that Question 1(b) would be inviting them to consider the clauses of the Treaty in some detail.
- Some candidates wasted valuable time by seeking to evaluate the 3 Sources in terms of their reliability - such comments could not be rewarded because they had not been asked for.
- Few candidates achieved Level 3 5 marks because, if attempted, their cross-referencing between & synthesis of the Sources was not clearly supported. To do so required using Source C which they found difficult, -not using the references to army and troops in A and C.

Question 1 (b)

This question was generally done quite well as most candidates are confident with this topic.

- Most students could identify some of the key clauses of the Treaty of Versailles, and the better ones could work out exactly why the Germans found these clauses so offensive.
- However there were a lot of "deficit Level 3s" on this question. This was because some perfectly legitimate arguments were not fully developed, e.g. an assertion that "a reduction in the armed forces meant that Germany felt vulnerable" was not supported by an explanation explaining "vulnerable" to what, from whom and why. Similarly, a statement that "They bitterly resented their loss of territory" was often not supported with precise examples.
- A significant minority of candidates mistakenly believed that Germany lost the Rhineland.

Question 1c (i)

This was generally the more popular choice of the 1c questions.

- There were a lot of answers based on simple but accurate understanding of the term hyperinflation: '*money became worthless; prices rose; the government kept printing more money.*'
- Problems arose with detailing the context for this. Weaker answers made an over-simple link between reparations payments & the German Government's printing of banknotes, assuming that the Allies accepted reparations payments in German paper money
- To get into Level 3 the candidates had to link hyperinflation to the problems caused by the Treaty of Versailles & the reparations burden, leading on to the events of 1923 with the invasion of the Ruhr, the consequent passive resistance, & how & why the Government kept paying the workers on strike.
- Many responses still put forward the mistaken belief that hyperinflation was caused by the Wall Street Crash.
- When students went on to describe the impact of hyperinflation (not strictly required) it was pleasing to read answers which showed how hyperinflation affected the middle classes more than the workers or the very rich.

Question 1c (ii)

Those who chose this option did so because they had knowledge and therefore there were a number of strong answers.

- Some students demonstrated an impressive command of the various measures, both economic & diplomatic, introduced by Stresemann. In many instances, however, such answers did not fulfil their potential because they only *described* these measures, rather than going on to explain *how* they helped the Weimar republic to survive during the period 1924-29. For example only a minority of answers explained how the Dawes Plan helped to bring stability to Germany.
- Also, though it could make an excellent concluding remark to comment upon the fragility of the recovery, it was an unwise use of time to devote a significant portion of the answer to this aspect.
- Fortunately for the candidates, no marks were reserved for the correct spelling of Stresemann.

Question 2

This was the less popular of the essay questions.

- The weaker candidates confined their answers to the bullet points provided, or (rather better) they only made general statements about Hitler's popularity (promised to make Germany great again - a powerful speaker - good propaganda etc.).
- The stronger answers went further than this & showed how events during the period 1929-32 gave a significant opportunity to the Nazis, & demonstrating how they exploited the dire situation. These were able to develop arguments based on the consequences of the Wall Street Crash to Germany.
- However some analytical answers could not be fully rewarded because they did not fully explain the relevant factors e.g. an assertion that "the Nazis appealed to all sections of German society" needed to be followed through with an explanation of precisely *how* the Nazi promises achieved this & what the consequences were. Few candidates could provide specific promises to win the support of named groups of society.

- To their disadvantage, some candidates' answers went beyond 1932, or they seemed to assume, when explaining the role of propaganda, that the Nazis were already in a position to close down all non-Nazi sources of information & control the school curriculum etc.

Question 3

This was the more popular essay, perhaps because the bullet points attracted the weaker candidates.

- However, they did not go much beyond the bullet points provided. Also many candidates' responses would have benefited from a more careful reading of the question & organisation of the answer so as to ensure that the material was fully & explicitly "on target".
- Many answers simply *described* what the Nazis did, without going on to demonstrate *how* their policies & practices helped to maintain them in power. Access to Level 3 or Level 4 could only be achieved by the latter approach, "shaping" the information to the requirements of the question.
- There were many general descriptions of life in Nazi Germany, often dealing with young people, women or the persecution of the Jews without focusing on the question set.
- Some students overlooked the question's request to deal with the situation in Germany "after 1933", & this meant that even well-developed examination of the role of events of 1933, like the Reichstag Fire, the Emergency Decree, etc. in **gaining power**, could only achieve bottom Level 2.
- There were candidates who used the events of 1933 successfully to support their arguments on fear (if the Nazis were willing to kill their friends in the 'Night of the Long Knives', what might they do to their enemies) and on control (the uses made of the Enabling Act).
- A surprisingly large number of students incorrectly claimed that the fall in unemployment numbers was solely due to the sacking of Jews from their jobs & their replacement with Germans, and to the dismissal of women from their jobs & their replacement with men (with the consequent exclusion of Jews & women from the unemployment statistics). All of these, while true, would only partly explain the fall in unemployment.
- On the other hand, many candidates did base their answers upon a "carrot & stick" approach, showing good knowledge of the work of Goebbels, & of the work of the S.S. and Gestapo. Balanced answers scored highly.

3336 Short Course (Question 12)

It was pleasing to see scripts of a good quality, indicating that this course is being taken by all abilities and has a role to play in schools where the curriculum is overcrowded.

- This was a popular question and the content is generally well known. It produced some very good answers.
- The purpose of education under the Nazis was apparent to most candidates, and many could articulate the link between brainwashing young people /future support for the Nazis/obedience.
- Many candidates were also able to explain why boys/girls had a different curriculum, and indeed, went into great depth re the content of the curriculum.
- The other two bullet points were not well used, or expanded upon fully.
- Some weak candidates were drawn into descriptions of anti-Semitism in education.
- Pleasingly, few candidates included details of the Hitler Youth, which indicates that there is more precision in the teaching of education and youth groups.

1336 Paper 1 - Study in development

P1 Medicine

The examination seemed to be accessible to most candidates and to differentiate successfully across the range of ability. Few candidates seemed to run out of time and there were a number of excellent answers to the extension units. However, it was noticeable that failure to analyse the question sometimes caused candidates to penalise themselves when the material they offered did not relate to the question asked. There were also a couple of “black holes” where knowledge seemed to be very limited.

Question 4 (a)

Most candidates recognised the Gillray cartoon and were able to show that people’s fears about the effects of vaccination were a reason why the practice was not widely accepted. However, many students found the graph difficult to interpret, often stating that the death rate rose to 300 million as a result of vaccinations. Those who understood the graph, tended to see the crucial role of the government in enforcing vaccination, which they were able to link with source F. It was also pleasing to see that a few candidates noted that source F referred to diphtheria and therefore the government campaign had widened acceptance of the whole immunisation technique.

For many candidates this was a relatively easy 5 marks, although some wrote much more than was necessary. Unfortunately, some candidates penalised themselves because they did not refer to the sources in their answer or they embarked on a detailed account of the work of Jenner and Lady Montague. It is worth noting that the question phrasing “What can you learn from these sources.” targets comprehension and inference and does not require additional own knowledge.

Question (4b)

Many candidates failed to do themselves justice here because they did not read the question carefully. Answers which explained the Four Humours and which were based on Hippocrates and Galen were unlikely to move beyond Level 1. Answers which recognised that the question was about the treatment of illness and the continuing importance of the Four Humours usually reached Level 2 but it was only those candidates who noted the dates in the question who reached Level 3.

Question (4c)

There were a number of excellent answers to this question, showing the greater intervention of the government, legislation leading to improved sanitation, government involvement in preventive medicine, etc. Many candidates clearly knew this topic well. However, some had difficulty shaping their knowledge to the question and tended to explain why the government role changed rather than assessing how far it changed. It was also disappointing to see that a number of candidates remained with the source material and offered nothing from their own knowledge. The instruction to “Use the sources and your own knowledge” means that marks have been specifically allocated for the introduction of extra material and candidates who fail to do this, automatically limit the marks available to them.

Question 5

This was a very popular question and most candidates could offer detailed knowledge about Ancient Greek medicine. Many candidates identified different aspects as “rational” or “supernatural” but these answers stayed in Level 2 unless there was an explanation of why something should be regarded as rational or not. There were a number of excellent answers which discussed both rational and supernatural features of Greek medicine and weighed these elements to reach an overall conclusion. It was also pleasing to see well argued answers which showed that elements we would consider irrational were perfectly rational by the Greeks’ terms of reference.

Question 6

This question was rarely attempted and answers were usually awarded very few marks. Florence Nightingale’s work in the Crimea was well known but there were few details about her role in training nurses and Elizabeth Garret Anderson seemed to be unknown.

Question 7

This was the most popular question and candidates generally had good knowledge of the problems of 19th century surgery and the developments of antiseptics and anaesthetics. There were some well argued answers at both Level 3, usually concentrating on one aspect of the question, and at Level 4, offering a well thought out comparison. The general feeling was that “The introduction of anaesthetics made surgery more comfortable for the patient but it was antiseptics which made it safer”. A few candidates wanted to give a prepared answer which included the work of Paré or discussed blood transfusions but most candidates responded well to this question.

Quality of Written Communication

Although most answers were easily understood, candidates should be reminded that poor grammar, such as “would of”, and poor spelling and punctuation, can affect their mark. In question 4(a) the use of “except” for “accept” could actually change the meaning of the candidate’s answer. There also seemed to be a number of candidates who were confused between “has” and “as”; this sometimes made their answer difficult to understand.

There were far fewer cases of examiners receiving the wrong answer booklet but centres are asked to ensure that **all** candidates write the numbers of the questions answered clearly on the front cover of the answer booklets.

Q1 Crime, Punishment and Protest

The examination seemed to be accessible to most candidates and to differentiate successfully across the range of ability. Few candidates seemed to run out of time and there were a number of excellent answers to the extension units. However, it was noticeable that failure to analyse the question sometimes caused candidates to penalise themselves when the material they offered did not relate to the question asked. There were also a couple of “black holes” where knowledge seemed to be very limited.

Question 4 (a)

This was a relatively easy 5 marks for many candidates who were able to point out the changing nature and purpose of punishment, from deterrence to reform. Some candidates did not read the question carefully and discussed changing reactions to begging while others penalised themselves by writing generally instead of referring to the sources, or by providing a description of the Bloody Code. It is worth noting that the question phrasing “What can you learn from these sources.” targets comprehension and inference and does not require additional own knowledge.

Question 4 (b)

It was disappointing to see that the work of John Howard was not better known since he is one of the 2 individuals named in the specification. However, it was noted that one of the major textbooks did not give much detail specifically on Howard and the Mark Scheme allowed candidates with good knowledge of prison reform to score highly. Nevertheless, many were confused about the chronology of prison reform, believing that the separate / silent system, treadmill etc were either stopped or introduced by Howard.

Question 4 (c)

Some candidates gave detailed comparisons of the work of the police in the 19th and 20th centuries and were able to show the expanding role and changing nature of their work. Unfortunately some candidates did not take note of the date in the question and wrote about the Bow St. Runners and earlier systems. . It was also disappointing to see that a number of candidates remained with the source material and offered nothing from their own knowledge. In previous years candidates have displayed good knowledge of the use of technology by the police and the changing nature of police work in response to the changing nature of crimes. Although these points were mentioned by a number of candidates, few provided any exemplification beyond a reference to fingerprints and the bomb squad, both mentioned in the sources. The instruction to “Use the sources and your own knowledge” means that marks have been specifically allocated for the introduction of extra material and candidates who fail to do this, automatically limit the marks available to them.

Question 5

There was a marked increase in the number of students answering this question and the level of knowledge displayed was very pleasing. Not all that knowledge could be focused to assess the role of the government but those who could do so usually gained high marks. It was particularly pleasing to read discriminating answers which differentiated between the government role in legislation, law enforcement and dealing with public order.

Question 6

This was a popular question but candidates tended to focus on Kett's rebellion or the General Strike rather than making a comparison. Many gave detailed accounts of what happened, which remained at Level 2, but a number were able to explain how contextual factors shaped the responses of the authorities and gained Level 3 or 4. However, a number of students believed that the government owned the mines and that the General Strike was a success, with the government giving in to all demands.

Question 7

This was still the most popular question but the difference between the numbers answering this and questions 5 and 6 is not as overwhelming as it was previously.

On the whole, candidates were well prepared and had detailed knowledge of the treatment of Conscientious Objectors in the 1st World War. Their treatment in the 2nd World War was usually less well known but a number of good reasons for the changed treatment were offered, eg. "If the government forced people to war then surely it was on a path to becoming a Nazi government".

Quality of Written Communication

Although most answers were easily understood, candidates should be reminded that poor grammar, such as "would of", and poor spelling and punctuation, can affect their mark. In question 4c there were a number of interesting spellings of "nowadays" and there also seemed to be a number of students who were confused between "has" and "as"; this sometimes made their answer difficult to understand.

There were far fewer cases of examiners receiving the wrong answer booklet but centres are asked to ensure that all candidates write the numbers of the questions answered clearly on the front cover of the answer booklets.

1336 Paper 2

Paper 21 Medicine

This year's enquiry focused on the significance of William Harvey's work and also allowed candidates to explore attitudes to change at the time and the role of the royal society. The format of the paper presented to candidates had changed in order to allow online marking. Examiners recognised that the timing of the notification to schools meant that many history teachers had not had the opportunity to prepare candidates for the implications of this new format. It was obvious from the rushed appearance of later answers that some candidates spent too long on the early questions in an attempt to fill the space provided. This was taken into account during the awarding process.

When preparing candidates for the 2006 examination, it will be helpful for them to be told that examiners do not expect them to use all the lines provided. Questions 1-7 will be given a double page spread and this will also make it easier for candidates to see at a glance the mark weighting for the question. The last question will be given three pages.

Question 1

This provided an easy first question, with many candidates gaining the full 4 marks. A number of inferences were made: that Harvey was curious, determined, methodical, obsessive, humble, caring etc. Most commonly, the reference to refusing a knighthood was used to claim that he was modest, and the dissection of the parrot was used both to claim that he was callous and caring. The most effectively supported inference, using sources in combination, was that Harvey was curious, or had an investigative bent. A small minority lost marks because they did not use the sources and wrote about Harvey generally or did not support their inferences from the sources. Quite a high proportion of candidates required an extra sheet for this question and really devoted too much time and space to it. Good practice for future examinations would involve the making of one developed inference with explicit support from two sources.

Question 2

Some candidates tended to answer this question with a very list-like approach. Many candidates acknowledged the role of the printing press yet some used this as an example of how he spread his ideas, rather than as part of a process of discovery. Many knew the factors that had helped Harvey but could not explain how they helped him in his discovery of the circulation of the blood. Some responses were appropriate but narrow, focused on the role of Harvey as an individual and his education. The best answers could also place Harvey, and his education at Padua, in the context of the influence of Renaissance, showing the significance of the work of Vesalius in promoting questioning and enabling challenge to previously held ideas.

Question 3

The focus of the question was on evaluating sources. A number of candidates treated the task as though they are being asked to 'do' the enquiry i.e. as if the question was 'what was the importance of Harvey's work?' Others saw it as a comprehension and inference task i.e. as if the question were 'what can you learn from these sources about the importance of Harvey's work?' Both these approaches limit the credit candidates can gain because their answers remain focussed on the content of the sources, rather than what the sources can contribute in the light of their content nature and origin.

However, there were very few answers which were based simply on whether the source was primary and although the majority of answers were based around the content of the sources, this content was being used to explain how it helps us to know that Harvey was important. A few answers still assumed that reliability and value are the same thing.

Students who also considered the value and/or limitations of the sources and in the light of their origins/nature, could gain level 3. Most candidates realised the need to use both sources but they tended to find D easier to handle than E. Opinion was divided about which source was more useful and there were nice examples of thoughtful differentiation, suggesting that D's value, given its authorship, lay in the implication of public recognition whereas E gave the scientific proof of his achievements.

Question 4

Candidates generally responded well to this question. There was good comprehension and inference of Lord Conway's attitude to Harvey. Some able candidates were unable to reach the highest level because they used the source to explain what Conway's views were, rather than analysing the source, using its language and content in order to show how they could tell what his views were. Nevertheless, a pleasing number could make perceptive comments about, for example, the tone being negative, the "the potent persuasive language" and the repeated use of the word "phantasy" suggesting "he makes Harvey sound mad and that his ideas are too far fetched to be true." A lot also commented on the fact that Conway begins by praising Harvey, suggesting, for example, that he wanted to get Anne on his side before raising the issue of his dangerous theories. The best answers focused on Conway's selection and treatment of content, noting for example the implications of his calling 'old ideas rules and new ideas opinions' and showing the way he conveyed his message through the metaphor - the dangers of extremes 'sinking the ship'.

Question 5

High level responses to this question required both a clear analysis of source I to identify the nature of the reactions to Harvey's work and an understanding of the concept of support for historian's claims. Many candidates lost marks by offering only implicit analysis of I - these were the responses which focused on support from G/H, but without making clear linkage back what it was Keele was claiming in I. Other candidates were simply looking for agreement between the sources and most candidates could see some agreement between sources I and G. Some students interpreted Source H wrongly and assumed that the reference to letting blood from a vein indicated use of Harvey's work rather than the very opposite.

There were many excellent answers from candidates who could reason from G and H to show support for Keele's claims not only that there was resistance to Harvey's work but that it was difficult to make use of it. Here they used H to good effect, picking up on the evidence of Scarborough's continued use of the 'principles of Galen and Hippocrates' in spite of his knowledge of Harvey's work.

Question 6

On the whole, candidates responded well to this question. Many went through the sources in a methodical manner matching points about Harvey losing patients, the opposition from Primrose etc. and gained good Level 2 marks. A few candidates penalised themselves by using the wrong sources and, although there were some good answers focusing solely on the reliability of J, they could not score highly if there was no cross referencing to the sources mentioned in the question. The best answers focussed on both authorship and content of J and explored the extent of corroboration from the other sources.

A pleasing number of candidates began to look at the origins of the sources and, for example used F as evidence to support a drop in Harvey's practice since it came from an influential figure or discounted F as evidence of medical opposition since it was not from someone with medical understanding. There were some who assumed that Cowley was a doctor, and few who picked up on the chronology of D to link with later acceptance of Harvey's theories. Nevertheless, there were excellent answers which had analysed I to identify points for corroboration and explored D, F and G to produce a well argued answer to conclude that Aubrey had, or had not, exaggerated the extent of opposition to, or acceptance of, Harvey's work.

Question 7

Few candidates had sufficient knowledge of the work of the Royal Society to score highly in this question. Valid concepts of communication, experimentation and challenge to old ideas were offered, but with little exemplification or specific detail. Surprisingly few seemed aware, for example, of experiments with blood transfusion after Harvey's work, and few offered information about the contributions of Boyle, Hooke or Malpighi to exemplify additional understanding of the circulation of the blood. The Royal Society was often assumed to be similar to a new university or an institution which licensed doctors to practice medicine. Although the emphasis in paper 2 is predominantly on assessment of candidates' abilities to interpret, evaluate and use source material, each case study is set within a nominated topic, and candidates are expected to have knowledge of the specified content.

Question 8

Candidates engaged well with this issue. Most offered sufficient material from the sources to achieve level 2 or higher on this question, but a worrying number of extremely well-argued responses depressed the marks available to them by offering nothing at all from their own knowledge. A very few lost marks by using only own knowledge and not making explicit use of the sources. However, most candidates were able to explain a contribution that Harvey made to progress in medicine, for example through his scientific approach, or the way in which he encouraged others to challenge old ideas. Others preferred to argue that his contribution was limited by the amount of opposition that he faced and the determination to cling to established ideas and practices. At the higher levels, a balanced and reasoned argument was offered. A few candidates really expanded on the limitations of Harvey's discovery by picking up on the points made in source I regarding the need for development in other areas of medical science.

22 Crime, Punishment and Protest

This year's enquiry focused on the reasons for the beginning and the spread of the Pilgrimage of Grace and the role of Robert Aske. The format of the paper presented to candidates had changed in order to allow online marking. Examiners recognised that the timing of the notification to schools meant that many history teachers had not had the opportunity to prepare candidates for the implications of this new format. It was obvious from the rushed appearance of later answers that some candidates spent too long on the early questions in an attempt to fill the space provided. This was taken into account during the awarding process.

When preparing candidates for the 2006 examination, it will be helpful for them to be told that examiners do not expect them to use all the lines provided. Questions 1-7 will be given a double page spread and this will also make it easier for candidates to see at a glance the mark weighting for the question. The last question will be given three pages.

Question 1

This was designed as an easy entry to the paper and was very well done. Only a minority of candidates offered unsupported comment. A few extensive answers concentrated on listing sources of income rather than going on to show how wealth was created from them. Most candidates picked up on the extent of the monasteries' income and profit, given the value of money at the time.

Question 2

Overall candidates answered this question well using the information from source C and own knowledge. Most referred directly to the dissolution of the monasteries or the religious changes that Henry VIII had begun. At lower levels there was more emphasis on what Henry did rather than the response or attitudes of the protestors.

A good many candidates gained level 3 by linking Henry's actions and/or other factors (economic, social or religious) to why this caused discontent and why this would lead to the rebellion/protest. There were perceptive comments about the role of religious belief in Tudor England and the protests of those afraid that compliance with the religious changes would compromise their immortal soul. A minority were also aware of the political tensions and the challenge to the King's advisors. A few very well developed answers lost marks by forgetting to use source C.

Question 3

Candidates generally responded well to this question. There was good comprehension and inference of the Bishop's attitude to the protest. Perceptive comments focussed, for example, on the use of the word 'claim' to show that this implied the bishop's doubting of protestors' motives. However, some able candidates were unable to reach the highest level because they used the source to explain what the Bishop's views were, or why he held these views, rather than analysing selection and treatment of material, using the language and content of the source in order to show how they could tell from this what his views were. The use of repetition was picked up less frequently than was the use of loaded language.

Question 4

High level responses to this question required both a clear analysis of source D to identify the nature of the Bishop's portrayal of the protestors and an understanding of the concept of support for claims or views. Many candidates lost marks by offering only implicit analysis of D - these were the responses which focused on support from E/F - but without making clear linkage back to what the Bishop was claiming in D. Other candidates were simply looking for agreement between the sources and most candidates could see some agreement by picking up on the banner. Better answers saw that the fact of the banner being carried did not go on to lend support to the Bishop's views of the protestor's motives

Source F was sometimes used simply to confirm that there was an uprising, but high level responses used it to explore how far it could be said to challenge the bishops views that 'the leaders deceive the common people' since it appeared to suggest a genuine popular uprising.

Question 5

Candidates overall answered this question very well using the information from the source to explain the big numbers of protestors and the difficulties in controlling these. The most common reasons offered from own knowledge were: widespread sympathy with the rebels' cause, effective leadership, or the king's lack of a sufficient force in the shape of a standing army or police force to counter the protest. There were some excellent answers which appreciated the King's dependence on aristocratic support in the North, and the fragility of that support at the time. Again, some very good answers lost marks by neglecting to use the source material.

Question 6

The focus of the question was on evaluating sources. A number of candidates treated the task as though they were being asked to 'do' the enquiry i.e. as if the question were 'what happened at Doncaster?' Others saw it as a comprehension and inference task i.e. as if the question were 'what can you learn from these sources about what happened at Doncaster?' Both these approaches limit the credit candidates can gain because their answers remain focussed on the content of the sources, rather than what the sources can contribute in the light of their content, nature and origin.

However, there were very few answers which were based simply on whether the source was primary or secondary and, although the majority of answers were based around the content of the sources, this content was being used to explain how it helps us to know what happened. A few answers still assumed that reliability and value are the same thing. High level responses were able to see the bias in source G with its reference to 'wicked' rebellion, but were still able to balance the colour and immediacy of G against the hindsight and objectivity of H. G was particularly valued in providing insight into contemporary attitudes to rebellion.

Question 7

On the whole, candidates responded well to this question. Many went through the sources in a methodical manner matching points about the help provided by monasteries for the poor etc. and gained good Level 2 marks. A few candidates penalised themselves by not identifying the elements in I they were confirming when they stated that A and C provided elements of agreement. There were also some potentially good answers focusing solely on the reliability of I, but they could not score highly if there was no cross referencing to the sources mentioned in the question. The best answers focussed on Aske's position before execution, the content of I and the extent of corroboration from the other sources.

For example, when considering the issue of aid to the poor, a pleasing number of candidates began to look at the origins of source C from a fellow protestor and used that to qualify the extent to which it could be said to lend support to Aske's claims, while putting more weight on source A which was designed as an investigation into monastery accounts. Some argued from A that the monasteries gave comparatively little help in the light of their vast income, while others appreciated the value of the aid given in real terms.

Question 8

Candidates answered this question well, mainly gaining level 2 and level 3 marks, but some extremely well-argued responses depressed the marks available to them by offering nothing at all from their own knowledge. Most candidates concentrated their response effectively but narrowly on the truce at Doncaster, isolating a reason for failure as either Aske's mistake in trusting the king and Duke of Norfolk or the success of Duke's wily tactics. Many also listed other reasons for the failure: the role of other leaders as well as Aske in the decision at Doncaster; the desire to avoid civil war; powerful opposition from key figures such as the Bishop. At the higher levels, candidates saw the defeat in terms of a web of causation, wider than the Doncaster decision, although appreciating its significance. Some were aware of the significance of the later rebellion which gave Henry the excuse to execute the leaders. There were many perceptive responses which focussed on the nature and aim of the Pilgrimage as a peaceful and loyal protest, and they explained the rebels' unwillingness to challenge the king or to provoke a civil war. Most generally concluded that the King (or Norfolk) had devised the best tactics. The best answers weighed the factors which were outside Aske's leadership and control against the evidence of the superiority of his forces at Doncaster and the evidence that the truce at Doncaster led to the decisive scattering of his power base.

1336/03 - Coursework

Candidates' Performance

Moderators commented on the high standard of work this year. Candidates who failed to make an effort, or who missed out questions, were conspicuous by their absence. This reflects well on the candidates' attitude and on teachers' confidence in working with their students to meet the demands of the course.

Good candidates can select and deploy information well in Assignment One and show good powers of analysis. They are able to construct quite complex explanations.

Good candidates meet all the varying demands of Assignment Two, including former problem areas like evaluation of utility and interpretations. This again surely reflects most teachers' confident understanding of these concepts.

Some candidates are writing far too much.

The word limit is 1500 words

Moderators expect candidates to submit assignments close to this length. There was an increase this year in the number of candidates submitting assignments two, three, four or even more times the required length. This appears to be for two reasons: either that candidates are being asked to do assignments with too many questions (see section on Assignments below); or that candidates are receiving insufficient guidance when writing their coursework. It is rare for candidates writing too much to score high marks. The excess text is frequently low level descriptive material, often very close to a textbook original. Indeed it is difficult for candidates to score highly with over-length Assignment Ones as Objective One requires them to "select and deploy" information. It is this ability to select and deploy ("choose and use") which marks out top level work.

Some candidates still evaluate the utility of a source simply by commenting on its relevance or quantity of information, without considering its reliability, through discussion of its provenance. It is not possible to score above Level Two without doing this.

Some candidates could do with help in structuring their Assessment Objective Three question in Assignment Two.

Assignments

There are many excellent Centre-set assignments being used. These clearly engage students with the issues and motivate them to do their best. They access all levels for all abilities and stretch the most able.

All Centre-set assignments need to be approved by Edexcel before being set. Furthermore, some may require fine-tuning after a year or two, even though approved, to deal with minor problems that have arisen in practice. These might be changes to wording to help candidates, or to focus on the objective, or to prevent candidates writing too much repetitive material. Advice about this has been given on U9 feedback forms.

There are still some old Centre-set assignments being used. These may have been approved a long time ago, or simply not approved at all. Some date from a time when assignments were worth more marks and so include what are now too many questions. (The norm is three questions for Assignment One and five for Assignment Two.) A note has been made on U9s of these cases.

Board-set assignments generally help centres meet all assessment requirements. Again, assignments may benefit from adjustment to the particular situation or interests of the students. A centre can add to, or replace sources, or change the wording of questions. The altered assignment should then be submitted for approval in the usual way, using form HG1 (in Appendix 3 of the Specification).

Centres are reminded that the coursework should arise from “a teaching programme designed to occupy approximately half a term”, as it says at the beginning of all the Edexcel-set assignments. There should be evidence of this in the context used by candidates in their answers. It is not permissible to simply hand out the assignment questions and work through them.

Marking

Teacher marking was very accurate. There was a slight tendency to over-reward conscientious, but un-analytical, work in Level 3.

Annotation was not always as helpful as it could be. Teacher-Examiners should bear in mind that their annotation of the assignment should help the Moderator understand the level and the mark that the teacher has awarded. This means noting exactly where a level is reached, which level and how far it is sustained.

Where the work has been marked by more than one teacher the marking should be standardised. On the whole this seems to have been done, but there was little evidence for this. It would help Moderators to agree the Teacher-Examiners' marks more readily if there was evidence of standardisation being carried out, either on the work or in a note.

Administration

Many centres made administrative errors in their completion of the package of items to their Moderator this year. Most were soon corrected, but time was lost and both Moderators and Teacher-Examiners were put to inconvenience.

Here is a list of items that need to be sent to the moderator, with a brief explanation of why they are required:

1. The yellow copy of the OPTEMS form. Please check that the transcription of marks from the candidate's work, to the HG2 front sheet, to the OPTEMS form is correct and that the arithmetic is accurate. If there are errors the whole form may be returned.
2. The work of all candidates marked by an asterisk on the OPTEMS form.
3. The work of the highest and lowest scoring candidates, if the asterisk system has not already included them. This is in order that the Moderator sees the full range of marks from a centre.
4. Every candidate's work should have a HG2 front sheet, giving their marks for each assignment and their total mark, (out of 100), signed by the candidate's teacher. This signed authentication statement is a QCA requirement and extremely important as the main guarantee against plagiarism and cheating.
5. The assignment tasks as given to the candidates, even if one or both are Board-set.
6. If an assignment is Centre-designed, the HG1 Approval Form.
7. The complete course of one candidate scoring more than 50 marks. The reason for this is referred to above - assignments should arise from a taught course, and the inclusion of this item provides evidence that this has been carried out.

In addition, teachers may wish to include further information as to when the assignments were done, what guidance students received, what materials they had access to, etc. All this information helps to support the Teacher-Examiner's marks.

GCSE History Syllabus C Grade Boundaries - Summer 2005

1336 Option A - (A1, P1 and 21)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	79	69	59	50	41	32	23	14

1336 Option B - (B1, P1 and 21)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	76	67	58	50	41	32	23	14

1336 Option C - (C1, P1 and 21)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	77	68	59	51	41	32	23	14

1336 Option D - (A1, Q1 and 22)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	76	67	58	49	39	30	21	12

1336 Option E - (B1, Q1 and 22)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	72	64	56	48	39	30	21	12

1336 Option F - (C1, Q1 and 22)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	75	66	57	49	39	30	21	12

Short Course

3336 (12 - The American West, c.1840-1895)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	81	69	57	46	37	28	20	12

3336 (13 - Germany, c.1919-c.1945)

Grade	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Lower Limit	85	73	61	49	39	30	21	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 UG 016645 Summer 2005

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

