

Examiners' Report Summer 2008

GCSE

GCSE History (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 2008

Publications Code UG020243

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

Paper 1

Introduction	04
A1: Britain c1815 - 1850	05
B1: The American West c1840 - 1895	08
C1: Germany c1919 - 1945	10
P1: Medicine	15
Q1: Crime, Punishment and Protest	18

Paper 2

21: Medicine	21
22: Crime, Punishment and Protest	25
Coursework	29
Statistics	31

Paper 01

Introduction

It was pleasing to see that candidates are now familiar with the new style of examination. The problems noted last year with the timing of the two parts of the paper seem to have been overcome with very few incomplete papers. However, examiners noted some possible problems with lack of time in answers that were not well organised.

Pleasingly, the balance of time for the two parts of Paper I has also produced a more even balance in student performance. This has resulted in an improvement in performance in the Development Studies - particularly Q1 - now that this part of Paper 1 is less rushed. This improvement has compensated for a slight fall in achievement in the Depth Studies where time is now more limited. Despite the shift in relative performance in the two sections, there has been no reduction in the overall pass rate.

Paper 1 therefore, showed candidates performing evenly across all the options. This may in part be due to the welcome reduction in length of answer for question 1a. A great many candidates can now answer this on one side, which then gives them time to use elsewhere in the paper. There are some centres, however, where candidates still use extension sheets for two lines of writing - which causes a lot of extra administration and costs them time. There were also fewer scripts which did not indicate an answer when a choice had to be made. It is also clear this year that candidates were aware of the need to look through the whole paper and this meant that only a very few did not attempt an essay question.

A1: Britain c. 1815 -c.1850

General Comments

Answers this year tended to polarise because of the amount of knowledge which was at the student's disposal, and some insecurity with the sequence of events. The main weakness shown in tackling this paper was a widespread inability to identify the topic of a question and thus not be able to use the information they had. Although most candidates answered all the questions required, there was a sense that only a minority took time to think though the answer before writing it. This led to a lack of control in many answers. This may be the cost of a stricter time limit on this part of the examination.

Question 1

(a)

- Few candidates failed to reach L2 as they could recognise issues with the way MPs were elected in Sources B (bribery) and C (open ballot - intimidation).
- Only a few could combine sources, most successfully by identifying the wealth of participants in both B and C.
- Source A proved difficult and only a minority were able to infer the lack of representation in boroughs. A number thought that because only one person voted it showed lack of interest.
- There were many assertions that all three sources showed corruption but this was not well supported.

(b)

- The majority of answers were in L2. Candidates were confident with the faults in the system of elections and could offer a wide range of issues needing reform.
- Those who read the whole question were able to enter L3 with answers which recognised the lack of representation in the new industrial towns.
- There were an appreciable number who scored highly because they could explain that new wealth and the new middle class wanted representation. Some answers considered the need for industry to have a place in government.
- The weakest answers relied on the examples in 1a to identify the need for reform.
- One unexpected oddity was the fact that some weaker candidates read electoral as electrical and explained why industry needed that.

(ci)

- There were many answers based on the idea of simplistic social divisions- the rich not wanting to give power to the poor (whom they despised) or repeating the corruption of the existing system.
- Knowledge was shown of events early in the century - Peterloo and the Six Acts.
- Those who knew events of 1830 -32 gave a narrative account rather than analysis.
- Only a few were able to offer any analytical points - the main one being the fear of revolution. However, the references tended to be to the 1789 Revolution. Knowledge of the Swing Riots and the riots in Europe in 1830 were only mentioned by a handful of candidates.

- Too many candidates gave an account of the Chartists' failure to achieve reform showing poor grasp of sequence of events in parliamentary reform.
(cii)
- The terms of the Act were widely known and more candidates were able to offer an analytical response, looking at the problems left unresolved by the Reform Act.
- All candidates had some idea about the fact that the working class were not happy. With a number concentrating their answers on the relationship between the classes.
- Some answers used 1b and picked up on the extent of change in the industrial towns.
- Again there were answers which gave an account of the Chartist movement (this could gain some marks - up to 6)
- Fewer candidates claimed that the Reform Act introduced the secret ballot, but those who did, made a great deal of the change.
- There was quite widespread confusion with the Poor Law Amendment Act with comment on workhouses and Chadwick's report.

Question 2

- This was by far the more popular of the essay questions. It would seem that candidates feel comfortable with the topic of railways.
- However, they found it difficult to deal with a question which had slightly different wording.
- The majority of answers stayed in L2 as candidates simply wrote down all they knew of railways without organising their thoughts. This was apparent in the number of 'added on' statements when they had apparently finished the answer.
- Those who took a little time to arrange their knowledge into coherent paragraphs immediately raised their marks, either to top L2 or into L3. By making a statement e.g. 'railways had a big effect on employment' and then using the evidence of job losses and job creation, the candidate had made an analytical statement and lifted the answer into another level. It was clear the candidates had knowledge but did not know how to best deploy it.
- Candidates could also reach L3 in a quite straightforward way - considering the opposition and then looking at the social and economic benefits.
- There were some pertinent comments recognising that opposition was overcome by the success of the railway. For example, farmers and landowners opposed railways until they found that they could make money by selling land at expensive prices.
- There was evidence that better candidates understood the importance of railways to the wider economy of the country.
- Surprisingly few answers reached a judgement which answered the question with any confidence.

Question 3

- The focus of this question is why did people want to change the Old Poor Law, and as such is a subject familiar to students. It was disappointing therefore that so many focused solely on the issue of cost and did not consider other factors. A question offering one possible reason is inviting the candidate to consider others.
- There was widespread knowledge of the systems of poor relief used and their cost.
- As with ci , knowledge of the context of the 1834 Act was weak. There was occasional reference to the reasons for increased numbers of poor (end of war, industrial slumps) and a few recognised the pressure on parliament from the newly enfranchised middle class rate payers.
- Although reference was made to Chadwick, Malthus, and/or Bentham there was little understanding of their ideas on poverty. It was particularly disappointing that so few considered the recommendations of the Royal Commission, and in particular the moral purpose of the workhouses.

Question 4 (3336 Short Course Only)

No candidates answered this question.

B1: The American West: c. 1840 – c. 1895

General Comments

Candidates performed confidently on question 1 with few failing to score L2 on all parts. Q2 & 3 were not, however, done well by the majority. Question 3 is a less popular topic and was chosen by a minority. However, these still lacked the knowledge to answer well. Question 2 was particularly disappointing as it is a familiar topic, but answers were poorly directed. It would seem that although more candidates tackled the essays this year, they are not yet organising the time sufficiently well to do justice to the longer answers. Further practice is needed to work within the time limits.

Question 1

(a)

- A majority of candidates achieved at least 3 marks and many were able to make inferences from at least two sources.
- Sources A and B were handled well as showing both positive and negative views of Custer's leadership and in many cases these inferences were clearly supported.
- Source C proved more challenging and some candidates saw it as giving a negative view of Custer: showing failure as his men were dead.
- Those who tried to combine sources were able to do so successfully in several ways: attitudes changing over time, using the dates of the sources or the significance of A and C reflecting on Custer's death; or recognising the difference between the view of the public (newspapers) and his own regiment (B).
- Some attempted to combine B and C - asserting, incorrectly, that the desertion of soldiers in B explained the few remaining men in C.
- Candidates found it hard not to base their inferences on own knowledge in this instance.

(b)

- The majority of answers were comfortably in Level 2 as candidates had a secure understanding of Indians ways and customs and could assert that these were savage.
- At low L2 candidates identified ways in which Plains Indians were 'different' as sufficient reasons to warrant the term 'savage'.
- Better candidates selected examples such as scalping, polygamy and exposure of the old.
- To answer the question it was necessary to show the reasons for white men's views and it was disappointing that so few candidates moved from descriptive answers to analytical ones and thus reached L3. All that was required after describing e.g. scalping and stating it was seen as savage, was to add 'because....' And give the white viewpoint.
- A few answers explored the 'backwardness' of Indians in technology or a written language to explain why the whites thought them savage.
- There were good answers which developed the conflicting religious attitudes of Christian and 'pagans' to marriage, the old, rituals and the role of medicine men. These included some impressive answers which identified animism.

- A number reached L3 by developing the views of Indians put forward by the white media or even the government. These were often strong answers showing a real sense of historical context.
- In contrast there were answers which showed poor contextual understanding of white behaviour in the 19th century. White settlers would not have seen killing buffalo or fighting as necessarily savage activities then.
- A very few candidates seemed unsure of the term savage.

(ci)

- This question produced a full range of answers and discriminated well.
- There was good knowledge of the battle and, from the better candidates, impressive command of detail.
- There was a strong tendency to answer the more familiar question of 'why did the US Army lose....', which did hold down marks.
- Most candidates thus concentrated on Custer and his mistakes: splitting his men, taking a short cut, not resting his soldiers, ignoring his scouts, disobeying orders, etc. This could earn them up to 8 marks.
- Stronger candidates recognised the thrust of the question and also considered the strengths of the Sioux, citing at least some of the following: superior weapons, knowledge of terrain, unusual numbers, strong leadership, exceptional situation giving rise to different tactics. These answers gained high marks.

(cii)

- This was the more popular choice at (c) and most candidates felt secure in their knowledge of the Indians life style and the purpose of reservations.
'they took away their freedom, they loaded them down with work, until the Indians had the ultimatum - live like us or die.'
- The most common reference was to the loss of a nomadic lifestyle and ability to hunt buffalo. This was often offered as 'a change in their way of life' in terms of food or materials although the better candidates did go on to consider the loss of status and their dependence on government handouts.
- Descriptions of life in the reservations were also offered as sufficient in themselves to answer the question and could only score in L2.
- There were, however, answers which were able to identify and discuss the effects of reservation life on the traditions of the Indians. These considered the erosion of spiritual beliefs and Christianisation, the destruction of the social structure, the policies used to change the role of men from warrior to farmer, and the 'white' education of Indian children.
- Too few took notice of the date given. Those who did were able to focus on the change of attitude after the Battle of Little Big Horn and showed the erosion of the power of the Chiefs and effects of the Dawes Act.

Question 2

- This was the more popular essay, dealing with a familiar topic.
- Many candidates responded to key words in the question and produced a list of problems and solutions for homesteaders without selection or analysis, therefore remaining in L2.
- A number of candidates seem to have been drawn into the proposition on extreme weather and their answers focused exclusively on that factor, producing one sided answers.
- Those who considered alternative factors scored more highly but few were able to develop or weigh factors to offer even a tentative conclusion.
- One of the few who reached an elegant conclusion: '*they could adapt their life as much as they wanted to suit the Plains, but what they couldn't change was the weather.*'
- Those candidates who were reliant on the bullet points found them difficult to use and two were frequently misunderstood. Many candidates were unfamiliar with the reference to the 'Great American Desert' and assumed it meant the plains were dry and sandy. The information on emigrants was incorrectly assumed to indicate overcrowding of the Plains rather than unfamiliarity with the conditions.
- Few considered difficulties for both farming and living - this could have been due to time constraints.
- The fact that many answers were shorter than in the past also suggests that candidates still have issues with time.

Question 3

- Fewer candidates chose this question and the majority who did so found it difficult.
- There was continued insecurity on chronology and sequence of events relating to the cattle industry as noted when this topic was examined in 2005.
- The bullet points were heavily used to mark changes in the cattle industry and better candidates used these 'pegs' to chart the fortunes of the industry and were able to show knowledge of Goodnight, Abeline and Iliff..
- Unfortunately, only a minority of answers were able to give valid examples of the work of the cowboys. Of these, the cattle drives were best known and the work on the open range least known.
- There were some confusion over the contribution of different individuals.
- There was also little understanding of the difference between cattle rancher and cowboy.
-

Question 8 (3336 Short Course Only)

- This was a popular question and there were some excellent answers
- Candidates were confident in their knowledge of the construction of the railway.
- Most answers looked at a range of reasons for building the line e.g. encouraging settlement, trade, linking east and west, controlling the Indians..
- The best answers showed a good understanding of the economic and political reasons for the railway, including role of US in the world, growth of economy, Manifest Destiny etc.

C1: Germany c.1919 - c.1945

General Comments

There was a wide range of achievement with a proportion of strong answers. Unfortunately there was also a noticeable proportion of poor scripts. As in the other Depth Studies candidates did not organise time to plan answers and lost marks because information was either lacking or poorly presented. As this is a Depth Study there is an expectation that the sequence of events will be understood. A generally disappointing response to the essay questions showed weaknesses in this basic understanding.

Question 1

(a)

- Majority of candidates could draw inferences from sources A and C.
- Source B was more challenging - yet in cii candidates showed understanding of the power of the church over public opinion.
- Most who reached L3 did so by making inferences on all 3 sources separately.
- Only a minority could use the sources in combination. Of these some were able to comment on the limits or small nature of opposition. Others could combine sources to show that opposition was not public or that it was non violent.
- There was still time wasted by rewriting the content of the sources with learnt, but unsupported phrases, 'this shows/infers/tells us'.
- Because students had knowledge of the climate of fear in Nazi Germany and of the youth movements there were answers which discussed the context of opposition fully with only passing reference to the sources.
- Source A stimulated some excellent inferences:
'graffiti was there for others to see'
'young people rebelled against Nazism in much the same way as young people rebel against anything. It does not appear to be violent rebellion, merely insubordination.'

(b)

- Many candidates gained L2 by describing some of the activities undertaken by the SS e.g. running concentration camps, Night of the Long Knives, Kristallnacht. In order to reach L3 it was necessary to examine why they did these things e.g. to purge specific groups who resisted Hitler; to eliminate a potential threat; to enforce the policy of racial purity, etc.
- However, knowledge of the SS was limited and many answers lacked specific detail. Too many relied on simple undeveloped statements: *'Hitler's bully boys', 'Hitler's private army'* or gave generalised answers on the fear that they generated.
- In other cases knowledge was insecure and the SS was confused with the SA. Answers which stated that the SS helped the Nazis get votes or controlled elections were either confused over date or lacked understanding of the nature of the Nazi regime after 1934.

- Too few candidates recognised that the date had significance. Those who did were more likely to obtain L3 as they would be looking at the role played by the SS, rather than describing its activities.

(ci)

- A well taught topic which many completed to a high standard, some achieving maximum marks.
- Candidates could write confidently about the activities of the HJ, particularly the preparation of boys for the army.
- Most answers correctly identified some of the aims of the Hitler Youth. The roles of male and female in creating an Aryan race; the creation of a body of informants; acceptance of the Nazi ideas on race and the betrayal of Germany
- A pleasing number of answers developed the idea of loyalty to Hitler and some talked of the sense of belonging generated by uniforms, rallies and common activities.
- The best answers covered the wider period and gave examples of the role of the HJ in the context of war or the intention of breeding future generations to secure a 1000 year Reich.
- Unfortunately in other cases answers were frustrating with a focused response which was unsupported. Statements such as ' they could learn the ways of a good Nazi' or ' Hitler could brainwash young Germans into what he wanted them to think' were left undeveloped. Candidates must be aware that they will only be marked for what they put down on paper, not for what they imply that they know.
- A minority lapsed into detail on education and thus could not score highly

(cii)

- The less popular choice for 1c
- Although candidates had a good sense of the reasons for cooperating with the churches in general terms, few candidates had the factual detail to flesh out their answers. Therefore many answers did not score above 6 marks.
- The size and influence of the churches in Germany - and in Europe were widely cited as was the power of the pulpit in putting over the Nazi message. Better candidates wrote of the shared values of church and state.
- Problems arose over specifics. Dealings with the Catholic church were better known with the Concordat frequently mentioned. Distinction between Catholic and Protestant was insecure and although the Reich church was described, its denomination was not understood.
- However, some centres provided excellent answers which could differentiate between the churches and the changing approaches over time.
- Very few indeed could name specific church leaders and their activities.

Question 2

- There were some excellent essays which showed that many candidates had previously prepared answers on the work of Stresemann.
- There was widespread knowledge of the events of the period, although some wasted time with overlong detail of events of 1923.
- Differentiation was achieved by the varying success with which candidates could explain the significance of these events to the economy or the popularity of the Weimar government.
- A significant number could access L4 because they could also demonstrate the underlying weakness and fragility of the Republic and the economy. Much was made of the consequences for the Republic of the Wall Street Crash.
- The bullet points proved supportive, particularly for weaker candidates.
- Information about Berlin as a centre for entertainment was developed surprisingly frequently. Often on a simple 'feel good' level but some answers were able to write with confidence about the Bauhaus movement demonstrating a pleasing breadth in some teaching.
- Common weaknesses were confusion of the terms of the Dawes and Young Plans and of the position of Stresemann in the government.

Question 3

- The parameters of this question were clearly stated and these years are usually taught as an identified period. However, it was poorly answered in comparison to Q2.
- There was knowledge of the Fire and its immediate consequences but many answers petered out at this point.
- Where candidates understood the chain of events in the period they could analyse the importance of the Fire, and some answers constructed arguments to show how all Hitler's subsequent actions stemmed from this.
- Those who did focus on the specific question scored highly and analysis of events usually led to a tentative conclusion.
- Many answers lacked a clear grasp of chronology, starting with the Reichstag Fire from the body of the question and then looking at the events given in the bullet points.
- Events were too often considered independently and as the sequence and links between them was missed, answers were held to bottom L3 at most. A great many answers failed to recognise that the Fire led to the Enabling Act.
- Fewer than expected brought in events other than those given, and very few commented on other factors he was able to use, such as the political situation which led to his appointment as Chancellor in the first place.
- Some answers responded to 'rise to ... power' in the question and gave a full account of events from 1923. Disappointingly, this was done at the expense of proper consideration of the events of 1933 -34.
- Common errors were confusion of Night of the Long Knives and Kristallnacht and of the emergency laws and the Enabling Act.
- The question was more complex than question 2 and it could be that pressure of time was responsible for fewer students controlling their answers successfully.

Question 12 (3336 Short Course Only)

- This question was more popular with weaker candidates who were attracted by its social, rather than political aspect.
- Most answers used the bullet points to effect and could describe Nazi education.
- Analysis of the purpose was hesitant and often stated rather than demonstrated.
- Other than the weakest candidates there was no great overlap between the answers to this and to 1ci
- Most answers were in L2 with a few rising into L3.

P1: Medicine

General Comments

The examination seemed accessible to nearly all candidates, most of whom answered all the necessary questions. There were some exceptionally impressive responses, especially to questions 2 and 4.

- It is worth stressing again the issue of unnecessarily lengthy answers for question 1a and then writing brief responses for the higher tariff questions. Students often used additional paper for 1a, and either copied or paraphrased the source material (sometimes including Source D). It would be very helpful to remind students concise answers which score highly are perfectly possible on 1a.
- Candidates should also be reminded to keep a clear focus on the actual question and avoid drifting into other subject areas. There were clear instances where some candidates clearly underlined or circled the key words in the question and as a result frequently produced very relevant and confident responses.
- Most candidates seem well prepared for the extension unit questions but they do need secure, precise and specific knowledge to gain the higher levels.
- It is also worth explaining the use of bullet points in the Extension Units. They are not intended to provide a framework for the answer or to indicate the required content. It is indeed possible to gain full marks without using them. They are meant to serve as a reminder to the candidate to develop argument and/or the timescale of the question.
- Most examiners commented on some candidates' lack of chronological understanding. This report highlights questions where in a significant number of cases this reduced individual performance.
- It is also noticeable that there has been a distinct trend in a slightly higher mean mark for both the Development Studies. This, together with more candidates answering all questions necessary, suggests that students are devoting a full hour to this component of the examination, rather than taking slightly more time for the Depth Study and less for the Development Study.

Question 1

(a)

- This question was often answered well, with candidates making valid inferences supported from the sources about the gradual development in understanding of disease. Most commented on the use of isolation and absence of knowledge shown in Source A, to some limited government intervention in Source B to authorities moving towards prevention in Source C.
- Lower-scoring candidates often included Source D in their responses, often copied or paraphrased the sources, or did not see vaccination as prevention. A few candidates did not seem to understand the term “leper” or made comments on lack of compassion in earlier times.

(b)

- In level 3 many candidates explained a range of factors from doctors being expensive, a lack of trust in them, the role of wise women, the role of tradition and the passing down of remedies through generations, the fact that some of herbal remedies were effective and had a sense of historical context with prevailing attitudes of the time, such as miasma.
- For level 2 candidates frequently gave a description of one of the above factors.
- Weaker responses displayed a lack of chronological understanding including comments on Ancient Egyptians, Greeks, monks, nuns, the Black Death up to comments on the NHS or contemporary use of herbal remedies.

(c)

- The highest scoring responses were able to explain contemporary objections with a clear sense of historical context (for example mentioning Gillray’s cartoon), and had a secure understanding of Jenner’s vaccination having limited applicability, until germ theory and developments by Koch and Pasteur were able to explain his ideas. Some candidates also explained the change from the government’s belief in laissez-faire to intervention.
- Level 2 candidates normally offered a description, in varying detail, of the story of Jenner. Some drifted into responses on public health, cholera or John Snow.
- This item had the highest rate of blank pages, although examiners felt that this was less than on the comparable question on Chadwick in 2007.

Question 2

- This was a very popular choice of question. There were some very careful well-informed and confident evaluations of both the positive and negative aspects of Islamic medicine. Many compared progress between western Europe and the Muslim world. Many candidates had secure knowledge on Ibn Sina, Rhazes and Nafis, on developments in public health, the recording of medical ideas, and how the Islamic faith encouraged care for the sick with consequent medical progress. This was often balanced against the forbidding of dissection and the unwillingness to challenge existing beliefs.
- Lower scoring candidates often added varying amounts of detail to the various bullet points.

Question 3

- This is traditionally the least popular of the extension units and is rarely well done. Although many candidates did attempt this question, many did not seem well prepared for it and consequently there were few high marks.
- Many remained in Level 2 by describing the lives of either Nightingale, or more occasionally, of Seacole. This was often followed by generalised comments on women in the NHS today or general views on sexual discrimination.
- A significant number of candidates drifted from the question set and wrote about Elizabeth Garrett Anderson and entered into debates on women doctors. Many were also confused about the introduction of forceps and believed that this actually helped women to progress in medicine.

Question 4

- This question retained its usual popularity. The highest scoring responses argued how anatomical advances did not necessarily correlate with advances in surgery. There were some impressive essays on developments and their respective limitations, and how issues in surgery were not resolved until mainly later 19th century developments.
- Some responses remained in Level 2 with comfortable descriptions of the work Vesalius, Harvey and Pare but without relating the information offered to the actual question.
- Others did not appreciate the exact wording of the question and did not direct their responses to the Renaissance period. There were either unsure about the time period or were determined to write about problems and developments in surgery during the nineteenth century.

Quality of Written Communication

- There seemed to be very little use of text language and very few illegible responses. Overall there were no real issues of poor quality written communication. It is noticeable that candidates that had spent a little time making a brief plan for their answer to the Extension Unit often scored the highest levels.

Q1: Crime, Punishment and Protest

General Comments

- The examination seemed accessible to nearly all candidates, most of whom answered all the necessary questions. There were some exceptionally impressive responses, especially to questions 1b, 1c and 4.
- It is worth stressing again the issue of unnecessarily lengthy answers for question 1a and then writing brief responses for the higher tariff questions. Students often used additional paper for 1a, and either copied or paraphrased the source material (including sometimes Source D). It would be very helpful to remind students concise answers which score highly are perfectly possible on 1a.
- Candidates should also be reminded to keep a clear focus on the actual question and avoid drifting into other subject areas. There were clear instances where some candidates clearly underlined or circled the key words in the question and as a result frequently produced very relevant and confident responses.
- Most candidates seem well prepared for the extension unit questions but they do need secure, precise and specific knowledge to gain the higher levels.
- It is also worth explaining the use of bullet points in the Extension Units. They are not intended to provide a framework for the answer or to indicate the required content. It is indeed possible to gain full marks without using them. They are meant to serve as a reminder to the candidate to develop argument and/or the timescale of the question.
- Most examiners commented on some candidates' lack of chronological understanding. This report highlights questions where in a significant number of cases this reduced individual performance.
- It is also noticeable that there has been a distinct trend in a slightly higher mean mark for both the Development Studies. This, together with more candidates answering all questions necessary, suggests that students are devoting a full hour to this component of the examination, rather than taking slightly more time for the Depth Study and less for the Development Study.

Question 1

(a)

- Most students were able to reach level 2 by making simple inferences from at least two of the sources. Some reached level 3 by recognising the change from deterrent to reform and usually considered the reasons behind the theft and how punishments have changed. The highest scoring responses were concise and to the point and avoided extensive copying or paraphrasing of the source material.
- Weaker candidates often described each source at length with minimal elaboration, and some were unclear about the need to only consider Sources A, B and C and included Source D. Many of these lower scoring responses used two full pages and often additional answer sheets.

(b)

- Many candidates scored highly by following the main thrust of the question. They had a clear sense of historical context and mentioned religious influences viewing laziness as a sin, often supported with secure knowledge on vagrancy laws. Other factors mentioned included the demobilisation of soldiers and economic and social tensions created by changes such as enclosures, the growth of poverty and financial cost of vagabonds.
- Level 2 responses tended to describe more what vagabonds were like and what they did, rather than offering reasons for why they were treated harshly.
- The weakest candidates used it as an opportunity to express their own personal views on begging and homelessness and a surprising number of candidates seemed not to know, or were very unsure, about who “the Tudors” were.

(c)

- This question was often answered well with many responses reaching Level 3. Most used the source well to indicate that the community often turned a blind eye to smuggling and were able to comment on how other factors made it difficult for the authorities, such as the long coastline, its organisation, bribery, and high taxes on specific goods. Some candidates also had secure knowledge of poaching laws and rural poverty. Some commented on the “victimless” nature of the crimes and on the concept of “social crime.”
- Weaker candidates tended to turn the question into the need for an effective police force or the need for better technology to prevent crime.

Question 2

- There were some very knowledgeable responses to this popular extension unit. There were good level 3 and level 4 answers where the key features of law enforcement, trial procedures and punishments were compared and conclusions were offered as to the extent of change and continuity. The best students argued reasons for maintaining continuity and or making changes and supported their responses with knowledge on areas such as the Forest Laws and Norman fears of rebellion.
- Level 2 students tended to discuss in detail their knowledge of the different ordeals and how tithings worked.

Question 3

- There were some good attempts to compare the two protests. Most candidates could compare violent versus non-violent methods some argued out that the very different contextual factors made valid comparisons difficult. Candidates' knowledge of the key features frequently seemed more secure on Kett's rebellion than on the General Strike.
- Level 2 candidates often produced a narrative description of Kett's rebellion followed by the General Strike with no real comparisons offered.

Question 4

- This was popular and often well answered question. The higher level responses had a clear sense of historical context and commented on religious changes and the influence of religious ideas on society and evaluated these against other factors such as the lack of educational and scientific understanding, economic and social tensions, the English Civil War and the significance of individuals such as Matthew Hopkins and James I.
- Level 2 answers tended to offer descriptions of witchcraft in general by describing who the witches supposedly were, what they were accused of doing, how they were treated and the various tests.

Quality of Written Communication

- There seemed to be very little use of text language and very few illegible responses and overall there were no real issues of poor written communication. It is noticeable that candidates that had spent a little time making a brief plan for their answer to the Extension Unit often scored the highest levels.

Paper 02

21: Medicine

General Comments

Most candidates seem to have understood that the amount of space given for an answer in the booklet is intended to exceed the maximum they should need and that it is not, in any way, a guideline indicating the desired length of their answer. This has had a significant effect in that there have been a number of succinct, high scoring answers this year, in particular on question 5.

However, there may still be issues of time management for some candidates. Although there were relatively few blank responses to question 8, there were a number of answers which stopped very abruptly and appeared to be unfinished. There were also pages left blank in the middle of the answer booklet, especially on question 6. It is not clear whether this was because candidates left out this question in order to do question 8, which carried a high number of marks, or if they left out this question because it targeted cross referencing, which many students find difficult.

Furthermore, a number of candidates continue to write an introductory paragraph which restates the question and does not gain them any marks. For some students this may be a deliberate tactic to ensure they are focused on the question and the relevant sources but it should be noted that it has the effect of limiting their time and also the available space in the answer booklet. There also continues to be a small number of students who write about each source, repeating the caption, describing the content or commenting on whether it is primary or reliable, before they actually respond to the question. This means that those students often do not begin to answer the question or gain any marks until the second page of their answer.

Question 1

Source A provided several details allowing students to make inferences about the link between poverty and health but candidates found Source B more difficult to use and very few candidates were able to make inferences supported by Sources A and B in combination. Some candidates wrote about poor living conditions from their own knowledge, which could not be rewarded.

Question 2

The work of Lloyd George and the Liberal welfare reforms were well known by many candidates who provided details of these reforms and were also able to point out their limitations, for example the fact that the National Insurance scheme applied only to working males who paid into the scheme. However, a disappointing number thought they could rely entirely on the source and assumed these provisions applied to all the poor or confused the National Insurance scheme with the National Health Service; a small number of candidates took the source literally and assumed people were given a train ticket. Centres are reminded that students should have contextual knowledge of the nominated topics.

Question 3

A question on the value of sources as evidence for an historian's enquiry is set regularly and it is disappointing to see that many candidates still discuss only the content of the sources. Many judgements were made on the basis of the amount of information provided by the source and the use of a photograph seemed to pose particular problems, with many answers dismissing it because of the limited details it contained when compared to a written text. Candidates also have a tendency to assert that a source is biased without providing evidence to demonstrate that bias or explaining how it affects the value of the source.

Some candidates focused on the nature of the information or reliability and how that affected the source's usefulness for the historian in his enquiry but again the photograph proved problematic, with many candidates asserting it was valuable simply because it was taken at the time / it cannot lie / it is a primary source. It was particularly disheartening to see a number of answers which still judged the usefulness of the source on the basis of whether it was a primary source and which assumed that a secondary will never be totally reliable because the author was not there and therefore cannot know the truth. Examiners comment every year on these blanket assertions which sometimes come at the end of a well reasoned answer considering a range of factors affecting the value of a source.

Very few answers included any explanation of how the reliability or nature / origins / purpose of the source affected the value of the information. Where candidates did understand this requirement, good answers included comments about the added insight that the author of D may have had because she, herself, was a doctor, or they commented on the opportunity to set McIndoe's work in context through hindsight; for E, the fact that McIndoe's work was so important that trainee surgeons attended and he was photographed, was noted, as was the additional information provided by a photograph about the equipment he had and context within which he worked, although candidates also questioned whether this was a typical situation.

Some candidates did not analyse the question carefully and wrote about how important the work of McIndoe was, rather than how valuable the sources are as evidence or they made comparisons between the sources, cross referencing the information to see how far the sources supported each other.

Question 4

This style of question has been set several times during the last few years and it was very pleasing to see that candidates have understood its focus. Most candidates could identify the disapproval in McIndoe's comments about the effects of a merger with a local hospital and his fears that standards would be lowered and many commented on the language or tone of the source although fewer could identify the negative emphasis created by McIndoe's selection of detail to include in his letter. Many recognised that his comments about 90% of doctors voting against the National Health Act and Bevan's economic sanctions showed a negative attitude, although they could not always explain their ideas clearly. Some problems were caused by students' own knowledge that doctors feared their income would drop under the NHS since they mistakenly thought that it was this to which "economic sanctions" referred or they tried to explain why McIndoe was opposed and commented about him being motivated only by financial profit.

Question 5

Candidates are now very familiar with this style of question and very confident in their answers. Although some unexpected interpretations of the cartoon were offered, most of them were valid inferences and the level of analysis, supported by direct references to details of the cartoon, was pleasingly high.

Question 6

Many candidates find it difficult to cross reference sources and there was a wide range of answers to this question. Most students recognised that the sources provided different views on Bevan's handling of the dispute and many were able to link sources H and J and show that I appeared to contradict them. Careful analysis of the sources allowed some candidates to show that the situation in I referred to the vote in February and that H and J showed what happened afterwards, while at the highest level, there was a good focus on whether the events showed "clever" tactics. In some cases there was also discussion of how much weight should be placed on individual sources, for example whether the report in I was based on accurate knowledge of the widespread reaction of MPs or just a few individuals.

Where candidates treated the sources separately, they usually reached Level 2; these answers often showed that there were 2 sides to the issue and focused on Bevan's eventual success although they occasionally contradicted themselves. For Level 3, candidates needed to cross reference the details carefully and use the sources in combination, noting the chronology of events. Some discounted I, coming from a local paper, or explained the "polemic" as showing Bevan's passion, as they used the sources together to reach a judgement.

Question 7

For many students this was an opportunity to show what they had learned. There were a number of excellent answers explaining how X-Rays, blood transfusions, and plastic surgery were all developed and accelerated through the context of warfare. There was also a pleasing recognition that the focus of the question was advances in surgery and the example of penicillin was usually related to infection after an operation. Unfortunately, some very good answers were prevented from getting full marks because they did not give 3 examples.

At the other extreme, some students could do little beyond repeat the information in D, or made valid comments about war providing the opportunity to develop new techniques but could not offer any details in support of their comments. A few did not recognise the focus on the 20th century and wrote about Paré.

Question 8

In a number of cases this question had clearly been anticipated and there were some excellent answers identifying the role of war, government and key individuals. Some of these answers were based entirely on the sources and therefore were limited by their failure to use additional knowledge but there were many comments about "Homes for Heroes", the Beveridge Report and the effect of evacuation raising the issue of poverty. However, some answers were not focused on explaining why national health services developed, and tended to provide a narrative of events, or they explained why the national health services developed without addressing the

question's focus on the role of war. A number of candidates focused solely on the NHS and Second World War and some claimed that the NHS was set up in 1911 or directly after the First World War. Some candidates wrote about developments in surgery rather than the health services.

Nevertheless, it was very pleasing to see that many candidates planned their answer and therefore produced a structured argument in response to the question rather than going through each source in turn. At the highest level there was a real sense of different factors being weighed against each other and a genuine understanding of their interaction.

22: Crime, Punishment and Protest

General Comments

Most candidates seem to have understood that the amount of space given for an answer in the booklet is intended to exceed the maximum they should need and that it is not, in any way, a guideline indicating the desired length of their answer. This has had a significant effect in that there have been a number of succinct, high scoring answers this year, in particular on question 3.

However, there may still be issues of time management for some candidates. Although there were relatively few blank responses to question 8, there were a number of answers which stopped very abruptly and appeared to be unfinished. There were also pages left blank in the middle of the answer booklet, especially on question 6. It is not clear whether this was because candidates left out this question in order to do question 8, which carried a high number of marks, or if they left out this question because it targeted cross referencing, which many students find difficult.

Furthermore, a number of candidates continue to write an introductory paragraph which restates the question and does not gain them any marks. For some students this may be a deliberate tactic to ensure they are focused on the question and the relevant sources but it should be noted that it has the effect of limiting their time and also the available space in the answer booklet. There also continues to be a small number of students who write about each source, repeating the caption, describing the content or commenting on whether it is primary or reliable, before they actually respond to the question. This means that those students often do not begin to answer the question or gain any marks until the second page of their answer.

Question 1

Source A provided several details allowing students to make inferences about the way that Conscientious Objectors were treated but candidates found Source B more difficult to use and very few candidates were able to make inferences supported by Sources A and B in combination. Some candidates wrote about the treatment of COs from their own knowledge, which could not be rewarded.

Question 2

The role and work of military tribunals were not well known by many candidates and many answers simply repeated or expanded on the points contained in Source B or provided other information on the treatment of COs by the public. Although many repeated the comment from the B that tribunals in the Second World War treated COs more leniently, very few were able to explain how the difference in the make up of tribunals led to that changed attitude or different treatment. It is disappointing to see that a number of students appear to think they can rely entirely on the sources in this paper and centres are reminded that students should have contextual knowledge of the nominated topics.

Question 3

Candidates are now very familiar with this style of question and very confident in their answers. Although some unexpected interpretations of the cartoon were offered, most of them were valid inferences and the level of analysis, supported by direct references to details of the cartoon, was pleasingly high.

Question 4

A question on the value of sources as evidence for an historian's enquiry is set regularly and it is disappointing to see that many candidates still discuss only the content of the sources. Many judgements were made on the basis of the amount of information provided by the source and the use of a table seemed to pose particular problems, with many answers dismissing it because of the limited details it contained when compared to a written text. Candidates also have a tendency to assert that a source is biased without providing evidence to demonstrate that bias or explaining how it affects the value of the source.

Some candidates focused on the nature of the information or reliability and how that affected the source's usefulness for the historian in his enquiry but far too many candidates asserted that a source was valuable simply because it was produced at the time / it came from a CO / it is a primary source. Examiners comment every year on these blanket assertions which sometimes come at the end of a well reasoned answer considering a range of factors affecting the value of a source and it is very disheartening to see how many still judge the usefulness of the source on the basis of the amount of detail it contains or whether it was a primary source (often stating that a secondary source will never be totally reliable because the author was not there and therefore cannot know the truth).

Very few answers included any explanation of how the reliability or nature / origins / purpose of the source affected the value of the information. Where candidates did understand this requirement, good answers included comments about the added insight the historian gains into the political views of the author of D, possible bias in the report since a Socialist newspaper might share his views, or the proportion of applications for exemption in the 3 categories in E, while at the same time displaying a caution about whether the historian can generalise on the basis of information from a specific time in Huddersfield.

A disappointing number of candidates did not analyse the question carefully and wrote about why men became COs - sometimes using own knowledge, sometimes using the sources and making comparisons between them or cross referencing the information to see how far the sources supported each other.

Question 5

This style of question has been set several times during the last few years and it was very pleasing to see that candidates have understood its focus. Most candidates could identify the approving attitude in F although they were not always clear about whether the author of F approved of COs or the NCF. Many commented on the language or tone of the source, in particular, identifying the importance of the word "actually" and a number identified the way a negative emphasis on treatment of COs

created an image of them as victims or heroes (both interpretations were valid) and engendered sympathy for them. Some excellent answers were able to show that the selection and organisation of points included in the source created a cumulative effect, building up to the achievements of the NCF in saving the lives of some COs.

Question 6

Many candidates find it difficult to cross reference sources and there was a wide range of answers to this question. At the lowest level, answers were very generalised or offered opinions on whether the treatment of COs was fair. Where candidates treated the sources separately, they usually reached Level 2 with most students recognising that the sources provided details of harsh treatment and details were matched to show that points in F about isolation, transport to France and the use of the death sentence were supported in G. Careful analysis of the sources allowed some candidates to show that H offered a different slant by saying that this treatment was irregular and was stopped but many answers remained in Level 2 since they did not go beyond identifying the 2 sides of this issue illustrated in the sources. For Level 3, candidates needed to cross reference the details and use the sources in combination. At the highest level, there was discussion of how much weight should be placed on individual sources, for example whether the treatment in G should be regarded as an isolated incident and whether the admission in H that this had occurred showed that such treatment was more widespread than the government knew. A number also pointed out that even though the treatment in G was irregular, the correct treatment of isolation could still be regarded as harsh.

Question 7

There was again a disappointing lack of knowledgeable answers here. Many students could do little beyond repeat the information in I, often commenting that the men looked happy and therefore they were not badly treated. Other answers often explained about the COs being shipped to France and then tried for desertion or disobedience. Very few could identify a range of ways in which COs were treated and many of those wrote generally about the sort of work done in the First or Second World Wars. A few wrote about the treatment of COs by the public and a number assumed that the majority of COs in the First World War were tortured or shot. However, a few were able to explain the range of different treatments and explain the rationale behind them.

Question 8

In a number of cases the focus on changing attitudes had clearly been anticipated and there were some excellent answers explaining that changing government attitudes rather than those of the public, led to better treatment of COs in the Second World War. Unfortunately, some of these answers were based entirely on the sources and therefore were limited by their failure to use additional knowledge,

The treatment of COs in the First World War seemed to be better known than in the Second World War but a surprising number did not comment on the fact that COs acting as stretcher bearers in the First World War had demonstrated that their stance was clearly not the result of cowardice, although some answers showed that the government felt uncomfortable with the idea of imprisonment when fighting in the name of freedom against a fascist dictatorship.

Answers which attempted to construct an argument in response to the question usually reached Level 3 but some answers were not focused on explaining why attitudes changed and simply considered whether attitudes had changed - these tended to remain at Level 2. Where answers went through the sources using a checklist approach, candidates often contradicted themselves, since K said public attitudes had changed but A showed the public were still hostile to COs.

Nevertheless, it was very pleasing to see that many candidates planned their answer and therefore produced a structured argument in response to the question rather than going through each source in turn. At the highest level there was a real sense of different factors being weighed against each other and a genuine understanding of their interaction.

Paper 03: Coursework

The process once again worked well this year with moderators once again commenting upon the impressive standard of work displayed by many candidates. Students obviously enjoyed their courses and were able to respond to the objective questions.

The majority of tasks set by centres are Edexcel designed which enabled students to respond satisfactorily. Many of the centre designed assignments followed the Edexcel format and these performed well in practice as well. It does need to be noted that all centre assignments need approval by the Board using form HG1 which should be sent to the moderator along with all the other details for moderation purposes. These forms only give some comment about the possible workings of a particular question and any advice from a moderator on the E9 should be taken as a course of action that should be followed in order to improve the tasks set. It is particularly important that the format of 5 questions for Objectives 2 and 3 are followed so that a spread of marks can be achieved and level 4 can be demonstrated. Where some centres disadvantage their students is by changing this format and consequently candidates cannot demonstrate the requirements for the top level 3 and level 4 descriptors. Centres should also take into account the quality of written communication when deciding at standardisation where a particular piece of work falls in a level. With objectives 2 and 3 moderators did raise a concern about the lack of understanding displayed by students with utility of source. It is crucial that students are able to demonstrate the context of the sources when explaining their thoughts. One requirement for objective one that moderators are becoming increasingly concerned about is the lack of ability to select, organise and deploy information. If this objective is followed correctly students should be able to produce concise answers instead of, in one case 10,000 words. The Board does suggest a word limit for assignments of 1,500 words for each assignment.

The most worrying development this year was the lack of adequate annotation and little evidence provided for internal standardisation. A few centres provided work to moderators with little indication of how the marks have been arrived at. It is a Board requirement that work is annotated by providing a level and a comment to support this decision.

Statistics

1336 Option 1 (A1, P1, 21, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	82	72	62	53	43	34	25	16	0

1336 Option 2 (B1, P1, 21, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	78	70	62	54	44	35	26	17	0

1336 Option 3 (C1, P1, 21, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	78	70	62	54	44	34	25	16	0

1336 Option 4 (A1, Q1, 22, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	79	69	59	50	41	32	24	16	0

1336 Option 5 (B1, Q1, 22, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	80	71	62	54	44	34	24	14	0

1336 Option 6 (C1, Q1, 22, 03) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	80	71	62	54	44	34	24	14	0

1336 Paper A1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper A1 grade boundaries	40	29	20	9

1336 Paper B1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper B1 grade boundaries	40	30	22	10

1336 Paper C1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper C1 grade boundaries	40	29	22	9

1336 Paper P1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper P1 grade boundaries	40	32	23	13

1336 Paper Q1 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper Q1 grade boundaries	40	32	24	11

1336 Paper 21 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 21 grade boundaries	60	42	31	13

1336 Paper 22 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 22 grade boundaries	60	42	31	12

1336 Paper 3 Grade boundaries

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

3336 Option 2 (12, 02) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	80	71	62	53	43	33	24	15	0

3336 Option 3 (13, 02) Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	U
Overall subject grade boundaries	100	80	71	62	53	42	31	21	11	0

3336 Paper 12 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 12 grade boundaries	55	41	30	13

3336 Paper 13 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 13 grade boundaries	55	39	30	12

3336 Paper 2 Grade boundaries

Grade	Max. Mark	A	C	F
Paper 2 grade boundaries	100	73	54	25

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

Telephone 01623 467467 Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA UG020243 Summer 2008

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