

GCE

Edexcel GCE

History (6523)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication Code: UA017994

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

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 2006

Publications Code UA 017994

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
1A	A Very English Reformation: the Church and Henry VIII, 1529-47	1
2B	Meeting the Challenge? The Catholic Reformation to 1563.....	2
3A	Crown, Parliament and Conflict in Early Stuart England, 1603-29	3
4B	The Sun King in Eclipse: the Later Years of Louis XIV, 1688 -1715	4
5B	War and the Revolutionary State, 1792-1815	5
6A	Parliamentary Reform, 1815-1850	6
7A	The Health of the People: Public Health and Social Policy, 1832-75	7
8B	Bismarck and the Unification of Germany, c.1848-71	8
9A	Responding to Reform: Party and Policy in the Age of Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867-85	9
10A	Conflict, Depression and Opportunity: British Society between the Wars, 1919-39	10
11B	Life in Hitler's Germany, 1933-39	11
12B	Life in the Soviet Union, 1928-41	12
13B	Promise and Performance: FDR and the New Deal in the United States of America, 1933-45	13
	Coursework	14
	Statistics	19

1A: A Very English Reformation: the Church and Henry VIII, 1529-47

Question (a) elicited many good but few excellent responses. Most candidates established More's renown with Charles V and supported this with apposite and brief quotation. Many acknowledged the Ambassador's ignorance but failed to provide a reasonable explanation. Higher ranking answers also examined More's international reputation and at the top of Level 3 the fact that Charles sent for the Ambassador and/or the provenance were noted. 'Own knowledge' - chiefly More's career - was infiltrated.

Question (b) produced a full range of responses and drew two complaints from Centres who felt that it strayed beyond the religious parameters of the syllabus. Most candidates warmed to a straightforward question. Most recognised Cromwell's religious radicalism and the Cleves marriage debacle but only the better knew about Norfolk and conservative faction. The range of reasons was the key determinant of Level 3 as relevance to Cromwell's fall was not an issue. An interesting minority summarised with Henry's tendency to abandon and destroy ministers who no longer had a use - Wolsey, More, Cromwell.

Nor were the demands of Question (c) complicated although it was taken by weaker candidates as an invitation to tell the tale of the divorce and the Break with Rome. Range and depth were again crucial together with judgement on the relative importance of factors other than the Anne Boleyn pregnancy and the search for a male heir. Power and money were the next most popularly cited causes, then anti-clericalism and Cromwell's role. Slight problems were posed by small numbers of candidates who took up the word 'conflict' and concentrated exclusively on resistance to the Reformation or who breached the chronological parameters.

2B: Meeting the Challenge? The Catholic Reformation to 1563

The Source question afforded plenty of opportunities for comprehension and basic inference. The best candidates were able to emphasise the problems of war caused both by the Turks and the Imperial/French conflict and/or draw attention to the range of reasons whilst emphasising the primacy of the latter conflict as a problem. Most candidates could write extensively in answer to (b) but tended to offer rather generalised causal explanations which reached comfortable Level 2 scores. There was a pronounced focus on the spread of Protestantism and its criticisms of the Church of Rome but few could address the date, linking precisely to some triumph over heresy in the 1530's. The better candidates referred to the recent loss of England (1534) or Wurttemberg (1533/34). Some stressed the growing influence of Catholic reformers at the papal court and some offered the cynical explanation that it was a delaying tactic to put off the calling of a General Council.

Candidates had plenty to offer in response to (c) but to gain Level 3 there had to be a clear emphasis on "effective". Too many in describing the work of the Jesuits discussed missions to Asia which were hardly relevant in the attack on heresy. The best focused on the work of St Peter Canisius in Germany. There was much on the Council of Trent in preparing the ground for an effective counter-attack and the best candidates pointed out that the practical applications of its decisions tended to be after 1563. Both the Index and the Inquisition figured in most answers and the better ones emphasised the geographical limits of both.

3A: Crown, Parliament and Conflict in Early Stuart England, 1603-29

A number of candidates explained and contextualised the Source rather than made inferences from it in Question (a). At a basic level some candidates struggled to comprehend the extract, failing to understand John Felton's position as a man who was owed money and who had been slighted in his promotion prospects. Some even failed to realise that Felton was the assassin of Buckingham despite the clear statement in the attribution. However the best were able to demonstrate the range of motives provided and the primacy that Felton accorded to the recent Remonstrance (confused by some with the 1621 Protestation and even with the Grand Remonstrance). He clearly felt that the assassination was a public duty and not the product of personal bitterness. It was perfectly legitimate to argue that 'he would say that wouldn't he'.

Question (b) was clearly demanding and some candidates knew nothing about Lionel Cranfield. The best answers were able to deal with the range of his financial innovations, firstly in enhancing customs returns then in paring down royal household expenses then in his boosting of returns from the court of wards. Level 3 candidates discussed Cranfield's battle to preserve peace as an essential prerequisite to financial well-being. In this he failed and of course fell dramatically from power. One key difference between Level 2 and Level 3 was citing specific examples to support general statements, and then more than 're-using candles at court' which seemed to be a fixation of weaker candidates.

Question (c), it is pleasing to report, was the best answered and again illustrated the value of substantiating general statements in order to make a convincing case. Problems in religion, with finance and with the House of Commons were readily identified and most candidates were able to attain Level 3 by dealing therein with the issue of 'success'. Problems arose with dates for those creeping beyond 1614 to Buckingham and the Thirty Years War, with terminology such as "Puritan" and with lengthy narrative such as of the Hampton Court Conference day-by-day. But most answers were relevant and focused, and a number were a pleasure to read.

4B: The Sun King in Eclipse: the Later Years of Louis XIV, 1688-1715

Question (a) posed few difficulties for it lent itself readily to inference as well as to the comprehension of as many as five relevant points attesting the Sun King's eclipse. Better candidates arranged the material thematically and quoted briefly from text. The best compared Louis' reputation in France with the respect in which he was held abroad but pointed out that 'praise and honour' is not synonymous with 'popularity'.

Range and development were sought by examiners in responses to Question (b), along with comparison which was active. Many candidates drew attention to two very different contexts of 1708/09 and 1713/14 but although a number could cite evidence of a French military revival like Denain, few appreciated the effectiveness of Vauban's defensive works. Level 3 answers tended to encompass French success in Spain and the palace revolution in Britain which brought the more pacific and tractable Tories to power.

Most candidates showed an awareness in their responses to Question (c) that they were entered for an option on the "Later Years of Louis XIV" and eschewed reference to the Edict of Nantes and to Protestants. Jansenism was a central theme and it was variously understood. It tended to be described at Level 2 but at Level 4 candidates were alert to the destruction of the Port Royal abbey in 1710 being but a superficial victory. Analysis of relations with the Papacy also ran the gamut and the best candidates showed real sensitivity to the Gallican reaction.

5B: War and the Revolutionary State, 1792-1815

Napoleon attracted an entry of 427 in the “War and the State” option. Most candidates were able to score at least 7 marks on Source Question (a), clearly inferring Napoleon’s belief in the supremacy of the state. Few, however, grasped that Napoleon wanted the Church to have an influence in the scholarly sphere as personified in the old Bishop of Nantes. Too many resorted to ‘own knowledge’ about the Concordat or the situation in 1813. It was more relevant that the dead Bishop accepted the hegemony of the state.

There were some excellent answers to Question (b), with a range of causes offered. The chief weakness, which kept candidates out of level 3, was a tendency not to refer in detail to the defeat of the First Coalition but to advance very generalised points about the size of the French army (the levee en masse afforded huge reserves) or the use of artillery sometimes citing battles (including Austerlitz) after 1797. One answer mentioned Carnot five times but Napoleon not at all.

The responses to Question (c) were very varied. At the top end there were level 4 answers in which the words ‘wide-ranging’ and ‘beneficial’ were absolutely central. Too many, however, expressed bias against Napoleon and his reforms, seeing them as cynical devices to cement his power and/or promote the strengths of the warrior state. The positive attributes of the legal reforms were all too easily passed over, as were the virtues of creating a strong state after years of chaos. Few quoted Napoleon’s famous dictum that “the Nation is as so many grains of sand” and his intention in consequence to unify it with “boulders of granite”. It is perfectly possible to be critical of Napoleon and yet accept his reform as crucial in the formation of the modern French state. There were some first-rate scripts which showed real perception and no little acumen allied to secure knowledge.

6A: Parliamentary Reform, 1815-1850

Question (a) worked well in differentiating the 696 candidates and most gained at least 6 marks for comprehension of the relationship between the three components - Crown, Lords and Commons - and of the danger of the unchecked power of the Lords. More elusive was the notion of 'constitutional' and the inference of 'checks and balances' overarching all arrangements. 'Own knowledge' was not uncommon as, also on a centre basis, was failure to quote directly from the text.

Question (b) taxed the candidates and was disappointingly answered. It attracted two complaints as straying outside the syllabus but it does in fact conform with the specification as the Chief Examiner replied. Striking a balance between the Crown and the House of Lords was a problem for many. Weaker candidates made no reference to the role of rotten boroughs and some even relied on the Source as the basis of their argument. The best showed how the Reform Act reduced patronage and removed many royal boroughs while the Lords had suffered a defeat and were afforded less opportunity to purchase seats in the Commons. The elections of 1835 and 1841 showed how the balance had shifted towards the Commons.

Question (c) was better answered and a number of candidates found so much to say that they ran out of time. The weak tendencies were either to dismiss the Tory Party crisis very briefly or to ignore anything but the fragmentation. Some candidates were led to speculate on the outcome had Liverpool lived longer and this was unfortunate. Good candidates - and there were many - detailed the collapse of the Tory Party (many noting the paradox of the Ultras voting for the Reform Act) and proceeded to analyse and prioritise 'other factors' such as economic recession and popular disturbance, the Political Unions, a new King not averse to the reviving Whigs and the effects of a revolution in France.

7A: The Health of the People: Public Health and Social Policy, 1832-75

Examiners reported a general rise in the standard of scripts on a Paper which was certainly accessible to its 469 candidates. Question (a) lent itself more to an accumulation of points of comprehension than to inference so the diligent students did well as they identified reasons for the desirability of better supplies of water. Those who departed from the text to speculate on knowledge of water-borne diseases tended to come unstuck as the Source was dated 1842. Relatively few candidates picked up the inference that as “domestic use” was almost an afterthought in the Report it could hardly have been a priority.

There could have been no more straightforward Question on any Unit 3 Paper than (b) and most candidates were able to describe Snow’s main contribution and to place this into context. Better candidates built up a progressive picture - early career, theory, investigation, publication, battle for recognition, post mortem impact - and a relatively small number linked his work to specific public health reforms. But the question had the capacity to expose paucity of basic knowledge and some candidates wrote little or confused Snow’s life and career with Simon’s, or even Chadwick’s.

Question (c) was more taxing. Those who had prepared for the 1832-48 period were confined to a narrow focus. Other candidates focused on the reasons for change in attitude to public health rather than how public responses to public health reform changed over the 1848-75 period. Most recognised a shift from negative - ignorant to positive - knowledgeable, fewer connected with the local versus centralisation debate and a high-scoring few tried to overarch the essay with the big ideological shift that was under way at this time. The impact of vested interests and Chadwick as forces for the negative were well covered.

8B: Bismarck and the Unification of Germany, c.1848-71

Some 880 candidates entered for the Bismarck option and on the whole they acquitted themselves well. Question (a) was certainly answered well as most candidates combed the article for weaknesses in the Frankfurt Assembly. They identified, and supported from the text, a talking shop beset by threats from Left and Right and one without the character and inclination to succeed. A higher proportion than usual grasped the higher level inference of an underlying lack of power. However, few were able to identify Engels so as to comment critically on provenance. Extensive 'own knowledge' intruded was a criticism from all four examiners and that a number of candidates took the reference to "old women" too literally.

The examining team were impressed by candidates' information and analytical skills in answering question (b). Although relating knowledge of the Schleswig-Holstein imbroglio to the German Confederation was a demanding focus to sustain, most eschewed dynastic complexity and dealt effectively with Austria and Prussia as well as German nationalism. Geographical confusion and the international dimension were more problematical for a minority of students. Most answers had a clear causal focus.

Question (c) was felt to have elicited higher quality essays than in previous sessions. The main problem was controlling the abundant knowledge possessed, striking a balance between 1866 and 1870 and finding time to set the stated Bismarck factor against a range of other forces at play. The great majority of candidates wrote clearly focused responses of sufficient range and depth to secure Level 3. Many broke through into Level 4 on the strength of the comprehensiveness of their coverage and the interactions and relationships established between factors as diverse as warlike intention, economic strength, military preparedness, nationalist support and diplomatic circumstance.

9A: Responding to Reform: Party and Policy in the Age of Gladstone and Disraeli, 1867-85

Most of the 697 candidates were able to achieve 7 or 8 marks on Question (a) by offering developed and supported statements about Gladstone's political beliefs and priorities by inverting the attack he makes on Disraeli's government.

Fewer were appreciative for Level 3 of the moral dimension to Gladstone's political outlook which is implicit in the Source. Candidates should be counselled against repeatedly using the term 'infer' when what is achieved is sound comprehension of something clearly stated. Nor should this question be used as a cue for a Gladstone monologue as on pacifying Ireland.

Question (b) was more problematical chiefly because of narrow and sketchy factual knowledge and the majority of candidates fell into Level 2. A significant minority could offer only one reason for the introduction of the 1884 Act, chiefly the rectification of anomalies of the 1867 Reform Act. Some candidates did not understand the term 'franchise'. Most, however, engaged with the question in a more wide ranging way and addressed electoral advantage, healing Liberal Party divisions, appeasing the Radicals and even winning the rural vote in Ireland. A significant minority wrote with eloquence on the self-interest and principle intrinsic to Gladstonian Liberalism.

On Question (c) most candidates achieved Level 3 but there were relatively few outstanding answers at Level 4. This was partly because of imbalance as some candidates failed to appreciate the necessity to cover both the 1868 and the 1874 elections as well as what came in between. Others offered narrative accounts of the Ministry on the lines of 'they did this so the act upset these people' with one or both elections bolted on. Or treatment of the Liberal government was patchy and left significant areas - chiefly Ireland and foreign affairs - untouched. That said, the opinion of the examining team was that the (c) question was better answered than last year.

10A: Conflict, Depression and Opportunity: British Society between the Wars, 1919-39

Source Question (a) was accessible and the chief complaint of the examiners was that many candidates failed to squeeze the text for all four posited reasons for the failure of the General Strike. A number, for example, failed to see how the technological revolution in motor cars and wireless was important to communication in a crisis. Most candidates resisted the temptation to intrude 'own knowledge' and a sizeable minority took issue with the provenance, noting that a leading Conservative writing some 27 years later would extol the virtues of "good sense and moderation" embodied in Stanley Baldwin.

Question (b) was straightforward and it produced the most disappointing answers. Detailed and accurate factual knowledge was at the root of a problem which appeared to be centre-specific. Where shipbuilding had been studied as a discreet topic candidates were enabled to harvest abundant marks. Their answers tended to encompass detailed insight into the industry from post-war excess capacity, to technological change (to oil), to foreign competition, to the nature of a highly unionised and concentrated staple industry. The less well informed relied more on what they knew of the economic context but many overlooked the effects of the return to the Gold Standard in 1925 before concentrating on the depressed 1930's, chiefly Jarrow, and frequently mistaking the consequences for the causes of problems. They often missed government initiative on Clydeside and the effects of the rearmament initiative from 1936.

The examining team reported that the quotation in Question (c) was not problematic for candidates. Indeed one candidate recognised Dickens and proceeded to cap it not only with Priestley but with Orwell! The main problem was imbalance and, surprisingly, it was "the best of times" that outweighed "the worst of times". Although the majority of answers addressed the North/South divide (and many cited the example of Halifax as an exception to the rule), few were able to analyse the social effects of unemployment so as to shed light on 'living standards' in the depressed areas. Slum housing was a relevant but limited theme and it is easy to over-generalise. The entry of 2006 was happier elaborating on the advantages of the burgeoning consumer society as a result of employment opportunities in the new industries. They tended to write as much about the quality of life as about living standards per se and this examiners treated liberally, but all five regretted the reluctance to analyse the gloom of the old industrial regions.

11B: Life in Hitler's Germany, 1933-39

With an entry of 10,074 the Hitler's Germany option dominates Unit 3 with the largest entry.

The Source in Question (a) was felt to have been well chosen for inferential potential and thus it allowed for clear differentiation between weaker and stronger candidates. The question also advantaged the majority of candidates who reached at least the Level 2 key mark point of 7. Most candidates had little trouble in grasping the point that "physical" activity and "practical...training" counted for more than traditional academic education, and they could support it from the text. Many also made reference to the "character" and "military" values being promoted but appropriate reference to the source was scarcer here, "Flanders" being lost on the majority. Some were, however, able to make inference about the emphasis on "struggle" from the textual comment about "failing" in the camp and the consequences for future careers. However, some candidates saw the regime as completely anti-education rather than it using the labour camp as an alternative form of "anti-intellectual" education. And perhaps because education is such a central topic for students, many off-loaded 'own knowledge'. On the other hand, occasionally candidates used provenance to telling effect as they squeezed the document usually by commenting that the date showed the urgency with which the Nazi regime addressed this issue.

Question (b) was problematic for some candidates. For these candidates the major problem was of adapting the formula 'control, weaken, replace' to the requirements of "undermine". Many candidates could distinguish between Protestant and Catholic Churches (coverage of one only met a ceiling of 9 marks) and could draw on a wide range of illustration - Concordat, Reich Church, German Christians, education, youth, ideology. Large numbers unversed in religious policies attempted to cobble together answers from their knowledge of education, youth groups, women and even the treatment of Jews, and a surprising number concluded on the closeness of the values of the Nazis and the church.

Despite its accessibility and centrality Question (c) also caused problems for some candidates. Identifying the "objectives" was not the problem and most candidates settled on an acceptable formula of Recovery/employment; Autarky; Rearmament. The issue was substantiation leading to judgement of "how far....achieved". Many took refuge in description - and it tended to work for tackling unemployment - and found it difficult to move out of Level 2. The other two objectives tended to be less well specifically supported and some drifted into social groups and living standards in a virtual re-run of the 2005 question. The names Schacht and Goring often triggered more relevant responses but a number who alluded to the 'Guns v Butter' debate were unable to focus it on the question. The best candidates had a clear sense of chronology allied to sound knowledge (some tied in foreign policy) which enabled them to explain why and how the "objectives" changed over time and they made appropriate judgemental comments during the course of the answer as well as in a conclusion. Thus there was excellent work but many candidates appear not to enjoy or to understand things economic.

12B: Life in the Soviet Union, 1928-41

Few candidates found this paper inaccessible and most showed comprehension of Stalin's criticism of the equalisation of wages in Question (a). Some were puzzled whether Stalin's support for differentials referred to the existing system or to one under consideration. With few exceptions candidates observed that lack of incentive was an issue for the unskilled and that skilled workers needed to feel appreciated. The inferences that wage differentiation would lead to a settled workforce to the benefit of rapid industrialisation and that Stalin appeared to be blaming management because he wanted to disguise the drive for production behind concern for workers' standards of living were noted by better candidates. The best suggested that Stalin was forced to sacrifice fundamental Marxist principles in order to build the economy. The question worked well and most candidates reached the Level 2 key mark of 7 or above.

The greatest problem in Question (b) was focus on the wording for many strayed into descriptive accounts of how collectivisation came about or evaluated its successes and failures. Those who reached Level 2 recognised the link between collectivisation and industrialisation and offered at least three of Stalin's intentions. The need to produce grain for the industrial workforce and for foreign capital were well rehearsed. The removal of the Kulaks was less widely recognised but under the guise of resistance to land or animal loss rather than Stalin's motives of facilitating grain procurement and of spreading socialist control to the countryside. It was not uncommon for candidates to achieve the full 14 marks.

That the 2006 Question (c) did not call for pro and con evaluation but rather the elaboration of a given theme was no barrier to excellent answers. Thus the idea that Stalin controlled the arts for "political purposes" was understood by the majority of candidates. They also recognised themes such as 'social realism', 'the cult of the little man' and, above all, the 'cult of personality' and the 'cult of Stalin' which pervaded the years 1928-41. The better were cognisant of change over time from 'successor to Lenin', to 'kindly father figure' to 'war leader'. And they linked this to different agendas and to a range of the arts - painting, music, literature, sculpture, cinema. Although many candidates saw the arts as being used mainly as propaganda and/or controlled to eliminate unacceptable attitudes or opposition to the regime, a few proceeded to examine the development of a proletarian culture as opposed to the elitist culture of the Tsars. The question was open to a creative approach and when candidates had researched an aspect of the arts this tended to produce less pedestrian illustration as well as invigorated writing. The importance of the control of literature, architecture and painting to support a Marxist view of family life and the changing position of women was explored by a few, and fewer still criticised the control mechanism of the cult of personality as at odds with Marxist/Leninist theory.

13B: Promise and Performance: FDR and the New Deal in the United States of America, 1933-45

The majority of the 1468 candidates for the New Deal option responded at Level 2 to Question (a) although some tended to slip into paraphrase, more failed to support their contentions with brief quotation from the Source and some wrote exclusively from 'own knowledge', typically about employment opportunities for women in the 1930's. Relatively few misunderstood the Source and many understood the tricks of the employers and the class-based nature of the office girls' objection to joining a union; but fewer that the CIO felt the same. Nor did many pick up on the idea that the CIO focused on more "important" "male-dominated industries. Thus many responses missed the gender reference as a contributory factor to the difficulties of unionising female office workers.

Question (b) was generally high-scoring and many candidates achieved Level 3. They did so by building from the Supreme Court's attacks and Roosevelt's counter attacks, developed by reference to court cases and the Judicial Reform Bill, to the composition of the Court as an underlying contributor to a discussion of the underlying constitutional issue of federalism v states' rights. A very few candidates reached the sophisticated overriding issue of checks and balances and the Supreme Court's function to maintain the Constitution. There were few low Level 2 marks as most candidates had a 'pretty good go' at question (b).

Similarly the vast majority of candidates were able to answer Question (c) at Level 3 or Level 4. The majority of candidates adopted a chronological approach with links to the question at the ends of paragraphs and in conclusion. Most attempted to indicate some limitations to New Deal measures. Stronger candidates maintained a clear focus on "transform the lives" and analysed the effects of measures on different social groups and different regions. In the interests of balance the strongest candidates considered the impact of the New Deal on ethnic minorities and women. Some candidates used the theme of question (b) to show how the New Deal was partially blocked before it could effect a 'transformation' of lives. Crucial for Level 4 was treatment of the effects of the Second World War when arguably the real 'transformation' took place. Candidates whose study ended in 1941 were limited to a passing comment or to general knowledge and they tended to stay in Level 3. Fewer candidates than in the past were felt to have experienced problems with time-management but those who attempted Question (c) first had to think fast as time ran out on (a).

Coursework

The candidature for the coursework option within Unit 3 represents slightly more than one third of the total entry for this Unit. The number of centres choosing Edexcel designed coursework schemes is roughly half of the total, with the other half submitting work relating to centre-designed and Edexcel approved, courses.

The work was moderated by three moderating teams, working under the guidance of their team leaders and the principal moderator.

Marking and moderating

Moderators found much to praise in the work they saw. The variety and range of coursework courses continues to impress, as does the accurate, sensitive and fair way teachers-examiners assess their students' work. Most centres present work that is carefully and professionally annotated, making it easy for moderators to follow the logic behind the marks they give and the rank order of their candidates.

This year as in previous years, most centre's marking was accurate, consistent and at an appropriate standard. Annotations were sharply focused on the qualities required by the mark schemes and showed a clear understanding of the overall qualities required for achievement at the various levels. The marks of candidates in a minority of centres were adjusted to align them with the common standard. Some of these centres had their marks raised, but most were reduced, some by a significant amount. Where marks had been too generously awarded, this was due to three main problems:

(a) Information overload

Some centres are over-rewarding information. Centres are reminded that higher-level marks are reserved for those answers that are analytical and argued, not overburdened with information. It is what students do with the knowledge they have, not the knowledge per se that achieves higher levels.

(b) Source evaluation

There was a marked increase in the number of centres that were giving high rewards for very basic source evaluation. Centres are reminded that comprehending and interpreting source material must be rewarded at levels 1 and 2. In order to achieve level 3, candidates must show an ability to ask questions of the evidence and draw inferences. It is at this point that a consideration of the source material moves, broadly, from providing information to providing evidence. Candidates operating at this level can make and sustain logical judgements about the value of evidence in a given historical context, and can use the evidence with some discrimination to reach and support conclusions. In order to achieve level 4, candidates must show that they can interrogate the evidence with confidence and discrimination to reach substantiated conclusions. In reaching these conclusions, the candidates must take the evidence holistically and any evaluation must seek to establish what weight the evidence will bear.

(c) Word limits

All centres were notified in writing in October 2003 about changes to the coursework mark scheme level descriptors and were provided with a copy of the new coursework mark scheme. The problem created by centres exceeding the word limit (3,000 words) was emphasised in the 2004 and 2005 coursework reports that were sent to all centres and, where appropriate, on individual centre reports. It is made clear in the Specification (Issue 4 published in November 2003) and in the Coursework and Teachers' Guide that candidates must not exceed the word limit. Appreciating that it is not always possible to persuade students to edit over-long work, the generic mark scheme published in the Specification (Issue 4 November 2003) details, as part of each level descriptor, what action teacher-examiners have to take when marking over-long work.

It was disturbing to find that, this year, a significant number of centres submitted work that was in flagrant breach of the word limits. The moderating team found:

- Documentation given to candidates by centres that clearly and accurately stated what the word limit was, with the reminder that there would be penalties should this be exceeded. Yet when coursework with stated word counts that were over the limit was submitted for marking, no such penalty was exacted by the teacher-examiner. In other words, the correct mark scheme was not applied.
- Word counts given as c.3,000 when the work was clearly longer.
- Word counts given as under the 3,000 limit 'excluding quotations' when Edexcel's regulations clearly state that quotations within the body of the text must be included in the given word count.
- Word counts not given at all, or written in obscure places on the work, forcing moderators to do the necessary computation when it is clearly stated that a total work count has to be given on the front of the work of every candidate.
- Candidates putting a considerable amount of text and argument into footnotes, which are excluded from the word count. Edexcel's regulations clearly state that this is not to happen.
- Notes in the folder of work indicating that students had been given erroneous advice about word limits eg statements such as '100-200 words over doesn't matter' against the statement that the word limit of 3,000 was not to be exceeded.

Having said this, the majority of centres submitted work from candidates that was within the word limits and, where it wasn't, applied the correct mark scheme appropriately.

Candidate performance

Candidate performance this year continued to show an increased understanding of the requirements of the two parts of the assignment and of the ways in which they require different competencies. In part (a), there were fewer examples of candidates taking the sources one by one and mining them for information. This approach almost always results in over-long work that achieves, roughly, at level 2. Pleasingly, an increasing number of candidates are standing back from the source material and treating it holistically, as a set that needs evaluating and considering what can be said of it as such. They then return to individual sources, using them selectively to support the points they wish to make.

In part (b), there were fewer examples of straight narrative responses, with candidates adopting the 'telling it as it was' approach. Far more candidates than in previous years are selectively deploying what they know to answer the question set in a direct, logically planned, manner. Many achieved level 3 by giving clear evidence of the ability to distinguish between cause, motive and intention and displaying an understanding of the basic relationship between cause and effect in a given context. Candidates are, too, appreciating that the simple mention of an historian, usually accompanied by a brief quotation from him or her, does not automatically qualify for entry to level 4. It is the use made of the views of historians in substantiating the candidate's own judgement that is important and is a high level skill.

There was evidence of slightly generous marking from centre's marking borderline performances on the previously published grade boundaries. The grade boundaries were increased by one mark in order to ensure that the coursework standard was comparable to the examined route.

Centre administration

An increasing number of centres are experiencing difficulties with the administration of the coursework element of this Unit. It is appreciated that there are enormous pressures on teachers at this time of year, but not to comply with Edexcel's regulations when submitting work to the moderator slows the moderation process and makes unnecessary extra work for examinations officers, teacher-examiners and moderators. The list below details what is necessary:

- The HA1, providing evidence that both course and tasks have been approved. It would be sensible to send a photocopy, retaining the original in the centre for use in future years. No HA1 is required if centres are following an Edexcel-designed course.
- The HA4, including copies of tasks and mark schemes. If the task is an Edexcel designed one, a note to this effect should be included.
- The HA3 Coursework Mark Record form, photocopied from the latest edition of the Specification. Please note that only those candidates in the sample being submitted should be listed, and these must be listed in rank order.

- The sample of marked work selected by the computer, with an HA5 authentication sheet completed for each candidate, signed by the candidate and the teacher. Please note that the HA5 from Specification Issue 5 (September 2005) must be used and that the total word count, including quotations but excluding footnotes, must be written in the correct box.
- The complete folder of work of the student who is second in the rank order of the sample selected.
- The work of the highest and lowest scoring candidates if these haven't already been selected as part of the sample to be sent to the moderator.

Teaching and guidance

Inspection by moderators of the complete folder of coursework revealed that the majority of centres are teaching full, and in many cases exciting and innovative, courses. However, a minority seem to be lacking in the substance expected of a course that should occupy one third of the AS programme of study. Many of these consisted of little more than photo-copied hand-outs. Others focused unduly on the work needed for completion of the set tasks, and did not allow these to grow naturally from the taught course. Centres are reminded that moderators are required to take this into account when moderating the marking of assignments sent to them. This is to ensure that some candidates are not advantaged over others because they have been taught a course that is too tightly focused on the coursework tasks. It is expected that the approved course will be taught in its entirety, not that candidates will devote the bulk of their time to preparation for the assignment. Where teachers find that approved courses are over-ambitious, centres are reminded that it is open to them to resubmit a revised course for approval.

The folders of work of some candidates revealed that some centres are still allowing students to submit drafts of coursework for comment and marking. In one case, three drafts of coursework assignments, annotated by the teacher, were seen before a final draft was deemed suitable for submission as coursework. This is not acceptable. Re-drafting after comment is not one of the skills assessed in GCE History coursework. Both teachers and candidates need to be able to sign the HA5 Authentication of Coursework form with clear consciences. This states that the only assistance given to the candidate is that deemed acceptable under the Scheme of Assessment. 'Acceptable assistance' means:

- The drawing out, or clarifying, of the meaning of a question
- Elucidation of the qualities required in the general level descriptors.

It is NOT legitimate to:

- Supply word or phrases for candidates to use in their answers
- Supply question-specific templates or structures
- Give detailed question-specific guidance on how to structure introductions and conclusions
- Tell candidates in detail how to improve their assignments
- Take in and comment upon drafts of work and then return them to candidates for revision.

The amount of guidance given to candidates will obviously have an effect on the marks awarded. Even within one teaching group, some candidates may well have received more help than others and this should be reflected in the marks given. Any guidance given to candidates should be included in the information sent to the moderator as this will help the moderator understand the thinking behind the marking and explain what might at first seem inconsistencies in a centre's rank order.

Feedback

This report constitutes one aspect of coursework feedback. A second aspect lies in individual centre reports. All centres will receive individual centre reports, most of which were completed by moderators on-line and which will form part of the centre's year-on-year record. It is important that notice is taken of these and of any advice contained within them. The third element of feedback lies in the INSET programme run by Edexcel in the autumn of 2006 and the spring of 2007 and centres are encouraged to participate in these meetings.

It is the nature of generalised reports to dwell on the negative and on what can be done to improve matters. However, it must be emphasised that all moderators found much to praise. The variety and range of coursework courses continues to impress, with innovative approaches and interesting work resulting from a high standard of teaching and learning. Many candidates, deservedly, were awarded high or even full marks. The moderating team looks forward to a continuation of this and to an even more successful 2007.

The future: 2007 and 2008

Centres are reminded that significant changes have been made to the coursework requirements for 2007 and 2008.

Only one task will be set and this must take the form of a single assignment offering the opportunity to assess AO1 (a and b) with a mark allocation of sixty marks. For most centres this will mean the removal of sources and the (a) question. Full details are to be found in the Specification Issue 5 (September 2005), in the revised Coursework and Teachers' Guide (Issue 4 March 2006) and on Edexcel's web-site. Please note that the word limits for this single assignment are 1,750-2,750. No assignment may exceed 2,750 words. If candidates are unable, for whatever reason, to keep within these limits, the correct mark scheme must be applied

Please note that coursework programmes and (b) tasks that have already been approved do not have to be re-submitted. However, a full and exciting range of coursework programmes, new for 2007 and 2008, is available on Edexcel's web-site and centres may wish to consider these as alternatives.

Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
1a	60	37.7	9.1
2b	60	37.3	8.4
3a	60	33.9	10.2
4b	60	36.9	10.5
5b	60	36.4	9.2
6a	60	36.3	9.1
7a	60	36.6	7.7
8b	60	40.3	7.2
9a	60	37.8	9.3
10a	60	36.2	8.4
11b	60	34.8	9.0
12b	60	38.3	9.0
13b	60	40.8	8.2
02A	60	43.2	9.2
02B	60	43.3	8.7
02C	60	42.9	9.1

Paper 1a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	33	29	25
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		36.9	58.1	72.2	84.0	90.9

Paper 2b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	36	32	28	25
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		40.6	59.4	75.2	89.1	92.1

Paper 3a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	39	34	29	24	19
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		34.9	56.9	72.0	84.0	91.8

Paper 4b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	34	28	23	18
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		44.6	66.3	82.3	88.6	93.1

Paper 5b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	36	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		40.8	58.3	73.8	82.8	90.3

Paper 6a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	36	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		33.3	56.9	73.9	84.6	90.9

Paper 7a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		19.5	42.9	61.5	80.5	89.1

Paper 8b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	39	36	33	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		41.3	63.0	77.4	86.0	92.6

Paper 9a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		40.1	61.1	78.8	86.4	91.2

Paper 10a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	38	34	30	26
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		26.6	43.9	63.4	77.1	88.0

Paper 11b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		23.7	43.7	65.3	79.8	89.4

Paper 12b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		32.0	51.9	64.4	79.3	89.2

Paper 13b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	42	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		31.1	51.9	69.5	81.2	90.3

Paper 02A

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	49	44	39	34	29
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		30.2	51.4	71.6	84.7	93.5

Paper 02B

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	49	44	39	34	29
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		31.1	53.3	73.3	86.0	94.9

Paper 02C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	49	44	39	34	29
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		30.7	51.6	71.3	84.6	93.7

Advanced Subsidiary award

Provisional statistics for the award

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	18.4	39.0	61.3	79.7	91.7

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced UMS grade boundaries

	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Advanced Subsidiary	300	240	210	180	150	120
Advanced	600	480	420	360	300	240

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 017994 Summer 2006

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

edexcel 
advancing learning, changing lives

A PEARSON COMPANY

