

Examiners' Report Summer 2007

GCE

GCE History (6521)

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 2007

Publications Code UA 019217

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2007

Contents

Introduction	4
1A: Securing the Tudor Dynasty: the Reign of Henry VII	6
1B: The World Turned Upside Down: Monarchy and Republic in England, 1642-53	7
1C: Poverty and the British State, c.1815-50	8
1D: Votes for Women, c1880-1918	9
1E: Russia in Revolution, 1905-17	10
1F: The Seeds of Evil: The Rise of National Socialism in Germany to 1933	11
1G: Boom and Bust: Economy and Society in the USA, 1917-33	12
Statistics	13

Introduction

This was the seventh June Advance Subsidiary examination of GCE History. However, this was the first time the revised examination format was assessed, and in general appears to have been very successful. This particular Unit attracted an entry of approximately 28,800 candidates. The Papers generated a wide range of responses, and in the words of some Examiners, they felt that they were reading 'real' history writing with candidates coming to grips with the source material, evaluating it and matching it to what they knew of the period and topic.

All Papers differentiated effectively and this produced a full range of marks and comparability across all Papers. The well established use of key mark points within levels and the inclusion of indicative content for each part question on every Paper led to greater examiner reliability and accuracy of marking.

Comments specific to each of the Papers will be made later in this Report. There are, however, some comments that relate to the Unit as a whole and to all 7 Papers.

Two sub-questions were set on each Paper and followed an identical pattern: (a) assessed AO2, interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material. This question required candidates to analyse and cross-reference the three sources for a specific enquiry and to draw a conclusion. Part (b) was intended to enable candidates to demonstrate an understanding of both AO2 plus AO1; recall, select and deploy historical knowledge accurately, present historical explanations and arrive at a judgement. It was intended that the two or three sources identified for this task formed the basis of debate and this would therefore drive the analysis. AO1, own knowledge; which accounted for only 15 marks out of the total of 40 marks, is intended to develop the range of issues identified in the sources and from own knowledge that are relevant to the question.

For sub-question (a) many candidates did go beyond simple matching/mismatching of the surface features of the sources. An increased minority of candidates went as far as considering the purpose for which the sources were being cross-referenced, as a result of which we are seeing more candidates accessing top Level 2, Level 3. However, many candidates failed to include any discussion of the attribution of the source in terms of relevance and purpose for the stated task, how this might add value or limit the evidence. A passing reference to the identity of the author, without any inferences demonstrates that the candidate has failed to realise that assessing evidence is not about reliability in general, but value and limitation for the particular enquiry given. Many candidates resorted to generic statements including, these sources were/were not reliable because they were primary.

There was a large tendency amongst the candidates to tackle the sources one at a time and then write a conclusion about the extent to which challenge or support could be determined. Such answers led to repetition, they lacked detailed referencing to specific phrases in the sources and judgements in the conclusion were, in effect, little more than generalised assertions. Some candidates wasted time by bringing in own knowledge that went far beyond what could be expected of straightforward contextualisation. This caused two significant problems. Firstly, it had the effect of dulling what should have been a sharp focus on the Sources themselves.

Secondly, it often meant that candidates spent too much time on (a) to the detriment of (b), which has the highest weighting.

The (b) question was generally well answered. Sources were used to drive the analysis and own knowledge integrated into the explanation. However, some Centres persist in adopting the Source by Source approach and then move onto other factors drawn from own knowledge. Candidates need to be aware that their explanation/argument should be driven by the Sources with own knowledge used to develop issues relevant to the question and identified in the Sources. In addition, candidates need to be aware of the need to substantiate their statements by drawing evidence from the text of the sources or from own knowledge, as appropriate. Some very able candidates did not access Level 4 despite writing excellent essays as there was insufficient focus on the Sources. Centres are reminded that the allocation of marks is AO1 own knowledge (15) and AO2, use of sources (25). Conclusions where the evidence is weighed are also important.

In the (b) question many candidates were not secure on the chronology of the period they studied and this meant they included the wrong events, or interpreted policies wrongly, or generated evidence not relevant to the question. In fact many Examiners reported the dates in the question were either ignored or not seen to be important. Candidates need to be reminded that chronology is important for two reasons. Firstly, part (a) and part (b) will always address different periods. Secondly, by ignoring the dates and writing everything they know they are not focusing on the demands of the question and will therefore not be rewarded for irrelevant or out of period evidence.

A small number of candidates resorted to evaluation of the sources by reference to authorship in a routine or generic way; this Source is a secondary source therefore must be accurate, this historian can be trusted etc. This sort of evaluation simply distracted candidates from the set task and more importantly wasted time. Attribution does need to be considered but only when the evidence is being weighed and judgements made about the validity of the stated factor.

Timing was a critical issue for a number of candidates, with many writing only slightly more for part (b) than part (a). Candidates need to be reminded that part (b) does carry the higher mark weighting. Centres would do well to discuss examination techniques with their students in order that they achieve the grades they deserve.

Finally, given this was the second of the new style examination it is pleasing to report that overall the examination provided real differentiation and a variety of responses. Some candidates wrote full and well balanced explanations that fully integrated the sources with points of analysis. Most importantly, the quality of history was high. The presentation of the sources challenged the candidates to show real understanding of the historical context to the evidence.

The quality of written English continues to worry Examiners. Candidates continue to incorrectly spell terms and names with which they are familiar or written in the Sources. Further, the quality of written English does, of course, extend beyond spelling. In general, sentence construction was good, but for a significant number of candidates, paragraphing was an unknown skill, and their answers resembled a stream of consciousness rather than a planned, logical approach.

1A: Securing the Tudor Dynasty: the Reign of Henry VII

Part (a)

Candidates on the whole found the cross-referencing question fairly straight forward. However, a minority were tackling this question without sufficient, or in some cases any reference/quotation from the sources concerned. Other candidates tended to tackle the sources one at a time, which is not the easiest way to do cross-referencing as it leads to repetition, or implicit comparisons. Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources and from their knowledge of the context, between Henry's aims to ensure compliance with the law by all classes of his subjects, but the sub-legal and dubious methods outlined in Source 3, he used to secure loyalty and obedience. The best candidates saw that the "rule of law" and "justice" are not necessarily the same thing. They pointed out that Source 1 is evidence of Henry's stated intentions but not proof, given the recent history of English royal government, of implementation. On the other hand, too many students simply cut and pasted various extracts from the sources to give a one-sided acceptance of the proposition in the question.

Part (b)

This was generally well answered with a good range of responses, and very few failing to reach Level 2. Most tried to engage with the debate set up in the question even if they did not offer detailed use of the sources. At least two of the sources were incorporated into most answers. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to substantiate their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. There is a need to focus on the time frame set out in the question. Many candidates ignored the dates 1495-1509 and wasted time writing about earlier events. A clear focus on the question is essential for success. Candidates needed to consider the stated factor, and weigh this against other measures such as statutes of livery and maintenance, the role of the Star Chamber and the 'new men'. Too many responses nonetheless assumed the proposition must be right and accepted that Henry curbed the power of the nobles, or, that the only defect diminishing Henry's success was his harsh methods. As far as criticism of Henry was concerned, many responses stated he had failed because he was so harsh and very few questioned whether Henry VII had controlled and subdued the nobility by 1509. Stronger candidates were able to show that the Sir William Stanley was a rare exception of nobles threatening to defect to Warbeck, and that Henry's discovery of Stanley's double-dealing and his execution in 1495 had a powerful deterrent effect. The knowledge offered on many of the financial policies was too general and could have applied to any part of the reign, rather than concentrating on the increasingly harsh measures after the death of Arthur and Elizabeth.

Finally, own knowledge needs to be precise and accurate, related to the question and used to develop issues identified in the debate set up by the sources and to provide further range.

1B: The World Turned Upside Down: Monarchy and Republic in England, 1642-53

Part (a)

Candidates on the whole found the cross-referencing question fairly straight forward. However, a minority were tackling this question without sufficient, or in some cases any reference/quotation from the sources concerned. Other candidates tended to tackle the sources one at a time, which is not the easiest way to do cross-referencing as it leads to repetition, or implicit comparisons. Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources with Sources 1 and 2 providing the material for support of the claim as well as some challenge and the Sources 2 and 3 giving opportunity for challenge. A number of student's misinterpreted Source 1 as fully supporting the execution, but, others provided the contextual knowledge that Fairfax did not sign the execution documents or take any part in the process. Other students declared that as Fairfax was a 'royalist supporter' he would have opposed the execution. There was some tendency also to drift into giving a narrative of the issue of the execution that lost some students the necessary focus. However, overall this question provided a good range of responses and gave students the opportunity to show the ability to use sources intelligently. Only a minority of candidates failed to use all three sources.

Part (b)

This was generally well answered with pleasingly few candidates ignoring the three Sources. The question allowed the students to see the reasons for the dissolution of the Rump and the opportunity to challenge whether it was done to satisfy Cromwell's personal ambition. The Sources gave students the opportunity to develop points relevant to the question from their own knowledge, but as so often seems to happen with questions about the Rump their own knowledge was often rather sketchy and disappointing. The more able candidates were able to use Source 6 to show how the unpopularity and perceived corruption of the Rump could be used to argue against the stated factor. Whereas, Source 5 was often used to show how Cromwell's political ambitions did benefit from the Rump's dissolution. However, some responses showed that candidates had clearly misread the question and delivered an evaluation of why the Rump was dissolved, with limited linkage to the second part of the question. Candidates too often struggled to provide any real depth of evidence and their own knowledge of the period.

1C: Poverty and the British State, c1815-50

Part (a)

This was generally well done, with relatively few candidates scoring below Level 2. Many candidates were able to use these sources effectively to construct a response that was clearly linked to the sources and to the question posed. There were some astute comments that showed candidates appreciated the attribution of the sources and were able to use this to develop their responses. A number of candidates did not appear to understand the term the 'honest poor' and therefore struggled to respond adequately to the question. A significant number merely worked through the sources, describing the content with varying degrees of success/understanding.

Part (b)

A significant minority of candidates did not understand the question focus, in particular 'primarily local self-interest', and described a variety of differing aspects of Poor Law history. Most worrying were those who dwelled at length on the Swing riots and the Luddites, neither of which has any relevance here. On the other hand, there were clearly focused responses that understood the demands of the question, used the two Sources well and were able to integrate sound own knowledge to develop a line of argument that explored a number of issues that were raised in the question and developed some that were not.

1D: Votes for Women, c1880-1918

Part (a)

This question was generally well answered with the majority of candidates engaging with the question and developing relevant and sound responses. Candidates were able to use all three sources effectively and there was some good cross-referencing evident in the scripts. However, many candidates continue to ignore the attributes of the sources when weighing the evidence and drawing judgements as to whether or not suffragette militancy weakened the struggle for the vote in the period 1910-1914. Candidates also need to be reminded that own knowledge does not apply to this question. It was noted that many candidates spent far too long on question (a).

Part (b)

The vast majority of candidates managed to use all the sources and own knowledge but at the lower end own knowledge was limited to assertion and inaccuracies. Own knowledge was often not precise enough to match the demands of the question which required candidates to explore the closer relations between working-class and middle-class suffragists in the period 1909-1918, and the influence this may have had on the suffrage campaign. In this question 'suffragists' was used to cover all women involved in the struggle for the vote, but very few candidates defined this as such, and many reverted to discussing the role of the NUWSS and its growing influence amongst the working-class through the Labour Party Pact and women's war work. Very few candidates used Source 3 to show changing attitudes towards women's suffrage. However, there was some outstanding work seen where candidates used the three sources to drive the debate. Finally, the dates in the question were often overlooked by even the most able of candidates.

1E: Russia in Revolution, 1905-17

Part (a)

This was generally well done with few candidates scoring below Level 2. However, a large proportion of candidates did not seem to understand that there was a requirement to discuss the origins of the sources when drawing conclusions from the evidence. Source 1 was misunderstood by some candidates who thought that Trotsky was 'a rough workman' or, it was Trotsky's speech that influenced the 'rough workman'. Candidates need to read the sources carefully in order to ensure they fully understand the attribution of the Source. Many were able to draw out similarities in all three sources, that Lenin was the key figure as opposed to Trotsky. There was much generic or very unsuccessful evaluation of the attribution of the sources, with a disappointingly large number of candidates stating this source, written by Trotsky, must be biased, or, 'biast' or 'biaysst'. In drawing conclusions there was little evidence of the weighing of the evidence in order to make judgements.

Part (b)

This was generally well answered with many candidates displaying good and appropriate knowledge about Russia prior to February 1917. There was a tendency to paraphrase the sources and then write about Russia during World War I or, the role of Alexandra and Rasputin rather than integrating the sources and their own knowledge. Some of the own knowledge was generic in nature with comments such as 'most of Russia's population were peasants and they were very poor so they were angry with the Tsar although some candidates were able to write well about the Tsar's inadequacies and to show good understanding of the situation in February 1917. By using the sources as the basis of their answer the majority of candidates, with varying degrees of success, engaged with the debate and attempted to reach a judgement using them and combining them effectively with their own knowledge. There was good focus on the role of Tsar Nicholas and how his personal inadequacies led to the downfall of the Romanov dynasty. Finally, many candidates engaged in a discussion on the attribution of the sources and this was often generalised and detracted from the explanation.

1F: The Seeds of Evil: the Rise of National Socialism in Germany to 1933

Part (a)

The vast majority of students' responses fell into Level 2 Developed Statements category. Almost all made comparisons of similarities and/or differences at some level, with many making links to the phrase 'personal power' in the question. This concept could have been explored further, since according to Source 2, it was possible for Hitler to be pursuing personal power for the sake of Germany. Some candidates did explore this tension. Many students only considered Source 1 as evidence; the purpose, provenance and attributes of 2 and 3 were not sufficiently analysed. The reliability of a public speech was not always properly analysed because its purpose was not examined; some assumed it was reliable because it was a public speech. The fact that Source 1 was written by an opponent was frequently commented on in relation to Hitler's attempt to grasp personal power, but this was not followed up in a meaningful way. Cross referencing was not always explicitly used by many candidates; this was linked to a failure to specifically address the 'how far' part of the question and arrive at a clear conclusion. Some students pursued their point by resorting to their own knowledge.

Part (b)

Many students used this question as an opportunity to display their knowledge of the causes of the collapse of the Weimar Republic, with usual suspects the Wall Street Crash, occupation of the Ruhr, hyperinflation, Brüning, the failure of coalitions etc, being wheeled out. The role of Von Papen was well recognized, with his overconfidence, hostility to Von Schleicher and his ability to manipulate the aging Von Hindenburg. Osthilfe and Oskar Von Hindenburg were also mentioned. This often led to weaker conclusions, where candidates concluded that the intrigues of elites were responsible for Hitler, but so were these other factors. This was frequently associated with misspellings of Schleicher, intrigue, fascism, bias and even Hitler. A good proportion of candidates failed to understand what was meant by the term 'intrigue' and/or its relevance to the appointment of Hitler, some confusing it with the idea of elites being intrigued by Hitler. Many also failed to understand the ways in which the sources actually described this intrigue, and those who did often failed to make good use of them in responding to the question. The nature of the establishment, business and agrarian elites was only vaguely understood by a number of candidates. Very few were confident in explaining the role of Papen and Schleicher, and many sought to involve the Reichstag Fire and the Enabling Act in their answer. Stronger candidates made clear the importance of Hitler having popular support as a prerequisite for being taken seriously by the elites. The figure of 37.3 % was heavily used by these students. It was unusual to find candidates who could handle the integration of background knowledge with information from the sources. Source 4 was assessed as evidence by a large number of students, with a diary being seen as automatically reliable evidence. Fewer were able to judge sources 5 and 6 in the same way; some assumed that primary evidence was more reliable than secondary textbooks.

The best candidates' responses were able to convey a sense of debate, integrating the sources, judging their reliability and comparing the result with their own knowledge, culminating in a strong conclusion.

1G: Boom and Bust: Economy and Society in the USA, 1917-33

Part (a)

Many candidates struggled to sufficiently cross-reference between the sources; more often than not, the sources were taken one-by-one with little attempt to establish links between them. Significant numbers seemed to link Source 2 with Source 1 as evidence of hope, oblivious of what Source 2 went onto say. Most candidates were able to identify the purpose of Source 1, but struggled with the attributions of Sources 2 and 3. In many cases, the question as to 'how far' the sources showed the Depression had damaged confidence was only tackled in the conclusion.

Although there were examples of candidates who really showed awareness of the relevant skills, it was rare to find one who was able to cross-reference, address the question and look at the provenance of each source. A significant number of candidates wrote at length using their own knowledge about the impact of the Depression which is not a requirement for this question.

Part (b)

Nearly all candidates demonstrated an awareness of the factors behind the economic boom in the 1920s; although - in many scripts - this did not go beyond the knowledge contained in the sources. There were some very good examples of well argued scripts that displayed extensive own knowledge about the role of government policy, the factors of credit and the booming stock market in the 1920s, as well as a good use of the sources and a sound structure. A significant number of candidates did understand how the Stock Market worked and their function, and therefore were able to construct a convincing explanation. However, there were many who did not, nor could they link the rising Stock Market to the growth of prosperity, and often wanted to discuss those who had not prospered in the 1920s. It is essential that students address the stated factor within the question. However, some candidates also found it difficult to link the many reasons for the economic boom and present a sustained explanation, they often presented a list of factors that were undeveloped or little more than assertions.

6521 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
1A	60	34.5	7.3
1B	60	33.7	7.5
1C	60	32.0	9.9
1D	60	32.8	8.3
1E	60	36.3	8.0
1F	60	34.7	7.8
1G	60	37.3	7.6

Paper 1A (2374 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	39	35	32	29	26
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		28.6	48.9	64.1	79.7	89.7

Paper 1B (2084 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	38	35	32	29	26
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		31.6	45.1	60.2	75.5	87.2

Paper 1C (1000 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	38	33	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		16.5	29.6	45.0	63.3	79.8

Paper 1D (3299 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	36	32	28	25
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		21.0	37.8	56.1	73.1	83.9

Paper 1E (7136 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	39	35	31	28
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		21.9	39.8	60.8	77.6	86.8

Paper 1F (9431 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	38	34	31	28
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		19.2	37.6	56.2	71.0	82.7

Paper 1G (3510 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	39	36	33	30
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		24.3	45.8	62.8	77.2	85.8

8264 AS Cashin (25124 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	300	240	210	180	150	120
% Candidates		18.2	40.8	64.4	82.9	93.5

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 019217 Summer 2007

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