

Principal Examiner Feedback Summer 2008

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UA020217

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

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	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, c.1880-1918	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 eighth June Advance Subsidiary examination of GCE History. This particular Unit attracted approximately 29,000 candidates. The Papers generated a wide range of responses, 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.

Two sub-questions were set on each Paper: (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 and 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 allow the exploration of the issues identified in the sources and to develop these using the sources and their own knowledge.

There were many successes this series, with some candidates producing outstanding work on both part (a) and (b). Most importantly, the quality of history was high. The presentation of the sources challenged the candidates to show real understanding of their historical context and to apply this in their answers. Candidates on the whole seemed to find the cross-referencing question fairly straight forward.

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 their nature, origin and purpose, and how this might add value or limit the evidence. A passing reference to the identity of the author, without any inferences drawn demonstrates that the candidate has failed to realise that assessing evidence is not just about reliability in general, but also value and limitation for the particular enquiry given. Many candidates resorted to generic statements such as "these sources were/were not reliable because they were primary".

A minority of candidates, for part (a), failed to fully activate the content of the sources and tackled 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 most effective technique for cross-referencing as it leads to repetition, or implicit comparisons. Unfortunately this often led to a lack of sharp focus on the task (AO2, analyse and cross-reference the three sources for a specific enquiry and to draw a conclusion) It also meant that candidates often spent too much time on (a) to the detriment of (b).

The (b) question was generally well answered. It was encouraging to see more candidates using the sources to drive the analysis, extracting points from the sources and developing them using own knowledge. However, a minority of candidates took the Source by Source approach, listing a range of other factors that had limited supporting evidence and/or were not relevant to the stated view or factor in the

question. There were a minority of candidates who rejected the stated factor, and therefore failed to answer the set question. This was particularly frequent in Paper 1F, *Do you agree with the view that it was Hitler's personal charisma that explains the growth of support for the Nazi party in the years 1930-32?*

In the (b) question some candidates were not secure on the chronology of the period stated in the question, this applied in particular to Papers 1B, 1D, 1E and 1F. This generally led to overlong narratives of the whole period of study, rather than a close reading of the sources and using relevant and accurate events, policies etc from the period. Candidates could have improved their answers with a more secure chronological understanding. This is important as part (a) and (b) often address different periods and, by ignoring the dates and writing everything they know, they are not focusing on the task or question and will achieve a low mark.

Option-specific comments

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

Part (a)

Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources and from their knowledge of the context. Most were able to show how serious the Warbeck threat was to Henry VII, the more able picked up on James IV being the 'poorest king in Christendom' and the significance of this in terms of threat. Further, many candidates explored the notion of the 'pretender' duke, and Stanley's lukewarm attitude to Henry VII, and used this well when drawing conclusions about 'how far'. Finally, a large number of candidates, with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to address the nature, origin or purpose of the sources, and were therefore not able to make judgments about their value or limitation as evidence.

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. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. Candidates needed to consider the stated factor that 'Henry VII greatly increased the wealth of the crown but at the cost of massive resentment amongst his subjects'. Many chose to skip over the resentment aspect and failed to challenge the point in Source 4, 'with less resistance from the common people' and link this to the Cornish or Yorkshire tax rebellions. On the other hand, many chose to focus on this latter point, and failed to explore the wealth of the crown and links to Henry VII's attempts to use Bonds etc as ways of controlling the nobility. The more able candidates were able to use all three sources and offered argument and counter arguments to explore both aspects of the question and present a balanced analysis based on the sources and own knowledge. Conclusions were often rather limited, descriptive rather than analytical, or poorly explained due to a lack of time. 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.

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

Part (a)

Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources with Sources 1, 2 and 3 providing the material for support of the claim and Sources 2 and 3 giving opportunity for challenge by highlighting the numbers coming forward in Myddle, and the level of support for the King outside of the named counties. On the whole candidates handled this question well, but Source 3 did pose a challenge to those who failed to read the source and its attribution correctly, and therefore misinterpreted what the Source had to say. It was also noted that many candidates continue to work through the Sources one by one, with limited linkage between the sources, or even integration of the attribution of the sources when drawing conclusions on 'how far'. Finally, a large number of very able candidates with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to discuss the nature, origin and purpose of the sources for their value or limitation as evidence.

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 three sources were incorporated into most answers. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated and accurate support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. It was evident that many students had limited knowledge about the Levellers, and often spoke only in general terms about incidents such as the Putney Debates or the points raised in Source 4 about the Ware mutiny and support in and around London. Candidates should be reminded of the need to read the sources carefully, and explore them for evidence to use in their analysis. However, on the whole most candidates seemed to engage well with this question. Sources 4 and 6 were used to show the potential threat of the Levellers, and Source 5 to counter this view. The more able candidates were able to show their awareness of the debate and clear conclusions were drawn. 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 .

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

Part (a)

Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources with Sources 2 and 3 providing the material for a challenge to the claim, and the Source 1 giving opportunity for agreement. However, a number of candidates misunderstood Source 1. More careful reading of the attribution would have helped them to contextualize the source and shown why it supported the stated factor. Those who did, picked up on the provenance of the source and the likely bias of the Poor Law Commissioner. Credit was given to those candidates who addressed the typicality of the sources in reaching a decision regarding the strength of resistance and so implicitly addressed 'how far'. Finally, a large number of very able candidates with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to discuss the nature, origin and purpose of the sources for their value or limitation as evidence.

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. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. On the whole the Sources provoked a wide range of responses. The more able candidates used both sources to drive an analytical debate over the issue of whether the New Poor Law authorities were trying to raise the standards for the poor. Many candidates differentiated between attempts to do so at a national and at a local level, pointing out that the issues raised by the Andover Scandal were not widespread. Others profitably explored the difference between intentions and reality.

Paper 1D Votes for Women, c1880-1918

Part (a)

This question gave the candidates plenty of opportunities to shine. Most of them wrote cogently about the 'proper role of women', explaining the separate spheres and drawing out the comparisons between the three writers views. The best were able to explain Millicent Fawcett's clever use of the separate spheres to explain and justify that suffrage was essential in the fight for the vote. In terms of attribution candidates need to be reminded that they must offer some appraisal of Millicent Fawcett's significance to the struggle. Finally, a large number of very able candidates with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to discuss the nature, origin and purpose of the sources for their value or limitation as evidence.

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 three sources were incorporated into most answers. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated and accurate support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. There were some well informed and sophisticated discussions of the view stated in the question, but far too many responses failed to fully explore 'significant consequence'. Most wanted to write about the increase in WSPU militancy, and failed to appreciate what Source 6 had to say about the alliance between the NUWSS and the Labour Party. Knowledge of the NUWSS' 1912 alliance with the fledgling Labour Party was disappointingly slight, and indeed, too many students thought the Labour Party was the government, with Asquith its leader. The best candidates used criteria to define what 'significant' meant, either in terms of impacting on the public of Britain or accelerating the progress of the suffrage movement.

Paper 1E: Russia in Revolution, 1905-17.

Part (a)

Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources with Sources 2 and 3 providing the material in support of the view, that there was strong hostility in Russia to continuing the war, and Source 1 giving the opportunity for challenge. However, not enough candidates attempted to use the dates within the attribution of Source 2, the failed summer offensives, and Source 3, set in the context of the July days to show why there was such hostility. Candidates should be encouraged to use the Sources in their entirety; that means content and attribution, in order to progress through the levels. Finally, a large number of very able candidates with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to discuss the nature, origin and purpose of the sources for their value or limitation as evidence.

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 both of the sources were incorporated into most answers. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated and accurate support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. It is important that candidates focus on the time-frame set out in the question. Not many candidates took the time to consider what was meant by 'the failure of the Provisional Government to listen to the Russian people' and many just discussed the failures of the Provisional Government without linking this to the increase in Bolshevik support. There were some candidates who considered the situation of the Bolsheviks after the July Days and how that changed after the Kornilov affair. Far too many just discussed the use of slogan, 'Peace, Bread and Land' and Lenin's role without going on to explore, 'from below' and what the Bolsheviks managed to achieve in the set period. Many candidates understood the different lines of argument that could be developed from Sources 3, 4 and 5 and were able to contextualise these arguments with their own knowledge.

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

Part (a)

Most candidates were able to see that Sources 1 and 2 were providing reasons for the appeal of the SA, discipline, work and bread and stamping out of the Communist threat and how Source 3 contradicted these views, by implying they attacked workers and were no more than 'trained killers'. In addition, many candidates managed to cross-reference the sources well, in terms of similarity and difference in relation to content, but were less skilled in linking this tightly to reasons for the appeal of the SA. Finally, a large number of very able candidates with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to discuss the nature, origin and purpose of the sources for their value or limitation as evidence, and therefore failed to fully address 'how far'.

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 both of the sources were incorporated into most answers. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated and accurate support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. It is important that candidates focus on the time-frame set out in the question. The period 1930-32 was not always focused on, with many students either talking about the growth of the Nazi party long term, or the weaknesses of Weimar from 1919 only. Very few answers attempted any definition of 'charisma', most just wanted to talk about the success or otherwise of Nazis propaganda. Source 5 was perhaps the least well used, candidates failed to engage with the issue of why Hitler failed to win around all voters, and other factors contained within the source such as 'party of protest' and 'energy and sophistication' were not developed. Some stronger candidates were able to challenge Source 4 and broaden out Hitler's appeal beyond the working class, but few candidates linked Source 3 to 4, in terms of methods used by the Nazis in relation to the working class. 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.

Paper1G: Boom and Bust: Economy and Society in the USA, 1917-33

Part (a)

Most candidates were able to see the contradictions shown in the sources with Sources 2 and 3 providing the material to challenge the view of the Ku Klux Klan given in Source 1. At the higher levels many candidates took the attribution of Source 1, 'The Programme of the Ku Klux Klan' into account to reason as to why the sources offered differing perspectives, such as the principled nature of Source 1 against the reality of the two somewhat anecdotal accounts given in Sources 2 and 3. Finally, a large number of very able candidates with good cross-referencing skills did not attempt to discuss the nature, origin and purpose of the sources for their value or limitation as evidence.

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 both of the sources were incorporated into most answers. The main problems with part (b) included the failure to offer substantiated and accurate support for their statements from the text of the sources or, from own knowledge as appropriate. It is important that candidates focus on the time-frame set out in the question. A majority of candidates were able to engage with the notion of a 'spirit of optimism', although for a significant minority this tended towards generalised accounts of the causes of prosperity with lesser success in exploring the specifics of the question. However, it was also disappointing to note that some answers were almost totally bereft of factual knowledge with which to develop the analysis. The years of the boom are a popular topic so it is worrying that issues identified in the Sources, in particular Source 6, were not fully developed or supported by specific own knowledge re role of bankers and heads of investment and government policies.

6521 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
1A	60	36.3	7.7
1B	60	37.3	9.3
1C	60	35.2	9.7
1D	60	37.4	8.0
1E	60	36.3	8.0
1F	60	35.0	8.0
1G	60	37.5	7.1

Paper 1A

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	37	34	31	28
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		26.7	46.7	66.8	79.6	89.2

Paper 1B

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	38	34	30	26
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		32.0	53.3	67.9	80.4	88.3

Paper 1C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		17.7	32.8	52.5	67.6	79.9

Paper 1D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	40	37	34	31
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		22.5	38.9	53.3	69.4	83.0

Paper 1E

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	39	35	32	29
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		21.5	40.2	60.9	74.2	84.0

Paper 1F

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		20.7	39.8	59.0	72.3	83.1

Paper 1G

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	40	37	34	31
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		24.3	42.1	60.3	75.0	84.7

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 020217 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH