

Principal Examiners Feedback Summer 2008

GCE

GCE History (6525)

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 UA 020225

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

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	Introduction	4
5A:	The Tudor State, 1485-1603	5
5B:	The Making of the British Empire, c.1660-c.1770	7
5C:	Representation and Democracy in Britain, 1830-1931	8
5D:	The State and the Poor in Britain, c.1830-1939	9
5E:	Britain and Decolonisation, c.1870-c.1980	11
5F:	Medicine in Britain in the Twentieth Century, c.1890-c.1990	13
5G:	Integration and Diversity in a Great Power: from Civil War to Civil Rights in the USA, 1865-1969	15
5H:	Coursework	16
	Statistics	

Introduction

Most candidates appeared to make good use of the time available in the examination. Few failed to finish, and a greater number than before were planning their answers. Many made their plans on one side, but others wrote either a few words or a plan that covered two or three sides. Producing a focused and effective plan is a skill which centres might wish to develop further with their candidates.

The majority of candidates had covered the entire chronology in their studies. Of particular note this year was an increased awareness of Henry VII in Paper 5A, the 1928 Reform Act in Paper 5C, Southern Rhodesia/Zimbabwe in Paper 5E, and Conservative reforms to the health service in Paper 5F. However, some candidates appeared to misinterpret their chosen question. Instead of ranging over the whole chronology they produced an answer with a very narrow focus, for example on the National Health Service in Paper 5E, and the leadership of the black community in Paper 5G.

At the same time, however, candidates are going outside the time period given in the question to provide some context material which often develops into little more than an extended narrative of marginal relevance. Candidates should be careful not to provide too much of this material since it may unbalance their whole answer. Material on events before 1830 dominated some answers in Papers 5C and 5D, and information of the civil war was deployed in Paper 5G with little success.

Centres are aware that the quality of written communication is taken into account in the marking of candidates' answers. Examiners reported this year on a surprising number of candidates for Papers 5C-5E who are failing to place their discussion in the correct century. There were many references to the Reform Act of 1932, the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1934, and the occupation of Egypt in 1982, while a handful of candidates referred to the Liberal government taking power at the start of the twenty-first century. While this may appear to be a fairly minor failing, it does have the cumulative effect of influencing clarity of expression overall.

5A: The Tudor State, 1485-1603

Question 1

Most candidates were familiar with the role of the nobility in the reigns of both Henry VII and Elizabeth. Henry's deliberate attempt to distance himself from the nobility was discussed, including the use of bonds, recognisances and acts of attainder, and the promotion of 'new men' such as Empson, Dudley and Bray. Brief contextual reference was made to the Wars of the Roses and the overmighty subjects, and to the fact that Henry's early life was not spent in the company of the English nobility. Elizabeth's often difficult relationship with her nobles was also well known, including the revolt of the Northern Earls in 1569 and growing problems towards the end of the reign. The other three Tudor monarchs were often handled less well. Good responses considered Henry VIII's strong relationship with the nobles, exemplified by their restoration to a traditional role of supporting the king in war, and to their acquisition of land through the dissolution of the monasteries. Less secure were those who considered individuals only. These often mistakenly identified both Wolsey and Cromwell as evidence of a new nobility. The power of Somerset and Northumberland was mentioned as showing the influence of individual nobles during Edward VI's reign, though few noted that Somerset's primacy overrode the powers of the rest of the nobility. Several answers considered the reign of Mary only with reference to English fear of Spanish nobles, though better answers noted the role of the nobility in resisting attempts to change the land settlement. A good range of other relevant factors influencing the power of the monarchy was discussed, including the personality of individual monarchs and the substantial change in royal power brought by the Reformation. There were two encouraging developments this year. One was the greater prominence given to Henry VII, who in previous years has often appeared as a little known and shadowy figure. The other was that many candidates were well prepared to assess the role of foreign and military affairs throughout the period in influencing the power of the dynasty as a whole.

Question 2

Some candidates began their answer in 1529 and went forwards from that point, thus ignoring a substantial part of the chronology. Better answers decided that the years 1485-1529 could be seen as a single period, linking Henry VII's attitude towards parliament to that of Henry VIII for his first twenty years. Most saw the Reformation Parliament as significant because of the number of times it was summoned and in the nature of the measures which it passed. Some very good answers noted that Convocation's powers had been virtually transferred to parliament, that parliament had become involved in determining the succession to the throne, and that the supremacy of statute law required later monarchs to call parliament to enact further religious change. This process was then explained with regard to subsequent monarchs. Some weaker answers became diverted into extended narratives on the King's Great Matter, or into a largely irrelevant discussion of Cromwell and the Tudor Revolution in Government. Several took some time to describe Neale's notion of the 'puritan choir' in Elizabeth's reign before going on to discredit it. There were some impressive answers which challenged the question in one of two ways. Many pointed to Mary's reign as being the most significant in the changing power of parliament. They supported this view by referring to the growing self-confidence of parliament and the way in which it challenged the queen over both her marriage and the land settlement. Others decided that there was no effective change in the power of parliament, simply in its role of carrying out the monarch's wishes. Some suggested that at the end of her reign Elizabeth was treating parliament in exactly the same way as her grandfather had done.

5B: The Making of the British Empire, c.1660-c.1770

Question 1

Some answers took the form of an extended narrative on changes to the navy over the period, including the role of Pepys, growing investment in the navy, and the location of important bases on the south coast. While some of this material was relevant to the topic, it failed to target the question of naval conflict. Better responses were aware of the major wars of the period, and of the role of the navy in securing their outcomes. There was some good material on the treaties of Utrecht and of Paris, and while some mentioned the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, they were unsure of its terms. Other relevant factors were deployed well, including the development of trade routes and the importance of commercial developments in encouraging the making of the empire.

Question 2

There was only a small number of answers to this question. These were focused on the given factor and did offer some other key factors which influenced the development of the empire. It was impressive to see that, on both questions, the whole chronology was explored by most candidates.

5C: Representation and Democracy in Britain, 1830-1931

Question 1

Many very competent answers showed a good awareness of the nature and extent of change. Some candidates appeared unsure about which factors constituted 'pressure for reform from outside parliament', especially when considering the first reform act of 1832. The French revolution (whether 1789 or 1830), the American revolution, Peterloo and even the Swing riots were all pressed into service, but these barely fall into the given category. More successful were those who assessed the significance of the Birmingham Political Union and the Days of May. Similarly, since Chartism petered out in the 1840s, it was often difficult to refer to the movement successfully as putting pressure on parliament for the act of 1867. Better use was made of the suffragettes. Few spotted the anomaly of giving the vote to some women in 1918 but not to those who had probably given most to the war effort. A number of candidates included the 1872 Ballot Act, the 1883 Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act and the 1911 Parliament Act when describing changes in the size and composition of the electorate. It is possible that they misinterpreted the question as 'changes in the electoral system'. A few were able to demonstrate how each of these Acts may have affected future changes in the size of the electorate by electing MPs who were more favourable to parliamentary reform, but most simply described the Acts and looked at whether or not they were the result of internal or external pressure. Many other relevant factors were developed, including party pressure, the rivalry between Gladstone and Disraeli, the decline of the aristocratic interest and the impact of the First World War, but often candidates were unable to decide the ways in which these factors influenced the process of change. It was encouraging to see that the reform act of 1928 is much better known than in the past and that few candidates failed to cover most or all of the chronology.

Question 2

This was less popular and also less well done overall, though there were some very impressive and wide-ranging answers. Many candidates made the mistake of sliding over the issue of party organisation which resulted in a misshapen essay. The focus in these answers was on the 'other factors' which had apparently been well rehearsed. The rise of the Labour Party was something of a mystery for many candidates who saw the Third Reform Act alone as leading to its formation. Those essays which did tackle party organisation were often scant with information or limited to the Primrose League and the Carlton Club. Chronology also seemed to be something of a problem for many. Most failed to link the extension of the franchise to changes in party policy as well as organisation, particularly in relation to the increasing female and working class vote. Many candidates raised the question of 1872 and 1883 but failed to develop them in the context of the question. The issue of Irish factors was by and large not commented upon. Those who tried to include 1911 did not really get to grips with the implications of this change in terms of party organisation. The issue of Trades Unions was also not well handled and growth of literacy and the impact of journalism were by and large unmentioned. There was, however, a good number of candidates who spotted the decline of the aristocracy in the context of the question.

5D: The State and the Poor in Britain, c.1830-1939

Question 1

One feature which differentiated between candidates was how successful they had been in structuring the answer. Candidates who organised their response around the chronological framework of the Reform Acts 1832, 1867, 1884, and 1918 clearly covered most or all of the period, and the majority reached Level 3 because such an approach lent itself to the response being shaped on the question. Candidates reaching Levels 4 and 5 often adopted a similar structure, but assessed the given factor of electoral reform against other appropriate factors (economy, changing attitudes, fear of revolution, fear of socialism) at each chronological point. This approach allowed the strongest candidates to make informed comments about the varying importance of factors across the period, and demonstrate their awareness of both the patterns and the pace of change. A third common response was a paragraph or two on electoral reform, followed by a list of other factors: there were exceptions, but the majority of these were descriptive or appeared to be rehearsed prepared responses.

Another key differentiating factor was the quality of analysis against description. Some candidates introduced a political context as another factor, such as the fear of revolution in the 1830s, but then described agricultural distress and the Swing riots rather than linking these to the political classes, ratepayers or electorate. Generally, candidates' subject knowledge was a strength, and nearly all responses contained a reasonable level of broadly relevant material, although sometimes entirely narrative, descriptive, or not linked to the question. Specifically, some candidates did not have detailed knowledge about the Reform Acts and growth of the electorate, and there were some basic errors on dates. Combining analysis and knowledge, some candidates made connections which were not secure: a common one was "the 1832 Reform Act led to the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834". A second was ascribing a direct link between the 1884 Act and the Liberal Reforms; stronger candidates were able to point out that the 20-year interval suggested no immediate connection, and investigated the influence of many other factors (Booth & Rowntree, national efficiency, changing attitudes, the late 19th century depression).

Question 2

There were a handful of common features in these answers. A sizeable proportion of candidates did not cover the full chronological range, stopping with the Liberals and ignoring any prospect of "decisive change" after World War One; clearly, restricting the chronological range also restricted their potential mark, in most cases. Another sizeable proportion simply wrote a narrative covering 1830-1914 or 1830-1939, concluding that the Liberals did or did not mark a change; again, as the majority of the answer was descriptive, candidates limited themselves to level 3 for the most part. A third sizeable proportion either interpreted 'decisive change' as 'turning point' (from previous years' questions), or answered a 'turning point' question anyway; these answers ran the risk of focusing too much on the Liberals, narrowing the chronological range, and constructing an argument which focused more on the reasons for change than the extent and impact of change. Good turning point answers did at least have the merit of demonstrating an awareness of patterns of change and continuity across the period, although many limited themselves to high level 3 rather than level 4 because the focus on the question was off-target.

As in Question 1, there were some common errors and misconceptions. Again, the 1884 Reform Act was often held as the prime, direct cause of the Liberal reforms; many candidates still struggle with putting the Majority and Minority Reports in the correct

chronological order with the 1905 election and subsequent reforms; there was confusion as to whether the Liberals were elected in 1905 with a reform programme or not; a handful of candidates were convinced that the Liberals carried on well into the 1920s, including finishing off the Poor Law in 1929.

A surprising number of candidates seemed to be answering the other question: that is, Question 1 answers which were predominantly on the Liberals and Question 2 answers which carefully explained how the Reform Acts led to various decisive changes across the period, but particularly the Liberals. There was sufficient information in the introduction or substantial other material to ensure this was not a matter of a simple mistake. The most likely explanation is that candidates made poor choices; however, centres would do well to remind candidates to ensure they have indicated the correct answer.

5E: Britain and Decolonisation, c.1870-c.1980

General comments

Answers to this Unit are approached with a good understanding of the concepts of the expansion and contraction of the British Empire over a one hundred year period. Most candidates are able to explain the changing pattern of Empire and to use 2/3 significant periods of time to support their argument. The best candidates use the pattern of expansion, maintenance and contraction to cover the whole time period rather than relying on the specified turning points as key time indicators. This means that a satisfying number of candidates reach Level 3 or above each year.

However, the progression seen in previous years was, perhaps, not apparent so much this year. Many well developed analytical answers based on concepts were unable to access high Level 3 + due to a lack of secure supporting evidence. Sound understanding of change over time was often undermined by inaccurate or imprecise knowledge e.g. lists of raw materials, colonies that do not apply to the area of the Empire being discussed or the reference to the 1945 government as 'liberal'. A worrying number of scripts this year joined together WW1 and WW2 resulting in generalised statements about the effects of the 'wars' or confusing the two. Also this year too many scripts began with the Boer War and ended at the Suez Crisis therefore limiting the candidates' ability to cover the whole period to access high L4 +.

This year has also seen a rise in the number of candidates referring to the historiography of Empire. This is a commendable development but descriptions of what historians think and statements such as 'Robinson and Gallagher suggest.....' without using the ideas to further the candidate's argument are essentially narrative L3 answers.

The best candidates were able to explain the contribution of the given factors whilst weighing them against other factors and selecting appropriate examples to substantiate. These answers were able to access mid L4 +. There were a good number of L5 answers that were able to create sustained evaluation.

Question 1

The majority of candidates seemed to be able to access this question with little difficulty and there were very few who addressed Empire as a whole rather than Africa. Economic concerns were obviously a popular factor to choose and candidates were able to weigh up economic issues against other factors such as strategic value, views within Britain and nationalism. The best answers were able to show why economic concerns/other factors were more important than other factors. There were some outstanding answers that were able to use examples from the inter-war period and to analyse Macmillan's cost-benefit analysis adeptly. In general there was an excellent coverage of the time period with many using the 1870-1918, 1918-1939/45, 1939/45-1980 division very effectively.

However, there were candidates who, although clearly understanding the change over time, did not have the supporting knowledge to create a substantiated argument. Many candidates have a good knowledge of the expansion of the African Empire e.g. Egypt but resort to more generalised statements when referring to the post-1918 situation. Candidates also had a tendency to confuse the specified turning points with factors and so many answers gave high level analysis of the factors involved in expansion followed by a more narrative-led explanation of the contraction based on the two World Wars and the Suez Crisis. General analysis should be supported with appropriately selected examples.

Also, as in previous years, there are clear issues with geographical knowledge, in particular the belief that Malaya is in Africa.

Question 2

This question was as popular as Question One but was approached with less security by most candidates. There were a number of different interpretations of the question by candidates (which was acknowledged in the marking) but few were able to encompass both parts of the phrasing - 'changing views within Britain about the strategic value...' - within their answer. A number of candidates appeared to be unsure of the concept of 'strategic value' at all and dismissed this explanation within a few sentences moving on to focus on other explanatory factors, such as economic concerns, and so limiting their answers to L3 at best.

The best candidates were able to weigh up the changing views within Britain of the strategic value of Empire by referring to military, defensive and economic issues and, in particular, whether economics or strategic value was the driving force behind expansion and contraction. There was some good knowledge of the concept of 'choke points', the geographic position of Egypt and the move towards Cold War & nuclear politics post-1945. Some of the best answers were able to refer with accuracy to the views of government leaders (Disraeli, Gladstone, Churchill, Macmillan) and changing popular views.

However, many answers were thinly analytical with very limited substantiating knowledge. Some candidates seemed to confuse the word 'changing' with 'turning point' and as a result too many answers began with the Boer War and dismissed expansion completely. As in previous years an emphasis on the specified turning points led to valid but far too assertive suggestions that the Boer War 'destroyed' Britain's belief in Empire and that the Labour government in 1945 (along with the population) were vehemently against Empire. In this question in particular the two world wars were regularly conjoined or confused leading to weaker sections of answers. Also many candidates referred to the 'expansion and contraction of empire' continuously throughout the essay even when referring to the events of either one or the other suggesting a lack of understanding of the nature of the question as a whole.

5F: Medicine in Britain in the Twentieth Century, c.1890 - c.1990

Question 1

This question was answered by three quarters of the candidates. One reason could be that at first glance it had similarities to Question 1 in 2007 which candidates would have encountered already. This would also account for the number who considered *factors of change* rather than turning points, and those who drifted from medical services to *medical provision*. These candidates were not able to reach above low L3 at best. Not all the candidates dealt well with the idea of a turning point and the term was frequently interchanged with factor of change. Thus the choices of alternative turning points by these candidates was sometimes eccentric. Those who held to the correct concept constructed competent answers concentrating on the services provided by the National Health Service, and those provided before and after its introduction.

Some candidates began with an analysis of the National Health Service as a turning point and then looked for possible alternatives. These had difficulties in making comparisons and tended to become muddled. More successful was the straightforwardly chronological approach which considered alternative turning points during the period such as the Liberal Reforms, World Wars and some key medical discoveries. Good knowledge was shown of the Liberal Reforms and there was informed analysis which argued both for and against the National Insurance Act as a turning point. Those who thought it was based their argument on changing government attitudes: *'the health of the nation became, not quite the responsibility of the government, but certainly a concern'; 'it became acceptable for those in power to offer support to the poor.'* Those who argued against made a strong case for the lack of change brought about: *'75% of those included in the National Insurance Act were already in Sick Clubs'; 'it gave more access to panel doctors -but the set up was still essentially private'; 'National Insurance covered a select demographic, not universality'.*

Consideration of the World Wars as turning points was less successful. There was a reluctance to leave out any information and therefore candidates could spend a disproportionate amount of time giving great detail of changes to medicine treatment or evacuation during the war. Much of this detail did not refer to medical services and therefore could not be rewarded. A general inability to select relevant information held down a number of answers. A number of answers focused on the EMS as the precursor of the NHS, and therefore in itself a turning point: *'the basis of one (the NHS) derived from the lessons learnt from the other (the EMS)',* but others dismissed it *'the EMS was for war and could not have coped in peace time'*. There was widespread knowledge of the systems introduced by the NHS and many candidates challenged its success in bringing about a revolution in health care. The Conservative reforms were also fully understood and valid arguments were made for these as the key turning point in services. On occasion arguments over the relative merits of Bevan and Thatcher owed more to political passions than historical judgement. It was pleasing to see that most candidates were prepared to make a judgement on the importance of the NHS and the majority did decide the it was at the least a very significant event. *'All other turning- points had never been a culmination, had always been leading up to something greater.....'*

Question 2

This was the less popular choice and produced the widest range of answers. It included the weakest answers but also a few really excellent ones. Candidates are comfortable dealing with factors and can identify and include all the significant ones. In this case,

public expectation was balanced against government, war, money and sometimes science and technology. The interrelationship of these is widely understood which helped to produce coherent arguments. The differentiating factor lay with the topic of the question - hospital services. Some answers simply overlooked this and wrote about medical services; some paid lip service by stating 'this changed hospital services' to every example given. This attribution was often incorrect. In choosing a question it is necessary to have relevant information about the medical topic identified. Candidates who did have knowledge of hospitals in the period produced well focused answers. There were confident chronological accounts of changes in hospital provision from the poor law hospitals right through to the Trust hospitals, focusing on the significance of different factors at points of change. Others dealt primarily with the relevant importance of different factors at different times and tried to illustrate those with detail of hospital changes, although this was more challenging and led to problems with sustaining focus. There were answers which showed positive understanding of the influence of war or science on hospitals '*science acted as the long term accelerator to the short term stimulus of war.*' A few identified links between technological advances and services, e.g. after World War One '*surgery had to take place in hospitals which could offer aseptic conditions and had stored blood.*' Although finance was widely cited as a reason for recent hospital reorganisation only one person noted that expensive new machinery necessitates larger hospitals.

5G: Integration and Diversity in a Great Power: from Civil War to Civil Rights in the USA, 1865-1969

Question 1

Many candidates focused almost exclusively on the idea of conflict between ethnic groups over the period, and were usually well-informed on the development of racial conflict. Thus in discussing relations with African Americans reference was made to the Black Codes, Jim Crow, *Plessy v Ferguson*, the Chicago riots of 1919, the rise of the Ku Klux Klan, and the civil rights conflicts of the 1950s and 1960s. Similarly, there was a lot of detailed material offered on the Plains Wars, Wounded Knee and the reservations as evidence of conflict between whites and the American Indians. Immigrant groups, especially the Chinese and Mexicans, were dealt with in the same way. This often resulted in an extended narrative on conflict which failed to score highly. Significantly better were those answers which, although concluding that conflict determined ethnic relations over time, were able to provide a more balanced discussion of conflict and cooperation. These considered the role of the Federal Government in the reconstruction period, especially the Freedmen's Bureau and the 14th and 15th Amendments, the actions taken by Roosevelt and Truman in the 1930s and 1940s, and the support given to the civil rights movement by many white people. There was also some useful comparison of attitudes in the north and the south of the country. The best answers noted how different institutions and elected officials changed their policies over time, notably the Supreme Court and successive presidents. Some perceptively suggested that attempts to create a single US identity caused more conflict than cooperation.

Question 2

Many candidates ignored the chronological demands of the question and concentrated exclusively on the 1950s and 1960s, with little success. Several decided, incorrectly, that Rosa Parks was a prominent leader of the civil rights movement. Others developed a one-dimensional view that every action taken by Martin Luther King was beneficial to the African American cause, while castigating Malcolm X as nothing more than a violent rabble-rouser. Future candidates might benefit from considering these two leaders in greater depth. Better answers had a good range of material to offer on the given factor, and were able to consider the contribution of a wide range of named individuals, notably Booker T. Washington, Dubois and Garvey, along with King, Malcolm X and Stokeley Carmichael. Thurgood Marshall made a welcome appearance this year. These leaders were often linked to organisations such as the NAACP, the Nation of Islam, and the SNCC. In considering other relevant factors, candidates dealt well with the Reconstruction era, the Harlem renaissance, and the respective roles of the Federal government and the Supreme Court. Many mentioned World War Two and Truman's desegregation of the armed forces, though there were few references to the Vietnam war. The significant contribution made to the cause of civil rights by Lyndon Johnson in the years 1964-68 is surprisingly often ignored. The comment made in last year's report, of the problems of enforcing Federal policies on often hostile State governments, is worth repeating.

5H: Coursework

The candidature for the coursework option within Unit 5 again represents approximately two thirds 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.

Coursework was moderated by three moderating teams, working under the guidance of their team leaders and the principal moderator. This is the second time that the 6523 and 6525 moderating teams have been amalgamated. Insofar as centres are concerned, this meant that, where candidates were entered for both AS and A2 coursework, the work was moderated by the same moderator. This had the advantage, for centres, of continuity of comment, and for the moderators of giving them an over-view of an individual centre's approach, thus making for more effective moderation.

Marking and moderating

Most centres had fully assimilated the new criteria and new mark scheme well. Only two centres worked to the old regulations and the work from them was moderated by the principal moderator in a way that did not disadvantage candidates. Teachers are urged to keep themselves up-to-date with Edexcel developments as they affect the Units for which they are preparing candidates. These can be readily accessed on Edexcel's web-site.

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.

Centres are reminded that careful annotation not only helps teacher-examiners reach an appropriate level and mark, but it also helps the moderator understand why a specific level and mark have been given. A minority of centres are submitting work that is simply covered in ticks and then awarded a mark and a level without even a summative comment. This is not helpful and does not aid effective moderation. Where there is more than one teacher-examiner assessing the work of a centre's candidates and cross-moderation takes place, it is essential that any change in the original mark is accompanied by a brief explanation as to why. It is equally essential that the final, centre-moderated mark is transferred to the OPTEMs sheet.

With the sharpened focus on A01, there were fewer examples of straight narrative responses, with candidates adopting the 'telling it as it was' approach. A pleasing number of candidates are selectively deploying what they know to answer the question set in a direct, logically planned, manner. In tasks with a causal focus, responses were more than ever structured to provide an explanation, rather than a description, of change. In tasks

requiring a comparison or evaluation of change, the moderating team found fewer unfocused surveys. The best work was impressively scholarly and well argued.

As was noted last year, there are still some candidates who have problems with the conceptual requirements of the tasks they have been set. Questions usually involve an exploration of the ways in which something changed - the nature of change. Or they focus on the reasons why something changed. Candidates need to be sharply aware of the different approaches needed to these different types of question. Effective consideration of the nature or extent of change stems from the ability to make developed analytical comparisons of the state of affairs at different points in time, accompanied by the ability to employ measures or criteria for establishing change. A different approach is needed for effective consideration of the reasons for change. An exploration of the factors bringing about change needs to address the inter-connectedness of these factors and their changing significance at different points in time in the period under consideration in order to construct an argument about their relative significance.

Disturbingly, moderators reported some centres setting amended tasks that did not cover the requisite 100 years; other centres were rewarding highly work that did not address a full 100 years although the task required them to do so. All centres are reminded that both the task, and candidates' responses to the task, must cover the appropriate 100 years. This was noted last year and there seems to have been no improvement, despite the centres concerned having had their attention drawn to the matter in their individual reports.

There were virtually no problems created by work that exceeded the word limit. Where candidates did exceed the word limit, the majority of centres applied the correct mark scheme. What, however, was surprising was the number of candidates who wrote assignments that were considerably under the word limit. Whilst this may be expected in weaker candidates, a disturbing number of stronger candidates wrote well under the limit and so did not appropriately develop their themes and could not reach the higher levels of the mark scheme. Some of these candidates were over-rewarded, the teacher-examiner presumably rewarding what they knew the candidate could do rather than what they had done. Centres are reminded that a word range is given for A2 assignments of 2,000-3,000 and that it would be wise for candidates' work not to drop below the lower word count.

A disturbing number of centres are failing to send to their moderator a full folder of work of the second highest scoring candidate. The purpose of the full folder of work is to enable the moderator to confirm that the whole coursework programme has been followed and that teaching has not just been to the task. More centres than in previous years failed to send the work of the highest and lowest scoring candidate in the whole cohort, regardless as to whether or not they were included in the sample. These oversights resulted in additional work for both moderators and centres.

Centre administration

An increasing number of centres are experiencing difficulties with the administration of the coursework element of this Unit. This was noted last year and the situation has not improved. 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 Coursework Programme Approval Form providing evidence that the course has been approved. It would be sensible to send a photocopy, retaining the original in the centre for use in future years. No such form is required if centres are following an Edexcel-designed course, but it would be helpful if a note to this effect could be enclosed with the submission.
- Copies of tasks and mark schemes. This is not necessary if the course is an Edexcel-designed one, but a note to this effect should be included.
- The Coursework Mark Record Sheet 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 Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet authentication sheet completed for each candidate, signed by the candidate and the teacher. Please note that the form 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 A level 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. **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 Individual Candidate Authentication Sheet 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 2007 and the spring of 2008 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 high standard in future years.

6525 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
5A	60	35.1	9.3
5B	60	32.6	13.8
5C	60	39.5	10.0
5D	60	32.1	9.9
5E	60	35.5	10.4
5F	60	31.0	11.6
5G	60	32.1	9.7
5H	60	46.4	8.5
5J	60	46.6	8.8
5K	60	47.1	8.7

Paper 5A

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		27.5	49.7	68.7	80.9	89.4

Paper 5B

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	39	35	31	28	25
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		33.3	41.7	41.7	58.3	75.0

Paper 5C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	47	42	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		26.5	44.0	61.1	73.7	83.0

Paper 5D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	35	31	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		25.4	41.1	54.8	65.2	84.0

Paper 5E

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	34	29	25
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		22.4	40.7	60.7	72.3	85.1

Paper 5F

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	36	31	26	21
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		25.8	35.2	45.5	63.1	82.0

Paper 5G

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	36	31	26	21
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		19.9	41.7	58.3	68.9	88.8

Paper 5H

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	51	46	41	36	31
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		36.4	60.8	76.8	88.4	94.1

Paper 5J

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	51	46	41	36	31
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		38.0	61.2	78.9	88.5	94.0

Paper 5K

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	51	46	41	36	31
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		40.1	63.2	79.8	90.0	94.7

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 0202225 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