

Examiners' Report

June 2016

GCSE History 5HB01 1C

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2016

Publications Code 5HB01_1C_1606_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

Introduction

It was clear that teachers and candidates had taken notes of comments made in the 2015 report regarding the strengthened specification and the revised format of the paper. In both Question (Q)1 and Q3 there was good use of additional contextual knowledge, which is required at the higher levels of the mark scheme.

In many cases, there was also good knowledge of the topics in the questions. Candidates seemed to understand that presenting information is characteristic of a Level 2 answer and that to move to Level 3, answers must show why that information is relevant to this specific question. It might also help more candidates to achieve this if they identify the target concept and check whether the question is about causation, change, continuity, consequences etc. Each of these requires a different approach, and relevant material needs to be deployed in a different way. Nevertheless, it was pleasing to see how many students were attempting to do this even if sometimes it was simply through an assertion that 'this shows why...'

In Q4 and Q5, candidates were expected to analyse and it was enough to explain a range of cause/effects/aspects of change etc; however, the 16-mark questions always ask for evaluation. Here again, many candidates had clearly been well prepared and adopted a structure of: evidence supporting the statement in the question, evidence challenging it, conclusion. This was a valid approach for Level 3 but for Level 4 there must be more than simply a summary of the two sides of the issue and the decision that the statement was 'somewhat' true. At Level 4, there should be a sense of evaluation, showing which evidence carries most weight. Ideally, this will create a sense of argument running throughout the answer and the best answers usually have plans, which show that the argument was thought through before writing began.

Most candidates also understood the need for depth and breadth in the extended answers. While it was not essential to use the two stimulus points that were given, it was expected that a good answer would cover three aspects or more, in order to show breadth of coverage. It was also helpful to have these three aspects clearly delineated and where candidates did not structure their answer in paragraphs, examiners may have found it difficult to confirm that three aspects had been covered.

Chronology remains a central issue on this paper. Since it is a study in development, questions will often cover a specific timescale and candidates must be able to recognise the relevant periods. The most frequent difficulty was failing to differentiate between the nineteenth century and dates in the 1900s, but candidates also needed to know the period covered by terms such as the Middle Ages/medieval period, the Renaissance /sixteenth and seventeenth centuries etc. Candidates needed to be able to place key people, events and developments into the correct context and avoid anachronisms. Knowing the approximate dates of a period was also important when analysing change and continuity: the gap between the Roman period and the Renaissance is over 1,000 years, and there are 400 years from the end of the Middle Ages to the nineteenth century.

Linked to this was the issue that candidates noticed key terms indicating the topic, but did not analyse the question properly. Terms such as 'during the years', 'since 1900', or 'in the nineteenth century', gave a clear timescale for their answer and material outside these dates was unlikely to be rewarded highly.

As noted last year, candidates using additional paper for Q1 rarely benefitted from doing so. Usually, taking extra paper on Q1 was counter-productive: the additional material simply consisted of detail about the individual sources or repeated points already made. Indeed, some of the best answers were concise, while in some lengthy answers, the focus was lost or the analytical point being made lost impact because it was overwhelmed by detail. The corollary to this was that candidates often found it difficult to finish the final question, which carried one-third of the total marks available.

Handwriting is becoming an issue of major concern. While examiners work hard to decipher poor handwriting, it destroys the flow of an extended answer and can also affect the marks awarded for spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG).

Question 1

There was a marked increase in the use of own knowledge to explain the changes illustrated by Sources A and B. This meant that far more answers reached Level 3 or could be awarded higher marks in Level 2, instead of being restricted to four marks. However, some candidates are now treating this as an open-ended question on change between the dates of the two sources. The question says 'What do Sources A and B show about changes ...?' and therefore comments about change and the use of own knowledge must be linked to details in the sources. Some very good answers, which explained change between the dates of the two sources yet with no reference to details in the sources, remained at Level 1. Alternatively, answers that treated the sources separately could not achieve marks beyond Level 1, even if they included a lot of additional detail, because the focus of the question is change. Another weakness occurred when the focus on change was left implicit, with Source A discussed and then Source B, and the use of words like 'more' or 'different' were the only indication that there was a change between the two sources. Other answers focussed on one aspect of Source A and a different aspect of Source B, making it difficult to identify what change had occurred.

It should also be noted that identifying a difference between the two sources is not the same as inferring and explaining a change, and this is not a question about whether or not change did occur and therefore answers about continuity scored no marks.

Good practice is to identify in the first sentence the change that has occurred, and then to develop the explanation based on the sources and the use of additional knowledge. This would avoid the problem where the answer has a lengthy description of each source, and only addresses the focus on change at the end. For Level 3, the explanation should focus on the nature or extent of change and additional detail might be provided to show how or why the change occurred, or to illustrate the change in nature, or extent of, change. It should be noted that it is not enough to state 'a huge change occurred' to access Level 3 – details from the sources and own knowledge must be provided to show that the change was huge.

This question asked about changes in the treatment of wounded soldiers. Although most answers identified a change in the hygiene or level of care based on the sources, it was often stated quite simply that conditions were better, with limited analysis of the nature or extent of change.

There were relatively few Level 1 answers because most answers did identify a change based on the sources and therefore reached Level 2. However, candidates often did not add relevant own knowledge and therefore many could not go beyond four marks. Where they did provide additional detail, they tended to link it to one of the sources rather than the change that had been identified. For example, many candidates explained how the problems of pain or blood loss, which were mentioned in Source A, had been solved, but they did not link this to Source B. Alternatively, answers talked about Florence Nightingale's work in training nurses and improving hygiene, which they linked to Source B, but they often did not show how that was a change from Source A.

The best answers could use both sources, and additional own knowledge, to talk about the increase of trained personnel, improvements in conditions, and hygiene, or the development of a system for the treatment and removal of wounded soldiers.

1 What do Sources A and B show about changes in the treatment of wounded soldiers?

Explain your answer, using Sources A and B and your own knowledge.

(8)

Source A depicts the idea that medical care was bad; we

learn that in the case of Captain Robert Adair it has led to his death. From my own knowledge I know medical care and treatment of soldiers was bad during the 19th century, evident from the fact 80% of deaths in the Crimean war in Scutari were caused by poor treatment, medical incompetence and disease. This shows how soldiers were not treated well as there was little understanding of medical procedures like amputations (shown in source A) as x-rays were not yet invented. It is also interesting how the same amputation utensil had been used for many other amputations thus explaining its bluntness; showing cross contamination and how many severe injuries there were.

Source B shows how medical care has developed from the 19th century to the 20th century as there are clothed nurses and beds for the wounded. This is true because after the work of Florence Nightingale we know that conditions and medical treatment improved as she cleaned the conditions for soldiers. This shows huge progression, in 1887 steam cleaning was introduced and in 1895 x-rays were introduced showing progression.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer received full marks. It used both the sources and the candidate's own knowledge to explain changes in the medical staff, hygiene, conditions and equipment.

8 marks



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Check the question carefully – if it is about changes then make sure you identify clearly what those changes were.

Sources A and B show that the medical care improved greatly between Waterloo and World War One as it shows that the surgeons or nurses had much more training as in source A it describes the surgeon as ~~being~~ ~~struggling~~ having 'difficulty with using his knife! This suggests that there were very few ~~the~~ medical advances in the time. However source B shows that the surgeons or nurses appear as quite relaxed which suggests that they might have more training. This corroborates with my own knowledge as I know that there were many advances between the two, especially during Crimea with the invention of the steam ~~sterilisation~~ steriliser and the theory that dirt (bad smell) was connected with infection.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer gives a rather general comment about change based on the sources (the surgeon's difficulty in A was the result of limited equipment, not poor training) and does not show how the own knowledge included at the end relates to this change.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure you link own knowledge to the focus of the question, do not just add it as information.

Question 2

The topics named in Q2 are taken directly from the specification, so candidates should be confident in writing about them and should be able to identify at least two key features or aspects and provide supporting details. The question asks about key features (plural) and therefore candidates should be aware that one key point, however well developed, can achieve only a maximum of five marks.

There seemed to be more answers about aerial warfare than about computer technology, but the quality of answers was fairly even. Good answers about aerial warfare usually discussed Operation Desert Storm, often with precise details, the role of stealth bombers, the use of jets and drones, and the attack on power and water pumping stations. Weaker answers had few details and relied on general comments about planes fighting and dropping bombs, which could have applied to any modern war. Some candidates missed the point that this was about aerial warfare and commented on planes and helicopters being used for transport.

Good answers about computer technology usually talked about being able to locate enemy positions by satellite and the use of GPS to target drones. Weaker answers wrote more generally about computers providing media coverage and helping troops to communicate.

The Coalition made heavy use of aerial warfare in the Gulf War by using aircraft to bomb enemy territories and civilian areas. The bombers targeted power stations and military bases to weaken Iraq's forces. Operation Desert Storm involved heavy use of bomber planes and drones (such as the deadly 'daisy cutter's) and some missiles were fired from as far as 1500 miles away, programmed to be accurate to 10m by computers. Another time aerial weaponry was used was after Operation Desert Sabre, when people fleeing Iraq were bombed on the 'Highway of Death'. By comparison, Iraq's army planes were slower and more dated, leading to an easy victory for the Coalition with only 350 casualties.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer has good detail on the key features of aerial warfare and achieves full marks.

6 marks



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

If the question asks for key features (plural) make sure that you identify at least two different aspects.

There was a huge advancement in computer technology as ~~was~~ officers could locate where enemy troops are using it. They used microwaves to bounce off aircraft so they knew positions, radar. ~~the~~ They also had laser guided missiles which could attack an enemy from far away. This was controlled by a computer up in a helicopter by a pilot. It allowed the pilot to drop bombs directly on units or key landmarks in Baghdad.

Pilots and troops could also communicate through radio so they could plan attacks and wipe out areas of the enemy extremely quickly. They could talk to each other by setting up a network through a computer system so they all had the same information. This was displayed on a screen inside helicopters, controlled and received by computer technology.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer explains two ways that computer technology was used during the Gulf War and it achieves full marks.

6 marks



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Make sure that you give specific examples whenever you can.

Question 3

In 2015 most candidates could make valid comments about the value of a source based on its content but they rarely took into consideration whether the value of this information was affected by considerations of reliability. It was disappointing to see that this trend has continued in 2016, meaning that relatively few candidates achieved Level 3. However, this year, more candidates have been able to access the upper marks in Level 2 because they brought in the use of additional contextual knowledge.

Level 1 answers, where candidates assumed that a source's usefulness (or reliability) depended simply on its nature, date or the amount/clarity of detail, were few. Comments at this level were generalised and could have applied to any similar source: it is from the time, so it is reliable; it is a photograph and we do not know who took it, so it is unreliable; it was taken to inform people, so it is reliable.

The majority of answers were in Level 2. At the bottom of Level 2, the source content was described, with the implicit assumption that it was useful to have this information because it was relevant. Such answers said that it was helpful to see the height of the castle walls and towers, they often explained the benefit of round towers, the use of arrow slits and the crenellations, and they sometimes identified other features of the castle that were visible in the photograph. However, describing the content of the photograph and then stating 'I know this is typical of medieval castles' did not count as the use of own knowledge.

Where the comments were further developed by the use of own knowledge, this was often through an explanation of siege tactics or the evolution of castle design from the motte and bailey to concentric castles. Other answers focussed on identifying the limitations of the photograph as a source by identifying typical aspects of castle design that could not be seen, for example a gatehouse. However, it should also be noted that a general list of what is *not* mentioned in the source, is unlikely to be rewarded, unless there is an explanation of how that information would help the historian answer the specific enquiry in the question. Therefore, answers that stated merely that the source did not show a moat, or that it did not show the interior of the castle, were not rewarded highly.

Fewer candidates focused on reliability and these were more likely to make assertions without providing supporting evidence, or showing how it affected the source's usefulness. The tendency to an automatic claim that the source was biased was avoided, but there was a number of answers that claimed the source was unreliable because we did not know who took the photograph. This had an implicit assumption that this was a negative point but with no explanation of how this affected the source's utility. Similarly, it was noted frequently that the source was modern, and therefore could not show what the castle was like during the Middle Ages. However, relatively few candidates linked this to the information in the caption about the later addition of the round tower and there was little recognition that this allowed us to see the evolution of castle design.

A number of candidates also used a checklist approach here, writing a comment about the nature, origin, and purpose of the source but presenting these as statements that were undeveloped and not applied to show how they affected the source's utility.

Better answers could focus on:

- the nature and purpose/intended audience of the source
- considering whether or not it was a private or public source
- if it were intended to influence other people
- whether or not the circumstances distorted the source content in any way.

A number of candidates noted that the source could have been used to publicise the castle's history and suggested this was useful evidence of the importance of castles in medieval society and the need to provide a strong place of refuge.

It is understandable that schools will try to help candidates to structure their answer, and many acronyms were visible but these were not always appropriate or candidates could not properly apply them. Too many comments consisted of statements such as 'The castle in the source is from the time so it is reliable but it is not reliable because we don't know who took the photograph'. Consideration of a source's provenance and reliability does not have to be negative. While the source content may not be complete, an objective presentation or the purpose to inform people about a situation may provide added weight to that content.

The best answers considered the usefulness of the content but modified the judgement about usefulness through a consideration of reliability, or whether or not the source could be treated as representative of the period. However, this nuanced evaluation had to be based on an exploration of the strengths and limitations of different aspects of the source's reliability and utility. For example, answers consisting of a paragraph asserting the source's usefulness or reliability, then a paragraph asserting it was not useful or it was unreliable, followed by the conclusion that it was 'partially useful', or 'useful to a certain extent', was not an evaluation.

In some cases, excellent answers were limited to four marks because they did not include additional own knowledge.

3 How useful is this photograph of a castle to a historian who is investigating medieval castle design?

Use Source C and your own knowledge to explain your answer.

(8)

Source C is usefull to a certain extent. ~~Useful~~
Source C is usefull ^{from my own knowledge} because it shows the advances from wood and motte and bailey ~~walls~~ walls to stone walls which, is a key advancement in castle design. The fact the photo is modern helps the historian to see advances in design, in this case we can see the round tower which has been added in 1226 which may not have been included on earlier accounts of what the castle looked like such as paintings. This would help the historian see through the ages how and why castle design changed because only from the benefit of hindsight can we see the progression of castle designs.

Source C is not useful because it is a modern photograph and, as is evident from this photograph, we can see that over ~~hundreds~~ hundreds of years the castle has decayed leaving only remains of what was once there. This makes it hard for the historian to see design advances because the advances that were made have not withstood the test of time. From my own knowledge I know castles were more strategically placed such as on hills and near the sea, evident from this photo, I also know round towers were created as a defence mechanism from sieges. This is all discoverable from the photo, it is also suggestable this castle may have been sieged as the stone curtain wall and round tower have partially been destroyed.

This photo is partially useful to a historian investigating medieval castle design as it shows key features however some have been destroyed making the evidence less useful.

(Total for Question 3 = 8 marks)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer uses own knowledge and a consideration of the source nature and origins, to evaluate the usefulness of the source content. It achieves full marks.

8 marks



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure that you think about whether the source origin, nature or purpose, strengthens or limits the source's usefulness.

The picture is useful because it shows them the castle is made of brick. This shows that it was hard to break down unlike other castles in that time, such as wood. The fact the castle is so high up gives the impression that the castle was protected. The moat means the castle was harder to get to, suggesting this was a good layout for a medieval castle.

The towers at the top of the castle suggest that, because they are so high up, they could see enemies trying to come to invade before they got there, giving time to ~~rep~~ prepare from the coming attack.

Brick is a hard material, telling us that it was very hard to attack this castle.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer discusses the usefulness of the source content but does not include any own knowledge.

4 marks



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Check the instructions – if you are told to use own knowledge, your mark will be limited if you do not do so.

Question 4

It was not surprising that this question was far more popular than Q5; the Roman army and the Battle of Watling Street are well-known topics about which candidates appear to enjoy writing. The majority of answers were very detailed concerning Roman weapons and tactics and the specifics of this battle. These details were contrasted with details about the Celts, and this was well used to explain Roman superiority in the battle.

Many answers were well organised, starting with the advantages of Roman weapons, where the javelin could become embedded in a Celtic shield and weigh it down, slowing the rushing advance of the Celts. This usually led to an explanation of tactics. Roman manuals and training were sometimes discussed here, but the key point was that standard tactics using the short sword and shield allowed good defence, while the wedge formation was an effective advance. This was contrasted with the Celts' lack of a unifying language or tactics, and the emphasis on individual heroic warriors. Many answers also explained how the Romans used the battleground to protect their flanks and nearly all explained that the presence of Celtic families and wagons limited their room for manoeuvre.

Most candidates found it easy to go beyond the stimulus material and there were a number of high-mark answers in both Level 2 and Level 3. The key difference was that at Level 2, candidates described Roman tactics and events at the battle; at Level 3 candidates were explicit about how this helped the Romans to defeat the Celts. There were very few Level 1 answers, but some candidates did become confused and included details taken from other battles.

Boudicca's Revolt was in 61AD and she gathered up her army and burnt down many Roman civilisations including London. The battle was concluded at the Battle of Watling Street where Boudicca's Celts faced the Romans.

The Romans were able to defeat Boudicca because of tactics. Roman military leaders were all given a handbook / manual so that all Roman soldiers got the same training, understood the same commands and could work well as a team. The Celts were made up of different tribes that all spoke varying languages meaning that communication was very hard consequently meaning the Celts had no real tactics and

could not function as one unit like the Romans. Celtic sub-leaders were warriors, classified by heroic actions they have done. Celts looked up to warriors and wanted to become a warrior. This meant that Celtic soldiers ~~would not~~ favoured individual heroism and tried to become a hero abolishing their tactics meaning they worked alone. ~~Moreover~~ Furthermore, this meant that the Roman tactics, like the wedge and testudo, meant that the ~~as~~ charging Celts got slaughtered as more Celts pushed ~~the~~ the Celts at the front into the Roman wedge.

The Romans had better equipment and discipline than the Celtic soldiers. The Romans were a paid full time standing army meaning they could train on a day to day basis. The Roman soldiers were full time meaning they would be provided with standard issue weapons and protective uniform consisting of two spears, one sword and some got a shield. This is contrasted by the Celts lack of weaponry and standing army soldiers. The Celts were made up of farmers who brought farm tools to fight with and wore little clothing meaning

They were more susceptible to death by Roman weapons. In the Roman army 1 in 10 soldiers were flogged (killed) to set an example making the Roman soldiers listen to orders and be disciplined. There is no such evidence of discipline in the Celtic army. This means when the Romans were given orders to hold formation they would unlike the Celts who just charged leading to many Celtic deaths.

The Romans were also able to defeat Boudicca's Celts because the Celts made mistakes. The battle field had hills at each side, the Celts decided to bring in supply carts chariots and other large items to one end of the field. This meant as the Roman army progressed forward many Celtic soldiers got stuck between the Roman wedge and the Celtic supply carts. A large mistake leading to many more Celtic deaths.

I think the main reason the Romans could defeat Boudicca at the battle of Watling Street was because they had such good tactics. To what extent these tactics were effective is evident from the fact 10,000 Romans were able to defeat 230,000 Celts. Without such good tactics the Romans would have been intimidated by the

Celtic paint and scale of the army however,
they functioned as one unit annihilating
the Celtic soldiers who favoured individual
heroism costing them the battle.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer is not very well organised but it makes a range of points about why the Romans won the battle. It is awarded full marks.

12 marks



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure that you include at least three key points or aspects – the bullet points can be used but you need to bring in a third aspect from your own knowledge.

The Romans were able to defeat Boudicca was that the Roman army had more discipline which means the army was organised. This shows the more organised the army are the more chance of winning.

Another reason why the Roman defeated Boudicca is that the Roman were better equipped which means they ~~had~~ wore armor to protect themselves however, Boudicca's army did not have armor which means they were not able to protect themselves fully.

In the battle the Celts had more men than the Romans. This shows that the better trained men are more efficient for battle. The Celts had mostly farms and not ~~to~~ good weapons to use, they some men use ~~to~~ wood against a sword.

*I know this from my own knowledge as



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer does identify three reasons for the Roman victory — discipline, armour and weapons. However, it is all rather general and these points lack supporting detail, so this is a Level 2 answer, not Level 3.

6 marks



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

You need to be able to provide specific supporting detail to achieve high marks.

Question 5

This question was less popular than Q4 and also tended to be answered less well.

There was good subject knowledge about recruitment and training in the feudal army, with many candidates explaining the feudal levy, scutage payments, the use of mercenaries, a knight's training and the demand for trained archers. However, the focus on change was often left implicit. Many answers simply provided a detailed description of the feudal army, followed by a shorter description of the New Model Army — consequently, these answers were marked at Level 2.

Where answers did progress to Level 3, they explained the:

- change from feudal service, based on land and social hierarchy, to a standing army
- limited training in a medieval army, apart from knights and mercenaries
- way that the introduction of the longbow necessitated the recruitment of archers who were already trained
- way that men in the New Model Army could be trained to use muskets, after they had been recruited.

Some answers went into detail about methods used by recruiting parties, which were more typical of a later period, and few could distinguish between the recruitment methods of Charles I and parliament. The main weakness was the 'bookend' approach, where answers went directly from the Middle Ages to the Civil Wars, with little discussion of what actually changed.

One way recruitment and training changed after 1066 was with the removal of the feudal system. Instead of receiving housecarls and the fyrd to fight battles, kings instead hired skilled mercenaries, ^{such as knights} paid for by scutage. This changed recruitment as it meant there was no longer need for 45 days annual service and kings could directly hire efficient fighters and mercenaries trained themselves. This is one way recruitment and training changed during the period 1066-c.1750.

A second significant change factor was the arrival of the longbow in 1350. It had the power to puncture plate armour from 200m, resulting in less successful use of knights in battles, ~~as~~ as they could be easily killed or pinned to their horses. This changed training because kings called upon people to learn to use this powerful weapon, leading to the use of drilling to train

soldiers. Recruitment changed because armies now wanted mercenaries who were more) longbowmen and less knights, for example Henry V's army at Agincourt had 5000 longbowmen out of an army of 6000 men.

Army recruitment and training changed again in 1645 when Oliver Cromwell introduced Britain's first standing army, the New Model Army (NMA). The proper organisation and funding of this army changed training as designated army barracks and training facilities were set up, where soldiers would practice with the new major weapon, the flintlock musket, in firing ranges. Due to the army being permanent, recruitment also changed from relying on mercenaries to placing ^{volunteers} ~~men~~ on 12 year contracts and giving them wages. This recruitment method also resulted in officers tricking men into enlisting using ^{the influence of} alcohol or signing up convicts who otherwise faced death. This is an additional significant change to training and recruitment of armies during the period 1066-c1750.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The feudal army did not end after 1066 and the use of convicts in the army is more generally associated with the late 18th century, but this answer has a good focus on change and also discusses both recruitment and training; it is awarded full marks.

12 marks



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Make sure that you cover the whole of the period in the question.

Recruitment and training showed great development during 1066 - 1750.

The first great development was the introduction to ~~the~~ the feudal system. Developed by the Franks in 700 AD, this recruitment method was beneficial. It worked by the ruler leasing land to tenants in return for military support. ~~and~~ Then the tenants would lease this land to sub-tenants, in return for military support. This method allowed benefits for both parties: weapons and men for the king, and a home for many. Feudal armies were used when recruiting troops for the Battle of Hastings (1066)

However, even though they initially had positive benefits, the feudal system began to have its drawbacks in 1350. The first problem was that they were limited to 45 days service. This meant that it was enough time for a battle, but for a full blown war, they would not have enough troops. Another key problem was their lack of skill and training. This resulted in high death rates, ~~and~~ which could cost

them the battle. These men weren't noble rich Normans, trained since birth as it was part of their society. But ~~these~~ peasants who ^{had} only used farm tools in their life, let alone fired a musket. One of the last problems was the lack of discipline. These men had not been trained properly and therefore didn't have much motivation when fighting. The feudal system was successful in the way of recruiting soldiers, but once recruited, it had more drawbacks.

Following on from this, Oliver Cromwell in the Battle of Naesby (English Civil War) began to stamp out these problems. At first, the typical untrained army began to fail the parliamentary forces. That was until, Cromwell, began his new model army. Full of discipline and weapon training this army outranked the Royalists. Prince Rupert's cavalry did not listen, where as Okey's cavalry did. Which resulted in the Royalists ~~losing~~ losing the war.

The use of mercenaries also solved the problems of the feudal system, but caused another: cost. The highly trained mounted knight, at a cost of 1 shilling per day seemed like a positive idea for England in the time of war, but the aftermath caused bigger problems. It meant that the whole of English society was affected, especially when the king had to raise the taxes in order to fund them.

~~Commiss~~ Commission created a lot of problems also. For example Prince Rupert. He had no military experience but bought his way up using his wealth. This meant the wars could have been lost many a time due to the wealth of ~~the~~ people. This was a key feature of recruitment during 1066-1750, as commission stopped in 1872, after the Crimean war.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This answer has some good information about the feudal army but it does not have a focus on change.

Valid details are included about Cromwell and mercenaries but they lack depth, and the comments about commission are not relevant here, because commission ended after the period in the question.

7 marks



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Check the time-frame of the question carefully – you will not be awarded marks for anything outside that time-frame.

Question 6

This question was more popular than Q7 and the details of the Battle of Waterloo were usually well known.

Napoleon's haemorrhoid problem appeared in practically every answer, although some referred to dysentery or cancer. However, few candidates could develop this point – even when they explained that finding it painful to ride his horse meant that Napoleon did not oversee the battle properly, candidates did not support this with examples of actual incidents within the battle.

Most answers could explain the use of cannon to reinforce infantry squares and the effectiveness of this tactic as a defence against French cavalry charges (although some answers claimed the cannon were inside a hollow infantry square). Some answers also mentioned the way Wellington hid some artillery behind a hedge and used them to attack the French column as they began their assault. Also mentioned frequently was Wellington's use of a ridge on the battleground. Most candidates could explain that Wellington ordered his men to shelter behind the ridge during Napoleon's bombardment but there were also some confused claims that being on the ridge – sometimes described as a steep hill – gave Wellington an advantage, because cannonballs could roll down the hill and smash into the French army. There was also a number of candidates who appeared to think that Wellington's use of cannon was a new tactic and the French did not possess any cannon themselves.

The weather was often mentioned, together with an explanation that the French attack was delayed in the hope that it would be easier to manoeuvre cannon once the ground had dried out a little, but again, this was not always linked to a reason why Wellington was victorious.

The best answers stressed that, being outnumbered, Wellington adopted defensive tactics in the hope that they would be reinforced by the Prussians. These answers showed that:

- Wellington's use of line formation was effective against Napoleon's columns
- the defence of La Haye Sante and Hougement weakened the French
- while infantry squares provided good defence against cavalry, they also allowed the use of musket and rifle volleys.

Napoleon's mistakes were also pointed out: that his decision to send Grouchy after the Prussians reduced his advantage; the delay at the beginning helped the British; and his refusal to send reinforcements to Ney when La Haye Sante might have been captured missed an opportunity to turn the battle.

Since this question called for evaluation of the importance of cannon, candidates were expected to weigh the use of cannon against other factors in Wellington's victory. Most candidates challenged the statement in the question with convincing cases being made for the use of defensive tactics until the Prussians arrived, the defence of Hougement and La Haye Sante or a more generalised discussion of tactics in which the use of cannon was recognised, but not seen as decisive. Candidates should be aware that for the highest marks, they should develop an argument that leads towards a judgement, rather than simply survey a range of factors leading to victory and then sum this up with a general comment that all the factors were important.

It was understandable that candidates became confused about details of individual battles but they need to develop a sense of chronology linking weapons and battles – there was a number of comments about archers at this battle.

One reason I agree with the statement is because Wellington effectively positioned his cannon on the battlefield. He arranged his infantry in squares and placed cannon in each corner which made his infantry difficult to be defeated by Napoleon's army, as they could easily ward off attackers using the cannon. This helped him win Waterloo as the French weren't able to launch attacks on Britain successfully in the battle, showing their well strategised and defensive use of cannon was an important reason for Wellington's win.

Although this argument contains validity, I am more inclined to disagree with the statement as I regard other factors to be the "most important reason" for Napoleon's defeat. One important factor of Napoleon's defeat was the mistakes he made as a leader. He sent 30,000 soldiers to attack Prussia, leaving both sections of his army outnumbered and unable to secure victory. Half his army couldn't defeat Britain and the other half couldn't stop Prussia from arriving to support Britain.

This tactical error is a very important reason Napoleon lost the battle. Additional problems Napoleon encountered as a leader also brought him to defeat, like his piles stopping him surveying the battle from his horse and Wellington's position behind a ridge reducing the impact of French cannon.

All this is one reason I disagree with the statement.

A second reason I cannot agree with the statement is because Wellington had very good tactics. Although supported by his cannon, a large reason the infantry squares worked well was because it allowed his infantry to achieve a constant volley

of fire by using a relay strategy. This helped Britain hold off Napoleon's cavalry attacks arguably as much as or more than the presence of cannon. Moreover, Wellington's placement of troops behind a ridge in the field and in buildings such as chateaus meant his troops were well defended and able to ward off French attacks until the arrival of support from the Prussian army. This shows Wellington's battle tactics were also a major reason Napoleon was defeated at Waterloo.

Looking at both sides of the argument, it is to my contention that Wellington's use of cannon was not the most important reason he was able to defeat Napoleon in 1815 as whilst his cannon was indeed a contributing factor, it was Napoleon's errors as a leader and the overall tactics of Wellington that I consider the most important reasons.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The answer makes a good range of points with supporting detail, but also it has a clear sense of evaluation and an argument is developed about the most important reason for Wellington's victory. It achieves full marks.

Question – 16

SPaG: good – 3

19 marks



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

For the 16-mark evaluation questions it is best to have a clear idea from the start, of the argument that you intend to develop.

On one hand I do agree that the cannon was a important reason why he won. I agree because it meant that he could attack ~~brer~~^{people} from further away. It was also good because he used infantry squares to help attack Foster and better. This was good because it meant they were more affective when it come to killing ~~to~~ Napoleon's team. This was how Wellington's use of the cannon was ~~the~~^a ~~most~~ important reason why he won.

Another reason why he won because of the cannon was because of how powerful they were. They could fire about 100 meters which meant they didn't have to get close to the enemy. Also the use of ~~in~~ infantry squares was good because it meant that one line, at the front, could fire then when they needed to re-load they ducked down and the next line fired and so on. This allowed them to keep firing so it kept killing Napoleons men. This ~~is~~^{was} another reason why the cannon was so effective for Wellington.

On the other ~~hand~~, ~~the~~ hand there were different reasons why Wellington won and that was because Napoleon had piles. This meant Wellington won ~~because~~ ^{because} the piles stopped Napoleon from being able to sit on his ~~horse~~ ^{horse}. This meant that Napoleon couldn't see the battle field very well so he made bad decisions on what his army should do, which lead to them fighting badly and loosing against ~~Napoleon's~~ ^{Wellington's} team. This was one reason why Napoleon lost and Wellington won.

Another reason Napoleon lost was because he didn't listen to anyone's advice. This meant that even though people ~~who~~ ^{who} could see the battle field and were giving good advice and trying ~~to~~ to help, Napoleon just ignored them and kept giving bad instructions to his army and what they should do. This was good for Wellington because he made good tactics and if anyone had advised him to do something, he would have listened ~~and~~ and maybe he did it, but

Napoleon just ignored the advice and carried on. This was another reason Napoleon lost and Wellington won.

Overall I don't think the cannon was the most important reason why Wellington won, I think it was a big help but I think it was down to other factors and the fact Napoleon was very stubborn and didn't accept the help.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer identifies various reasons why Wellington won at Waterloo but some of the points mentioned are not clearly linked to the question focus or lack supporting detail.

Question – 10

SPaG: reasonable – 2

12 marks



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

You do not need to use the bullet points in the question when writing your answer, but make sure that you develop three different reasons for Wellington's victory and include supporting detail.

Question 7

This question was less popular than Q6.

The level of knowledge displayed in the answers varied a great deal. Candidates were generally more knowledgeable about military tactics during the First World War, and especially at the Battle of the Somme, than they were about military tactics used in the Crimean War. There was also a tendency to provide irrelevant detail about propaganda, transport and conditions in the trenches.

However, the main weakness, here, was that candidates did not recognise the focus on change and continuity. Many answers, which did include relevant detail about military tactics during both wars, were descriptive, and some claims were invalid. A number of candidates said that trenches were not used during the Crimean War and that cavalry was not used during the First World War. Other answers focused on what was new during the First World War and described the use of tanks and poison gas, without recognising any element of continuity.

At Level 3, answers tended to focus on change, showing the declining role of cavalry and the need to develop trench warfare, in response to the use of artillery bombardments and weapons such as the machine gun. Some answers drifted into a critique of Haig's policy of attrition or an evaluation of the effectiveness of tanks, but there was a number of good, Level 3, answers.

However, the evaluation of change and continuity that was needed for Level 4, often did not appear until the final paragraph and this limited the marks that could be awarded. As was noted in Q6, a good Level 4 answer *develops* an argument about the nature of extent of change and continuity, rather than simply summing-up examples of change and continuity. Many answers at Level 4 did include a plan, but candidates should realise that a plan needs to incorporate an argument: it is not merely an *aide-mémoire* of detail to include.

On the one hand I think military tactics were ~~very~~ very different in World War 1 in comparison to the Crimean War. This is because during World War 1 there was an abundance of tanks, gas and barbed wire. ~~None~~ None of these new technologies were used in the Crimean War. This difference in tactics means that World War 1 had many more casualties than the Crimean War showing progression in the tactics of war.

~~Secondly~~ Secondly the use of heavy artillery was present in World War 1, this tactic

~~Secondly~~ Secondly the use of heavy artillery was present in World War 1, this tactic meant that the British forces were able to break up the German forces in World War 1. This is instead of charging at each other and meeting in the middle like in the Crimean war. In addition in World War 1 there was a new type of warfare called trench warfare, this warfare was a supposed advance on massed infantry charge however, it was this trench warfare that led to a stalemate on the western front during the first World War. Furthermore, in the first World War there was Blitzkrieg warfare meaning lightning warfare. This was totally a new kind of tactic because the casualties were now 75% civilian where they were minimal during the Crimean war. This is a large change because it was this tactic that led to changes in attitude towards war.

On the other hand tactics were not different and this is evident from the makeup of armies. The factor that has remained constant ever for all was up until the Second World War is that the infantry is still the largest part of

the army. I understand that over 1000 shells were being fired by the British every minute however, the infantry was still the largest part of the army limiting warfare. The fact soldiers rifles still had bayonets on them shows how there was still lots of hand to hand combat. This shows how military tactics are not different from what they were during the Crimean war.

~~Secondly~~ Secondly, even though defensive weapons had been developed the main offensive weapon was the rifle. This was because it was mass produced in the LeGarde factory where 1750 rifles were made a week. This was happening in 1850 before the Crimean war, supplying both was with the same rifle. It was hard to develop new tactics when ~~the~~ all of the possibilities have already been exhausted. It would take the development of new weapons to advance the same tactics we see during World War 1 and the Crimean war.

It is my contention that military tactics during the Crimean war were very similar to those used during World War 1. I

understand that new offensive weapons were made, however tanks could only travel 3-4 miles per hour and often got stuck in the mud. Gas often blew back and harmed the soldiers using it and barbed wire got its own troops stuck trawling across no mans land. This meant that warfare remained the same with mass infantry attack as the most prominent ~~tactic~~ ^{tactic} seen in the First World War and the Crimean war. I understand that the focus of war changed to civilians however this did not change the outcome of war and was just a diversion of resources meaning that the tactics seen during the Crimean war and the First World War are very similar and the progression of weapons leading to new tactics took place in World War 2 not world war 1. This is why it ~~was~~ is my conclusion that tactics were not different in the First World War in comparison to the Crimean war.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Despite the comment about Blitzkrieg, this answer makes valid comparisons and builds up to a well-argued conclusion.

Question - 15

SPaG: reasonable - 2



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

An answer does not need to be perfect to gain achieve high marks.

Military tactics were very different during the Crimean War and the First World War. This was because of things such as the use of heavy artillery, trenches and machine guns. During this essay, I will be discussing how different the military tactics were in the Crimean War to the First World War.

The use of heavy artillery in the Battle of the Somme made warfare much slower. This was because during the Somme, the English decided to constantly bomb Germany for a week. This led Haig to believe that not a single German had survived. Haig ended up being completely wrong as many of the shells were faulty and ~~didn't~~ didn't explode upon impact. This gave Germany a whole week to prepare for war which gave them the upper hand. When the bombing was over, Haig ordered his soldiers to go over the top at walking pace and were met by German gun fire. This meant that an ~~advance~~ advancement in technology ~~made~~ meant that many different tactics were used at the Somme.

Furthermore, the industrial revolution made warfare much more defensive. This was because of advancements in weaponry such as machine guns and rifles. This made the Battle of Somme more defensive than the Crimean War as soldiers were far less likely to charge at each other. Also, an advancement in tanks changed military tactics as at the Crimean war, tanks were not as advanced as they were in the Somme.

Additionally, ~~the~~ cavalry was used much more during the Crimean War than that of the Battle of the Somme due ~~to~~ the fact that not a lot of advancements were made at the time of the Crimean war. There was also a major difference in how the army was supplied during both of these wars as steam ships ~~at~~ ^{and} motor vehicles were used to transport things for the army.

In Conclusion there was a lot of change in military tactics from the Crimean War to The First World War as there was a huge

advancement in technology during the industrial revolution as things such as machine guns

and tanks became more advanced] which made defense more of a key feature during the Somme.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response has good detail on the Somme but very little on the Crimean War and does not develop any comparisons; it therefore stays in Level 2.

Question – 8

SPaG: reasonable – 2



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Try to identify the target of the question – change, causation, comparison, significance, change and continuity etc. Then make sure you focus on that during your answer.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar

The SPaG marks will be reduced if there are weaknesses in these areas:

- Appropriate use of capital letters
- Correct use of apostrophes
- Weak grammar ('would of') and casual language ('chucked') – this is not appropriate in an examination
- Paragraphs: failure to structure answers in paragraphs not only affects the SPaG mark, but may also make it difficult for the examiner to identify whether three different aspects have been covered
- Poor handwriting: this is causing an increasing number of problems and exacerbates the difficulty in understanding a badly-expressed answer.

General Points to note

- Confusion over chronology is the main difficulty for candidates
- High-level answers are characterised by a focus on the specific question being asked, and the use of precise detail
- Well-prepared candidates demonstrate excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation

Examiners noted that there were many candidates who displayed impressive knowledge deployed in well-structured answers that were a joy to mark.

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.