

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2009

GCE

## GCE History 6HI02 Option D

**ResultsPlus**  
Helping you to raise attainment  
[www.resultsplus.edexcel.com](http://www.resultsplus.edexcel.com)

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.com](http://www.edexcel.com). If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2009

Publications Code US021428

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

## Contents

### *History 6HI02 Option D*

General Comments	2
Question D1	5
Question D2	10
Conclusion	17
Grade Boundaries	17

## 6HI02

### General Comments

There were many candidates who attained high levels in this examination, having demonstrated a good range of historical knowledge, clear understanding of historical development and its related concepts. While the option-specific comments set out below offer detailed reference and examples of student work, the purpose of the comments that follow is to highlight problems experienced by students across all options, and to suggest strategies for improving performance in the future.

Some candidates continue to create difficulties for themselves because they do not plan their time and do not read the sources with sufficient concentration.

The marks awarded for (a) and (b) questions indicate the amount of time that should be spent on each. The best responses in both (a) and (b) tended to be based on **analysing the sources as a set, with a sense of context**, to establish arguments that relate to the question. This approach allows the response to be source-driven, directed towards developing a judgement, as the question requires. It is therefore likely to score highly because **it is coherent and focused**. A key point is that the analysis should be carried out **before** the response is planned and written, so that the response is **structured around points of argument**, with **selective** source reference offered in support. Candidates who base a response on the sources in isolation are rarely able to cross-reference effectively and build a developed conclusion, sometimes running out of time.

Under pressure, candidates sometimes overlook key words or connections within the source, which can cause a serious misunderstanding that undermines a whole response. This is less likely if they habitually ask themselves whether what they **think** the source is saying is logical and appropriate in the context of the period to which it relates. Confidence in reading and using historical sources is derived **from regular and ongoing use of historical texts for research**. The essential skills of reading, comprehension, analysis and making notes from a range of historical texts lay the necessary foundations for handling extracts from such texts under examination conditions.

It is pleasing that the great majority of candidates avoided these basic pitfalls, and produced responses that varied from competent to excellent. Most candidates achieved good L2 in at least one objective, thereby demonstrating some knowledge and understanding of the period that they had studied, and the ability to analyse and comprehend individual sources, at least at face value. The skills of inference and cross-referencing, however are required to reach the higher levels.

Broadly speaking, the performance descriptors related to the E/U boundary, as described in the Specification, page 233, indicate a secure L2 performance, and a candidate achieving good L2 in all three descriptors will move beyond the borderline area.

**Progression towards higher levels in objective AO2** depends on the ability to make **developed inferences** from sources that have been **cross-referenced** as a set. Candidates who analyse sources into relevant points, reason from the evidence and link points taken from more than one source are likely to achieve L3. Those who also demonstrate the ability to **apply provenance and contextual understanding** to the **evaluation** of such evidence are moving into L4. It is the ability to **weigh the evidence** in order to come to an **overall judgement** that takes account of any conflicts, takes a response to the top of L4.

**Progression in AO1** depends on the **contextual understanding** that is applied to the sources as a set, in order to **develop and explain their implications as relevant arguments**, and on the deployment of **contextual knowledge to support, challenge and develop such arguments towards an overall judgement**.

Examples of such progression are included in the option-specific comments below, but certain points are

applicable across all options and may usefully be summarised here to highlight the ways in which candidate performance can be improved.

Most candidates made some attempt to draw inferences from source material but weaker candidates tended not to develop them. A **developed inference** requires the point to be clearly stated and supported by some reference to the source material, and **the connections between them made explicit**. This can be described, as in the AO2b mark scheme, as 'reasoning from the evidence' and the reasoning needs to be explicit. It is the key difference between treating sources as information (L2) and treating them as sources of **evidence**, which needs to be interpreted and explained.

Many candidates appeared to believe that pointing out agreement or disagreement between sources or parts of sources meets the requirements of **cross-referencing**. There remains a widespread tendency for candidates to analyse (or too often describe) the content of each source in turn, then try to draw out points of comparison. This tends to lead either to responses that are overly long, or to comparisons that are brief and general. The purpose of cross-referencing is to develop and bring out the implications of **sources as a set**, on the basis that if they are used in combination they offer more understanding than can be developed by considering them separately or cumulatively. **Cross-referencing therefore requires sources to be broken down so that comparisons can be drawn between points, rather than between whole sources**. The candidate can then reassemble the points into an answer to the question.

An area of particular weakness seems to be the **application of provenance**, using the nature and purpose of a source to evaluate the significance and reliability of the evidence within it. Very few candidates failed to mention provenance, and equally few were able to **apply** it effectively. Many candidates could identify 'bias', often quite accurately, but few were then able to make a **reasoned judgement as to how far this discredited the evidence within the source**. Many simply discounted the problem by finding a matching bias in other sources. Others assumed that the nature of a source dictated its value – newspapers were generally deemed unreliable, private letters accurate. Some candidates had difficulty accepting that opinions could be both sincere and objectively unreliable. There is also a tendency for candidates to see provenance only in negative terms, and not to take into account that testimony which is unwitting or from a 'biased' source can provide very strong evidence if it runs against expectation. The key issue is that **provenance needs to be related to particular points** within a source to **demonstrate its effects** on the **quality** of the evidence **in relation to the particular enquiry**. In (a) questions, where candidates are dealing with contemporary sources, this is often the means by which they can come to an overall judgement.

Candidates also offered some strange perceptions as to the value of historians' interpretations. Some candidates were aware of different 'schools' of historians, and often sided with one or other according to their own preference. A few engaged in polemics to the point where their response was seriously undermined. It is clear that the concept of reliability remains difficult for many candidates, but most have some idea of how to approach contemporary sources. However, historians' views do not lend themselves to explicit evaluation for 'reliability'. **The best candidates demonstrated an understanding that historians offer views that are based on reliable research, but are nevertheless interpretations using evidence and judgement**. As such, they indicate possible explanations of the past, from which we can learn by comparing the different interpretations, and evaluating them in the light of the evidence in order to develop our own. Candidates will address this more fully in A2, especially in Unit 3. It is not expected that they will routinely demonstrate a full appreciation of historical interpretation at AS level. However, those who understand that historians' views are interpretations, and that they can be both valid and varied, are likely to reach high levels at AS as well as laying good foundation for further progress. In the context of the Unit 2 examination, the historians' sources often provide a structure for the (b) response as a whole. They allow conflicting arguments to be established, evaluated against the other sources and the candidate's contextual knowledge, and used as the basis of a balanced judgement as required for L4. In doing this candidates can evaluate the historians' sources without specific consideration of 'reliability'.

In both (a) and (b) questions the best candidates offered an overall judgement drawn from their preceding arguments. However an effective judgement cannot simply ignore the existence of conflicting evidence, or describe differences before asserting a preference. The key to L4 is recognition of different or conflicting interpretations **and** an attempt to **weigh the quality of evidence** in order to judge between them or resolve apparent conflicts. In (b) questions candidates could also assess historians' judgements, such as the role and significance of particular factors, in the light of the evidence and their own knowledge. Some candidates offered these elements within the body of their response, others in a developed conclusion. The best did both, pointing to evaluation as they developed their arguments, and summarising the results in a direct comparison at the end.

## Option D

### Question D1

1a There were some very good responses to this question, but many candidates found the sources demanding. As in other options, a common weakness was the desire to analyse sources separately and in isolation, which often drifted into description of their content. For example, the implications of Source 2 needed to be developed in conjunction with Source 3 to show how religion caused divisions within Ireland and acted as a barrier to progress in dealing with the Irish national problem. Without careful cross-referencing the full implications of the evidence were difficult to see. Another tendency was to introduce significant quantities of contextual knowledge into the response. At best this distracted from the interpretation of the sources, and in some cases led to significant misinterpretation. In particular, many candidates assumed that the Fenians were automatically Catholic in religion, and could therefore only make sense of the last sentence in Source 1 as a desire to disestablish the [Anglican] Church of Ireland. A number constructed invalid arguments on this basis and failed to develop valid inferences from Sources 2 and 3. Better responses identified the religious conflicts within Ireland and contrasted them with resentment of English rule and an 'alien aristocracy', thereby suggesting that the main obstacle to progress was English power. The best candidates addressed the sources as a set, arguing that all three sources suggested a link between land, religion and English power, epitomised by Source 2 and the determination of Protestant Orangemen to retain the English link. By keeping the Irish divided, this posed an obstacle to solving the national problem.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response set out below goes a long way to developing a balanced judgement about the role of religion. It argues that the Fenian desire to take religion out of the equation by separating Church and State was an attempt to avoid the conflicts between Protestant and Catholic Irishmen exhibited in Sources 2 and 3, in order to unite them in a struggle for land and freedom. In this way, all three sources suggest that religion was a major obstacle. The response has some weaknesses of organisation and expression, but the argument is clearly developed. The Sources are cross-referenced and provenance is taken into account. It does offer a perceptive overall judgement based on inference and reasoning from the evidence of the Sources as a set. It therefore reached L4, but the lack of a developed conclusion to summarise the points meant that it achieved only 17 marks out of 20.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

(a) How far do sources 1, 2 and 3 suggest that the main obstacle to solving the Irish National problem was religion?

Source 1 explains that the main cause for the trouble in Ireland, the main obstacle facing the Irish National problem is the 'alien aristocracy' that has 'sieved... land' and 'material wealth'. Sources 2 and 3 show the polarized state of Protestants in Ulster (like Colonel E.J. Sanderson) and Catholic Nationalists in the South (like D.P. Moran).

The Fenian Uprising of 1867 was generally ignored by the people of Ireland as they felt no real need for an uprising at the time. Their views including the non-denominational Republic they desired did not represent the views of Ireland as a whole. This said, their aim for 'complete separation of church and state' was emulated in further uprisings by Fenians and the

(a) continued) like. This shows that people of Fenian beliefs still felt the church had and wanted too much power. In 1916 the Easter Rising proclamation of an 'Irish Republic' was modeled on this earlier Fenian constitution.

Source 2 explains that he can only 'define [his] political principles' as protestant. To him his political

and his religion are intertwined and ~~to~~ there is no other way it can be. Source 3 although trying to say otherwise at the beginning explains ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> view that 'any genuine non-Catholic Irish must be reconciled to a Catholic atmosphere or turn Orangemen'. Simply, you cannot be non-Catholic and Irish. With people of this viewpoint on either side of the political and religious spectrum of Ireland the Fenians non-denominational dream was unlikely to become a reality.

Whereas Source 2 only talks about his own personal beliefs, Sources 1 and 3 are more public and talk about the whole history of Ireland. For the Fenians in source 2 'alien aristocracy' is the enemy but for the writer of this article in 'The Leader' the enemy is 'non-Catholic and Anglicized'. Unity in the way needed to tackle the Irish National Problem (of being ruled by the British) ~~could~~ not be achieved with such divisions in their nation. Source 3 gives a way to tackle the issue (highlighting that religion is an issue) by saying 'one side'

((a) continued): must 'get on top and absorb the other until [they] have one nation'. This is not showing the view that 'all men are born with equal rights as declared by the Fenians'.

Although Colonel Sanderson doesn't show hatred for Catholics or show that he has plans of overtaking them (as Source 3 does) he clearly allies himself with the Protestants to show his beliefs. It is

not true that all Unionists were protestant or that all nationalists were Catholic (Parnell and Butt for instance were protestants), but the fact that the Fenians (in 1867 before much of the trouble between north and south and Catholic and Protestant had begun) felt the need for a state completely separate from the Church shows that it was a major obstacle in the Irish National Problem.

\* There seems no obvious reason for either legitimacy or truthfulness of any of these sources to be taken as bad. Source 1 is a declaration of Independence, if it worked they would have to stand behind it. Source 2 is a letter to someone of the same mindset and Source 3 is aimed at an audience which had much the same ~~same~~ beliefs as the author of the piece.

1bi Question 1bi was the more popular of the two options in part (b) and was generally answered well. Some candidates attempted to rely on the sources to structure their response, but this only worked well if they had previously cross-referenced them. Sources 4 and 6 could be used effectively to argue that a peaceful solution to Ireland's problems was highly unlikely in 1814, and that therefore the war made little difference or, as Source 6 suggested, actually prevented civil war. Few candidates were able to develop the role of the Tories effectively, and most concentrated on the situation in Ireland, particularly the roles of Carson and Craig and the resistance to Home Rule in Ulster. On this issue there was great deal of sound knowledge. Some candidates were also able to explain the problems faced by the Liberals, and Asquith in particular, and the best utilised Source 4 to show the interaction of English domestic politics with the situation in Ireland. Source 5 was effectively used to introduce a counter argument, and some good candidates were able to refer to events during the war, particularly the issue of conscription and the Easter Rising to develop the argument that delay in implementing Home Rule led to frustration, more radical attitudes, and eventually failure to find a peaceful solution. Others were able to link Sources 4 and 5 to argue that, had the war not distracted politicians like Churchill and Redmond from the issue of Home Rule, a solution based on partition would have been developed in spite of the difficulties. The best responses attempted to weigh up the arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement. Some argued that Source 5 was not reliable, representing what Dillon wanted to believe rather than reality, while others challenged Churchill's view that the Tories would support Ulster as a means of pressurising Redmond into making concessions. The very best responses showed clear understanding that all such judgements are based on interpretation, and cannot be conclusive.

**1bii** Question 1bii was handled less effectively than 1bi, although there were a number of good responses. Weaker responses tended to select points taken at face value from the sources, and lacked detailed knowledge to develop them. Some misunderstood source 7 and argued that the British government was opposed to Home Rule. Better responses cross-referenced Sources 7 and 8 to argue that partition was increasingly accepted as inevitable in Britain, and utilised Sources 8 and 9 to suggest that opinion in Ireland remained divided. This was supported by contextual knowledge of the Anglo-Irish war and the later civil war in Ireland to suggest that partition was not accepted in 1918 but came to be seen as unavoidable in the ensuing three years. Some candidates also referred to long-term developments to show how resistance to Home Rule in Ulster had made partition an increasingly likely solution since the failure of Gladstone's efforts at Home Rule, and argue that all but a small minority had accepted the idea by 1918. Others focused on Collins' arguments in Source 9 and the final sentence of Source 8 to suggest that it was only accepted as a temporary measure for political reasons.

## Question D2

**2a** Many candidates found the sources accessible and were able to make comparisons as required by the question. Few failed to reach L2, but a significant number treated the sources as information rather than evidence. Such responses were characterised by a claim that Sources 11 and 12 totally disagreed with Source 10, or an attempt to find some agreement by surface matching – for example, by claiming that the 'Ladies of the Punjab' agreed with the Hunter Committee by 'deploring the loss of life' at Amritsar or that the Committee itself stated that Dyer's actions 'saved the Punjab'. Candidates are expected to comprehend the sources, even at face value, which does require attention to the meaning rather than to single phrases taken out of context. A few candidates sought to judge the evidence on the basis of contextual knowledge, and, for example, challenged Dyer's evidence on the basis of knowing that he ran out of ammunition. It is helpful for candidates to approach the sources with contextual awareness, in order to understand the significance of its provenance or to see the implications of their content, but care is needed in the introduction of external 'facts' that detract from the task of evaluating the evidence as it stands.

Most candidates, however, were able to define the conflicts between Source 10 and Sources 11 and 12, to utilise provenance to question the reliability of Sources 11 and 12, and in some cases to argue that Source 10 had greater reliability because British lawyers were questioning the actions of a British soldier. Better responses were able to analyse Source 11 in detail, to see how Dyer's account of his actions offered evidence to support the view in Source 10 that they were unreasonable and unjustified. His assumptions about the intentions of the crowd, the lack of a warning, and the amount of ammunition used were all used to indicate an overreaction. Many responses reached L3 on this basis. Few candidates, however, fully addressed the need to make a judgement of 'how far' the evidence supported the views expressed in Source 10. The best responses used the provenance and attitudes shown in Source 12 to reinforce the implications of Dyer's evidence about fears of a new 'mutiny' to show how far the evidence of Sources 11 and 12 supported the judgement of the Hunter Committee in Source 10.

**2bi** Question 2bi was slightly the more popular of the options in part (b) and produced a full range of responses. Weaker candidates tended to describe Gandhi's actions and assert that he did or did not contribute to the achievement of progress towards independence. A significant number went beyond 1939, either in describing his role or in arguing that he contributed little because the key developments came in 1940-47. Some candidates relied almost entirely on the sources; others based an argument on contextual knowledge and made brief references to the Sources as illustrative material. A few scored well in AO1 using this approach, but lost heavily in marks for AO2. Better candidates were able to analyse the sources as a framework showing both the strengths and weaknesses of Gandhi's leadership, and to develop their arguments by reference to contextual knowledge. Sources 13 and 14 were cross-referenced to argue that Gandhi's leadership created popular support and posed serious problems for the British, while Sources 13 and 15 were utilised to argue that he contributed little to solving internal divisions or providing a practical and workable basis for government. Reference was made to the campaigns of 1920-22, the Salt March and the growth of support for Congress to develop the first argument, while the Round Table Conferences and his relationship with the Muslim League offered support for the alternative. Some candidates challenged the evidence of Source 14 as sympathetic to Gandhi, but most who attempted an overall judgement focused on the limits of Gandhi's effectiveness in terms of progress towards independence. Some argued that he retarded progress, and attempted to consider the contribution of other leaders. Those who offered a balanced conclusion on this basis were able to achieve L4.

**2bii** Although slightly less popular, Question 2bii was addressed by a large number of candidates. The majority utilised Sources 17 and 18 to address the issue of Britain's 'indecent haste' and weaker candidates relied heavily on the material in the sources. Some were able to develop this with accurate contextual knowledge – for example, concerning the operation of the boundary commission or the nature and extent of violence to reach L3. Better responses also considered the role of Congress and the Muslim League, and argued that Indian divisions, including the part played by individual leaders, were also a significant factor. Many good responses looked back at the history of Indian rivalries, or drew on Source 16 to consider how far British reluctance to make progress was a cause or a result of Hindu and Muslim rivalry. The role of Mountbatten and his links with Congress was also addressed. The best responses sought to evaluate the different factors and adjudicate between them and considered how they interacted.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response set out below offers an example, which not only seeks to show the interaction between British and Indian misjudgements to explain the reasons for a violent partition, but also differentiates between partition and the extensive violence that accompanied in assessing their relative responsibilities. Based on analysis and cross-referencing of the sources as evidence, developed by reference to accurate contextual knowledge, and offering a developed judgement based on evaluation, it merited 37 marks out of 40.

Answer EITHER part (b)(i) OR (b)(ii) of your chosen question.

(b)(i) ~~Some~~ The idea that the violence at partition was caused by the "indecent haste of the British" is supported strongly by source 16, but source 17 and 18 ~~also~~ offer other explanations for the violence.

The haste with which Britain did partition India, as stated by source 16, did cause violence. The constitution, and hence the army were both drawn up by the British in a matter of hours. It is hard to see that there was a sense of haste or preparation for it, leading to a absence of soldiers to protect people. However, many British Indian administrators had doubted or whose reliability was in question, especially after the mutiny of 20,000 soldiers in the Royal Indian Army mutiny. Therefore, little evidence can be seen that it was the speed, rather than underlying problems. However, it does seem likely that if preparation had been better, the people would have been protected better, and less violence would have occurred. This is supported by source 18, which says the plan was "added together", however it suggests that they had to be on all one mind was would have worked, which is also supported by source 17, in which it claims the Muslim League were prepared to wage civil war. Due to civil war killings and slaughter in 1946, for example the 4,000 deaths in Calcutta on Direct Action Day, or the 20,000

and violence in the Punjab is seen from June 1947  
 ((b) continued) Making Kangladesh in Partition, this seems to be supported. Therefore, it seems likely that the speed of the British was not the cause of the violence at Partition, but a symptom, and that if they had not <sup>acted</sup> ~~acted~~ quicker more deaths would have happened. Therefore, it seems likely that the speed of partition was not the main cause of violence.

The division and discord between the Muslim League ~~was~~ is stated as one of the main causes of partition by Somerville, so it suggests division here would have been a civil war, which is further supported by Somerville <sup>that</sup> to say it averted a civil war. If the two sides had been prepared to work together and compromise then it seems likely that an agreement could have been reached, which is supported by Jain to ~~that the two sides agreed to work with the CFA 1935.~~ <sup>and that they failed to work with the CFA 1935</sup> along religious divisions. However, the INC and ML repeatedly fuelled these divisions for their own gain. Sinnah gave speeches supporting the 'Hastage Plan' claiming that media would be dominated, and that an independent Pakistan was needed. The INC in turn increased the divisions for example Nehru gave a radio broadcast about how an independent India would be dominated by Hindus, and to the INC, and many INC members in the 1947 elections used rhetoric from the Hindu Mahasabha, with only 2% of INC representatives

((b) continued) being Muslims, and once in power were often gloriously  
 patron to Hindus. In this way it can be seen that  
 the parties postered hatred, as supported by Source 12 that  
 Nehru aimed the Cabinet mission's goal for a united  
 India, and Source 16 that religious divisions were very  
 important. The fact that ~~as seen~~ Source 12 says the MC  
 to form a Hindu state makes it likely that such religious  
 divisions did exist. Therefore, it was likely that the  
 religious hatred stirred up by the MC and this was a  
 large factor in the violence at partition because it stirred up  
 both sides to such an extent that violence was inevitable.

Both sources 12 and 13 note it clear that neither the  
 EAC or the MC were prepared to compromise. Source  
 12 states that the MC prepared a white paper to a united  
 India, and the level of compromise is strengthened by the  
 realisation of Nehru, as seen in Source 13. The fact that Nehru  
 wanted to "please both sides" makes it clear that there was no  
 compromise either would accept. This is true as although  
 there were frequent discussions between the MC and <sup>EAC</sup> ~~MC~~  
 for example in London in 1946, no agreement was ever  
 made. The EAC did partly accept the May <sup>Statement</sup> ~~Statement~~, but  
 refused to compromise fully with Jinnah. Neither party would  
 compromise on the protection of minorities, or if some  
 concessions were made were soon raised again, e.g. Nehru's  
 speech in Source 13. Therefore it does seem likely that if

(b) continued) The two sides had compromised then the violence would have been avoided. If the country had not been split, or with refugees rising everywhere then it is clear that the violence would have been greatly reduced. Therefore it seems likely that the refusal of the Prime and the to compromise, as stated by Source 17 and 18, was a significant reason for the violence as it prevented a united front, and with such large population change <sup>was inevitable.</sup>

However, as stated by Source 16 there were other long-term reasons for violence. The Malay-Malay regions of 1909 created separate districts, and strengthened the feeling of two distinct communities between Muslims and Hindus. The long-standing religious tensions like forced conversions, and other divisions was a major cause of the violence, and was what much of the violence, especially in Bombay was about. The partition by Sir Archibald Khan was a separate Muslim identity quarter strengthened the notion that they were two different nations. The divisions in India were ~~the~~ done by religious lines, as stated by Source 19 about the Muslim League, and since the divisions were done this way it supports the idea that long-standing religious tensions was to blame. This is supported by Source 16 that shows religious tensions, as blocking agents of compromise. However the events immediately preceding partition like the hate of the British, disagreement by INC and the



## Conclusion

There were many good responses offered in all options. A few lacked sound knowledge of the periods that they had studied, and there were a number whose understanding was simplistic. Some had difficulty in expressing their points clearly because they lacked confidence in using the terminology of the period. However, most candidates had some range of knowledge and some understanding of how to approach the questions. Most attempted to focus on the question and there were relatively few who wrote purely narrative or descriptive responses. A significant weakness in part (b) was the tendency to rely mainly on the information taken from sources, but most candidates offered some contextual knowledge or showed contextual understanding. Most candidates were capable of reaching L3, although poor planning and timing sometimes prevented them from doing so.

**Points for improvement are:**

In both (a) and (b) questions, sources should be analysed as a set to draw out points for and against the claim in the question, before planning a response. This allows conflicting interpretations to be established to structure the response.

Both (a) and (b) questions require a developed conclusion that addresses the conflicting arguments and judges between them or shows how they can be combined.

Any judgement must be based on both quality and quantity of evidence – i.e. the content and provenance of the sources, interpreted and evaluated in context. In (a) questions contextual knowledge informs interpretation; in (b) questions it is deployed to develop it.

## Grade Boundaries

### 6HI02 D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
6HI02 D grade boundaries	60	45	40	35	30	26
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40

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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)  
Order Code US021428 June 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

