

Examiners' Report January 2009

GCE

GCE History (6HI02)

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.

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.

January 2009

Publications Code US021002

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2009

Contents

General Comments	5
A: Early Modern British History: Crown and Authority	7
B: British Political History in the 19 th Century	11
C: Conflict and Change in 19 th and 20 th Century Britain	13
D: The British Empire Challenged	15
E: Britain in the Later 20 th Century: Responding to Change	19
Statistics	21

General Comments

For the first examination under the new History specification, the number of entries was relatively small, with only one option attracting more than 500 candidates. This is not surprising, given that there has been only a short time for centres to prepare candidates and for teachers to familiarise themselves with its requirements. However, the experience of implementing and marking the new specification provides the opportunity for lessons to be learned and conveyed to prospective candidates as advice.

Candidates who sat the examination in January produced a good range of attainment, and some truly impressive work. The best were able to interpret evidence from a set of sources and to evaluate conflicting interpretations with awareness of context, to establish a balanced judgement. In the context of part (b) questions they were able to develop these arguments more fully through the deployment of contextual knowledge, to make and sustain judgements that drew on, and sometimes reconciled conflicting interpretations of the evidence.

There were, however, some common errors and pitfalls that undermined the quality of some candidates' work and lessons can be drawn from these for the future.

Technical issue(s)

1. A number of candidates committed rubric errors. Most filled in the wrong question on their scripts, and these could be marked as normal when the problem was identified. A few, however, answered parts from different questions, and these could only be awarded marks for one of their responses. It should be reiterated that candidates have a choice of part (b) options within question 1 or question 2, but cannot select elements of both.

Exam technique

1. The most common reason for poor performance in the (a) questions was difficulty in understanding and interpreting the sources effectively. In some cases there was misunderstanding, possibly caused by difficulty with vocabulary or hurried reading. It should be emphasised that good understanding of the sources and the claim made in the question is the necessary foundation for an effective response.
2. Candidates should also be aware that interpretation of evidence in a history paper requires them to have, and to apply, contextual awareness. In part (a) questions candidates are not expected to write about the events and situations from which sources are drawn - in fact any substantial reference to material not contained in the source content or provenance is likely to prove a distraction from the task. However, to see the implications of source content and/or the significance of information given in the provenance, candidates do need to interpret them in their historical context. In option A1, for example, candidates needed some understanding of the role of the king in a personal monarchy, in order to make inferences about Henry VIII's attitude in two contrasting source. In option B1, candidates who noted the dates of the three sources and were able to identify where they came in the struggle for the Reform Act were also able to explain the differences in the intensity of fears that there would be a rebellion, to establish an overall judgement. There were also many examples of candidates who misunderstood a source in a way that would not have been possible had they borne the context of contemporary attitudes and beliefs in mind. However, the emphasis must be on contemporary attitudes and beliefs rather than a modern

outlook - in option D, for example, a number of candidates misinterpreted sources because they made assumptions based on recent debates about the legacy of Britain's imperial past.

Contextual awareness is also essential in applying information about provenance. If a writer is identified as Radical, Whig, Tory, Nationalist, Republican etc. the significance of this can only be developed on the basis of awareness of the attitudes associated with such labels in the context defined by the specification for study in the option. Without such awareness attempts to assess reliability or relate provenance to the quality of evidence tend to become speculative or stereotyped. The question specifies a particular enquiry about a particular historical situation, and evidence must be interpreted and evaluated in that context. At best sources that are read out of context tend to be taken at face value, with only logical deductions or common-sense inferences drawn, rather than the historically informed interpretation that leads to high levels.

3. In part (b) questions, candidates at the lowest levels demonstrated misunderstanding of sources and/or lack of accurate knowledge to deploy in support of their arguments. However, responses in the middle range of attainment often fell short in one aspect or other, not because they lacked knowledge and understanding, but because they did not address both. Some candidates approached the task by analysing sources, deploying a limited range of contextual knowledge to support claims based on the evidence. Better examples of this approach utilised cross-referencing to develop and build an argument, but many took the sources in sequence and in isolation, or with only a brief comparative reference, limiting themselves to lower levels in both AO1 and AO2. Others began from a base of wider knowledge, and developed arguments on this basis, using the sources as illustration. While many of these responses achieved good marks in AO1, they tended to offer only simple or barely developed reference to the sources, at L2 or at times L1 in AO2. Thoughtful analysis, cross-referencing and developed interpretations are difficult to make on that basis. The best responses combined these approaches, beginning with analysis and interpretation of the sources as a set to establish basic conflicting arguments, and presenting them with support, development and evaluation from wider knowledge, to go beyond what the sources offer and offer a balanced conclusion. The foundation of such responses lies in the initial planning.
4. The demands of Unit 2 are such that candidates might wish to spend more time planning. In both questions there is a need to analyse sources in relation to one another, and this can only be done successfully as a prelude to planning an answer, with the focus fully on the sources and their implications. In part (b) there is a need to integrate contextual knowledge into the argument, and again this needs to be thought out before starting to write. It is also the case that the best responses include a conclusion in which arguments are weighed up, while the more extended (b) response benefits from an introduction that sets out the possibilities. The process of source analysis is ideal for this, setting up arguments that can then be developed, tested, and evaluated to create a final judgement. It cannot, therefore, be emphasised too strongly that initial planning from the sources is an essential requirement in creating a clearly constructed and well-directed response, which will take less time to write because it is focused and coherent. This and the other points summarised above are illustrated in the more detailed analysis of the different options set out below.

A: Early Modern British History: Crown and Authority

A1 Henry VIII: Authority, Nation and Religion, 1509-40

There slightly less than 240 entries for this option in January, probably reflecting some caution in entering for a new specification, and perhaps the impact of two rather than three units on the distribution of teaching time across the year. However, the standard of work was generally pleasing.

In each option, question (a) provides candidates with source material containing conflicting evidence. Where only two sources are used, it is likely that one at least will contain conflicting evidence within it, and candidates need to be aware of this. In this case both sources included evidence that implied different relationships between Henry and the nobility.

The package also highlighted the importance of contextual awareness in supporting source interpretation. A significant number of candidates were unable to move beyond taking the sources at face value and made only logical or common-sense inferences about the King's attitude to the nobility. Better responses showed appreciation that the relationship was both personal and political, and that early modern rulers had to both rely upon and control the powerful nobility through personal and political management. Part (a) questions do not require knowledge of particular events outside the source content, but effective interpretation of historical evidence does require some familiarity with the customs and attitudes that characterise the period under examination.

In part (b) question 1b(i) was significantly more popular than question 1b(ii). This may well reflect the fact that the Pilgrimage of Grace comes from the later part of the period, but it is likely that it also reflects the central position occupied in this period by Wolsey. In general candidates handled the questions well.

Those who attempted 1b(ii) were clearly at home with the sources, and understood the significance of religion as a cause of the revolt. Many also appreciated the economic problems of the period, and were able to link the issue of the monasteries with their social and political role in the north as well as their religious significance. Only the best were able to bring the issues together and utilise the material in Source 8 to show that religious and other causes of resentment could be seen as parts of a more deep-seated conservatism and regional reaction against the encroachments of central government.

The majority who attempted question 1b(i) were able to utilise the sources to define several reasons for Wolsey's fall from power - in particular the 'divorce', financial problems and the role of aristocratic factions. Some also went beyond the sources to highlight his wealth and greed, personal enmities, and his abuse of his religious status in a time of anti-clericalism. The best responses sought to link factors, and many used their wider knowledge of foreign policy and Henry's ambitions to show that issues such as the Amicable Grant, financial weakness, failure abroad and the difficulties of obtaining the annulment combined to undermine Wolsey's status with the king, allowing faction to bring him down. Others focused on the reference in Source 5 to his 'numerous enemies' and developed an explanation of how they were able to exploit his failure. Most referred to the role of Anne Boleyn as one of his

enemies, but surprisingly few directly cross-referenced source 3 to demonstrate how the factions referred to in sources 4 and 5 were able to challenge him. In general terms, cross-referencing of the sources was often implicit, with candidates linking points from sources to wider knowledge rather than each other. While this meant that many reached high levels in AO1 by integrating knowledge with sources, it sometimes worked against the use of sources as a set, the evaluation of evidence and the awareness of interpretation required at the very top of AO2b. In addition, many candidates offered only a summary conclusion, rather than using it to weigh the arguments and develop an overall judgement, resulting in a large number of good scripts at L3/4 rather than secure L4. One way to remedy this is for candidates to conduct an analysis and linking of sources before starting their response, which can then be used to set up conflicting interpretations as an introduction, before developing the arguments in the body of the essay and evaluating them in the conclusion.

A2 Crown, Parliament and Authority in England, 1588-1629

Approximately 180 candidates entered for option A2, and produced some excellent responses. In question 2a they were able to develop the contrast between the Speaker's attitude to Elizabeth in Source 9 and the criticisms implied in Sources 10 and 11. Good use was made of provenance to challenge the evidence in sources 10 and 11, and many saw the link between Bacon's difficulties under Elizabeth, his success under James, and his account of the Queen. Some candidates created difficulties for themselves over the meaning of his 'Apologie' while others misread the provenance of Source 10 to link him to the Essex rebellion, but most handled these sources well. Fewer made reference to the provenance of Source 9 to suggest that an address presented to Elizabeth herself might be less than objective, and many tended to take this source at face value. Some candidates were able to use it as a means of reconciling the conflict, arguing that MPs might well appreciate all that the queen had achieved in the past while still becoming restless as she aged and declined.

In part (b) candidates opted for question b(ii) in a ratio of perhaps 2:1, but both questions were dealt with quite effectively. In 2bi many candidates offered a good range of supporting knowledge to develop points taken from the sources, with most criticising James's handling of finance and parliaments while praising his record in religion and foreign policy. The best were able to see the conflict between his theoretical claims to Divine Right and his respect, in practice, for the law, but many candidates became confused by Weldon's claims, while others seemed unaware that a peaceful foreign policy was often more sensible than popular. Most were able to integrate sources with wider knowledge and attempt some kind of judgement, reaching L3 in AO1, but a significant number of responses simply described the features of his reign without assessing his successes and failures, thereby failing to reach L4 in either objective. As in option A1, a clear analysis of the sources to establish conflicting interpretations and a more developed weighing up of the evidence in context as a conclusion would raise the levels of achievement.

Question 2bii was generally handled well. Candidates were able to see the implications of Source 15 for both religion and foreign policy, and many cross-referenced effectively to link Charles's promotion of Arminians and the fears demonstrated in source 17 into a case for the claim in the question. The best integrated secure knowledge to develop the argument, with reference to Laud, Montague and Mainwaring as examples, the role of Henrietta Maria and the impact of

the Thirty Years War. Some candidates were also able to pick out the political role of the Arminians from Source 16 and link religious attitudes to fear of absolutism. Source 16 was also used extensively to challenge the claim, with references to finance, Buckingham, the Forced Loans and Five Knights' case being used to explain other causes of conflict. Again wider knowledge was often integrated well, with better responses able to trace the deterioration of relations and focus on the issue of 'breakdown' through the Petition of Right, the assassination of Buckingham and the Three Resolutions of 1629. The best responses gained very high marks by showing how different problems interacted, using good awareness of chronology and sometimes the personality of Charles to bring them together.

B: British Political History in the 19th Century

B1 Britain 1830-85: Representation and Reform

There were only 56 entries for this option, but many scripts were of high quality. As a cohort the candidates demonstrated good understanding of their material and in some cases, excellent handling of sources. Responses to (a) almost invariably analysed and cross-referenced between sources effectively, and many were able to relate the conflicting views to the political attitudes of the authors as well as the nature of the documents, as defined by the provenance. There was also some excellent application of contextual awareness in developing the implications of this information, using both political rivalries and awareness of chronology to explain the conflict and establish an overall judgement. It should be emphasised that this did not involve significant passages of 'own knowledge', which could not have been rewarded, but relied on brief references to set the sources in context and draw out links and implications.

Both questions in part (b) of the paper attracted a reasonable share of responses and both were handled quite well. In question 1b(i) most candidates were able to analyse and draw out the implications of the sources, but weaker candidates tended to follow these points with a description of Chartist activity and development across the period, only vaguely related to the issue of motives and origins. Better responses cross-referenced Palmerston's claims (sometimes allowing for his purpose in making the speech) with the reaction of the Poor Man's Guardian to support the claim in the question, and developed the argument by reference to Source 6 and to contextual knowledge of how the movement developed and emerged. They were able to use Source 6 to introduce other causes and motives, but some failed to develop these with wider support. The best referred to economic pressures, social conditions, the impact of the Poor Law, Corn Laws and 'middle class' interests, while the very best were able to resolve the conflicts in the sources by linking economic and social interests to the need for political representation.

Question b(ii) was also handled quite well. Weaker candidates tended either to rely heavily on wider knowledge and make only passing reference to the sources in support, or to analyse the sources in great depth and rely on assertion in making judgements about how far they were convincing. In many cases the two historians' views were portrayed by the candidate as totally conflicting, and one or other was assumed to be demonstrating bias. Better responses were able to develop the analysis by reference to wider knowledge, drawing on knowledge of Disraeli's career and his reputation to analyse his aims. Most were able to utilise source 7 to introduce the issue of voting patterns and Tory prospects, while the best cross-referenced this with sources 8 and 9 to discuss how far Disraeli understood and sought to capitalise on opportunities to win working-class support for both himself and his party. Many were aware that political and personal ambition did not necessarily conflict with party interests. Sources 8 and 9 were cross-referenced and supported with contextual knowledge to explain Disraeli's rivalry with Gladstone, and this was often related to personal ambition. Some responses used these arguments as a base and then moved beyond them to discuss other possibilities - for example drawing on Derby's comments in source 8 to consider Disraeli's role in the passing of the Act and to weigh up the evidence of opportunism against the wider pressure for and benefits of reform. The best responses demonstrated the ability to analyse the sources in depth and in context to establish conflicting arguments, and then draw on wider knowledge to develop and evaluate them to establish an overall judgement.

B2 Poverty, Public Health and the Growth of Government in Britain, 1830-75

Option B2 attracted a greater number of candidates (a little over 200) and produced more varied responses. Most candidates dealt effectively with the sources in part (a) and were able to utilise the figures in source 10 to support the claim, with source 11 being used to both support and challenge the significance of costs. Most showed familiarity with Malthus and were able to draw out his concerns about population and dependency. Weaker candidates tended to describe the conflicts rather than address them, and there was much stereotypical use of provenance in relation to source. Some candidates treated the lack of a named author as evidence of unreliability, while others asserted that figures could not be 'biased'. Only a few suggested that the figures did not, in themselves, show the motives behind reform, but those who linked the figures to Malthus' statement that costs were a concern were able to establish a convincing interpretation. Some analysed the figures in detail and usually out of context, simply describing the patterns of demand. A surprising number of candidates seemed to believe that source 12 spoke for itself, simply pointing out the principle of less eligibility without considering its implications. This may well reflect its familiarity, but good responses drew out the implications of deterrence and moral condemnation, while the best also related this to costs.

Questions 2b(i) and 2b(ii) both produced a good range of responses, with some excellent work on the issue of outdoor relief. Most candidates were aware of the impact of cholera and some could offer other factors for change, but many dwelt on the sources and failed to develop the points from wider knowledge of the issue. There were some detailed descriptions of the work of John Snow, but this was often not explicitly related to reasons for change, such as the work of individuals, the growth of scientific knowledge or even the impact of cholera itself. In order to challenge the claim some candidates suggested that Leeds might have been the only example of such problems in 1831-32! Better responses cross-referenced sources 13 and 14, supported by wider knowledge to explain the impact of cholera, and then drew on sources 14 and 15 to show that wider concerns, other diseases and increasing understanding of their causes lay behind improvements in public health. The best responses added some other factors drawn from their own knowledge, such as the role of individuals, technical progress, changes in the franchise and parliament's proximity to the Great Stink.

Question 2b(ii) also produced a range of responses. Very few relied primarily on contextual knowledge, and most made good use of the sources to explain the difficulties of implementing any restriction of outdoor relief. Weaker candidates tended to describe both problems and conflicting evidence, but many were able to develop the arguments to explain why the policy of ending it was unsuccessful. There was good understanding of geographical conditions and, in particular, the role of trade fluctuations in the urban north in causing the practice to survive. Some candidates were able to support these arguments with accurate examples of local variation, but weaker candidates tended to rely on generalisations. The best responses analysed the sources in depth and drew on wider knowledge to assess the progress made in limiting outdoor relief, referring to local examples, the intermittent issuing of circulars and the role of the commissioners to show that implementation was not impossible, but was difficult and always variable. Only a few developed this into an overall judgement to reach L4.

C: Conflict and Change in 19th and 20th Century Britain

C1 The Experience of Warfare in Britain: Crimea, Boer and the First World War

There were 185 candidates entered for this option. Although there were some very good responses indeed, a sizeable proportion found it difficult to deploy detailed own knowledge in support of their arguments in part (b). This was particularly evident in responses to question 2b(ii) on morale in the First World War, although this may, in part, be explained by the early timing of the exam and the fact that the topic comes from the latter part of the specification.

In question 1(a) the contrast between Wolseley's view in Source 1 and Simpson's in Source 3 was recognised by virtually all candidates, although only a very few appreciated that Wolseley was focusing on professionalism while Simpson was, for the most part, commenting on personal characteristics. Source 2 was handled less well with its ambivalent nature being missed by many. Indeed, a significant minority of candidates mistakenly assumed that the piece was by Cardigan. This does re-emphasise the importance of close reading of both text and attribution. Most candidates were aware of the need to examine the provenance of the source material when arriving at a judgement, and some valid comments were made on the relative value of Wolseley's and Simpson's assessments. However, for some such evaluation remains at rather a superficial level: eg. 'Simpson was biased'.

In question 1b(i) most candidates appreciated the basic challenge posed by Price in Source 3 to the patriotic rejoicing described in Sources 1 and 2. Those performing at higher levels were able to go beyond this surface comprehension and nuance the challenge by recognising the gulf that exists between immediate reactions (Source 1) and long-term attitudes (Source 3). Although there were some very detailed responses, many candidates found it difficult to develop from their own knowledge the references to volunteerism, the Khaki election and Mafeking night made in the sources. Equally, only a very few were able to explore further the class divide raised by Price in Source 3. Responses that described the contemporary debates on the rights and wrongs of the war, or the furore over the concentration camps, needed to ensure that this material was directed securely on popular views of imperialism. The very best responses used the sources as a platform to analyse the importance of both timing and class in assessing public attitudes towards Empire.

Many candidates on question 1bii seemed reluctant to challenge the contention in the question despite the evidence presented by Jeremy Black in source 9. Descriptions of casualty rates, frontline conditions and attritional warfare were all deployed as proof of falling morale, with Sassoon in source 7 and slack in Source 8 being used in support. Higher performing candidates provided a more balanced viewpoint by examining army life in the round, with pay, rations, post and leave featuring in many responses. However, even here the sources were rarely used to their full advantage. The changing make-up of the army (Source 8), the importance of pre-war industrial discipline (Source 9) and the political focus of Sassoon's protest (Source 7) would all have provided fruitful ground for further analysis. It is important for candidates to remember that the sources should be seen as a platform from which responses can be constructed and, hence, they should look to deploy the full range of source handling skills.

C2 Britain, c1860-1930: The Changing Position of Women and the Suffrage Question

There were 338 entrants with a significant number showing confidence in handling source material. Equally, the depth and range of own knowledge deployed was impressive, especially when the limited teaching time available is considered.

On question 2a there was an encouraging number of very strong responses to the question with candidates handling the material with confidence. Judgements were often supported by detailed cross-referencing, with those performing at higher levels able to spot areas of reconciliation between contrasting sources. Thus, Although Ullswater is clearly in disagreement with Pankhurst over the efficacy of militant tactics, his admission that the government could do little to prevent 'a continuance of outrages' could be taken as evidence of the success of the WSPU's approach. A sizeable majority of candidates appreciated the need to evaluate content in light of provenance, with the better responses going beyond simple assertions of bias to explore in more detail the motivation of the authors.

Many candidates who opted for Question 2bi, although able to access the debate raised by Bartley and Perkin in Sources 13 and 14 respectively, struggled to utilise effectively the cartoon from *Punch* in Source 15. Nonetheless, the claims and counter-claims made in Sources 13 and 14 were developed by a significant number of candidates, with many of these displaying a good grasp of the provisions of the Married Women's Property Acts. Those performing at higher levels focused explicitly on the assertion in the question that the Acts were key 'milestones' in the development of women's suffrage and explored not only the strengths and limitations of the Acts but also their importance in relation to other advances. Thus, reforms in such areas as education, welfare, employment, local government were all valid areas for discussion.

For question 2bii there were some extremely strong responses to this question and it was clear that many candidates had a sound understanding of the complexities of the political landscape and the uneasy relationship between the women's movement and the Liberal party in this period. Nearly all could pick up on the reference to 'questions of principle' made in Source 16 and use this to explore the Liberal party's concerns over the impact women's suffrage would have on voting patterns. Higher performing candidates could link this to Asquith's attitude in Source 18, noting the political pragmatism that underpins his response to the East London Federation of Suffragettes. Similarly, the more knowledgeable were able to contextualise Becker's denunciation of the Liberals in Source 17 by pointing out that her speech was made in the immediate aftermath of the disappointment of the 1884 Reform Act. The very best responses contained detailed coverage of the Liberal party's involvement with suffrage campaigners, from the establishment of the Women's Liberal Association to the failure of the Conciliation Bills, with, not infrequently, a clear understanding displayed of the gulf that sometimes existed between the grass-roots and the Parliamentary party.

D: The British Empire Challenged

D1 Britain and Ireland, 1867-1922

There were only a very small number of entries for this paper - fewer than 20 - so it is difficult to offer a range of comments. The quality of responses varied, but they were not strong overall. In part (a) most candidates were able to analyse the sources in some depth and extract relevant points, but many failed to see the invitation in the question to draw direct comparisons as evidence for change. Many tried to use the sources in conjunction to show that there was hostility towards English control rather than considering how far it increased and intensified in the years between the two sources.

Some candidates included long passages of contextual information, of varying relevance, which cannot be rewarded in this part of the examination. Candidates should utilise contextual knowledge to inform and guide their understanding of the sources and their provenance, but the arguments need to be drawn from analysis and interpretation of the sources, and developed by direct reference to them. The best responses were able to compare the claims made by Butt and Parnell and to highlight differences between them. The very best noted the different audiences to which the speeches were directed, and used that to evaluate the extent of change. In part (b) the majority of candidates attempted 1b(ii) with varying degrees of success. Most were able to explain the impact of the Easter Rising and the ways in which the British response encouraged support for Sinn Fein. Fewer seemed to fully understand the issue of conscription, and ideas about the impact of war were often hazy. The few who addressed Gladstone's problems were able to make good use of the sources to consider some reasons for his failure, but often lacked detailed knowledge to support their arguments. The role of the Conservatives was understood, at least in general terms, but differences among the Liberals were not clearly appreciated and the sources were taken very much at face value. Across both questions there was a worrying absence of accurate knowledge of the period, and significant uncertainty in appreciation of sequence and chronology.

D2 Britain and the Nationalist Challenge in India, 1900-47

Option D2 attracted a greater range of candidates with 277 designated entries and another 13 who answered question 2 but designated themselves as addressing question 1. Rubric errors of this kind can be dealt with, and the candidates were marked as if entering for question 2, but it is a point to watch. Responses ranged widely, from excellent to very poor. In part (a) most candidates were able to find evidence from the sources of a desire to 'elevate' the Indian people, and good responses cross-referenced source 9 with the details of improvements in source 11. However, many candidates simply misunderstood the sources. In some cases this arose from a failure to read carefully - for example claiming from source 9 that the Indians were a subject race who hated the British or assuming the improvements in Source 11 were carried out by the Maharaja. Others appeared to arise from pre-conceived assumptions about British and Indian attitudes, or from political attitudes based on recent experience. Some candidates simply believed it impossible that the British could seek to benefit the Indian people, and twisted the sources to support this. Others saw the patronising elements of sources 9 and 11, and used this to dismiss any good intentions as lies and duplicity. Source 10 was rarely used effectively, with some candidates regarding Shaw as a historian writing with

hindsight, while others considered 'local self-government' to mean Indian independence despite the explicit reference to 'by white traders and residents'. Equally significant were the number of candidates who simply dismissed Shaw's views because he was a Socialist, and therefore by definition unreliable! Despite all this, some candidates produced very good answers, linking sources 9 and 11 to demonstrate the British desire to improve conditions for the Indian people (including raising the status of Indian magistrates) but also seeing the implications of the term 'elevate', the Euro-centric assumptions and patronising attitudes of the British, and the implications of oppression in Source 10. The best were able to offer an overall judgement, often based on the difference between intentions and reality, occasionally on a genuine understanding of imperialist attitudes at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Similarly, question 2bi produced a number of responses that showed understanding of Curzon's role, but almost completely ignored the implications of elitism among Indians at that time. This question was not attempted by many, but responses showed the same tendency towards racial generalisation. The implications of Curzon's dismissal of the 'Bengali Babus' was clearly understood in terms of British arrogance, as was the refusal to appoint Ghose (although riding a horse was the essential means of transport for a district officer in the ICS) but the reference in Source 14 to the 'poverty of the many' and the 'rejection of the privileged few'. Most responses dealt effectively with Curzon's role and the impact of his actions, but many were much less secure on the nature of nationalist aspirations in the years before the First World War, and struggled to offer any valid alternatives. The best utilised the 'natural aspirations' referred to in Source 14, cross-referenced with Source 13, and supported by wider knowledge of the role and development of Congress to suggest that such aspirations pre-dated Curzon's appointment. A few were able to show that 'the poverty of the many' was also a genuine concern and that British attitudes were in part responsible for it.

While it is always pleasing to see candidates engage actively with the issues that they study, these responses suggest that some care is needed in addressing this option, to encourage candidates to understand and make judgements based on attitudes current at the time rather than either pure hindsight or modern concerns. This is particularly important in tasks that require accurate understanding and interpretation of sources that were produced in a different time and context, since misunderstandings can effectively undermine an otherwise well-constructed response. In contrast, the majority of the candidates, who attempted question 2bii handled these problems well. Most were able to utilise the sources to develop conflicting claims, and the reference in the question to alternative arguments (sometimes seen as a 'double-header') seemed to be helpful rather than unduly demanding. Good responses utilised sources 16 and 17 to demonstrate the role of British Imperialism and the Imperial Defence league in delaying progress, and cross-referenced all three sources to show the impact of divisions within India. Both claims were accurately supported from wider knowledge, often developing the references in source 16 to integrate knowledge effectively. Some argued (as opposed to asserting) that the British exploited these divisions to maintain control and demonstrated that delay in allowing greater Indian participation helped to undermine the unity shown in the Lucknow Pact. Many, however, were able to show that there was a genuine difference among British politicians, and to demonstrate how those seeking to increase Indian self-government were frustrated by conflicts between Congress and the Muslim League. The best sought to evaluate as the basis of a judgement. In conclusion some candidates were able to show how American pressure eventually forced even the Imperialists to accept the need for independence. They were then

able to use this and the election of a Labour government counter-factually, to emphasise that Indian divisions still delayed independence for a further two years and could therefore be seen as the more significant obstacle. This question produced some very impressive responses, based on objective interpretation of the sources, sound knowledge of the period in question and an understanding of contemporary attitudes that went well beyond the acceptance of stereotypes.

E: Britain in the Later 20th Century: Responding to Change

E1: British Political History, 1945-90: Consensus and Conflict

There were 121 entries for this option. Question 1bi proved to be more popular than 1bii by a ratio of about 2:1 and this was reflected in the range and depth of own knowledge that candidates displayed, with most who opted for bii struggling to exemplify their arguments adequately.

Question 1a dealt with the conflict between the views of Young (Source 1) and Hughes (Source 2) and those of Thatcher (Source 3) was highlighted by nearly all candidates and most could support this with close cross-referencing. The grudging acknowledgements of Thatcher's successes that appear in Sources 1 and 2 were picked up by fewer candidates and it was noticeable that those who did had, on the whole, approached the sources as a set rather than sequentially. Most candidates were aware of the different political viewpoints of the authors of the sources and how this could colour their interpretations of Thatcher's time as Prime Minister, but only a very few extended this by recognising the importance of political objectives in shaping judgement.

In question 1bi many candidates displayed an impressive range of knowledge of the long-term factors that influenced the outcome of the 1945 election. The social and economic changes brought about by war, the prominence of Labour politicians in the years 1939-45 and the importance of the Beveridge Report were all valid areas for discussion and were explored in many responses. There was less detailed understanding displayed of the nature and importance of the 1945 election campaign itself, with only a few able to develop the reference to Churchill's 'Gestapo outburst' in Source 4. Most candidates, however, successfully used the sources as a platform to weigh up the significance of policy and personality in the 1945 election. At the top level, candidates were able to focus explicitly on the inevitability or otherwise of Labour's victory by exploring further the long-term structural changes to British society referred to by Chris Rowe in Source 5

For question 1bii the question was focused on the extent to which the two major political parties followed similar paths in the years 1951-64. Most candidates could access the debate by reference to the contrasting views expressed in Sources 7 and 9, although the satirical nature of extract from the *Economist* in Source 8 was not so well handled. Welfare and tax policy mentioned in Source 7, economic management (Source 8) and nationalisation (Source 9) were all valid areas for inclusion. However, many responses lacked depth and range here and, thus, failed to explore in any significant detail the extent to which a consensus really did exist. Thus, only the very best examined the key areas of mixed economy, unions, welfare and employment with any sense purpose or direction.

E2 Mass Media, Popular Culture and Social Change in Britain since 1945

There were 253 entrants for this option. An encouraging number of candidates displayed a good range of own knowledge in responses to part b, which is particularly impressive considering the difficulties in resourcing this option.

In question 2a candidates generally handled the surface comprehension of the source material well and were able to access arguments for and against the contention in the question. There was a tendency to tackle the sources sequentially which restricted effective cross-referencing. Thus, very few established a link between Steel's 'it wasn't just me' in Source 12 and *The Times*' assertion that 'adolescents wish to belong'. Equally, only a small minority of candidates recognised that commercialism and youth rebellion were not necessarily mutually exclusive, and that both could justifiably be cited as factors in the success of popular music.

Question 2bi was focused on the representation of women in film in the 1950s and 1960s. A number of candidates lost sight of the central focus of the unit on mass media and drifted into a discussion on the changing socio-economic position of women generally. The contrasting viewpoints presented by the two sources was acknowledged by most candidates although some missed the key information contained in the attribution of Source 13 that the scene was altered as a result of the censor's report. An encouraging number of candidates could provide extra detail on the films cited in the sources and supplement this with reference to other films from the era. In the same vein many responses displayed a good grasp of the social and cultural context, although only the very best appreciated that the films were challenging generational and class preconceptions as much as those of gender. There was also little attempt made to go beyond the confines of the British 'New Wave' and explore the continuing popularity of more traditional films.

In question 2bii many candidates displayed an impressive range of relevant own knowledge here, with Prince Harry and Sarah Ferguson featuring strongly. Virtually all candidates were able to access the opposing views by reference to the three sources, although only a few appreciated the fact that they were referring to different decades. This highlights the importance of close reading of the text. Some candidates were distracted by the reference to Princess Diana in Source 16 and became side-tracked by long descriptions of her marital difficulties and general celebrity. It is, of course, imperative that any own knowledge remains tightly focused and, where possible, integrated with the source material. Some very strong responses highlighted the symbiotic nature of the relationship between the media and the royal family, with the courting of publicity sitting uneasily with the demands for privacy and the preservation of the crown's mystique. Equally, some successfully argued that familiarity did not necessarily breed contempt, and could point to the continuing popularity of set-piece royal occasions.

6HI02 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
A	60	36.9	7.3
B	60	38.8	6.7
C	60	30.4	8.4
D	60	35.8	8.8
E	60	33.5	10.8

Paper A

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		16.6	33.7	55.7	79.7	90.2

Paper B

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	42	38	34	30
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		15.9	35.1	59.0	82.3	92.6

Paper C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	36	31	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		11.2	26.8	49.9	70.6	81.7

Paper D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	36
% Candidates		15.1	37.2	60.6	75.1	85.8

Paper E

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	39	33	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		17.6	32.7	52.7	69.8	84.3

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced UMS grade boundaries

	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Advanced Subsidiary	200	160	140	120	100	80
Advanced	400	320	280	240	200	160

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 US021002 January 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

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