



Pearson

# Examiners' Report

## June 2017

GCE History 8HI0 1H

## 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2017

Publications Code 8HI0\_1H\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the reformed AS Level Paper 1H, Britain transformed, 1918–97.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections - in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where Section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the Section B questions covering a broader time span.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

## Question 1

Question 1 was the more popular of the two in Section A, and was generally well answered, producing a wide range of responses. Most candidates were able to offer some analysis and support on the importance of the given factor. Stronger responses were tightly focused on the demands of the question, assessed the given factor against other issues, and made distinctions across the time period, e.g. differentiating between inter-war and post-1939. Whilst this was a Section A rather than Section B question, many successful candidates appreciated that the relative scope of the question meant a broader approach was valid, focusing on arguments relating to war and social change with selected examples to examine the impact of both world wars, rather than an extensive and separate treatment of each war in minute detail. The most common limiting features were vagueness about which war was being referred to, concentrating unduly on just one of the two world wars, a failure to consider other factors behind social change, a lack of clarity on what constituted social change, and extensive consideration of social developments well beyond 1951.

Main reason.	Not the main reason
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- NHS 1948</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- <del>As society</del> Society changes itself</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The Education Act 1944</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The unemployment benefits</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Social changes due to economic factors</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- National Insurance Act</li></ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 1920s → beggars with medals on the street</li></ul>	

After the First World War ended in 1918 some social change started taking place. The government tried to organise the education system, started giving benefits to the unemployed, tried to improve healthcare in the country. ~~For the first time in history the state tried to take care of all~~ However, the real change started taking place during and after the World War Two. Government tried to take care of its people: free healthcare was introduced, the education system improved completely. The impact of war was the main reason for social change in Britain in the years 1918-1951, but the biggest change happened because

(Section A continued)

of the World War Two. The effect of the First World War was smaller.

It can be argued that there were ~~a lot of~~ changes happening after the First World War. The Unemployment Act of 1920 covered 7.5 million people all over Britain and provided men with 5p allowance and women with 6p. This was a considerable change in society as before people without jobs and money had to go to the workhouses. ~~Another important changes took place however, it wasn't like this partly happened~~ because after the First World War there were beggars on the street with medals on their chests. The disturbing fact that the war heroes don't get any help from British government partly made them pass the Unemployment Act of 1920. This suggests that the First World War was one of the reasons for social change. ~~However, those changes weren't as important as the changes that took place after the World War Two. If after the Unemployment Act in 1920 there was another one passed in 1934 introducing the Means Test, which means that the government was still not ready to make any changes, it after the World Second World War government introduced a number~~

New paragraph

(Section A continued) of acts in order to help <sup>people</sup> ~~the unemployed~~.  
1945 Family Allowance Act gave ~~money~~ money to the parents in need to help their children, the National Insurance Act was introduced in 1948 in order to help the disabled people with money. This suggests that the Second World War was a massive trigger for social change in society. What is even more important is the fact that before the world war two there was no organised healthcare. After this war the government wanted to improve ~~to~~ the living standards of people and created the NHS in 1948.

In conclusion, both wars were the reasons for a certain amount of social change. After the First World War there were first attempts to improve people's lives, by giving them ~~a weekly allowance, small benefits and after the second world war~~ but after the second world war the government created a welfare state with healthcare system that covered everyone. This means that both wars caused social change, but the second world war was much more influential than the ~~first~~ First World War.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response demonstrated some grasp of the question, attempting to shape material towards the demands of the question. However, whilst there is valid knowledge of the impact war had, this is not all convincingly linked to the issue of social change. There is also limited range beyond the issue of war. It only just made it into Level 3.

## Question 2

Although a less popular question of the two on Section A, this nevertheless produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within the higher levels. Where candidates were less successful, it tended to be due to a misconception of the term 'austerity' – a term drawn directly from theme 4 of this option – or a lack of detail to develop an analysis of this. On the former, this more often tended to be illustrated by a desire to frame austerity in the modern sense of the word, which at times led to assertion or confusion, e.g. in relation to welfare state spending, although in a smaller number of cases the term was taken to mean something very different, such as prosperity. There were still cases of candidates treating a consequence question as being about cause, although thankfully this was reduced from last year. At the higher end of the mark range, responses were tightly focused, and had the grasp and knowledge to weigh and judge the relative significance of different effects. Within the given effect, the introduction and extension of rationing was the most frequently addressed issue; as far as other effects were concerned, the creation of the welfare state, changes to the position of women, immigration and a shift in political attitudes were the more commonly found points.

In the 1940s and 1950s, the second world war had massive long-lasting effects on British society. While the improvement of jobs and the consumer boom of the 1950s had a massive impact, austerity and the economy was the main effect of the second world war on British society in the 1940s and 1950s.

Austerity and the economy was the main effect of the second world war on British society in the 1940s and 1950s because it had a large impact on their spending and it led to rationing being continued because of their economic state. After the war ended, the government had ~~lost~~ <sup>a debt</sup> of £4 billion, meaning they had to pay around £70 million a day with interest. This had a massive effect on society as it meant that the government could not work on repairing/helping industries and people after the war. It also led to a decline in 2/3 of industries, resulting in a loss of money to the economy as well as a loss of jobs. To try and receive some more money, John Maynard Keynes visited Washington in the USA in 1945 where he tried to

~~they~~ negotiate another loan from the USA and hoped it would be non-repayable for their war effort. However, the USA had alternative ideas and would not allow this. This meant that there was another lack of funding for Britain. However, Britain took advantage of the Marshall Aid in the mid-to-late

(Section A continued) 1940s, which ~~was~~ aimed to help European countries in need, and Britain took advantage of this the most, by taking out a total loan of £2.7 billion, which they reinvested into revitalising their key industries. To sum up, austerity post-war had a massive impact on British society as the failing economy ~~was~~ made it harder for the government to repair Britain and therefore increase employment, but this did pick up later after the Marshall Aid came into place.

Another factor that had <sup>the second</sup> ~~an impact on~~ <sup>World War</sup> on British society was the increase of jobs. During this time, there was an increasing amount of work available for people towards the war effort, such as factory work. It was said that 33% of people were working towards the war effort, and this included seven million women <sup>in 1944</sup>. This had a positive impact as people could earn more during this time, and it also stimulated the economy. In addition to this, the Essential Work Order 1941 tied people to jobs that were essential to the ~~war~~ <sup>war</sup> effort, meaning that more people were given jobs as it was compulsory for the war. As well as this, the Essential Work Order also improved work conditions by providing food for workers, as well as having crèches for workers who were

mothers. This meant that people were more motivated and happy at work, as well as enhancing the role of women as they had increased work and facilities to aid them through

**(Section A continued)** this. However, it can also be argued that the role of women was not heavily affected by the second world war as post-war, women were expected to return to their traditional roles. To conclude, while jobs were extended as a result of the second world war which helped and aided British society, austerity was still the main effect as it led to a loss of jobs once the war was over.

In addition, the consumer boom <sup>in the 1950s</sup> was also a large effect of the second world war on British society in the 1940s and 1950s.

The consumer boom took place in the 1950s under Macmillan and was a result of the end to rationing in 1954 as it meant that people who had limited their spending due to rationing could now spend their money as they wanted. This meant that there was a large amount of economic stimulation because there were massive spending increases. In addition to this, unemployment was kept low as a result of the consumer boom, as on average it was kept at around 500,000, with lows of 300,000.

The high levels of employment meant that the economy could be stimulated well as it resulted in more tax payers, allowing the government to aid society in a better way. The consumer boom and high levels of money also meant British people could spend more time in leisure and on holiday, such as holidays to Butlins and for middle-classes and some working-classes, holidays abroad. To sum up, the second

World War also had an impact on British society in terms of the

(Section A continued) consumer boom in the 1950s and increased spending.

~~Overall~~ Overall, even though the Second World War had an impact on British society in the form of increasing jobs for high amounts of the population (including women) and the consumer boom of the 1950s and rationing ending, austerity was the main effect of the Second World War on British society in the 1940s and 1950s as it led to a loss of jobs and had a massive negative impact on the economy due to Britain's debts as a result of the war.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a Level 4. It has a clear focus on the question, considering austerity alongside other effects. Sufficient knowledge of austerity and other economic and social consequences is deployed to begin to explore these issues, and issues are developed to offer reasoned judgement. Judgements are considered, with sound justification for decisions made, and the answer is generally well-organised and clear in its argument.

### Question 3

This question was a popular choice within Section B, and many candidates offered impressive knowledge of educational legislation relevant to the period. Whilst there was a tendency in some cases to detail the 1944 Education Act without fully focusing on the issue of significance, most candidates were able to establish reasoned argument and so go beyond description. More successful responses clearly established issues pertaining to significance, rather than lapse into narrative of the 1944 Act, or attempt an analysis more focused on the perceived fairness of the system it established. Some candidates did display confusion on key details of the different acts and reports, and at times some treated the 1944 Act, 'Butler' and the establishment of the tripartite system as different entities. Stronger responses tended to address the chronological parameters of the question by means of relative comparison to other developments in education, notably the 1918 Act, the development of comprehensive education and the expansion of universities, although successful approaches were also seen which essentially focused on the 1944 Act itself, setting this in the context of an analysis of the difference it made to education when measured across the period.

The 1944 education act was significant in the development of education to a certain extent.

The act changed the legal age of when you can leave school to 16. Many were happy with this as it means that students were getting a better, longer and more effective education.

This was significantly more appealing to young girls as educational opportunities for females were increasing since the 1918 education act and the 1918 representation of the people's act.

The government wanted to introduce more comprehensive schools to encourage mixed ability schools where those who were less able would receive practical instructions, and those who were more able would get advanced instructions.

This resulted in the British government converting secondary schools into comprehensive ones.

The government spent more money building new schools that offered better facilities and materials.

The Education system became an increasing priority for the government because of the effect of the war. Britain wanted to educate children in the sciences so that if another war would occur they would be people who could make advances in technology and machinery. The government had learnt from the Germans the importance of science and technology, especially due to the disastrous effects of the German U-boats, which forced Britain into rationing.

To conclude, I think that the 1944 education act was significant because it meant that children were getting a better education which would benefit Britain's economy in the long-term. This is because better educated children can get better jobs.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This example demonstrates some of the qualities of a Level 2 response. Whilst there is an attempt to come to terms with the demands of the question, analysis is limited. There is a lack of clarity and precision in places, and problems with supporting knowledge mean attempted development is unconvincing, and does not form the basis for reasoned judgement.

## Question 4

Question 4 was the less popular of the two within Section B. At the higher end, there was an impressive knowledge shown of industrial relations across the period, with references to Bevin, the 1946 repeal of earlier restrictive trade union legislation, the attempts at corporatism with NEDDY and NICKY, the implications of *Rookes v Barnard*, the development of public sector unions such as COHSE and NUPE and the growth in white-collar trade union membership, Wilson's Royal Commission and the Seaman's Strike of 1966, as well as more typical offerings such as positive relations in the era of WWII and the nationalisation programme, *In Place of Strife*, and the troubles faced by Heath and Callaghan. Less successful responses tended to be limited by difficulties focusing on the given period, e.g. extensive references to pre-1939 developments such as the General Strike or post-1979 developments such as the miners' strike of 1984-5, or a difficulty in focusing on, and/or understanding the central term of industrial relations, e.g. through drifting to a more general discussion on industry or economic policy in this period. That said, impressive use in some cases was made of wider contextual material, such as the rising inflation and attempts to impose prices and income policies.

With regards to the second-order concept of change, some candidates seem less familiar or confident with addressing questions on this. Whilst there is no ideal formula for such essays, stronger responses tended to ensure the essay is driven by argument over the extent of change, with detail selected to support and provide exploration, rather than the other way round, risking lapsing into description. Candidates should also be reminded to address the full question, in terms of both the given date range, and the extent of change – in some otherwise well-argued responses, areas of continuity were at times given limited treatment, making it difficult to address the extent of change.

Industrial relations changed significantly in the years 1939-79. The relationship between the government and the TUs were weak and very ~~de~~ tensed during <sup>the ending of this</sup> ~~this~~ period. Examples such as the Winter of Discontent, Industrial relations Act, the Miners Strike and the white paper - *In place of strife* highlighted the indifference and the unsettled disputes between the TUs and government. This was a drastic change from ~~the~~ post war years of during war and post war years of 1945-50, as there was a post war consensus between government and workers that was seen to battle the 'total war' experience.

During the WWII the industrial relations was good due to

the increase in employment. The policy of rearmament meant that many people got into sectors such as coal, steel and iron industry in order to make resources that were needed during war time. Unemployment decreased drastically from the almost 3 million that was displayed due to the economic slump that had occurred after the Great Wall Street Crash. Because of this decrease in unemployment, <sup>especially structural unemployment,</sup> many workers were happy to comply and this led to industrial relations

(Section B continued) remaining relatively well.

~~From~~ This continued throughout the war with minimal strikes and working days lost. After WWII a period of austerity continued throughout the war and was also shown during the time of 'total war' during the 1942-45. A period of austerity was developed after the war that meant that rationing continued till 1951-54 and resources were cut, this may have been the turning point of the Industrial relations. The end of the war and increase in technology meant that ~~old industries~~ resources such as coal was not needed any more resulting in a decline in their pay.

The power of the Trade Unions had increased significantly from after the war due to the post war consensus, which allowed a relationship between the government and the TUs meaning that they could work together to settle disputes. However, the power of the TUs were too high and due to this a white paper was made called 'In Place of Strife' made by Barbara White in 1969. This paper issued rules that lowered TU power such as: calling for secret ballots and banning unannounced strikes. However because the TUs power were too high, this white paper was ignored and was

(Section B continued) very unpopular among the TUs. This displays a change in industrial relations as it infers that the Labour government wanted to shift away from the consensus with the TUs and limit their power, whereas ~~before the end of~~ during the war, there was a general consensus between them.

Industrial relations Act in 1971 implemented by Heath was also another way for the government to limit the power of the TUs, compared to the Post War Consensus that had offered them this power. This Act attempted to settle disputes with the TUs but was ignored by them and so the Act failed. The TUs ignoring ~~the~~ and not following the Industrial relations Act suggests that there had been a significant change

as the Post War Consensus included the working together of TUs and the government but just as this Act this policy had been rejected and we can see a turning away from the post war consensus.

Industrial relations had changed significantly compared to the Post War Consensus. Again this is shown in the miners strike. The increased tensions and bad relations highlight the significant change ~~of the~~ from the consensus. The miners strike in 1972, 74 led to demands in a pay rise. 27% in 1972 and

(Section B continued) 35% in 1974. The miners used the OPEC Crisis - which had meant that there was a shortage in oil and the price in oil ~~was~~ rose to 400% - £ in order to get what they wanted. This was a great shift in industrial relations as beforehand after the war when coal resources were not needed as much, ~~the~~<sup>miners</sup> were in a vulnerable position as their pay decreased as demand was low. However the OPEC Crisis meant that the ~~the~~<sup>miners</sup> had the upper hand and therefore were in a position to demand as much in light of the Crisis, showing a low drop in industrial relations.

This strike also led to the "Who governs Britain" campaign by Heath whom had called for a ~~campaign~~<sup>general election</sup>. He lost this election displaying that it was now the TUs that governed Britain, again displaying a very

low drop in industrial relations as it had cost the Labour prime minister to display the threatening power of the TUs.

To conclude, I believe that the Industrial relations had changed significantly between the years 1939-51. During the war industrial relations were high as due to rearmament, industries such as coal, steel and iron were able to ~~ra~~ work and make resources that contributed greatly to the war. This led to increase in trade, ~~high~~ relatively high wages and increased

(Section B continued) employment. ~~However~~ The post war consensus between TUs and the government was an agreement that meant that TUs and the government relations remained high. However this dropped after the increase in demand for reserves and led to ~~a~~ increase in strikes. At 1939 there was only about 128 strikes, this number increased exponentially by the 1960s to over a thousand strikes that displayed the increasing power of TUs and the lowering of industrial relations.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response has a clear focus on change, and applies knowledge - both about industrial relations, and wider relevant material - to examine the issue across the period. Whilst this could go further in places, and could develop an examination of aspects of continuity and the extent of change, the response does demonstrate some of the qualities of a Level 4 response.

## Question 5

Most candidates were able to access the higher two levels, generally by recognising and explaining the arguments in the two extracts, and building on this with their own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most were able to identify differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, although a number of candidates did seem to struggle more with the second extract. Whilst there were cases of misunderstanding, there was also a tendency for some candidates to become waylaid with using detail from an extract in a manner drifting away from the focus of the question, e.g. discussion of the electoral system from Extract 2. Issues that limited some responses were relatively limited use of the extracts, or to use these in a manner not fully suited to Section C, e.g. through attempts to analyse provenance in a manner more suited to AO2. Section C is focused around A03. Responses which made consideration of the argument and evidence within the extracts central to their responses, applying their contextual knowledge to consider the validity of the arguments offered were more successful. For some, it seemed the breadth of this particular question was of great benefit in allowing scope to what contextual knowledge they brought to the argument, but it was those candidates who applied this within a response which consistently considered the extracts and their arguments which achieved the higher levels.

Responses tended to be more successful when they addressed the issues drawn from the specific question and extracts. Some candidates appeared to offer pre-prepared material 'for' or 'against' Thatcher, and whilst this could be productive, at times this amounted to undue amounts of personal judgements about the nature of Margaret Thatcher's rule and diversion from the debate.

Beyond points already mentioned elsewhere, one issue candidates should consider is how they answer such questions with regard to their own opinion. Whilst it is perfectly valid to reach a judgement which is essentially 'positive' or 'negative' with regards to the impact Thatcher had, candidates should seek to ensure they consider the merits of different views in the light of evidence. Overall conclusions may be forceful and come down one way or the other, but discussion and analysis requires some degree of balance.

(20)

David states <sup>in extract 1</sup> that Thatcherism was a rejection of the "social democratic consensus" that had plagued Britain after world war II's end. The Post War Consensus was a notion that Thatcher was entirely opposed to and ~~referred~~ referred to it as "creeping socialism" within the government. Extract 2 however states that by ending the consensus <sup>Thatcher</sup> ~~she~~ marginally decreased the industrial power of Britain during the 1980's. With these extracts, I agree that Thatcher's governments had <sup>greatly</sup> transformed Britain by leading it in a different direction from the post-war consensus.

Extract 1 states that Thatcher's government was heavily focused on the economy and competition which shows Britain's economic change from pre-1979. For example, the Big Bang was achieved after Thatcher's deregulation of the London stock exchange which allowed for shares to be taken out quicker and easier by the public, making London the financial centre of the world.

Extract 2 however ~~contrasts~~ this by stating it was Thatcher's rolling back of the state that caused <sup>the</sup> number of workers employed in manufacturing to fall by 42%, this left the working class worse off and it left Britain worse off.

It is true that Thatcher's deregulation of the stock exchange had only a short term benefit and would lead to a number of housing crisis later on in the years. In conclusion it can be said that Thatcher's ~~rolling~~ rolling back of

**(Section C continued)** the state had its intended effect for only a few years, the policies <sup>themselves</sup> not looking too far in the future. Therefore Thatcher's governments had transformed Britain for a short while before causing long term deficit that was unavoidable due to such radical policies being used.

Secondly, Extract 1 states that the welfare state was heavily reformed under Thatcher and that it provided beneficial changes towards healthcare and education. While the majority of the people did not want to get rid of the welfare state, many wanted to change it so that it would be more prosperous and beneficial for all. However, Extract 2 states that benefits in welfare such as increased opportunities for working mothers were present even before Thatcher took office. Thatcher's 'Right to Buy' allowed anyone who lived in a council house for five years to purchase the house from the government, this encouraged the notion of popular capitalism and everyone having the right to own their own property. While the 'Right to Buy' scheme saw short

term success, however, the ~~abundance~~ increase in house sales led to higher mortgages that people were not able to pay off after purchasing their property, in addition it led to a shortage in council homes meaning that those who needed the government's support could not find decent enough council homes due to them being bought off. In conclusion, Thatcher's reformations of the welfare state had benefitted only those who were financially stable and ~~but~~ provided less help for those who could not afford the mortgage or price of the council house itself.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response displays the qualities of a Level 4. There is clear recognition and analysis of the arguments offered by the two extracts. These are confidently examined in combination, with the candidate's own knowledge being integrated in order to discuss and reach judgement on the given views.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A/B responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question.
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors.
- Explaining their judgements fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but rather a demonstration of their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements.
- A careful focus on the second-order concept targeted in the question.
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable them to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one.
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions.
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes/consequences, etc., with only limited reference to that given in the question).
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues.
- Assertion of change/causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change/cause, of the issue within the question.
- A judgement was not reached, or not explained.
- A lack of detail.

## Section C responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to writing seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification.
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question.
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits.
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge.
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors.
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments.

Common issues which hindered performance on Section C were:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other.
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations.
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support.
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered.
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources.
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract.
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

## 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>



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

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

