



Examiners' Report **June 2023**

GCE History 9HI0 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 or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2023

Publications Code 9HI0_1H_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

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. This was most evident on Section C, as would be expected. Whilst the impact of this cannot be fully mitigated against, and the best advice is thus to plan time accordingly in the first place, the responses that appeared to experience such timing issues yet overcame them to some degree were those who offered more direct responses. Those who wrote abbreviated question 5 responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given views, rather than offering extensive explanations and quotes, were more likely to still produce a reasonably effective response, than those failing to reach any comparative analysis and evaluation. Finally, examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. 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 broader timespan.

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.

Question 1

This question was a popular choice within Section A, and produced a range of responses, the majority of which were able to reach the middle and higher levels. Many students offered impressive knowledge of the policies of both the Conservative and Labour Parties. The most popular issues considered were the legacy of the Beveridge Report and the welfare state, the influence of Keynesianism, policies relating to the nationalisation of industries, attempts to control inflation, provide full employment, and to a lesser extent, industrial relations. A minority also made skilful use of other material, e.g. policies relating to the liberalisation of society in the 1960s. In general, responses were stronger on the period from 1945 through to the 1960s, although a good number were effective in examining the breakdown of previous consensus policies during the 1970s, or even that the period saw a shift in the policies of both major parties.

Whilst there was no formula for successful essays, stronger responses tended to make and develop direct comparisons around different themes and areas, exploring the extent of differences within these points. A common argument, as would be expected, was to see consensus running through the early part of the period, with this breaking down at some point from sometime around the 1970s; some high level responses did question the assumptions behind such a view, e.g. examining the extent to which both parties were truly wedded to consensus politics out of ideological rather than electoral reasons, or through an analysis of the largely aborted measures which broke from consensus, such as under Heath.

Some responses addressed the question via more chronological structure, and some demonstrated a real grasp of specific governments and policies in their selection of knowledge; where this was carefully related to the analytical demands of the question, it proved effective.

Factors limiting responses to some degree or other were (i) a failure to address the full chronological range, particular with regards to the 1960s onwards, (ii) lack of balance and (iii) a lack of sufficient knowledge placing limitations on the ability to develop points fully.

Chosen question number: Question 1 Question 2

After World War Two, it can be argued that a political consensus occurred between the political parties. This ~~occurred~~ consensus can arguably be seen throughout multiple areas of policy, such as the economy and industrial relations, housing and healthcare ~~and ~~healthcare~~~~. Whilst a consensus existed in all 3 of these policy areas, it was most strongly ^{sustained} ~~seen~~ through ^{the economy} ~~housing~~ as both the ^{consensus within} ~~economy~~ ^{housing} and healthcare ~~was~~ was not sustained throughout the whole period. To assess whether the consensus was maintained, the extent to which the two governing main parties at the time agreed and had similar policies must be evaluated. Overall, it is clear that whilst there was political consensus at the start of the period in all three areas, it was only ~~sustained~~ ^{maintained} in ~~housing~~ ^{economy}.

Within the economy and industrial relations, there is some evidence that a consensus was maintained. For example, the economic ideology of 'Butskellism' developed, implying that the ideas of the Labour Chancellor Gaitskell and

(Section A continued) The Conservative Chancellor Butler had very similar policies. These included high spending on welfare, education and housing. The agreement between these two led to ~~a development of~~ the increase in quality of people's lives and the services that they used throughout the period. This highlights that ^{some} consensus within the economy was maintained. Within industrial relations, a consensus ~~was~~ also occurred, with Labour's Repeal of the Trade Union Act in 1946 and the Conservative's Industrial Charter in 1947. These both highlighted a softer and more co-operative relationship with trade unions. Even when this attitude changed, both Labour and the Conservative's tried to reduce ~~the~~ union power with Labour's 'In Place of Strife' in 1969 and Conservative's Industrial Relations Act in 1971. Both included measures such as cooling off periods and secret ballots as a way to limit unions. Whilst both ~~were~~ ^{in failed} ~~sustained~~, it highlights ~~a~~ ~~maintained~~ that similar policies were maintained throughout. However, this political consensus can be limited through the emergence of more right-wing politics in the Conservative Party in the 1970s. For example, Keith Joseph publicly proposed and

(Section A continued) argued for monetarism ~~and~~ and against Labour's increased spending. Whilst this was backed by some Conservatives (such as Margaret Thatcher), these calls were ignored and Heath continued to exercise similar ~~political~~ economic policies as Labour. Therefore, it can be argued that ~~even~~ within the economy and industrial relations, a consensus was maintained.

A consensus can also be seen through housing. For example, the Attlee government of 1945-51 promised to build 200,000 more homes and improve those that were of poor quality. Lots of money was spent on this and led to the development of ~~more~~ better and safer housing. This was accompanied by the Conservative's promise to also build more houses. For example, they promised to build 300,000 more homes, with Macmillan exceeding this and building more. This highlights that a political consensus was maintained ~~to~~ particularly as both parties prioritised housing as a way to increase the quality of life and therefore can be argued to have similar policies. However, this consensus is limited as ~~it~~ it was not

(Section A continued) maintained throughout the whole period. In 1963, 10% of homes in Manchester remained slums, highlighting for example, whilst Labour only promised 200,000 and then but were instead more focussed in on healthcare and improving education (such as carrying out the National Health Service Act in 1946), whereas the Conservatives prioritised housing over this and so spent money on it. Therefore, the consensus was not maintained as the extent to which the parties prioritised it differed. Similarly, the priority of housing for the Conservatives decreased over time, which is proven by the fact that in 1963, 10% of homes in Manchester remained in slum condition. This highlights that their focus on housing reduced, whereas Labour's (although less prominent) remained. Therefore, it can't be argued that a political consensus within housing remained as these similarities with their policies only remained for a short while at the start of the period, rather than lasting the whole period.

Finally, it can be argued that a political consensus was maintained through ~~education~~ ^{education} and healthcare. This can be seen at the start of the period, with both

(Section A continued) parties motivated to increase access to healthcare. The Labour Party passed the National Health Service Act in 1946 which legislated for free access to all from 'cradle to grave' in terms of healthcare. The Conservatives continued this commitment throughout the period. For example between 1957 and 1963, MacMillan built 90 new hospitals. Similarly, spending on healthcare increased from 4% to 4.8% of the GDP between 1948 and 1979, highlighting that both parties were keen to increase ~~are~~ spending on it. Therefore, it is clear that there were similarities in policy that were maintained and so a consensus can ~~have~~ be argued to have been sustained. However, the extent to which it was maintained was limited. In terms of healthcare, ~~the conservatives were~~ Health was more focussed on changing the management within hospitals whereas Wilson ~~was not~~ did not count it as a priority and was instead ~~a~~ focused on preventing the dandruff effect (where people came to hospitals for issues that weren't that severe and so wasted doctors' time). Similarly, Wilson's commitment was limited by the economy. The 1976 IMF loan would ~~also~~ ^{only} be given if Wilson cut spending and so by ~~cutting~~ ~~spending~~ doing this,

(Section A continued) Spending on healthcare decreased. Therefore, whilst ~~healthcare~~ the similarities in healthcare policies remained for some of the period, this can not be seen ~~throughout~~ through to 1979 and so the consensus within healthcare can not be ~~seen~~ argued to be maintained, as their healthcare policies were starting to differ.

Overall, it is clear that whilst consensus did occur within all 3 factors, it was only maintained in the long-term within the economy and industrial relations. whilst housing and healthcare ~~is~~ in 1945 were main priorities of both Labour and Conservatives, these began to change over time, often due to the economy, and so their policies can no longer be described as similar and so a ^{maintained} consensus can not be argued to have occurred. Whereas, in the economy ^{and industrial relations}, their ideas were similar throughout and it can be argued that their commitment to increased spending weakened the economy which then forced the parties to change their policies within ~~educati~~ healthcare and housing, leading to their decrease in consensus. Therefore, overall, it is accurate to argue that whilst all 3 had experienced

(Section A continued) a political consensus, it was only maintained in the economy and industrial relations, due to a continuation of similar policy between Labour and the Conservatives.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. One of the strengths of this response is the quality of specific exemplification, and the deployment of this – the response offers a range of detailed examples which are used to demonstrate the extent to which a political consensus was maintained. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement.

Question 2

This question was a popular choice within Section A. This question produced a range of responses, with the majority having a good focus on the conceptual demands of the question, and the necessary knowledge to reach the middle and higher levels. A key discriminating factor within these levels was candidates' ability to support analysis, particularly on the given issue of the 1944 Education Act. Those with sufficient depth to substantiate claim for or against its significance in the development were able to access the higher levels.

Commonly cited issues relating to the 'Butler Act' were the establishment of the tripartite system, in particular how this broadened access to grammar schools, with many also able to examine the inequalities that existed in relation to these, and the significance of the 'eleven-plus'. Many also examined the development of technical and secondary modern schools, with the majority tending to highlight the limitations of these, as well as the raising of the school leaving age. Stronger responses maintained a clear focus on significance, and a good number considered the extent to which the proposed system had lived up to aims and expectations throughout the 1950s and 1960s.

The most commonly covered of the other developments were the comprehensive system and the development of university education. The former was mainly well understood, with most candidates seeming secure in the main differences between it and the tripartite system, and the broad implications of the change to comprehensive schooling, although fewer addressed the significance in terms of how the process of this developed over time. With regards to the latter, most candidates were able to broadly support arguments that there were significant changes to university access over the period, typically with reference to the Robbins Report, the expansion of Higher education in the 1960s and the Open University. A smaller number referenced the expansion that had occurred in the 1950s, although a good number of these did explore the relationship between developments in school and higher education.

Stronger responses offered sufficient coverage of issues (typically the given issue and two or three other substantial points), the necessary detail to substantiate claims, and a clear and critical focus. With regards the latter, many candidates in the higher levels were able to explore the relationship between different developments and weigh their relative significance through consideration of their scale, depth of impact, duration, and the extent to which they lived up to expectation. Less successful responses tended to offer some focus but lacked sufficient accurate material. A significant number did confuse detail; whilst in most cases the impact of this was not so great, e.g. mixing minor details such as the dates universities were established, there were some who included a fair amount of detail but ascribed this to the wrong acts and measures, e.g. seeing the 1944 Act as having ended the tripartite system.

It could be argued that the 1944 Butler act was the most significant development in education from 1944 to 1979 as it enabled social mobility for the working class and altered the organisation of education. However, it could be stated the other developments were more significant such as the developments in comprehensive and progressive education, as well as the expansion of university education. In order for a development to be classed as significant it would have to improve opportunity for all genders and classes, be accessible to the masses and widen the curriculum. This essay will argue that the expansion of university was most significant.

It could be argued that the 1944 Butler act was the most significant as it enabled social mobility. The 11+ exam provided an opportunity for the working class and girls to progress to Grammar schools where they could gain a higher quality education with skills to progress in society. It also allowed education to be available to the masses as fees for secondary education were abolished. It also reformed the curriculum as children would remain in education until 15. Furthermore, it catered to new skills with the tripartite system; establishing technical schools to encompass science and maths. However, it could be argued

(Section A continued) That the 1944 Butler act was not the most significant as many working class within grammar schools struggled with fees and a sense of 'imposter syndrome'. Furthermore, technical schools never had an intake of more than 4% limiting changes to the curriculum. Finally, it failed to create equal accessibility as the 11+ exam favoured the middle classes with the act failing to create parity by ~~uniting~~ ^{uniting} state and public schools. In this way, comprehensives can be seen as the most significant development as they enabled accessibility to masses with greater curriculum changes to be more wide-ranging and inclusive.

It could be claimed that the growth of comprehensives was the most significant development in education as it changed the curriculum. The 1965 Crossland circular stated that education should be more inclusive and focus on a wide range of subjects, such as science and the humanities. It was also accessible to the masses as by 1979, 90% of students attended comprehensive schools. It also led to the decline in grammar schools creating more equality as there were only 150 remaining by 1979. Governments also supported the expansion of comprehensives, as seen with Wilson's 1976 Education act which proposed to end direct grants to grammar schools. Despite this, comprehensives may not be the most significant as they actually reduced social mobility. As many grammar schools lost funding they chose to become private, excluding accessibility to the working class, reducing

(Section A continued) the opportunity for social mobility. Furthermore, many reforms were not ~~not~~ implemented due to ~~the~~ Wilson's loss to Heath, which capped the extension of comprehensives. By the 1960s (comprehensives) also began to decline in quality with fewer resources and teachers, suggesting they were not the most significant development as they did not see sustained progress. It could be stated that university education would have ~~not~~ ^{more} significant developments as it continued social mobility for the masses with a range of courses in reach to all classes as well as ages.

Finally, it could be argued that the expansion of university education was the most significant development. This is because it became available to the masses as ~~by~~ by 1979 around 60,000 people graduated with degrees. Furthermore, students received financial support as university education was reformed. This was evident with the 1963 Robbins report which proposed a national grant to all students, increasing accessibility to the masses. Furthermore, the curriculum was also widened with the Percy and Barrow reports of 1964 which stated an increase in science to challenge the heavy emphasis of classical education. University education was also widely encompassing. The 1971 Open University enabled adult education from correspondence. In this way, university education was most significant as all age groups and regions could partake in

(Section A continued) high quality education as by the 1970s the number of universities ~~rose~~^{rose} to 58. However, university may not be the most significant as the curriculum was resistant to change - emphasis on classical education remained deeply embedded within the system, limiting its significance. Furthermore, it was not always accessible to the masses as Oxbridge only admitted women by 1948 - furthermore, it did not guarantee social mobility as the elitism of the upper classes outpaced the working class with employment opportunities being awarded to privilege and background rather than egalitarian beliefs and assessment.

To conclude, the expansion of university education can be seen as the most significant as it encompassed more egalitarian beliefs with a widening of course choice that were available to the masses. Although, the 1944 Butler act and the rise of comprehensive can still be seen as significant as they were key developments that lay the foundation for the reforms in education and widened opportunity to the masses before university. However, this argument is limited as university education ensured social mobility for all and did not undergo relative decline but instead saw sustained progress from 1944 to 1979. By the end of the period, university education was no longer the reserve of the wealthy upper class, but all members of society who could then access social mobility.

(Section A continued) *with qualifications to access high-earning professions, such as that in law and medicine.*



This response demonstrates most of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with sufficient knowledge to explore these. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, evaluating the extent of change. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 3

This was the more popular of the two options in Section B and produced a broad range of responses. The majority of candidates were able to access levels three and above, showing an understanding of the demands of the question and offering enough of the necessary knowledge to develop points. Stronger responses tended to be more successful in combining understanding and analytical focus, with detailed contextual and relevant knowledge. In such responses, the effect both wars, the extension of the franchise, the General Strike and the Great Depression had on class structure were addressed and explored, and the variation in their impact on individual classes, and on class structure overall, were considered.

Stronger responses were able to address the whole timeframe, focused carefully on the second-order concept of change, and tended to be more able to give attention to the issue of class structure, and not just individual classes. Whilst candidates were able to draw upon material from across the course of study, and many made good use of this, it tended to be the responses which had a clear focus and understanding of class distinctions and related issues which scored most highly, e.g. exploring the extent to which events such as the First World War contributed to a decline in deference. The highest attaining responses were focused, evaluated the significance and impact of a range of relevant issues and reached supported judgements. These responses also covered the whole timeframe of the question and had a distinct focus on class structure.

Where responses were less successful, they tended to lack a clear understanding of the key issue in the question, class structure. Some responses tended to provide a narrative – at times detailed – of the different classes but lacked a clear focus on change within and across these. Some responses also offered only partial coverage of the time period in question, in such cases typically focusing on either the period immediately after the First World War, or the years 1939-1945. Such responses often evidenced that candidates had some knowledge and understanding of class distinctions and differences but lacked a clear focus on the precise demands of the question.

The class structure before 1918 was very clear between upper middle and working class. Often there was little changes in status between classes, the professions and opportunities were all very different and distinct between each class. However between 1918-51 there were changes in British societies' ~~own~~ class structure, ~~some of the changes~~ ~~were~~ ~~lead~~ such as as a result of the wars, and the consensus. Despite some changes, 'significant' change may be too strong a word, especially when considering the status of women in this period was not changed drastically.

After WWI, there was a change in class structure due to the ~~experience~~ war. The divide between classes had be blurred due to the common experiences between officers and soldiers - upper/middle class men had worked along side working class and now ~~each side~~ had something in common and a better understanding of each others lives.

As a result, the middle class (and some upper) felt more responsibility, or at least reason, to care more for the people of lower status. Contrastingly, the ~~lower~~ working class men, had less deference to higher status people and felt less automatic respect for them. This coming together of classes

(Section B continued)

made the structure slightly less prominent in relationship between classes, however, the opportunities and living standards still highlighted the divide and therefore the change can't be accurately described as 'significant'.

The Representation of the people act ~~1918~~ 1918 and 28 was quite important in creating a more equal British society since it meant all people over the age of 21 regardless of economic status or income had the right to vote and have their opinion ~~noticed~~ noticed. The working class vote had been significantly widened and ultimately effected the governments in charge - Labour became a significant ~~conservative~~ opposition to Conservatives and gained power in 1924 for the first time, allowing for the working class voice, aided by trade unions, to have significant impacts (although the first administration was shortlived and tame it was a step towards more class equality).

The labour party and growing strength of unions was a way for working class people to earn more and living standards to rise. ~~The interwar years saw small changes but~~ After the second world war, the growth of the middle class was very noticeable showing a change in class structure. However, this wasn't so much the case in the interwar years, most changes were in attitudes not in reality so the 'significance' of the change is ~~rather~~ smaller.

(Section B continued)

Women's status and class structure was relatively unchanged in this period. Although they had won the right to vote, their role and expectations remained mostly the same. ~~The~~ Women in all classes were expected to be homemakers and mothers, and if they had a job, were expected to leave it after they got married. Despite ~~that~~ ^{was} giving vast amounts of women the opportunity to work, once peace was restored, most returned to their homes ~~again~~; after WWI the Restoration of Pre-war Practices act 1919 forced women out of servicemen's roles and after WWII most were happy to return to home. Arguably it was the 60s - and women's liberation, that ^{changed} ~~affected~~ women's class structure most significantly, as quality and standards of living rose and the middle class grew. So although, some changes were made, they were definitely not enough to be deemed significant.

The postwar consensus helped even out the class divide in terms of healthcare access. Prior to the second world war, ~~the~~ welfare and health provision was highly determined by class and wealth. ~~Many workers were~~ Some workers were insured while the others had to rely on the expensive private treatments. In 1939 50% of people were uninsured and maternal mortality rates were ~~the~~ 50% higher in low income areas such as Tyneside (Wales). This shows a clear class structure in Britain and its impact on society. But after ~~the~~

(Section B continued)

WW2, the postwar consensus helped to even out these disparities - with universal benefits and treatments to all based on compulsory taxes from the National Insurance Act 1948. Infant mortality rates declined and prescriptions for the poorer people were available - helping to improve their health. However, the full employment also helped to shift the class structure although that was more significant after 1951. However despite the consensus, the focus was more on equal opportunities than equal class - so the class structure was still prominent up to the 1950s despite some of these things such as health care, being more available to all classes.

Overall, although some changes were made, such as in the attitudes towards class structure and the access to healthcare became more equal, the changes were not 'significant', divides were still prominent, especially between the North and South divide ^{during} the interwar years. Perhaps after the 1950s the change may be considered significant, but between the period of 1918-51 the changes were small and differences in class were still quite large and noticeable.



This response demonstrates most of the qualities of level 4. There is a clear awareness of the demands of the question. Sufficient material is used to examine a range of relevant issues, and in doing so, the response explores key changes to the class structure, although this could be developed further. The response is effectively organised, with logical argument.

Question 4

Question 4 produced a broad range of responses, and the majority were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question to some degree, and make appropriate use of their knowledge, to achieve the middle and higher levels. Where responses were less successful, the main issue limiting candidates tended to be as a result of paying less attention to the earlier part of the period, typically with cursory references to points of comparison from the years 1918-79, but with the bulk of the material offered being drawn from the latter years. Some responses did cover the key issues in some detail, but in a more illustrative manner, providing detailed accounts of entertainment and popular culture, with less focus on the extent of difference/similarity. Again, in such cases, the post-war period dominated, in particular the development of television. There was also some chronological confusion in a minority of responses, e.g. seeing television as being widespread prior to the Second World War.

Thankfully, the vast majority of responses were able to make use of accurate and relevant knowledge from a range of issues. Common issues referred to included cinema, television, music, radio, and, in particular, the development of youth culture from the 1950s. Many of the stronger responses took a thematic approach, e.g. structuring responses around a selection of the above, then exploring within these points the extent to which the experience was different. Stronger responses were both informed and analytical; candidates who produced responses in the higher levels were able to identify key issues and explore similarity/difference, deploying specific knowledge to examine and assess these critically, considering the second-order demands in various terms, e.g. the extent to which the content, nature, and technology were different for a given form of entertainment, or whether the experience took place individually or was shared, domestically or in public. Responses attaining the highest levels were thus able to consider the extent of difference/similarity for the individual themes addressed, and also reach substantiated judgements overall.

One final note: as in some previous questions where this topic has been covered, some responses did seem located somewhat in contemporary experiences of certain aspects of culture, e.g. references to the superiority of televised sport which reflected more the 21st century experiences, rather than those of the 1950s to 1970s. Whilst these tended not to significantly hinder otherwise strong responses, it does point to the issues in studying more contemporary periods.

The growth of popular culture during the 20th century was extremely rapid and lots of different forms of entertainment evolved from this period to what we have today. The changes in the interwar years were an explosion of cultural change, often involving music and radio but the period 1950-1979 were where both pop culture and entertainment thoroughly revolutionised with television (TV) and ~~been~~ youth culture. ~~Some~~ Evidently ~~say~~ there are huge differences but upon closer inspection we can start to see a few similarities between the two periods of time in terms of popular culture and entertainment.

There are several stark differences between pop culture in the two periods in question and perhaps the most notable of these is TV. Television played an extremely small role in popular culture before 1939 because there were

(Section B continued) ~~less than~~ ¹⁹ only 12,500 TV sets by 1938 in circulation in Britain and so, ~~these~~ ^{they} were extremely hard to get a hold of, only being accessible to the elite and the richest in society. Furthermore, even when owned, there ~~were~~ ^{was} only a singular broadcasting channel and one often had to be in close proximity (no more than 20 miles) to receive transmissions.

This significantly reduced the impact of TV. In stark juxtaposition, TV had really developed post WW2. This was particularly evident after TV ownership received a boost of 40% after the televised Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II in 1953. This meant that a significantly higher amount of people had access to television, a figure which kept growing until 1989 where over 95%

of British households had access to TV programming. This was extremely different to the interwar period as now everyone was able to watch TV shows, especially with a growing number of channels to watch. Moreover, this huge level of accessibility meant that social change was more poignant than ever as TV shows like

(Section B continued) 'Up the Junction' in the 1960s were able to influence people's ideas on abortion. This blatantly shows a huge difference in people's experiences of Popular Culture because in the interwar period, there was a minimal social impact whereas in 1950-79, it had a huge social impact, even changing people's ideas on moral dilemmas like the 1967 Abortion Act.

Despite this difference in TV, there is a large similarity between the two periods in terms of the experience of pop culture; Music and radio. In the 1920s, music from America and radios took the Britons by storm. The radio gained huge popularity and 71% of households owned one by ~~the~~ 1929. This paired alongside with the influx of Jazz music meant that radio and jazz were becoming more and more acceptable in Britain, forcing a pop culture revolution. The huge boost of ~~danceable~~ dance music also meant that social areas such as dance halls were gaining popularity and socialisation as a ^{product} of music was sweeping the nation. Not too,

(Section B continued) disimilarly, in the 50s and 60s, music and radio was also hugely influential in the world of entertainment and pop culture. For example in the 60s, Radio Luxembourg offered a show named the '6-5 special' where new popular music would be enjoyed by over 4 million listeners. This also had a similar impact to that of jazz in the 1920s as it changed how people socialised, dancing moves such as the twist ~~and~~ made a huge impact on culture and particularly, it introduced Rock'n'Roll to the UK. A type of song looked down on by elders, but like jazz, it changed people's views on music. In total, Music and Radio completely had a significant and positive effect on society during both periods, crystal clear evidence of the experience of pop culture being similar across the two periods.

Although this similarity was extremely significant, it is impossible to not mention the glaring difference in Youth Culture between the two periods in question. Prior to WW2, the youths of society did not possess a huge amount of liberties and the term 'teenager' had

(Section B continued) only ~~just~~ ^{has} been coined in 1921. This youth culture ~~were~~ ^{was} limited by the economic problems of the 1920s and '30s and so didn't have a collective power as a group in society, but they did have dance halls and ~~to~~ socialise. Contrary to this, after WW2, the youths as a whole had much more liberty, especially financially as they were able to obtain jobs during WW2. This meant they were able to buy more things, like clothes and they were able to socialise a lot more. Furthermore, thanks to other pop culture such as music, they were allowed more power to do as they wished. For example, the mod, rockers and punks were all influenced by the music at the time and could purchase clothing such as studded metal jackets, big platform boots and ~~the~~ plaid. The role of the teens really did affect culture as radio stations like ~~the~~ Radio Luxemburg directed their attention at this new marketable group with shows like the '6-5 special', creating more social spots like Milk Bars and Coffee Shops. This was a complete contrast to the interwar period wherein the teenagers had

(Section B continued) little to no impact on society.

Overall, it can be said that there were extremely large differences between the British experience of popular culture and entertainment. ^{This is} because popular culture had a greater impact on society post WW2 with changes to ideology, socialisation and fashion compared to the interwar years where pop culture just didn't have enough ^{gravitas} ~~put~~ to have that societal changes. Despite these glaringly obvious differences, there definitely are similarities in the two periods especially in relationship to the impact of music on social views and dance. Nevertheless, the similarities aren't strong enough to sway the argument and the two periods were definitely very differing in the experience of pop culture and entertainment.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement, weighing the relative importance of the various causes. Sufficient knowledge is effectively deployed throughout the answer.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses developed a clear extract-based analysis of the extent to which 'the achievements of the Thatcher governments were startling'. Such responses explored most of the arguments raised within the extracts, e.g. using Extract 1 to examine the extent to which her economic policies were successful, in relation to issues such as employment and inflation, and the impact these had on the British public, referencing fiscal policies and the creation of a property-owning democracy, set against Extract 2, which offers a very different take on many of the same issues, questioning the economic achievement and emphasising the limitations of policies such as privatisation.

Contextual knowledge was also used effectively to examine the merits/validity of the views put forward in the extracts, e.g. relating arguments over employment and the shift away from heavy industry to the closure in the steel industry and coal mines, or examples of privatisations that took place and relating this to the deregulation and expansion that took place in the stock market and financial services. Such knowledge was obviously most effective when firmly linked to the analytical demands of the question and the extracts, e.g. some candidates offered specific material about the Miners' Strike, but drifted somewhat from an analysis of the view in the question and extracts. Stronger responses made more effective use of the material, e.g. rather than expanding upon Extract 2's point concerning the benefits of privatisation being only really short-term gains by giving examples of share offers that took place, they used such knowledge to explore whether it led to a deterioration in service, or to examine the extent to which share ownership became a widespread phenomenon.

Less successful responses showed some understanding of the extracts but tended to select quotations, paraphrase or describe, without proper reasoning. At this level, material from the extracts were used more to illustrate. Such responses often revealed limited recognition of the differences between the two extracts. Responses in the lower levels were more likely to rely heavily on the extracts as sources of information and engage less with these as interpretations. Stronger responses were more effective in deploying contextual knowledge to clearly discuss the arguments and issues arising from the given interpretations, typically reaching confident and developed judgements on the merits of these. Stronger responses were also focused on the precise question rather than the more general debate on the impact the Thatcher governments had on Britain.

SECTION C

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that 'the achievements of the Thatcher governments were startling' [Extract 1, line 19]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

To a somewhat considerable extent, one could find the view that the achievements of Thatcher's governments were startling, with Hams arguing her unexpected success were 'startling' and Bronstein arguing that to a lesser extent. Bronstein's argument considers both social and economic success, as well as laws, whilst Hams' narrow focus on economics proves Bronstein's argument to be more far, and Hams' summarising the most convincing. The criteria one must employ to evaluate this will be widespread and narrow of user type and long term ones similar for necessities, with success defined as unexpected and a dramatic change from long term trends.

Hams suggests that the achievements of Thatcher's governments were startling not only due to her anti-inflationary budget of 1981 which reduced spending cuts from £11bn in 1980 to £8bn in 1981, but also due to her ability to successfully 'curb trade union power'. The Trade Union Act 1984 changed trade unions to hold a secret ballot before commencing strike action - this limited trade union power incredibly, unlike that of Heath. This is extended in the 1980 Employment Act which banned secondary picketing.

This impact was widespread, decreasing union membership by 40%. Hains argues that this not only was starting out also allowed for higher productivity and economic efficiency. However, one could argue this achieves nothing, but on a gross scale Britain lagged behind Europe for inflation in all but 5 years, and productivity was only 50% as high as America in 1979, increasing significantly however to 77% in 1997. This could perhaps indicate widespread and positive improvement to long-term economic trends of low-productivity and inflation, affirmed by Hains who suggests Blair continued 'broad economic policies' of Thatcherism. Moreover, ~~Hains argues that~~ ^{Despite this} Thatcherism economic growth averaged 4% in the 80s, but 2.5% overall - indicating perhaps a return to existing long term trends. Moreover, Hains argues that 'large scale privatisation proceeded with high pace' and proved an economic achievement. Bronfen agrees with this, arguing that the results of the British Telecom were a benefit. This is corroborated by Hains by also suggesting that the 1987 revenue exceeded expenditure. The sale of the British Telecom in 1984 brought £3.7bn into the treasury, to disprove what was said prior and there was projected £1bn in public spending cutⁱⁿ July 1981 wrong. As well as this, we can see additional income such as the North Sea oil as a starting success, bringing a substantial £1bn

into the treasury (2x that of Thatcher's last term). Despite the fact that Harris suggests that unemployment went to 10%, one could differ ~~to~~, undermining the convincingness of Harris's argument that unemployment rates under Thatcher averaged ^{9.1%} 9%. Despite this one could argue Thatcher's policy of monetarism to be flawed or inflation, added to the employment line long term trends of previous British governments. Moreover, Harris suggests moves to a Democratic bus, suggesting that Tony Blair 'made great public play' of Thatcher's lasting achievements - sharing long term impact. This is convincing for Blair distanced himself from Hammond and Foot, who wanted a 10% increase on top income tax, money to PFI, privatisation, reducing dependency culture. However, this is again undermined by the fact that Blair indeed had and labor elements of his campaign (the third axis) such as repeal of section 25, The European Bill of Rights and minimum wage - though these policies aren't economic, hence attesting to the success of Thatcher's breakaway from Keynesian economics.

Moreover, on the other hand, one can see Bronstein's argument as 'misread', but a useful economic claim which undermined the convincingness of Harris. Bronstein argues that Thatcher had 'its ups and downs' undermining the validity of the statement, 'Many appreciated Thatcher' due to their ability to buy their corner

house under the 1950 Housing Act, increasing home ownership from 50% to 78%. One can see this ideal in the model man, a young class-conscious taxpayer who has benefited from home ownership and Thatcherite achievement. What this is a stark achievement, more than of any provision before. Bronstein later comes out ~~that~~ ^{the} 'negative impact of housing surpluses' ~~as almost 20%~~. This is cunning, and ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~causing~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~act~~ as the 1988 Housing Act termed local governments being reinvesting into new housing schemes - depressing ^{lower-} income brackets of course for homes. This act was 'starring', in a more negative way. Mr. Scott and weak humanism grew at this time due to the divisive housing policy. Moreover, Bronstein notes that division was created due to 'the gradual decline of British northern manufacturing' - strong limited harm impact of Thatcher's achievements. Contrarily, Hans argues that for cuts (of 2 million when Bronstein states) he later helped increase productivity. One can find Bronstein's superior cunning in his way for the total loss losses of British steel closed to improve profits, continuing to make a loss of £450m and Leylands 30,000 job cuts laid too. This hints the cunningness of Hans' movement and accentuates the cunningness of Bronstein, proving Thatcher's achievement was starring in a socially negative way. Bronstein implies that Thatcher was parasitic when

as deflation, British Airways were positive for it gave people a sense in society - this is communiting! approved by Hains and suggests 'increases are the form of revenue into the treasury.' One can see the increase of state ownership from 7% to 25% during the 1970s, suggesting widespread sense of measures achievements - corroborated by the sale of BT in 1984 bringing £7.7bn ~~to the~~ However, Bronstein argues that this is linked to 'bureaucratic public services' & and natural monopolies in Water was widely unpopular in the 40% increase in water bills. Despite this, one could argue that Major mainly privatised these industries in 1992 Railways and 1995 electricity. Bronstein argues that the exacerbated social divide, especially with unemployment which hovered at 20% and peaked at 32% in 1975, is ~~linked~~ ^{unmentioned} in Hains.

Overall, one can see considerable merit in the arguments of Hains, with an economic focus. Hains suggests that the 'reduction of income taxes', from 83% to 60% in 1979 to 40% in 1987 'increased incentives for high earners to pay and work in Britain. This is indeed highly communiting and the same for standard rates which was exponentially lowered from 37% to 30% to 27% to 25%, highlighting widespread impact for all classes. However, one can see as Bronstein as generally arguing,

a narrow impact with Home raising VAT from 8% to 15% - taking a higher percentage of working class business income and exacerbating hardship for them. As well as this, the consistency of Branson's argument that the 'national' economy was worsened is indeed true, seen in the 67% increase in manufacturing ^{compared} to that of 30% in the finance sector. Despite Home's views, we can see a long term trend of Thatcher, in fact Britain GDP in the world dropping from 6th in 1950 to 11th in 1973 to 14th in 1997. However, one may argue factors indeed began to thrive, unlike before, with one government's spending of £1.1bn, but then rising to £1.3bn in 1995, proving Home's consistency. Overall, ~~most~~ ^{intergenerational} ~~are~~ ^{are} ~~concerning~~, one can see that of Branson's widespread view economy and society as valid, but Home's economy flawed as most concerning - emphasising the 'stagnating' nature of Thatcher's economic achievements by conceding 'occasional setbacks', but focusing on the presidential ^{style} leadership of Thatcher as 'clear and consistent' long term and widespread.



This Question 5 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths,

- It offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views.
- It uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views.
- It is focused on the precise issue (whether the achievements were startling) rather than the general controversy.
- It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue.

Paper Summary

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

Section A/B responses:

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

- 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
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question 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:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt 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
- Answer 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
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail.

Section C responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to 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:

- 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:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

