



# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2024**

**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](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 2024

Publications Code 9HI0\_1H\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, Advanced Level, paper 1H.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1). Section B offers a further choice of essays, typically covering a longer time span. Both Sections A and B target 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 a few 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, although there seemed to be fewer instances of this than has been seen in some previous years. The responses that managed time most effectively planned time accordingly in the first place and offered more direct responses. Where responses indulged in lengthier contextual description or explanations of, say, leisure and travel, rather than analysis of the significance of car ownership and other developments within this (for Question 4), or descriptions of the extracts and the policies of the Thatcher governments, rather than an analysis and evaluation of the views in relation the proposition that the Thatcher governments significantly changed Britain (Question 5), they were both less likely to produce responses at the highest level, but also experience time pressure issues. Those who produced responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given issue in the question, and on Question 5 the given views, were more likely to produce an effective response.

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 offered substantial knowledge, but did not effectively direct this towards the conceptual demands of the question. In the main though, candidates 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 timespan. One of the central features of responses attaining the highest marks was an ability to consider and evaluate in relation to the specific demands of a particular question. For example, some candidates offered detailed explanation of changes, but the strongest responses tended to offer more consideration of the extent of change.

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 also need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that responses sufficiently cover the given period, and do not spend time detailing issues that are outside the timeframe of that particular question.

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. A small minority did approach the question in a manner which would be more suited to an AO1 (ie. Section A/B) response, engaging with the issue in the question and showing understanding, but tending to neglect the extracts, or treat them more as sources of information, rather than interpretations.

## Question 1

This was the more popular of the two choices in Section A. Overall, this question was well answered, and marks were mostly spread across level three and above. Most candidates were able to demonstrate an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question, and deploy at least some range of accurate knowledge in relation to issues examined.

The vast majority of candidates were able to offer some examples to consider the question's given proposition, with commonly cited examples being the legislation concerning equality and discrimination in the workplace, changes to the law concerning divorce and abortion, and the setting up of the post-war welfare state. A smaller but sizeable number also discussed government mobilisation during wartime and changes to education, or lesser considered legislation, such as the Life Peerages Act of 1958. In considering alternatives, the most commonly offered factors were the impact of war work, the influence of the feminist movement, social changes such as the development of a more liberal society, and to a lesser extent, technological and scientific advancement. Whilst knowledge of the women's liberation movement was generally good, both in terms of their literature and activism, some candidates seemed to be less able to establish how, and to what extent, this brought improvements for women.

Whilst, for the vast majority of responses, knowledge was generally accurate on the range of issues covered, the more successful tended to be those who could clearly develop this in relation to the question. A number cited issues, but did not adequately explain how these led to improvements in the role of women, eg reference to changes to abortion law or the growth of a permissive society, without explanation or analysis of these in terms of improvement for women, or claims that the Dagenham Strike was evidence of feminist influence without examination of this. More secure responses clearly explored the various ways in which these issues resulted in improvements to the role and status of women, and in many strong responses, examined the relationship between the different factors, eg the extent to which legislation was in response to pressures such as that arising from the Dagenham machinists.

Government action can be regarded as the legislative framework for improvements in the economic status of women, yet cannot be labelled as the main reason. As a de jure protection of female employment did not translate to equal opportunity. Rather, the political consciousness generated by the women's liberation movement and female activism must be given greater weight, as this not only pressured government actions to grant women greater freedoms, but also would alter conservative attitudes towards women. Equally, the involvement in the second world war must be considered, in demonstrating the contribution of women to the war effort which would pressure government action to protect female employment.

The role of government action in improving the role and status of women must be considered in creating the legal framework for the protection of female employment. This is highlighted in the removal of the marriage bar in teaching, the Bank of England, and the civil service in 1946, removing the structural barriers with which

hindered female economic advancement. Yet, the outcome of this is limited as Mas observation reveals female ambiguity towards work as there was no incentive given pay remained unequal. As such, women returned to the domestic sphere despite the legislative amendments that granted opportunities in work beyond marriage, indicating government action through legislation did not translate into material outcome in economic advancement. Nonetheless, this is mitigated by the passing of the 1970 Equal Pay Act and 1975 Sex Discrimination Act, highlighting progress in the government's approach to protection of female employment. This must be given weight in not only granting equal pay on par with men, a clear advancement as women previously earned 15% in industries such as Dagenham, but also monitored workplace discrimination. Nonetheless, equal pay did not guarantee equal opportunity, as only 50% of married women were in work by 1970, indicating whilst government action legally protected economic status of women, this did not manifest into a change in society. ~~At~~ the limitations of government

action are further reinforced by consistently minimal female political representation, as female MPs remained constant at 20-30, revealing male dominated power structures in government hindered substantial improvements in the role and status of women.

The involvement of women in the war effort must be considered, in laying the precedent for an improvement in economic status. Whereas previously 2/3 of women remained confined to the domestic sphere as traditional values prevailed, the involvement of females in traditionally male dominated industries, such as the chemical industry where females grew from 11% to 33% in 1939-45, highlighted the skill and competence of women in the economy, also empowering women through the provision of opportunity. This brought to attention the issue of inequalities in employment pre-WWII, and thus the female employment in the war effort can be given greater weight than government action, as though government action removed the structural barriers of female employment through the marriage bar post-WWII, the pressure for this was borne

out of involvement in war work. However, the impact of war is limited as Betty German's 'squeezed like sardines in suburbia' highlights the return to domestic life postwar, reinforced by a 1965 survey by Viola Klein highlighting 60% of women continued to be employed in unskilled work. Nonetheless, the impact of the war can be regarded with significance given advancements in education rooted in the 1942 Beveridge Report. Where previously Oxbridge and university education was an upper class privilege, the shift in consensus towards a more egalitarian system, where spending for university education would grow from 1 million pounds in 1919 to 80 million by 1962; highlights increasing opportunities in education for women, laying the groundwork for an improvement in their status through allowing greater economic opportunities. Yet, this is undermined by the persistence of traditional values, where only 13% of Oxbridge students were female. As such, equal opportunity is undermined by conservative values, giving weight to the political consciousness

generated by the women's liberation movement in altering such attitudes.

The women's liberation movement must be given significance in advancing the role and status of women through both pressuring legislation and generating a political consciousness which would alter traditional values. This is highlighted in the activism by females such as Germaine Greer's *Female Sexuality*, pressuring government action in the realm of personal freedoms and sexual liberation beyond the narrow economic focus previously held. This is highlighted in the 1976 ~~the~~ Domestic Violence and Matrimonial Proceedings Act, imposing trials and injunctions for assaulting a spouse, revealing the material outcome of the political consciousness and practical aid offered by the Rape Crisis Centres and Crisis Women etc. Whilst it may be argued this is indicative of the continued oppression of women, that this placed female oppression on the national agenda and pressured government action must be given weight. Further, given the 1968 Dagenham Machinists' strike for equal pay predates

The 1970 Equal Pay Act, it is clear government action was borne out of female activism. The role of government action is further undermined by its regressive nature, as though the 1967 Abortion Act legalised abortion up to 28 weeks, this was followed by an Amendment in 1971 by James White limiting it to 20 weeks, with the 1979 Carre Bill limiting the grounds for abortion further. Rather, the continuation of campaigns, including the National Abortion Campaign and socio marching in protest of the Carre Bill must be given greater weight, as government restrictions on female personal freedoms were met with opposition. As such, given government action was borne out of pressure from women's liberation, expanding rights beyond the acceptable into personal freedoms, this must be recognised as the main reason for female advancement.

On balance, whilst government action can be viewed as the legislative framework protecting the economic status of women predominantly, this cannot be given

weight when assessing the pressure this was borne out of, and the failure of secure advancements to manifest as a change in attitudes. Rather, the work of the women's liberation movement must be regarded as the main reason for advancements in the role and status of women, by generating a political consciousness that placed personal freedoms on the national agenda, driving government action beyond the previous narrow economic focus. Whilst the impact of the war can be seen as a catalyst for economic advancements, this did not yield significant impact given the prevalence of traditional values limiting opportunities in the workplace, giving weight to the women's liberation movement which would drive a change in these attitudes, as well as pressure government action.



This response demonstrates many of 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 examine the reasons for improvements in the role and status of women across the period, demonstrating knowledge and understanding of a range of issues. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is a well-substantiated overall evaluation.

## Question 2

Question 2 was the less popular of the two within Section A, although the majority of candidates were able to respond to the demands of the question sufficiently to reach levels three and above.

A range of detailed evidence was used to explore the issue of cost. Responses were typically stronger on the general economic context, recounting issues such as IMF involvement and the growing stagflation of the 1970s, and the growing demands of welfare budgets, often citing amounts or figures as a proportion of GDP compared to earlier in the period to demonstrate how this had grown. Most tended to centre on healthcare for this, although a good number showed awareness of unemployment and pensions. The strongest tended to be more secure in drawing on specific knowledge of economic challenges at various points in the 1960s and 1970s and relate these to welfare provision in order to explore and evaluate the extent to which cost was the main driver, eg consideration of the Wilson government's abolition then reintroduction of prescription charges. A good number also referenced predictions of costs when the welfare state was expanded earlier in the period and set this against the reality of this in the 1960s and 1970s, and in some cases developed this to explore the extent to which the public's growing expectations were part of the challenge. In considering alternatives to the question's proposition, the most commonly offered arguments concerned the growing challenge to consensus politics, especially from the right, with some detailed analysis of how this became influential to some extent in the Conservatives both under Heath in power, and under Thatcher in opposition. A number also examined changing attitudes amongst the public such as a reduction in support for collectivism, and in smaller number of responses, concerns over state intervention. Other responses considered the influence of monetarists, beliefs that welfare was inflationary and created a dependency culture, and discussed the influence of individuals such as Keith Joseph.

What determined the success of responses beyond this tended to be, the ability of candidates to develop reasoning with detailed knowledge to support and explore arguments relating to cost; the degree of focus on the given time period, with a small number of responses losing focus from the question and detailing the setting up of the NHS at length; and the ability to give some breadth to the answer, eg go beyond cost in relation to just the NHS. The strongest responses were also typically able to explore the relationship between different factors.

In the years 1964-79, challenges arrived regarding the provision of welfare that had ~~been~~ become a crucial part of British people's lives since after WW2. Although the general public was keenly in favour of retaining ~~welfare~~ these benefits, for the governments in the mid 60s to late 70s, it became a point of contention. Some of the challenges to welfare provision were the cost, party opposition and ~~left~~ want to break away from consensus. The main challenge to welfare was opposition from both parties.

One of the challenges to welfare provision were cost related difficulties. ~~The~~ During the mid sixties Britain faced substantial economic decline, which had continued until the 1980s. The use of Stagflation - direct control over the economy by the government - as a means to control the economy had, among other things, led to Britain becoming known as the sick man of

Europe: The governments in control ignored the declining economy until it was too late. ~~Therefore, these governments had~~ The cost of maintaining the welfare state - NHS and benefits - had become a point of contention when many MPs wanted to get rid of it. However, despite the opposition it had, the cost of the welfare provision put into place could not cause the collapse of it. The general public were extremely supportive of welfare provision and were willing to pay the taxes to fund it. The cost of welfare provision had little effect on it because ~~the~~ all governments in power during this time period were aware of the high stakes it held. Keeping welfare provision despite the cost and economic downfall showcases that money was not the problem with keeping it.

Another challenge to welfare provision

was Party opposition. On both sides of the Political Spectrum, ~~ideologi~~ political ideological challenges cried. These ~~or~~ either particularly either left or right wing disagreed with how the provisions were carried out and what the extent of them should be. Many in the Conservative Party felt the support offered to people by the government was too 'coddling' and caused people to become lazy and unwilling to work. On the other end, many in the Labour party felt further provision should be made and wanted Britain to become a socialist state. This was the main challenge for welfare provision because it faced criticism from both the left and right. Both sides had many who felt it was not being handled correctly. A large majority were generally supportive of the welfare provisions, but criticism from either side

caused contention about it.

Lastly, another challenge to welfare provision was the rising dispute about breaking away from consensus. Trade union disputes and the economic difficulties faced led to the debate among governments over whether breaking away from consensus was the right thing to do. When discussing breaking away from consensus, the topic of welfare provision came up and many felt that <sup>welfare</sup> social benefits should not be given to a large percent of the unemployed. However, the NHS remained something that should not be taken away. Other consensus policies (such as keeping a positive relationship with trade unions) were at more debate and caused more strife and problems for the governments in this time period.

Overall, political opposition was the main challenge to welfare provision in 1964-79. Although the problems with the cost of it did cause some debate about the need for it, the people of Britain were happy to keep funding the welfare state and the cost was hardly an issue. Comparatively, those on either end of the political spectrum disagreeing with how it was done about ~~did~~ ~~to~~ did cause contention about the welfare provisions because a lot of people felt it could be done better.



This response shows most of the qualities of level 4. There is an overall analytical focus, and issues are explored to some degree. Sufficient knowledge is offered to develop arguments, although some areas could be developed further. Judgements show reasoning, and the overall judgement is substantiated.

### Question 3

Question 3 was the marginally more popular of the two within Section B, and produced a wide range of responses. The majority of candidates were able to select from a range of issues and focus on changes to the political landscape. Commonly considered issues included the decline of the Liberal Party, the rise of the Labour Party, the continued significance of the Conservative Party, and the advent of consensus over welfare and economic policy, along with related issues such as the expansion of the franchise, the significance of the Westminster system in effectively producing a two-party system, the limited influence of non-mainstream parties and the extent to which different economic and political priorities and policies featured at different times. Where candidates kept such material focused on the demands of the question, they were able to have success.

Less successful responses often had some knowledge and understanding of issues, but lost focus on the question or offered limited chronological range, eg cases where responses detailed the decline of the Liberals in the 1920s with limited extension beyond this, and thus were not sufficiently focused on the chronological demands of the question. Responses in general seemed weighted towards the interwar period. In some other cases, candidates explained ways in which the political landscape changed, but with limited exploration of the counter argument.

Stronger responses again reflected good understanding, and whilst they often had detailed contextual knowledge, they were often more selective in their deployment of this towards an assessment of the degree of change across the wider period. Many responses were successful in reaching the upper levels by organising material around, say, three sections, and within each, examining an issue which covered a broad span of time, exploring arguments for and against, and reaching judgement on the extent to which there was a transformation on that given issue.

The highest attaining responses were more convincing in their analysis of the key issues; these 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 transformation.

I think that it is very accurate to say that in the years 1918-79, the British political landscape was transformed. This can be seen through the changing party fortunes in the interwar period, the creation and break down of the post-war consensus in Britain, and finally the ~~the~~ disagreements and changes in the 1970s as industrial unrest and strike action grew.

Firstly, it is crucial to consider how the changing political fortunes in the interwar period contributed to a transformed political landscape by 1979. This can primarily be seen through the ~~the~~ decline of the Liberals and the rise of Labour. When the Conservatives broke the war-time coalition with the Liberals in the 1922 election as they felt strong enough to govern on their own, they left a party that was so damaged by the war time split between Lloyd George supporting the coalition and Asquith, <sup>(who didn't)</sup> that they were never able to recover and become electable again. In 1922 Labour, <sup>the new</sup> ~~the new~~ and rising party of the working class, overtook Liberals as the main opposition - this was a huge transformation as it had been Conservative-Liberal for the past two centuries. Another important development in the interwar period was the 1918 Representation of the People Act, which tripled the electorate and allowed 8 million women and 6 million men previously enfranchised. This ~~it~~ contributed to a ~~the~~ transformed political landscape as it became a battle about who could respond to electoral changes ~~the~~ in the best and quickest way. The answer was Conservatives and they dominated the interwar period. The inability of the Liberal party to adapt to ~~the~~ social and electoral changes further contributed

to their downfall, and Labour struggled as the working class who could now vote were not interested in politics. However they did have two governments in this period, <sup>slowly</sup> strengthening their credibility as a government fit to run the country. ~~Therefore~~ Therefore, it could be argued that it is very accurate to say that the political landscape in Britain was transformed in the years 1918-79 - in fact, it is possible to argue that in the interwar years alone the political landscape was transformed as drastic changes were made to the party system and the dominating rival against the Conservatives.

secondly, it is important to explore how the political landscape was further transformed during the second <sup>world</sup> war and into the post war era. Following the wall street crash and economic problems Labour had endured since 1929, the Labour government fell in 1931 and a National Government was formed. This laid the groundwork for the popular post war consensus as this coalition was continued wartime and led to a general agreement between the parties on political principles in the post war years. It can be argued that this further transformed the political landscape in Britain as in the 1950s especially the main parties were in general agreement, especially in creating the welfare state and establishing a National Health Service, <sup>in 1948</sup> However, on the other hand it could be argued that this was not a transformation but a return to 1918 and the wartime coalition that dominated the First World War, between the Conservatives and the Liberals. Overall, it is possible to conclude that although during the war there was a coalition similar to that in the First World War, ~~therefore~~ the British political landscape was ~~is~~ transformed in the years 1918-79 because the post war

years saw a consensus between the main parties - and a popular one too - agreeing to an extent that hasn't been seen before or since. In the 1950s and 60s Britain experienced a degree of prosperity with both parties committed to full employment and state intervention in people's lives + keep inflation low (Keynesian economics).

However, this coalition unfortunately broke down in the late 1960s and 70s, transforming the British political landscape once more. Dominated by rising inflation and economic challenges, as well as increasing problems of industrial unrest, the two main political parties were forced to react in very different ways. As the party of the working class, Labour relied heavily on trade union funding and therefore found it very difficult to resist their demands. The Conservative party, on the other hand, disagreed completely, arguing that unions had too much power. Edward Heath in particular tried to break the post-war consensus and split away from Labour and to the right by introducing some radical changes to Wilson's incomes policies to fix Britain's economic decline. Unfortunately his cuts to government spending just fuelled inflation and he was forced to make a U-turn in policy. Therefore, it is possible to argue that by 1979 the political landscape in Britain had been transformed once more as economic problems forced the parties to take contrasting views in order to limit them. In 1979, people were disgusted and frightened by the impact of industrial relations and strike action and thought unions had too much power, - radical Conservative Margaret Thatcher promised to do just that.

In conclusion, I think that it is very accurate to say that during the years

1918 to 79 the political landscape in Britain was transformed because despite some similarities especially during the two world wars, by 1979 the political landscape was completely different to 1918 - the party fortunes had been transformed, Labour had risen to a fit government to run the country and was now starting a move to the right, and the Liberal party had declined to unelectable. The only similarity was the Conservative dominance throughout the period - despite some years of Labour in power



This response demonstrates some of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with good knowledge to explore these, if not fully. Confident and substantiated judgement are offered as to the extent of change. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

## Question 4

This was the marginally less popular choice of question in Section B, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within levels three and four. The main discriminating factors in the success of responses was the range and depth of knowledge, particularly with regards to addressing the question's timeframe, and the degree to which responses were focused on the conceptual demands of the question, particularly with regards to the second-order concept of significance. Those candidates who marshalled the material they had to offer towards an analysis of change and continuity were most successful.

Most candidates were able to offer some material on a range of issues, including car ownership, paid holidays, the start of cheaper travel abroad, road building and spectator sports. Some did so in general terms. In contrast, more successful responses were able to demonstrate how the car went from being what was essentially a plaything of a minority to mass ownership, offering a consideration of how car ownership changed over the period, and relating this to an examination of the extent to which it improved leisure and travel. With regards to other factors, popularly cited examples included the Holidays with Pay Act, developments in spectator sport, the impact of television, overseas travel by air, and holiday camps such as Butlin's. At the higher levels candidates were able to analyse the relationship between different issues, such as the rise in car ownership, cheap charter flights and holidays abroad, or the popularity of spectator sports and the impact television had on how sport was consumed, or the relationship between cinema attendances and television.

Stronger responses were more likely to address more of the time period, and a good number considered a broad range of relevant issues across the period. Some responses did tend to cover the key issues but in a more illustrative manner, with a small number providing detailed accounts of developments across the period, with less focus on significance.

For the strongest responses, of which there were a significant number, candidates produced informed, analytical responses. Responses attaining the highest levels were able to discuss the various ways in which car ownership was significant, and weigh this against other issues. Such responses were also evaluative in reaching substantiated judgements.

It is accurate to say that agree with the statement and say that the growth of car ownership was the most significant development in leisure and travel from 1918-79 as it ~~was~~ led to the growth of a variety of other industries such as UK holidays, advertisement and travel as a whole. Whilst the growth of cars is ~~is~~ the most significant factor, other factors such as the growth of Butlins and the growth of holiday allowance must also be considered, as they were also important in the development of leisure and travel in these years.

When considering what is the development of car ownership was the most significant factor, it must be considered whether leisure and travel would have grown to the extent it did without it, and what developing leisure and travel actually is - such as more people going on holiday, more access to holidays and leisure, and more destinations. When measuring the factors of car owner-

ship, Butt Bublin's and the growth of holiday allowance against these ~~criteria~~<sup>criteria</sup>, it is clear that the growth of car ownership was the most significant development in leisure and travel from 1918-79.

Firstly, it must be considered how important the growth of car ownership was to the ~~gross~~ development of leisure and tourism. Prior to cars, horse and carts were the primary form of transport, however the numbers of these fell, and by 1937 there was only 12000. Cars on the road by 1939 numbered 2 million, and the growth of this ownership stimulated other industries such as roadside advertisement on billboards, and travel agencies developing leisure and travel.

The 1930 Traffic Road Traffic Act allowed governments to control traffic with lights, roundabouts and one way roads, along with removing speed limits on all but the most dangerous stretches of road, and making third party insurance compulsory, however this led to average deaths of 4800 a year, so the act was

unattended in 1934 and imposed the need to take a driving test, and a limit of 30mph in built up areas. This act provided much safer ~~driving~~ driving, and encouraged more road users with less risk of accidents, and so led people to travel to more destinations, such as the Lake District, with 72000 travelling there every year in the 1930's, a place previously inaccessible ~~by public~~ as public transport was scarce. Therefore, the ownership of cars allowed more people to travel to new destinations, and therefore developed leisure and travel from 1918-79. It is also arguable that without the growth of car ownership, leisure and travel wouldn't have developed to the extent it did.

As another factor, the growth in allowance of holidays must also be considered in the development of growth and leisure. After WW1, the only group in society with access to holidays were the upper class, meaning that leisure and travel was quite limited. However,

throughout the 20th century, holiday rights grew, and by 1925, 1.5 million working class workers had access to two weeks paid holiday, causing a surge in travel around the UK. Blackpool was a popular destination, and as a cheaper alternative, families stayed in boarding houses run usually by widows - there were 4000 solely in Blackpool. With growing rights as workers and holiday entitlement, more people could access holiday, go on holiday, and go to places they had never been to before - therefore ~~was~~ developing leisure and travel. However, there was some disparity in holiday entitlement, as less working class were able to go on holiday than middle class -  $\frac{1}{5}$  of working class were able to but  $\frac{1}{3}$  of middle class were able to - this suggests that the impact of holiday entitlement on development of leisure and travel was limited, however it still allowed some development. Whilst this is a significant factor in the development, it is arguably not as important as the growth ~~as it improved holiday access~~

as car ownership, ~~as even with paid holidays, with limited methods~~ as is you had no car, even if you had paid holidays, access to travel was limited, and this therefore suggests that travel and leisure wouldn't have developed to the extent it did without car ownership.

Another factor which undeniably had ~~the~~ impact on the development of leisure and travel was the growth of Butlins and its impact on holidays in the UK. Established in 1936 in Skegness, Butlins provided 'a week's holiday for a week's wages', providing family holidays with accommodation, 3 meals a day and entertainment. By 1939, the Skegness and Clarton camps were providing for 100,000 people a year, and suggests how many people went on holidays due to Butlins, showing it developed leisure and tourism. In the 1960s, 6 more camps were established, and it was seemingly popular. However, in the 1960s and 70s it declined, giving

way to other ~~hot~~ holidays such as caravaning (with 90 models of caravans available in 1934) and foreign holidays in the 50s and 60s. ~~Despite~~ Butlin's ~~decline~~ decline was due to its routine feeling like an army camp for some. However, despite the decline, Butlins was the first 'resort holiday' and undeniably led to the growth of new ideas for holidays in new destinations such as Spain, Portugal and the Mediterranean - with 14 million travelling abroad by 1959. Whilst Butlins led to more people going on holidays, ~~it~~ and more access to holidays as they were cheap, it is arguably not as important as the growth of car ownership as without this, access to Butlins would have been limited, and families wouldn't have been able to see roadside advertisements of Butlins's, suggesting leisure and travel wouldn't have developed to the extent it did without car ownership.

Overall, it is evident that the growth of car ownership was the most significant

development in leisure and travel from 1918-79 as it allowed industries such as advertisement and travel to flourish, ~~as well as~~ and so had lasting impact. Whilst it is arguable that holiday entitlement was another significant factor, drastically improving holiday entitlement, it is not as important as the growth of car ownership, as even if you didn't have a car, travel was limited even with holiday entitlement. Furthermore, the growth of Butlins as the first resort holiday from 1936 was significant in developing leisure and travel as new locations led to more people going on holiday and to new destinations, however without the ~~develop~~ growth of car ownership, travel to Butlins and other destinations would not have ~~extended~~ <sup>developed</sup> to the extent it did, and therefore shows car ownership was the most important factor in the development. When considering if Butlins or holiday entitlement was more important as a second factor, it is arguable that holiday entitlement was, as no one would have been able to travel to Butlins without this



This response demonstrates some of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with good knowledge to explore the significance of the various developments. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

## 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 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 candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, eg how Extract 1 essentially argues that the policies of the Thatcher government significantly changed Britain, reducing the state's role, enacting economic policies such as privatisation and in general rejecting the social democratic consensus, or how Extract 2 argues that the Thatcher governments did not shift public attitudes as they had hoped to do, saw limited success in some policy areas and that many of the changes in the period were unrelated to or unwelcome by the Thatcher governments.

Where candidates were less successful, this tended to be (i) limited use of contextual knowledge, or offering valid contextual knowledge, but with limited linkage to the discussion of the views, or (ii) a tendency to describe and explain the extracts and see them more as sources of information, rather than attempt to discuss and assess the arguments they offered. Thankfully very few responses became side-tracked in an attempted analysis of the provenance of the extracts.

Candidates' knowledge and understanding of issues was generally sound and varied. The vast majority were able to identify the conflicting arguments of Kavanagh and Morris (E1) and Jackson and Saunders (E2), and a good number built their success on establishing the essential differences at the outset of the response, giving a sense of early structure and coherence to their responses. A good number also made use of select phrases in and quotations from the extracts that could be developed by candidates. A small number did cite details or statistics from the extracts with limited development of these, but most were able to at least attempt discussion, eg typical responses explored Extract 1 in relation to contextual knowledge of restrictions on trade unions or policies such as 'right to buy', or Extract 2 in relation to Edward Heath's attempts to implement policies that could be argued to have been an earlier break with the consensus. Some points within the extracts were more commonly used than others, eg very few candidates examined Extract 2's point regarding the declining vote share of the Thatcher government. The vast majority thankfully avoided neglecting the extracts at the expense of own knowledge, eg producing a response where contextual knowledge leads and where a phrase from the extract is then added on by way of support. Rather, the majority were extract led, identifying and attempting discussion of these views.

A discriminating factor in success was to some extent the deployment and development of knowledge offered, ie the difference between referencing an issue with contextual knowledge linked to the extract, and, at the higher end, exploring this in relation to the precise focus of the question, and assessing the validity of argument. With regards to judgement, it was pleasing to see a substantial number of candidates offer reasoned and considered assessments of the merits of both arguments, regardless of their ultimate decision. Overall, Question 5 produced a strong response from a good number of candidates.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Thatcher governments significantly changed Britain?

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

(20)

Historians have disagreed to what extent Thatcher's governments changed Britain. Morris argues that ~~that~~ there were very few aspects of the 'old consensus' that stayed the same, with Thatcher making sweeping changes both economically and socially. Jackson however argues that Thatcher's government didn't change Britain, due to the already changing policy direction of previous governments, and the transient <sup>impact</sup> ~~presence~~ of Thatcherite principles on the country. On balance, it is clear to see that Thatcher's government did significantly change Britain, as is evidenced by the radical policies she implemented and the impact this had on the future political landscape.

Morris argued that "only the commitment to the National Health Service remains of the old consensus. This is partially convincing, gives Thatcher's caution to upset public opinion ~~and~~ by changing the NHS too much, she actually increased spending in the early years. In the post war consensus, the NHS was the 'jewel in the crown' in the welfare state, and it is arguable that its continued ~~the~~ reliance still demonstrates this. However, Morris is less convincing in this argument as Thatcher did make some changes - she encouraged people to take out private health insurance, and introduced the idea of ~~internal~~ trusts to create an internal market, in theory increasing competition and efficacy. This massively increased spending on managerial positions to 381 million. Overall, Morris here is only partially convincing - changes were made with

markets but didn't have the effect of rolling back the state, so could be said to still be in line to an extent with the old consensus.

Morris also argues that there was change through "restrictions on trade unions, ~~the~~ income tax cuts and privatisation". <sup>This is convincing as</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>the sweeping</sup> reforms included Employment Acts 80, 82 and 84, which reduced unions' ability to call strikes; she also stood up to Scargill in the 1984-5 miners strike. She cut income tax from 80% - 63-40% from 1980-81 and favoured indirect taxation through increasing VAT 8-15% - this was regressive and hit the poor harder. Moreover, through the MINIS she was able to abolish the Civil Service department and reduce civil servants by 22.5%. ~~In addition to that~~ However, this is <sup>could be seen as</sup> ~~arguably~~ less convincing, as some here argued that Heath attempted free market economics, and ran an anti union election in 1975 under the

phrase 'who governs Britain?'

Overall however, this is still arguably convincing due to the changes made from the post war consensus of large state, to rolling back the state through civil service and tax cuts.

Mom's finally argues that there was a social change through an increase in "share ownership" and "middle class households". This is convincing given Thatcher's privatisation of British Gas and BT in 1984 and 86 (among others), causing the number of shareholders to increase from 3-11m. Moreover, the 1980 Housing Act led to the Right to Buy scheme, which saw the sale of around 400,000 council houses. Despite this, the convincingness can be limited; only 9% of labourers owned shares compared to only 50% of professional moreover cuts to welfare meant that many people got poorer

rather than became part of the middle class - welfare lower decrease from 61-53% of average pay.

Overall, Morris is on balance still convincing, gives the large economic changes brought through her policies.

Jackson however argues that Thatcher didn't significantly change Britain. He <sup>examines</sup> suggests Thatcher's "ideological arguments" didn't ~~pers~~ persuade the electorate of Thatcherism. In contrast to the ~~post-war~~ <sup>post-war</sup> consensus, Thatcher prioritised a small welfare state and didn't pledge full employment. <sup>Jackson is convincing</sup> ~~However~~ <sup>as he</sup> argues that the public were not convinced of its arguments, hence an expansion of the welfare state through high education spending and the introduction of the minimum wage by Blair. <sup>As well as SNP and Plaid Cymru</sup> ~~However~~ <sup>therefore</sup> this is arguably not very convincing -

Thatcher ~~eventually~~ moved the centre ground right, evidenced by Blair's New Labour principles of indirect taxation, privatisation and continuing with Thatcher's trade union legislation, as well as use of PFI. Moreover, the electorate support for this is seen in the unpopularity of Foot's hard-left policies in the 1990s.

Jackson also argues that "many of the social and economic developments that occurred were in progress before Thatcher took office". This could be seen as convincing due to Heath's support of free market principles and of trade union reform - he passed the Industrial Relations Act 1971 that tried to suppress unions, as well as running an anti-union election in 1975 to try and take back control. However, this is arguably less convincing,

due to the popularity of TINA in  
top 1979, and Heath's <sup>& Callaghan</sup> failures to  
break away from consensus that led  
to the Winter of Discontent - it wasn't  
until Thatcher that economic and social  
reform comprehensively occurred.

Jackson finally argues that the  
public were not influenced by Thatcher's  
moral <sup>and personal</sup> principles - "personal borrowing  
increased dramatically". This is convincing  
as the 1986 Big Bang led to more risky  
mortgages, so by 2001 1/5 families  
were struggling with debt, mortgage  
debt having increased from 43-235bn.  
This is in contrast to Thatcher's wish  
for popular capitalism and for every-  
one to take responsibility for the  
economy. Overall, Jackson's <sup>convincing</sup> ~~is limited~~  
~~partially convincing~~ - ~~but~~ ~~some~~  
~~reasons~~ it is arguable that Thatcher  
~~really~~ significantly changed Britain -  
this can be seen through the po-  
tential Thatcherist principles of New  
Labour, so and the contrast between  
that the economy of the post war

consensus <sup>and</sup> ~~emphasised~~ Thatcher's state reducing policies.

To conclude, it is clear that Thatcher's government significantly changed Britain. Both ~~the~~ ~~the~~ policies changed through privatisation, civil service and tax cuts, as well as attitudes, with <sup>Thatcherist principles</sup> ~~Thatcherist principles~~ adopted by both Blair's New Labour and major Conservatives. Whilst it could be argued that there were limited elements of consensus, for example some state intervening methods, ~~on~~ and non-support of Thatcher (especially devolved nations with an increase in SNP and Plaid Cymru's support in later years), on balance the elements of significant change considerably outweigh ~~these~~ this. Thus, Morris' argument can be considered most convincing through his emphasis on the significant economic changes especially that Britain experienced.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear grasp of the demands of the question, and a secure understanding of the views in the two given extracts. Arguments and issues raised are analysed, and contextual knowledge is clearly used to discuss the views. The response clearly discusses the interpretations, and reaches substantiated judgements.

## 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 (eg main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explaining 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
- Focusing carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable themselves 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 – eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance where when responses:

- Answers which pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, eg 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
- Where a response does not give sufficient consideration to the given issue/proposition in the question (eg looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg 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, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg 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, eg. 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, eg 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, eg 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>

