

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_1H_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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, rather than an analysis and evaluation of precise demands of the question, 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.

Two other issues were evident which impacted upon candidate performance. Firstly, there were responses where candidates offered analysis which was in some ways detailed and extensive, but partial, in the sense that it only addressed some aspects of the question's demands. An example would be a causation question, where the response explores the reason, but does not sufficiently relate this to the outcome, e.g. question 1, analysing aspects of the decline of the traditional industries (and other factors), but with only limited exploration of how this related to changing industrial relations. Secondly, many candidates opted to include material from across the specification to explore particular issues, from beyond the theme which a question most obviously targets. This can be perfectly valid, as is the nature of the thematic course. Question 2 on living standards, and question 4 on welfare, are examples of this, drawing directly from themes 4.1 and 2.1 respectively, but allowing candidates to draw on material from elsewhere in the course. However, when doing so, candidates need to ensure they demonstrate how any

material is relevant, keeping analysis focused, and would be advised to ensure that coverage of such material is not simply a substitute for that which is more directly obvious.

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 the 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 (i.e. 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 less 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 relevant issues.

The vast majority were able to offer material on the decline of traditional industries, typically setting this in the context of events and developments such as the after effects of the war, Red Clydeside, the Triple Alliance, the 1921 Miners' Strike, and most commonly, the General Strike. Other factors that were frequently put forward included government policies, including the passing of the Trade Disputes Act of 1927, the return to the Gold Standard and subsequent leaving of this in 1931, the impact of the First World War, the Great Depression, the development of newer industries and the regional shift in employment, and rearmament. Material was generally stronger on the earlier part of the period, as may be expected, although more secure responses were more likely to pay heed to the question's chronological timeframe.

A key factor in the quality of responses was the degree to which issues covered were related to the stated outcome. Less successful answers described or explained the decline of traditional industries, but struggled to link this or other factors to changes in industrial relations, with limited development, or assertion that it led to problems with industrial relations. Stronger responses were more able to make the link between whatever factor they were explaining, e.g. 'the decline of traditional industries' and link that to specific examples of changes in industrial relations, e.g. the general strike and its consequences. There were some extremely strong and knowledgeable answers, exploring the whole time period, with some being able to argue that towards the end of the period the push towards rearmament reinvigorated traditional industries. Stronger responses were often able to explore the relationship between different factors, e.g. the relationship between the war, global conditions and the fortunes of the industries which saw strike action in the 1920s in changing industrial relations. A minority also made astute distinctions over the developments and divisions within the trade union movement, alongside changing relations between workers and the government.

In the period 1918-39, the interwar period, relations ~~with the~~ the government had with the trade unions declined. There was a decline in heavy industries such as coal, shipbuilding, and steel works. Whether the two were intrinsically intertwined or not, ~~or if this was a symptom, not a cause~~ or if there were other factors which affected heavy industry, will be judged based on the longevity of each factor (if it impacted relations industrial relations for a long time). What were the underlying causes ~~which~~ which led to relations with the trade unions deteriorating, such as the economy, and the short term vs long term impacts of each cause.

It could be ^{moderately} accurate to say the decline of the traditional, heavy industries were the main reason behind the decline in industrial relations. This is because they can be directly attributed to the miners' strikes that occurred in the period. One of these was the Miners strike in 1921. This occurred because ~~of a~~ the heavy industries were not competitive enough. In world war one, we stopped trading & advancing the machinery involved in these heavy industries and started using them for the war effort. This meant that after the

(Section A continued) war, they used old, outdated technology that could not compete with the similar quality, but cheaper resources coming out of places such as Japan and West Germany. The industry that was the worst for this was coal, which was reliant on international trade. ~~Instead~~ Coal had also been nationalised during the war, and afterwards, given back to the mine owners. ~~Because~~ Instead of modernising the technology, to save money, mine owners laid people off, and reduced their pay and ~~hours~~ hours. Due to this, the workers struck. They asked the train and dock workers to strike with them, ~~but were~~ so the country could not import coal, but they did not accept this. ~~The outdated machine~~ so the strike failed, and the workers had to accept a 30% trade decrease. The outdated machinery was a direct cause of this. The mine owners would not have had to cut costs if their methods were more innovative, and this would have avoided the strike. Also, outdated heavy industry would continue to be an issue after the war, so it is a long term, lasting factor, and clearly an underlying cause.

On the other hand, whilst the decline of heavy industry was a significant factor, an arguably more significant factor was the return to the Gold Standard, pushed by Churchill in the 1920s. This was significant because ~~attaching~~ Britain was forced to leave the Gold Standard.

(Section A continued) prior to World War one, because the cost of the war was too expensive, which meant their gold reserves were too low to cover the cost of the currency. Returning to it in 1926 meant that value was added back to the pound, which made the price of ~~good~~ British goods internationally look more expensive. This again hit the coal industry the hardest, so mine ^{owners} ~~workers~~ chose to cut pay and hours again. ~~This~~ This caused the workers to once again strike, but this time, the TUC (Trade Union Congress) supported the strike. This led to the General Strike in 1926, which was not technically a General strike, because only industrial workers in the TUC chose to strike, and some of them still went to work. This lack of organisation, no clear plan from the TUC, and government organisation, caused the strike to fail. Famously, the government prepared for the strike by involving the army and the navy, the latter of which put 2 battleships on the Mersey river in Liverpool. The strike itself may have failed, mainly because the government had been prepared ^{ing} ~~ed~~ for a year, as shown by the 2 battleships, but its cause can be partly attributed to the Gold Standard. However, this lacked longevity, as Britain left the Gold standard in 1937. Its cause can once again be attributed to the decline of heavy industry as an underlying cause, because if the coal industry had been modernised, its increase in price would have been less of an issue.

It may not have been either of the previous two factors. Instead, the cause could be attributed to the Industrial

(Section A continued) relations act. This was an act by Stanley Baldwin, British prime minister in the ~~late~~ 1920s. The act was intended to prevent 'sympathy strikes', as spurred on by the previous two miners strikes. This was the idea that people could not strike for another industry. For example, if the coal workers were striking, the ~~steel or~~ rail workers could not strike for an issue they were facing. This prevented further turmoil in the interwar period, as after this act was put in place, there was no more major strike action. This changed industrial relations by killing major strike action during the Great Depression where millions were unemployed. However, this policy lacks longevity, as it was later overturned in 1945 by Clement Attlee. It was a relatively short term factor, as it only ~~was~~ was implemented in the middle of the period, and happened as a result of the strikes, which happened because of the decline of heavy industry. ~~This makes~~ It was not an underlying factor, and was only short term.

In conclusion, the decline of heavy, traditional industry in Britain caused a number of changes to occur, one of which being an overt hostility from the trade unions, which were ~~generally~~ generally only prevented by their own disorganisation, and not the government. It was the only significant, underlying factor that continues to be a long term issue.

(Section A continued) even after world war one and two, which makes it a significant cause of declining industrial relations.



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

Question 2

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

Candidates were asked to examine whether living standards saw improvement in the years 1939-79, and most were able to focus to some degree on the second-order concept of change. The vast majority were successful in demonstrating a range of sound knowledge, which was in the main focused towards the analytical demands of the question. Issues which were commonly found included the growth in earnings across the period, the development of consumerism, employment, changes in housing standards, and the impact of the welfare state. The significance of relevant periods within the timeframe were also considered, notably the impact of the war and subsequent austerity, the relative prosperity from the 1950s and economic stagnation in the latter period.

A high proportion of responses considered issues from different parts of the specification, e.g. healthcare, education, regional differences, women, immigration and race, developments in popular culture, and leisure and travel. Where candidates could convincingly relate these to the issue of living standards, these could be rewarded. However, there were a number who wrote extensively on such issues, producing passages that were more descriptive, with relatively limited analytical focus. It was also the case that candidates who had a more secure grasp on issues such as employment, real wages, consumerism and other aspects of material comfort tended to produce stronger responses. Within such responses, there was impressive knowledge and analysis of the extent to which wartime and post-war constraints impacted living standards, the extent to which it could be said that people 'never had it so good' in the 1950s, discussion of the notion of Admass, and the extent to which economic conditions in the 1970s saw conditions stagnate or even decline.

A minority of responses did tend to approach this along the lines of a causation question, identifying factors bringing improvements, with explanation of these and some link to living standards. This could have some success, although in many of these responses it was limiting insofar as there was less discussion of the extent to which standards improved.

In the years 1939 - 79, overall, living standards did improve as following the first World War, Britain was in a state of recession and unemployment, and by 1979 when Thatcher came into power, unemployment had lessened, there was less class disparity, and people had more opportunities. Historians would argue that living standards improved in these years due to the development of new housing e.g. high rise flats and the Gyalibur Estate, the increased opportunities for minorities e.g. the Race Relations Acts, and the fall in unemployment e.g. 215,000 under Eden. However, historians would argue that living standards did not improve in these years due to the poor quality of the housing e.g. Airey houses, the number of people still living under the poverty line, and the conditions within Britain e.g. 1978 Winter of Discontent. Overall, historians would agree that living standards did improve, as although there were still problems with poverty and inequality, these had decreased significantly by 1979 and showed a trend of improvement overall.

Firstly, historians would argue that living standards did improve in the years 1939 - 79, as in 1939, poverty was widespread and there was significant regional inequality across Britain. In London, unemployment was 12%, and in Wales, unemployment was 40%, despite the efforts taken in the 1934 Special Areas Act to provide additional support to deprived areas.

(Section A continued) The 1936 Jarrow Crusade highlights how extreme and dire the situation was for many people, as they were deprived of food and necessities, and this continued into 1939. Following the start of the war, however, when Churchill was appointed, he made a commitment to full employment, so the majority of the country was involved in war work and were therefore crucial in securing Britain's victory. 500,000 people were involved in manufacturing, building arms and vehicles e.g. Spitfires for the Battle of Britain. Women worked in the industry too, with 80,000 being part of the Women's Land Army. This commitment to full employment meant living standards increased, as people became employed and contributed to the war effort, and without their contributions, Britain would not have secured victory and therefore living standards would have catastrophically plummeted under Nazi rule. Although rationing was very unpopular in Britain, this did also lead to a rise in living standards as the quality of life of people improved due to eating a healthy diet and only being allowed limited supplies of food e.g. 1 egg a week. This improved the health of the nation, therefore showing an increase in living standards. In 1945, pre-fabricated houses such as the Fcailibur Estate were built, offering people more affordable housing options, showing an increase in living standards as less people were homeless and living in poverty. The construction of high-rise flats also provided another housing opportunity for people, as in 1966, Shelter was formed and showed that thousands of people were still homeless and

(Section A continued) needed options for housing.

Historians would also agree that living standards increased following the introduction of the NHS in 1948, as this offered free, universal, comprehensive healthcare which significantly improved the health and welfare of the nation, showing an increase in quality of life and living standards as people were living longer; life expectancy for men increased from 65 to 70, and for women increased from 70 to 77, showing that people were living longer, fuller lives and the healthcare system had revolutionised living standards from its inception. Before the NHS, healthcare was expensive and inaccessible for many working-class people due to this, whereas after it was introduced, working-class people had access to the same healthcare as other classes, reducing inequality. The number of prescriptions grew from 6 million in June 1948 to 13 million in September 1948, showing the demand for the service and how it helped so many people, a significant difference from the Poor Law hospitals that existed prior.

Historians would also agree that living standards improved due to the fall in unemployment and the increased opportunities for minorities. Before WW2, unemployment was high and was exacerbated in deprived regions such as South Wales and Tyneside, but following WW2, in 1955 under Anthony Eden, unemployment reached its lowest ever

(Section A continued) figure of 215,000 people. This represented a significant change, as due to the post-war consensus and commitment to full employment, the number of people living in poverty and unemployed fell, indicating an improvement in quality of life as more people could engage in consumerism and afford other services they wouldn't have been able to previously e.g. transport. Minorities also had an improvement in their standards of living following the Race Relations Acts of 1965, 1968 and 1976. These meant that it was illegal to discriminate against people based on their race, and put emphasis on this in the housing industry. When compared to earlier years, where minorities had to declare themselves to authorities and were only allowed into Britain if they had a job waiting for them (Commonwealth Immigration Act 1968), this represents a significant improvement in living standards as minorities now had more opportunities and ability to live a better life without facing discrimination and the colour bar.

However, historians would disagree that living standards improved, as during WW2, with rationing, people were severely limited in both food and clothes, meaning they became dissatisfied with the government. People faced starvation as German U-boats sank British supply ships, and rationing continued even after the war had ended, resulting in a reduction in the quality of life as people had scarce supplies for many years and became close to starvation. Also, during the

(Section A continued) war, 2 million homes were destroyed, leading to an increase in homelessness and poverty and therefore a decline in the standards of living in Britain. Their solution was to build more pre-fabs, but these had problems with cold and damp and were therefore not suitable for sustained living. They were known as Airey houses. In Manchester, 80,000 slum houses remained, and in deprived areas, unemployment was still high and poverty was rife. Although the NHS improved healthcare, it still had regional inequality and some areas received inadequate services. The inverse care law took place, where people in Wales and deprived areas needed more help but had less access, whereas people in London and affluent areas needed less help but had more access, exacerbating the already poor living standards of the working class and increasing class disparities.

Historians would also disagree that living standards improved as by 1979, the most damaging winter ever had struck Britain, paired with the Miners' Strike of 1972, putting Britain in a state of turmoil. The Miners' Strike had Arthur Scargill using flying pickets at power stations, reducing Britain's electricity output by 25% at a time when Britain had run out of coal and oil. This caused a state of emergency and a 3-day working week, impacting employees who were earning less and couldn't provide, therefore worsening poverty and worsening living standards. The Winter

(Section A continued) of Discontent in 1978-79 was also extremely harmful to Britain, and was accompanied by Ford workers striking for a pay increase. This exacerbated its effects, leading to further damage to the working class and a fall in the quality of life, making Callaghan's poll rating drop to 69%.

Overall, historians would likely argue that living standards did improve overall across this period, as starting in 1918 and moving to 1979, the quality of life of people increased significantly through the NHS and Race Relations Acts, and from 1939, when unemployment was high, this figure also fell by 1979. Although there were several instances where quality of life decreased e.g. Winter of Discontent, these were only temporary and the overall trend was a sustained increase in living standards.



This response demonstrates the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with sufficient knowledge to explore these. The candidate takes a broader approach, but is successful in relating associated issues to the given issue of living standards. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, evaluating the extent of change. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 3

Question 3 was the more popular of the two within Section B, and produced a wide range of responses, with the vast majority able to offer sufficient development of valid material to attain the middle to higher levels. Most candidates understood the comparative nature of the question. There were different approaches within this, with some treating this as two periods, i.e. 1918-39 compared to 1939-79, whilst others broke the latter period into smaller periods. Either approach was valid. What tended to distinguish the stronger responses was a tighter focus. Some less successful responses offered detailed descriptions and explanations of issues, but were less clear in developing this in relation to significance, and ultimately relative significance.

It was common for candidates to discuss the impact of World War One and the increasing suffrage of the 1920s in their 1918-39 section. A smaller number explored legislation such as the Sex Disqualification Act or the Matrimonial Causes Acts of the inter-war period, and in general it seemed candidates had greater awareness of related legislation from the 1960s and 1970s. With regards to the latter period, most could offer some discussion of the role of World War Two and the role of government policies such as the Divorce Reform Act, Equal Pay Act, Sexual Discrimination Act and the Abortion Act. A smaller number considered the significance of the liberalisation of society, the impact of changes in education, and developments such as the availability of contraception. Others also successfully made use of knowledge relating to issues such as the Dagenham Strike. In general, candidates seemed more informed on the latter period.

As well as the degree to which these were focused on an analysis and evaluation of significance, one factor determining the success of responses was the quality and precision of knowledge, e.g. on issues such as the impact of war and employment, some responses offered precise details, such as employment numbers and emphasis on the types and nature of work done, whereas others wrote about these in more general terms, of confused material relating to the two wars for example. Some candidates debated thematically and looked at economic, political and social progress, offering a comparison of the periods framed within these themes. A small minority discussed how later gains ought be judged against different standards, insofar as they were made possible by earlier ones which changed attitudes. In the main, this did seem to be a topic for which candidates were well prepared.

The view that in the years 1918-79, the most significant advancements in the role and status of women were those seen in the years 1918-39 can be argued to be accurate to a limited extent. To arrive at this conclusion, the relevant factors of political, economic, and social advancements in the role and status of women can be assessed on how profound and wide spread they were between 1918-39 compared to between 1940-79.

The economic advancements in the role and status of women can be used to argue that those which occurred between 1918-39 were not the most significant. By 1928, most women were employed in clerical or household related jobs such as maids. By 1940, 80% of the female workforce was widowed, divorced, or single. This is because of entrenched perceived roles of women within society, as being unable to perform in more academic fields of work, and that it is unsuitable for a married woman to work. The only advancements made against this notion ~~occurred~~ between 1918-39 was because of war. Due to WWII, many women joined the workforce,

(Section B continued) and this advancement continued until slightly after WW2. As men reentered the workforce, most women returned home as housewives, illustrating the advancement made was superficial. Conversely, between 1940-79, much more profound advancements in the economic role and status of women were made. In 1944, the ~~teaching~~ marriage bar for teachers ended; until then, a female teacher had to resign if she ~~was~~ got married. This was followed by the end of the marriage bar in civil service in 1948. The 1968 Ford Dagenham strike prompted the Equal Pay Act in 1970, which was backed by the TUC. The Sex Discrimination Act in 1972 also banned discrimination against women in the workplace. However, it could be argued that advancements in the role and status of women were not most significant between 1940-79. The 1970 Equal Pay Act only came into action in 1975 as a prerequisite for Britain to join the EEC. The Sex Discrimination Act was weakly enforced, and women still faced immense discrimination in the workplace. Nonetheless, it is clear that advancements made between 1918-39 were superficial and easily reversed, and that advancements between 1940-79 were much more entrenched and widespread. Therefore the view that between 1918-79, the most

(Section B continued) Significant advancements in the role and status of women were those seen in 1918-39 is accurate to a limited extent.

The ~~political~~ social advancements in the role and status of women ~~between~~ can be used to argue that those seen in 1918-39 were not the most significant. During the 1920s, little advancements were made within the social sphere for women in society. The 1937 Matrimonial Causes Act allowed for divorce to occur, although the criteria for this to happen was very limited (desertation for more than 3 years, both spouses cheating). The divorce law was revised in 1939 however, and this did lead to significantly more autonomy for women, as the number of divorces occurring drastically increased. Conversely, between 1940-79, significantly more social advancements in the role and status of women were made. The 1970 Abortion Act legalised abortion, and by 1972, 80% of abortions carried out were without medical grounds. The legalisation of the contraceptive pill also provided women with increased sexual freedom. By 1948, the Church of England allowed its married members to use contraception, which the Catholic church opposed, and doctors were also allowed to give contraceptive

(Section B continued) advice to couples for the first time only. However, it could be argued that ^{social} advancements in the role and status of women were not most significant between 1940-1979. The National Register for Isolated Housewives was created in 1967, which found many women felt trapped in their homes, which acted as 'comfortable concentration camps', suggesting insufficient advancements made in women's social lives. Increased sexual autonomy was also largely available to upper class women. For example, despite legalisation of contraceptive pill and abortion, safe ^{operations} ~~access~~ ~~was~~ ~~hard to~~ were hard to access for working class women, suggesting advancements were not widespread. Nonetheless, the legalisation of abortion and contraception themselves profoundly enabled women in their social life. Between 1970 and 72, the number of women's organisations in London grew from 4 to 28. While divorce was legalised between 1918-39, the advancements between 1940-79 for women socially were much more profound and widespread. Therefore, the view that between 1918-79, the most significant advancements in the role and status of women were those seen in 1918-39 is accurate to a limited extent.

(Section B continued) Finally, the political advancements in the role and status of women can be used to argue that those seen between 1918-1939 were not the most significant. Compared to social and economic advancements, more political advancements were made for women between 1918-1939. The Representation of the People's Act (ROTPA) 1918 allowed for home owning women above the age of 31 to vote, and the ROTPA 1928 allowed all women over 21 to vote. Over ~~200,000,000~~ 3 million women were enfranchised. The ability to vote allowed women to be politically represented. Women also became MPs; the number of female MPs peaked at 15 in 1931 between 1918-1979. ^{Conversely,} Between 1940-1979, the number of female MP candidates continued to grow. Margaret Thatcher becoming the leader of the Conservative party and then Prime Minister in 1979 is a extremely profound political advancement in the role ~~of~~ and status of women. However, it could be argued that the political advancements in the role and status of women between 1940-79 were not most significant. Despite an increase in the number of female MP candidates, the proportion of female MPs did not rise. Political advancements remained rather stagnant between 1940-79, suggesting they were not profound. ~~the lack of~~ Nonetheless, the lack of female

(Section B continued) MPs arguably negates advancements made by the 1918 and 1928 ROTA; without women to accurately represent them in parliament, a woman's vote lacks significant power to help advance the role and status of women, suggesting advancements made between 1918-39 are limited in significance. The rise of Thatcher as the Conservative Party leader is arguably the most significant advancement for the role and status of women between 1918-79. Therefore, the view that between 1918-79, the most significant advancements in the role and status of women were those seen in 1918-39 is accurate to a limited extent.

To conclude, the view that the most significant advancement between 1918-79 in the role and status of women were those seen in 1918-39 is accurate to a limited extent. The advancements made by women during WW2 ~~on a large~~ was superficial and easily reversed, whereas between 1940-79, advancements such as ~~the~~ equal pay and laws against discrimination were entrenched and significantly more profound. Similarly, ~~also~~ many more advancements were made between 1940-79 than 1918-39 for the social role and status of women, including increased

(Section B continued) individuality, and bodily autonomy. There were comparatively more political advancements than social ~~and~~ economic between 1918-1939, but the stagnant nature of these advancements ~~was~~ arguably ~~untrue~~ the ~~reverse~~ effect of gaining the vote due to the lack of political representation. Therefore, between 1918-39, advancements made in the role & status of women between 1918-39 were not most significant.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question, with a real grasp of the need to compare the relative significance of developments in different periods. 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 and examine changes to women's role and status. The argument is logical and well organised, and there is relative evaluation.

Question 4

This was the less popular choice of question in Section B, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within levels three and four. Candidates were asked to make a comparison between welfare policies in the years 1945-79 with those in the years 1918-39.

A mix of responses were offered, with two issues tending to discriminate with regards to the quality of these. The main one of these was the quality of knowledge offered. Some responses were hampered by limited knowledge of the provision of welfare, particularly in the earlier period. Stronger responses were able to offer both a range and depth of information, with more common issues being policies towards the unemployed, pensioners and other aspects of provision under the national insurance scheme, family allowances, and relevant aspects of healthcare. Many made reference to the Beveridge Report, and whilst some seemed uncertain as to how to relate this to the question's demands, the vast majority used it successfully, typically to see it as demonstrating a change in approach which set the foundation for a different approach in the latter period. A good number of stronger responses showed detailed understanding of issues, such as the distinctions between dole payments and insurance, the means test, the Unemployment Assistance Board, changing approaches to funding and the scope of provision in the post-war era, with the increase in taxpayer funding and new measures such as family allowances, and the development of welfare in the face of challenges by the 1970s.

Some candidates would have benefitted from being more judicious in their selection and deployment of material. Many candidates chose to include material on healthcare, housing and education. Where this was demonstrably framed in relation to welfare provision, it could be credited. However, in some cases, this material lacked focus.

The second issue evident in a proportion of responses was the extent to which responses were focused on the demands of the question. A number of responses offered valid knowledge which, to a lesser or greater extent, was not targeted towards a comparison of provision in the two periods. Where candidates were able to structure the knowledge they offered within an analysis of the extent to which, say, unemployment policies were different, they were more likely to make better use of the knowledge they offered.

In the years 1918-39, there were significant attempts to advance a welfare state, with the government beginning to accept its role of state intervention, but this was limited by the Great Depression. On the other hand, the provision of welfare exponentially increased in the years 1945-79, with the welfare state only being reduced later in the period. The ~~ex~~ extent of the similarity of these periods will be judged based on their ideological similarity, what they did to extend the provision of welfare, and what limited this.

One thing which was quite similar across the two periods ~~was~~ was the ideological similarity. Both periods began after the end of a Total War, and began with the government more accepting their role of state intervention. In the period 1918-39, the government introduced the Insurance Act. This was an extension of the previous insurance Act in 1911 1906 by the Liberals. Both acts allowed people to pay into an insurance pot, which they could withdraw from if they became unemployed. The initial act limited this to very few industries, so that only 10% of workingage men could withdraw from it. However, this new act in 1928 ~~also~~ ensured more workers were included. Additionally, the government promised ^{for} soldiers returning

(Section B continued) from the war, they would have 'homes fit for heroes' that they could return to. This is similar to the ideology of the period 1945-79, which furthered the idea of state intervention, made more accepted by the pseudo socialist government of world war 2 (with things like rationing, limitations on the freedom of the press, etc.). ~~This~~ Clement Attlee's government ~~1945-51~~ 1945-51 promised welfare 'from the cradle to the grave', which the previous period was beginning to accept.

~~On~~ The previous points, which supported the ~~idea~~ ^{idea} that the 2 periods were similar due to the ideological similarity, ignores the massive limitation of the interwar period: The Great Depression. As previously mentioned, the government provided Britain with the Insurance Act. However, they did this at a time where the Great Depression was beginning. This meant not enough people had contributed to the pot before millions more were unemployed, leading to it quickly draining before the government was forced to ~~of~~ cover the cost through taxation. This led to them being forced to ~~set~~ resort to austerity, which Ramsay MacDonald, the first labour prime minister, refused to do, so he resigned. This led the coalition government to introduce the incredibly unpopular Means Test in 1931. This was a humiliating process whereby after 6 months of receiving benefits, a person ~~was~~ would have to reapply, and

(Section B continued) to be accepted they had to prove they were looking for work, had no other savings and have their homes searched. Everyone's income would be counted, even young adults, so they would have to leave home, and even their food would be investigated. It led to many people losing their benefits, and it was highly humiliating. Additionally, the promises of 'homes for heroes' were also not met. They built some homes, but were still left with a 300,000 shortfall, limiting the success of the provision of welfare. This showed how the interwar period's success at providing welfare was limited in comparison to the post war period, even though there were some initial attempts at change.

On the other hand the post war period was more successful at implementing welfare change. This can be attributed to people remembering the failure of the interwar period, and the ~~Be~~ incredibly popular Beveridge Report of 1942, which a lot of the post war consensus was based on. The Beveridge Report ^{said the government should} ~~promised to~~ look after people 'from the cradle to the grave', which the government promised to, and identified the five evil 'Giant's of society', all of which Clement Attlee tried to tackle. These were: ignorance (which Attlee tried to tackle through education reform, namely the Butler act in 1945); squalor (which he tried to tackle through housing, namely the New Towns act); ~~idle~~ idleness (which he tackled through ~~unemployment~~ unemployment acts); disease (which he dealt with using the National

(Section B continued) Health service Act of 1948); and want (which he tackled through benefit programmes such as the family allowances act) - this allowed women to have an independent income because of their children). All these acts were formed on the basis of the failures of the interwar period. People remembered the embarrassment of the means test, and the homeless soldiers who had medals. This portrays the two periods as opposing. They had minor ideological ~~and~~ similarities, but in practice, they did little to extend the provision of welfare due to the limitation of the Great Depression.

In conclusion, the period 1918-39, or the interwar period, laid the basis of the ideology that would form the welfare state. However, it had too many limitations with the economic decline of the Great Depression to ever be considered similar to the extent of the welfare state, and the post war consensus, which laid the groundwork for Clement Attlee to establish a welfare state which was continued by the Conservatives in 1951. The postwar period of 1945-79 ~~was~~ did more in terms of the welfare state, and was more successful, not ~~at~~ that similar to the interwar period.



This displays many of the features of a good level 4 response. The candidate deals with the given issue of welfare, and offers a response which is largely focused, and developed using sufficient knowledge. It thus demonstrates an awareness that this needs to be focused on comparison. The response goes on to marshal material to explore these issues, and reasoned judgements are reached.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to understand the differing arguments in the two extracts, and then explain and discuss these using their own knowledge, and thus the vast majority of responses reached the middle and higher levels. Very few responses simply used the extracts as illustrative support, or paraphrased. The strongest responses maintained a sharp focus on an evaluation of the given views, and tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Stronger responses were also more likely to make use of the extracts in their introduction and conclusion. A small minority did attempt to analyse provenance or approach the extracts in a manner akin to an AO2 exercise.

Most candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2. Stronger responses picked up on the nuances in the arguments and were more careful in their analysis of this. A minority tended to recognise broad arguments, but treated these in a way so as to distort them, e.g. Marr's claim that 'people... became much wealthier' was disputed by some as outright untrue, whereas stronger responses were able to explore exactly which groups did or didn't see increases in wealth, and in what sense. In this vein, those who were able to go beyond sweeping generalisations of rich and poor, or upper and working class, and explore the variation, and indeed the changes that took place within the social classes, were those best placed to offer a reasoned analysis of the views. Those with knowledge and understanding of notions such as 'Essex man' were placed to explore such issues effectively. Those who perceived Thatcher's policies as only benefitting the 'rich' or 'upper class' tended to assert that claims like that of Marr cited above were simply untrue. A number of responses were successful in taking a thematic approach and exploring the views within this, e.g. with sections organised around issues such as unemployment, privatisation, or other economic policies.

Candidates' knowledge and understanding of issues was generally sound and varied. Most candidates were able to develop references to issues such as 'right to buy', 'share/property owning democracy', privatisation, unemployment, inequality, and the reduction in the power of the trade unions. Most candidates demonstrated a sound understanding of the tenets of Thatcherism, and responses across the levels were able to offer statistics and other evidence. Most used them judiciously to support their arguments, and there was much evidence of integration of own knowledge. Less successful responses tended to demonstrate more limited linkage between knowledge and the views in the extracts, or added knowledge but struggled to frame this in relation to the question's demands. For example, many cited the miners' strike in relation to extract 2's reference to trade union 'rights being stripped away', but some lacked convincing development in relation to people being better off. There are also still a number of candidates who seem determined to set out and 'side' with one view over another, but in doing so, fail to fully discuss issues, and offer argument and evidence which is one-sided. Stronger responses were able to address these issues by a more thorough discussion, e.g. exploring the issue of trade unions by examining both the extent to which those in unionised industries were indeed the victims of the Thatcher governments, set against the context of the impact of problematic industrial relations that Thatcher inherited.

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.

SECTION C

'LOCAL GOV
'POPULAR CAPITALISM
'TAX CUTS AND WEALTH

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 British people were better off as a result of the Thatcher governments?

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

(20)

The idea of the British people being "better off" could be fairly subjective. In economic terms, Marr highlights the increase in property ownership and 80% increase in personal wealth as evidence of increased economic prosperity. However, Todd takes a different, less positive view, arguing that the British people became worse off - the "bargain struck" by the post-war consensus was stripped away through welfare reforms and increasingly centralised government control. Overall, I would agree more with Marr's view, taking an economic focus - many of the issues raised by Todd can be put down to other factors, for example "greater insecurity" referring to the closure of old industries that had long been unsustainable. The emphasis on "popular capitalism" and privatisation did succeed in promoting greater personal responsibility, while Todd's argument around local government could show success in moving services such as housing to central government, leading to greater fairness

across the nation and successful initiatives such as "Right To Buy", as well as combating local "loony left" policies.

A key area of Thatcherite reform was ^{the} local government - Thatcher believed that local authorities had become overly powerful and that local residents' "limited power" had been used to promote policies such as the imposition of vegan school meals and progressive teaching. She therefore took action to centralise control - a key example was the 1986 Local Government Act, deconstructing larger authorities and, most notably, abolishing the left-wing GLC in London. It could be argued that this was appropriate, especially when considered with other reforms - Marr identifies the role of "increasingly un-unionised" private companies, and councils such as Wandsworth were encouraged to outsource their work, for example school catering. However, Todd does highlight the undemocratic nature of some of these reforms - power over services was "previously exercised" by residents, but councils ~~from~~ ^{post} 1986 had an incentive to sell them to the lowest bidder, potentially reducing service quality and removing direct oversight. However, "right to buy", which also removed control from local

councils, handed it straight to the occupants of council houses - this refutes Todd's argument around loss of democratic oversight, and supports Marr's idea of increased wealth and a "property owning democracy", where personal responsibility and prudence would lead to meritocracy and success.

Another key area of reform was the idea of "popular capitalism" - during the post-war consensus, most major industries had been nationalised - Thatcher saw them as bloated and inefficient, while critics such as Todd saw them as having solved the "hard times" of inter-war unemployment and industrial strife. A programme of privatisation therefore dominated Thatcher's term, most notably British Gas from 1981. Shares were sold off to the public at a discount, in this case using the slogan of "If You See Sid, tell Him" during a national advertising campaign. This undoubtedly succeeded - Marr correctly identifies that the proportion of share-holding adults rose by 18% in Thatcher's 11-year term. However, the idea of this leading to a pro-private sector attitude or sensible democracy is refuted by Todd's focus on economic insecurity, as well as by the argument that the 1980s saw a "get rich quick" culture, where

shares were bought and sold for personal gain rather than for any sense of personal responsibility or interest in company success. This is supported by Todd's view of the economy as "low-wage" and irresponsible.

Another area of reform was on taxation and welfare spending - there was a seismic shift away from progressive taxation and deficit spending on welfare, and towards regressive taxes. In the 1990 Budget, for example, VAT was doubled from 8.5% to 17%; while the top rate of income tax was slashed by 20%. This supports Todd's view of changing Conservative beliefs, and an abandonment of the focus on ~~error~~ full employment. However, I would suggest that this was already taking place - the Labour government under Callaghan 1976-79 made deep spending cuts, pursued an ultimately unsuccessful policy of wage restraint, and began to tackle the benefit trap. I would therefore argue that the "beer gain" suggested by Todd was already coming to an end - as identified by Callaghan in a 1976 speech, Keynesian economics are unsustainable over long periods, so the focus on spending cuts can be seen as pragmatic. However, this argument, along with Marr's that Labour politicians "despaired"

to match the economic changes working is weakened by the fact that government spending actually increased by 8.4% in the first 2 years of Thatcher's term. However, this also refutes Todd's idea of benefits being cut when Thatcher came to power - they were kept the same until 1986, which caused much of the 1981 overspend. It has been suggested that Thatcher benefitted from the 20% tax on oil in the North Sea - a stroke of luck ~~rather~~ rather than personal pragmatism.

Another issue highlighted is that of trade union rights being "stripped away" - this is a supported argument, as Thatcher's governments banned wildcat and sympathy strikes. A ballot was also required for "closed-shop" union practices from 1983, increasing the limitations on union action. However, Marr argues that the decline in union power is less significant than the increased prevalence of un-unionised industries. This is also supported, as the decline of traditional industries led to more roles in unskilled industries such as call centres and newly built shopping centres, reflecting the newly popular consumer goods Marr identified. However, this allows us to argue that Thatcher

presided over a general decline in the quality of British employment.

Overall, therefore, I would strongly support Marr's argument that Thatcher made British people "better off" from an economic view - she increased personal wealth, and laid the groundwork for Britain's move to a service-based economy. However, Todd's view is useful in identifying some negative socio-economic impacts of her policies, such as the move to a "low wage economy" - this worsened under Major's governments, particularly after the ERM crisis significantly weakened the pound and cut people's real earnings. Overall though, I would support Marr's argument. Economic problems with Britain's reliance on old heavy industries had been present since 1918, and Thatcher was pragmatic in preparing Britain for the modern economic reality, ending decades of "relative decline". This made the average Briton better off, particularly when compared with other Europeans, and gave access to new luxurious consumer goods.



This Question 5 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) It offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views. (2) It uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views. (3) It is focused on the precise issue (whether the British people were better off) rather than the general controversy and (4) 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
- 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—e.g. 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, 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
- Where a response does not give sufficient consideration to the given issue/proposition 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 or 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>

