



Examiners' Report

June 2024

GCSE History 1HI0 12

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2024

Publications Code 1HI0_12_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

Candidates had clearly been well prepared for this examination in terms of both their knowledge of specification content and the skills required for this paper. Examiners noted that many answers showed confident treatment in both sections, the Historic Environment and the Thematic Study, and there seemed to be relatively few unfinished papers.

Nevertheless, many of the following comments are made every year and remain relevant. As a general point, centres should remember that the Thematic Study focuses on change and continuity over time and therefore a good sense of chronology is vital. Candidates should be familiar with the names given to the different periods in the specification and recognise the dates and key events involved in these chronological divisions. They also need a clear understanding of the key themes and the factors involved in the Thematic Study, as identified in the specification

- governments and individuals
- science, technology and communications
- attitudes in society.

It is also important to remember that this is a Thematic Study in British history. Comments about the war in Vietnam or Nazi policies about women during the Second World War are not relevant and cannot be rewarded.

In the extended answers, the stimulus points are usually intended to remind candidates to cover different aspects of content and the full timescale of the question. Candidates do not need to include these stimulus points in their answer but they do need to cover three aspects of content in order to show breadth in their answer and to access the higher marks.

A number of answers to these questions remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. The mark scheme's bullet point for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) at Level 4 expects an analytical explanation, directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question. Candidates who responded to the topic rather than the key idea were unlikely to achieve high marks. Those who did reach Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus, which the analysis should address.

While the target for the 12-mark question is an explanation of causation, there is no expectation that causes will be prioritised or evaluated and no marks are available for such comments. However, in the 16-mark questions there is an additional element of judgement. Many candidates structured their answers in questions 5 and 6, to discuss points supporting the statement in the question, then points challenging the statement, before offering their judgement. In a number of answers, this resulted in a judgement that summed up the two sides, with the conclusion that the statement was 'somewhat true' or 'true to an extent'. This is a logical structure and can be very effective but for the higher marks, the criteria being applied needs to be explained and the judgement needs to be consistent with the overall answer. In high scoring answers, the application of appropriate criteria included an explanation that some aspects had a longer lasting impact, more people were affected, a factor acted as a catalyst for other developments, and many high-scoring answers had a sense of evaluation running throughout the answer so that judgement was not just restricted to comments at the start and end of the answer.

GCSE History specification and assessment changes

This note is a reminder that minor changes are being made to the Pearson Edexcel GCSE History specification content and assessment model: assessment and language changes apply from the June 2025 exam series onwards, and content changes from the June 2026 exam series onwards.

We strongly recommend, if you haven't already, that you familiarise yourself with these changes in time for the start of the new academic year in September 2024. Some options are affected more than others, but all options are affected by the assessment changes.

Below is a link to the summary guidance document, which will help you to find all the specific information and guidance available to help you take on board these changes:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/History/2016/Teaching-and-learning-materials/gcse-history-changes-for-2025-and-2026-summary-guidance.pdf>

If you have any queries, please contact Mark Battye, our History subject advisor, at TeachingHistory@pearson.com.

Question 1

The key feature named in the question is always something that is in the specification. Extensive knowledge is not needed but it is important that candidates know something about everything in the specification, so that they can add a further detail which will explain the feature or provide some context. They should make sure that the additional detail provided is linked to the key feature that has been identified and also that different material is used in the two sections of the answer.

When candidates had written two sentences for each feature, it was easy for examiners to identify and reward the feature and the additional detail; if the answer consisted of just one sentence it was sometimes hard to distinguish whether additional detail had been provided, while answers which listed four disconnected points of information were limited to a maximum of two marks.

Students should use the mark and the space in the answer booklet as a guide for the length of their answer. There were relatively few answers that continued beyond the lined space but these were often wasting time as the answer had already scored the full 4 marks and no further marks could be awarded. Where the candidate was unsure about the answer, the additional comments were usually irrelevant. Consequently, it was very rare for additional comments to gain any marks.

This question on the significance of London as a target for German attacks was intended to be accessible for the whole range of candidates. Answers suggested that as the centre of government or the site of many factories and warehouses, attacks on London would weaken Britain's war effort. Other answers suggested that attacks on the royal family, the large population of London and large-scale destruction, would all weaken morale. Some answers also noted that London's proximity to the Channel made London an easy target for planes from Europe or that the Thames provided a guide for the German pilots.

There were very few blank answers but a few did not provide relevant supporting detail. Students should be clear that the additional detail needs to be linked to the stated feature. Other answers that could not be rewarded wrote about the Blitz in general or the precautions being taken such as evacuation or the provision of Anderson shelters.

Centres should note that the format of this question will be different next year as candidates will be asked to provide one key feature and supporting detail for each of two questions.

1 Describe **two** features of the significance of London as a target during the Blitz.

Feature 1

London was the city with the largest population in Britain, with many landmarks of cultural significance such as St Paul's Cathedral, making it an ideal target for bombers who aimed to damage morale.

Feature 2

London was home to the Government, making it a target as it was where most of the planning made by the Government occurred and where significant figures in our war effort stayed.



The answer offers 2 valid points, each with valid supporting detail. In the first answer, there are actually two valid points – that London is a big city so bombing would create a high number of casualties and that destroying significant landmarks would affect morale. The second answer is also valid: bombing London, where the government is based, would affect the conduct of the war.



Signal the additional detail clearly, by starting a new sentence or using phrases such as 'which meant that'.

1 Describe **two** features of the significance of London as a target during the Blitz.

Feature 1

because its the biggest city in UK and also capital

Feature 2

London has the most population in UK, ~~also~~



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Two valid points are offered but both of them lack supporting detail. The answer simply states that London is the capital and a big city but there is no explanation of why that made it a target. The second answer says that London has the most population but without an explanation of why that was significant in making London a target.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you can identify two features of everything named in the Historic Environment specification and provide some additional detail.

Question 2 (a)

The Historic Environment has a focus on the process of history, considering the value of sources as evidence and the way an historian follows up an enquiry. It is nested within the context of the Thematic Study and therefore knowledge of both the specific and the general context is expected.

It is important to note that the question asks about the usefulness of the sources in relation to a specific enquiry, in this case, an enquiry into dealing with the effects of German attacks during the Second World War. Answers describing the nature of the Blitz or measures such as evacuation and the use of air-raid shelters missed this focus and were unlikely to reach Level 3.

It is also important to note that the focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned and sources should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation. Students should also recognise that unreliable sources can be very useful, depending on the focus of the enquiry.

Contextual knowledge is mentioned at every level of the mark scheme and failure to include it limited a number of otherwise good answers. However, it should not simply be offered as additional information. Contextual knowledge should be relevant to the enquiry and used to assess the source, for example, to provide detail that confirms or challenges something mentioned in the source, to add weight to an aspect of the provenance, to place the source in a broader context, or to assess whether the source gives an accurate view or shows a typical situation. It is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the student's own knowledge – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that contextual knowledge. When contextual knowledge was used effectively, there were insightful remarks concerning Black Saturday, fire watchers and wardens, incendiaries, V2 rockets and 'Blitz spirit'.

The question asks 'how useful' the sources are, so a judgement should be made on the usefulness of the source's evidence for the specific enquiry. At the lower levels, answers identified information contained in the source that was presumed to be useful because it was relevant to the enquiry, or they listed limitations in the content coverage. Low level answers also asserted that a source was reliable because of the date it was produced, because it was from an eyewitness, or stated that its usefulness was limited because it was biased, only one person's view or was simply a 'snapshot'.

Level 2 answers were often detailed explanations of the way the sources contained useful information or the significance of the provenance. However, it should be noted that answers cannot reach the top of Level 2 without contextual knowledge.

At Level 3, comments need to assess the usefulness of the sources for the enquiry, weighing the value of the content in the light of the provenance and integrating the candidate's own knowledge. Various criteria could be used, for example accuracy of detail, reliability, the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, and how representative the source is.

There is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Candidates who focused on comparisons between the sources often failed to develop their judgement on each source properly; if this approach is used, it is important that the answer still comes to a judgement on each individual source.

Very few answers only considered one source but it should be noted that every level of the mark scheme refers to 'sources' and therefore answers which do not consider both sources cannot access high marks.

The sources used in this enquiry produced a range of good comments about the difficulties of the Fire Brigade in dealing with large fires – this could be seen by the number of firemen working in Source A, the equipment they were using and the fact that the warehouse appeared to have been gutted by the fire and efforts were concentrated on preventing it spreading. Some candidates dismissed this as a snapshot that only gives us a view of one moment in time, not recognising the value of a visual image in showing the scale and ferocity of the fire. Source B was used to suggest the physical destruction caused by V2 rockets, the problem of rescuing people from collapsed buildings and the involvement of a teenage boy in the rescue of a girl trapped in the rubble.

Candidates need to read the provenance carefully and use it thoughtfully, rather than making generic comments. The attribution for Source A said the photograph was taken and used by the Fire Brigade yet a number of answers stated it was unreliable because it was government propaganda or had been staged. Similarly, many answers stated that R Simmons' memory of the event would be unreliable after 50 years or because he was only a boy at the time – but the attribution said his account was based on a diary he kept at the time. Better answers focused on Simmons' purpose in giving this account at a later date, sometimes speculating that this was to commemorate the role of communities during the Blitz. As a general point, anything included in the attribution is intended to help candidates consider aspects of the provenance of the source.

2 (a) Study Sources A and B in the Sources Booklet.

How useful are Sources A and B for an enquiry into the difficulties in dealing with the effects of German attacks on London?

Explain your answer, using Sources A and B and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source A looks at firefighters dealing with a warehouse fire in London, which is important for an enquiry as it shows a group effort and how London off acts as a team to deal with the affects of German attacks.* I know this is accurate as London was split into 28 boroughs, each with its own firefighting squad, with teams of volunteers acting as firefighters to put out fires caused by incendiary ~~and~~ weapons. The provenance makes this enquiry useful as it is a photo showing a moment in time of the firefighting scene. As it was kept by the Fire Brigade rather than being used in a newspaper, it means its more likely that this photo isn't set up to create the image that London is dealing with the German attacks effects, and is actually a real ^{and accurate} representation of whats being done ^{which makes it useful}.

Source B looks at an account of a V2 attack from R Simmons, which is important to an enquiry as it shows the difficulties of ~~german~~ German attacks, come from the impact of humans on the war, and how the Germans attacked the people which prevented them fighting the Germans back, a difficulty of the Blitz. I know this is accurate as the German bombers targeted

different areas of London, including residential areas rather than just the East End factories and ports, as targeting civilians lowered civilian morale, which is what the Germans wanted to do to ensure an easy takeover of Britain. This evidence comes from a first person account, which makes it accurate as he experienced the effects of war directly. Even though it's 50 years after war, it's still accurate as he would remember a key event in his life, however it may miss a few key details.

* Also it is important as it shows the difficulty of dealing with German attacks through the Germans targeting large, hard to deal with buildings that support our war effort massively.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer discusses the sources' content and considers the significance of the provenance, using contextual knowledge to add weight to the value of the sources. It is also concise and focused.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Instead of making several points about the source content or provenance, make sure you cover all three strands of the Assessment Objective (source content, contextual knowledge and provenance) when evaluating the source utility.

2 (a) Study Sources A and B in the Sources Booklet.

How useful are Sources A and B for an enquiry into the difficulties in dealing with the effects of German attacks on London?

Explain your answer, using Sources A and B and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source A is very helpful because it shows how the fire brigade responded to the attacks and what they did to prevent major damage from spreading due to the fire. The photo also shows how many members of the fire brigade responded to a fire of a large size. This helps us to learn about the difficulties faced during this time due to the large fires starting from the bombs and it also shows some insight into how busy the fire brigade were, even from the early days of the attack.

Source B is helpful because it tells us about the damages caused by the V2 attacks towards the end of the war, it also tells us about the services that responded to the bombings and how they helped. This helps us to learn some of the difficulties as it also tells us that because the writer was "reasonably small" that

That he ~~was~~ was used to "crawl into
one pile of wreckage" This shows that even
though there was designated rescue services, they
still required help from the public. This gives us
insight into the struggles of the community even
towards the end of the war and the bombings.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer focuses on the usefulness of the content of each source. There is no discussion of provenance so it remains in Level 2. There is a small point of contextual knowledge in the reference of Source B being in the early days of the Blitz.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure contextual knowledge is used to evaluate the usefulness of the sources.

Question 2 (b)

This question should be treated as a package linked to the enquiry that was identified in question 2a (difficulties in dealing with the effects of bombs during the Second World War) and the aim is for students to show that they understand how historians work. The first sub-question asks them to identify a detail from the source that could form the basis of a follow-up enquiry; this was most commonly done by quoting a phrase from the source but a clear reference to the source content is also valid. Students should be aware that a detail from the provenance cannot be rewarded.

Students then have to propose a question they would ask to follow up Source B in relation to the overall enquiry. Consequently, the proposed question should be broader than following up a very specific person or event mentioned in the source. It should also not be a question they would ask the author of the source questions about the specific bomb attack or how R Simmons felt about being involved in the rescue attempt. These were not related to the broader enquiry about difficulties in dealing with the effects of bombs in London. This failure to recognise the link to a broader enquiry may limit the marks available for this question, since it also affects the suggested source they said they could use to follow up their enquiry.

While it is recognised that students cannot have detailed knowledge of all possible sources, the specification states that students should be aware of the types of sources available and the nature of the information they contain. Answers such as 'government records', 'Mass Observation' or 'other diaries' are too generalised to be rewarded. In some cases, where a generalised source was named in sub-question three, a mark could be awarded because the explanation in the final sub-question made it clear what sort of information might be located in those records and how that information would help the historian with the overall enquiry. For example, identifying newspapers as a source to be consulted is too generic to be rewarded but in some cases this was followed by the explanation that a local newspaper would be likely to cover the impact of bombs in the area, including details of how local services dealt with the devastation caused. Records from local councils were also suggested, with the explanation that these records would contain details of how the damage caused by bombs was dealt with. However, if the explanation was not clear, or the suggested source would not contain information that would help answer the proposed question, then marks could not be awarded for either of these sub-questions.

Students should be showing an awareness of appropriate sources that already exist for the historian to consult. This means that answers suggesting they would carry out an interview were not rewarded. They also need to be clear that they should suggest a source from the period in question – history books, the internet and documentaries were all unsuitable answers. Instead, it would be more appropriate to think about the sources consulted by the producers of history books, internet articles or documentaries.

When multiple suggestions had been given to a sub-question, it was often counterproductive. Offering more than one detail or question meant that the follow-up sections were not clearly linked, while offering multiple sources in sub-question 3 meant that the explanation in the final section was usually invalid.

Successful answers treated the questions as a package and thought about the follow-up question and the source to be consulted before writing the answer to the first sub-question. In general, the basic approach was most effective, for example, questions about how rescue teams were organised or how the damage to roads and houses was repaired.

(b) **Study Source B.**

How could you follow up Source B to find out more about the difficulties in dealing with the effects of German attacks on London?

In your answer, you must give the question you would ask and the type of source you could use.

Complete the table below.

(4)

Detail in Source B that I would follow up:

~~the~~ I would follow up the mentioning of the rescue teams being 'quickly organised'.

Question I would ask:

How were the rescue teams organised and who was responsible for the efficiency ~~and~~ of their response during a raid?

What type of source I could use:

I could use an account from a member of the rescue teams situated around London and their story of how it would work.

How this might help answer my question:

It would allow me to see and delve into the workings of the rescue teams from someone who was apart of it so I could find out who was in charge and the roles people played.



The first part is clearly taken from Source B and the proposed question links to the wider enquiry. The suggested source in part 3 only refers to one account but saying this would be 'from a member of one of the rescue teams situated around London' makes this appropriate for the wider enquiry and the explanation in the fourth part makes clear how the information this might contain would help to answer the proposed question.



Make sure the proposed question, suggested source and explanation all relate to the wider enquiry.

(b) **Study Source B.**

How could you follow up Source B to find out more about the difficulties in dealing with the effects of German attacks on London?

In your answer, you must give the question you would ask and the type of source you could use.

Complete the table below.

(4)

Detail in Source B that I would follow up:

The destruction

Question I would ask:

How many houses were destroyed by the V2 ~~bomb~~?

What type of source I could use:

~~Fisthand~~ Diary

How this might help answer my question:

~~Records~~ It would have recorded how many houses were destroyed after a V2 attack



'The destruction' is a clear reference to the start of Source B ('The destruction was complete') and although the proposed question refers to following up this specific incident, it does have a wider application than just following up the description of rescuing a girl from an individual house. Therefore this was accepted as a valid detail from the source and a valid question. However, the suggested source was too general to be rewarded and there is no guarantee that a diary would include such information.



Be as precise as possible when suggesting sources to be used in following up the enquiry and explain clearly how the information in the suggested source might help to answer the proposed question.

Question 3

It is important that students note whether the focus of this question is to identify a similarity or difference as detail of the event or period by itself cannot score highly. In some cases, the supporting information was unbalanced, describing the situation in one period and simply stating that it was different in the other period. Occasionally, answers identified a valid difference, such as close combat as opposed to inflicting damage at a distance, but the details provided did not support that difference, for example answers giving details about the technology and weapons being given to support comments about the role of the commander.

Good answers identified differences in cavalry being used at Waterloo as opposed to tanks in Iraq, the limited range of the 'Brown Bess' used at Waterloo and the Iraq War being fought at long range due to more developed weapons such as drone missiles. Other points that were explored were that at Waterloo, Wellington was on the battlefield whereas in Iraq, leaders could direct their troops from a different location, and that tactics were different, Iraq was offensive, Waterloo was defensive.

Responses that were not credited included differences in uniforms, how soldiers were recruited and differences in transport. In some cases, comments about the Iraq War saw this as an American enterprise. A few answers discussed similarities, which also could not be credited.

While many candidates scored the full four marks, some wrote far too much. Such answers demonstrated excellent knowledge but could not be rewarded beyond four marks and possibly the time taken here affected the completion of the longer answers which carried more marks.

3 Explain ~~one~~ way in which fighting in the ~~Battle of Waterloo~~ (1815) was ~~different~~ from fighting in the ~~Iraq War~~ (2003).

In the Battle of Waterloo cavalry were used, for example ~~Napoleon's~~ ^{Napoleon's} cavalry charge ~~at~~ ~~was~~ against Wellington's army.

In Iraq cavalry were not used, instead tanks ~~which~~ ^{which} were used which ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~more~~ ^{much} more destructive and powerful.

At the Battle of Waterloo there were lots of soldiers packed into groups for example formations were used with the muskets ^{and cavalry}. However, ~~at~~ in Iraq groups are much more specialised due to the improvement in equipment for example drones and missiles which were used for shock and awe. Overall, more soldiers were used in Waterloo whereas in Iraq there are lots of small specialised groups.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer identifies a difference in the fighting at Waterloo and in the Iraq War. It points out that at Waterloo, they fought in formation, using muskets and involving cavalry whereas the Iraq War was fought by specialised groups and using 'shock and awe' tactics.

Although this is clearly identifying the difference, this answer would have been even better if the difference was clearly identified at the start, eg 'the deployment of troops was different' or 'the weapons used meant different tactics were used'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Identify the similarity or difference clearly and then provide relevant supporting detail.

3 Explain **one** way in which fighting in the Battle of Waterloo (1815) was **different** from fighting in the Iraq War (2003).

one way in which fighting in the Battle of Waterloo was different from fighting in the Iraq war is because in ~~the~~ the Battle of Waterloo they had ~~less~~ bombs and ~~guns~~ but where as in the Iraq war there technology was more in depth and had much dangerous bombs and ~~guns~~ and also ~~is~~ in the Iraq war they had tanks and helicopters and possibly jet fighter jets and also possibly most ~~likely~~ most likely more fighters.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer implies that a difference in the fighting was the weapons used but this is not stated clearly, just 'the technology was more in depth' (AO2 low L2). Valid details are provided about the Iraq War but the details about fighting at Waterloo are incorrect (AO1 is L1).



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure that the similarity or difference is supported by details from each period.

Question 4

It was pleasing to see that a number of answers were awarded full marks here and it was noticeable that many of these were relatively concise. These candidates had understood the focus on explaining causation and provided enough detail to support their explanation without becoming descriptive, while some answers that were very detailed and had excellent knowledge of weapons and warfare, did not develop the analysis of causation or recognise the focus on changes in attitudes towards war.

The most successful answers demonstrated an explanation of the change in attitude linked to the reason for that change. For example, some answers described the patriotic enthusiasm for war in 1914 and explained why the horrors of trench warfare led to a revulsion against war. Similarly, many answers discussed the change from government-controlled reporting and censorship to the rolling news and social media coverage of the Iraq War, which made people more aware of the impact of war on civilians. The development of the Home Front and the experiences of the Blitz was also often used to explain that war now affected civilians to a much greater degree than before and that this changed their attitudes towards war. Answers also explained how the development of nuclear weapons led to new attitudes through fear of such powerful weapons.

It was disappointing to see that some candidates stated that conscientious objectors were cowards. Better answers recognised that some people had always opposed war but the introduction of conscription highlighted this attitude.

Some candidates referenced recent events, explaining how reporting of events in Ukraine or Gaza affected attitudes – this was acceptable as long as the explanation was based on attitudes in Britain. However, some detailed explanations of the significance of American coverage of the war in Vietnam and its effects on American attitudes could not be rewarded. Similarly, there were no marks for details of early war reporting, covering the Crimean War, which was outside the period in the question.

Many answers had a good understanding of the issues involved and included thoughtful analytical comments. However, this was not always supported by accurate or precise details and there was sometimes little sense of context in comments about a new understanding of the horrors of war or the impact of war on civilians. The best answers gave specific details about the number of journalists embedded with the troops during the First World War and the Iraq War, details of the introduction of conscription, the impact of bombing during the Second World War, and used terms such as patriotism, jingoism, imperialism, pacifism, MAD and CND.

4 Explain why there were changes in people's attitudes towards war during the modern period (c1900–present).

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Conscientious Objectors
- war reporting ✓
- Fingoism / pacifism
- Civilian deaths ✓

You **must** also use information of your own.

One reason people's attitudes towards war changed in the modern period is war reporting. In WWI, there was initially only one embedded reporter, Colonel Swinton, with 'the Call' and 'the Tribune' newspapers being closed numerous times for not censoring information. As a result, civilians received an optimistic and biased view of war (e.g. the Forces Programme), and this led to positive attitudes towards conflict. Contrastingly, in Iraq, there were 700 reporters embedded amongst coalition forces, with the initial bombing of Baghdad being broadcast on live TV. Hence, and with fewer newspapers self-censoring, civilians today are more exposed to the deadly reality of war, resulting in pacifist and predominantly negative attitudes, which are seen by 1 million people protesting in London in 2003 against the Iraq war. Hence, attitudes towards war have changed, as reporting has become less optimistic and more focused on the profound human cost of war.

Additionally, another reason attitudes towards war have changed is because of the changing ^{civilian deaths} ~~experience~~ ^{experience} of war. Before 1900, only 5% of war casualties were civilians. However, by the 1990s, this was 90%, and in 2014 alone, 60 million people were made homeless by war. Therefore, civilians are now aware of the abhorrent consequences of war (70 000 were killed instantly when 'little boy' was dropped over Japan), and as a result, know of the huge human cost of war. Therefore, attitudes have changed towards war, as war now encompasses bombing, and drones, and ICBMs, which cause profound civilian death.

Furthermore, attitudes towards war also changed due to conscientious objectors (COs). COs were men who refused to fight, despite mandatory conscription introduced by the national service act. COs were forced to appear before a military tribunal, and were usually forced to enlist or sent to prison. In one prison alone, 10 COs died while there, and 60 soon after release. Therefore, COs changed attitudes towards war as it showed that the Government was willing to force people to fight, and often to die (450 000 Britons died in WW2), and this revealed the horrible reality of



The answer analyses the impact of war reporting, the impact of modern warfare on civilians and the significance of the introduction of conscription and the development of conscientious objectors. Specific details are included and used to support the analysis.



Make sure the details you include are used to support your analysis and are explicitly linked to the question; don't just offer them as information.

4 Explain why there were changes in people's attitudes towards war during the modern period (c1900–present).

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Conscientious Objectors
 - war reporting
- You **must** also use information of your own.

• Somme
• Blitz
• WW2
• Iraq
• trenches

During the the modern period, peoples attitudes changed drastically during and after ~~the~~ World War 1. This is due to the fact ^{that} in WW1, not many ~~was~~ young men had been in war before, so when the opportunity arose, many young men over the age of 18 and under the age of 30 applied to become a soldier ~~as~~ they wanted to fight for ~~the~~ and protect their country.

However this was posed to be a bad idea as during WW1, after training was accomplished, the horrors of trench warfare set in; ~~cons~~isting of extremely cold winters and illnesses or diseases spread by rats it turned out to be life changing for every soldier who compeel out in a trench during

the war. further more some soldiers even contracted ~~an~~ an illness known as trench foot - giving them immeasurable amounts of pain and suffering with no way out.

Once WWI conditions were televised and broadcasted on radios, news papers and photos, it lowered the countries morale exponentially due to the fact of seeing young and middle aged men in these dier conditions. This demotivated many peoples attitudes toward the war effort and resulted in soldiers having to be forced into battle when the second World War approached.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer makes some good points about the impact of war reporting but the only specific details are about trench warfare.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Aim to show that you are covering the whole period in the question.

Question 5

This question was generally well done. Students knew details about the rate of fire of the longbow, its range, its armour-piercing power and its significant role in the battles of Falkirk and Agincourt. Many answers explained that these qualities had an effect on the nature of warfare. There were also many answers which explained developments such as the Assize of Arms and the Statute of Winchester, as attempts to increase the amount of trained archers available for the army. Answers also explained the limited impact of other new weapons, such as cannon, although it was recognised that cannon did have an impact on siege warfare. The impact of new tactics such as the schiltrons was well evaluated, with answers explaining how it had a strong impact as a defensive tactic but was overcome by Edward's use of archers.

This knowledge was impressive but it was also important that it was used to show the impact on the nature of warfare. Answers often explained how the use of the longbow contributed to the decline of the mounted knight but also pointed out that new weapons and tactics did not significantly change the nature of warfare, which remained based mainly on close combat and a combination of infantry and cavalry. Edward I's use of the longbow to defeat Wallace's schiltrons was used to argue that new weapons or new tactics did not change the nature of warfare by themselves; rather it was the role of the leader in deciding how to use the new weapons or new tactics. However, details such as the use of musket and pike formations or the creation of the New Model Army, were outside the time frame of the question.

Many answers also addressed changes in the nature of the army. The shift from the feudal levy of untrained infantry to the more professional army created by the use of indentures and mercenaries was seen as a key development that allowed the commander to use more flexible tactics and make good use of new weapons.

Chosen question number: Question 5 Question 6

I ~~was~~ mostly agree with this statement as weapons like pikes and longbows did cause major changes in strategy. But the recruitment of troops did also impact the ways wars were fought. ~~But~~ the idea of using your environment also effected native

I mostly agree with this statement because of the development of weapons such as the longbow. It had a 200m range and ~~too~~ had enough power to pierce through armour. It could ^{also} fire 15 arrows per minute! This led to more developments in armour and a change in tactic, as it was not smart to charge with cavalry anymore. This is shown in the Battle of Falkirk (1298), Wallace's army had ~~no~~ no armour and was decimated by Edward I's use of the longbow. Furthermore, the use of pikes also greatly effected the nature of warfare as they could form schiltrons and stakes. This prevented cavalry from charging directly into troops. This is also seen in the battle of Falkirk (1298), when Edward's unorganised cavalry charge could not get to the

infantry because of their schiltrons.

On the other hand, the idea of using your environment to achieve a better and more advantageous position, greatly affected the nature of warfare. This is seen in the Battle of Agincourt (1415), between Henry V and the French. Henry V positioned himself between woodland, which covered his flanks. Furthermore, the only way to get to him was through mud that would slow the opposing troops down. In addition, as the battle field was narrow, it bunched up the troops, so they could all be easily killed by longbows.

To add on to the point above, the methods of recruiting troops affected the nature of warfare. Methods such as the assize of arms or feudal levy, provided inadequate troops who were with poor quality weapons that cannot be trusted. But, hired mercenaries were much more trustworthy and powerful. These would have a higher chance in winning a war and would affect the nature of warfare.

In conclusion, I mostly agree with this statement, as weapons such as the longbow and pike greatly affected the nature of warfare in terms of pace, strategy and tactics. But other factors like the use of the environment and methods of recruitment, changed the entire way a war was fought, due to one side ~~being~~ having stronger troops or a better position.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is valid analysis on the impact of the longbow and the pike. The middle section is not as strong because the comments about the environment are really about the tactics used or the outcome of an individual battle rather than the nature of warfare. A valid point is made about recruitment but it is not developed in relation to the nature of warfare.

This is low L4 for AO2, L4 for AO1, although the third aspect of content is not very convincing, and the judgement is L4 because the criteria and justification are made clear.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

The best answers have a sense of evaluation running throughout the analysis.

I agree ~~to~~ with the statement to a very large extent that improvement in weaponry had the most significant impact on the nature of warfare.

The longbow emerged in the mid 13th century and had an effective range of three times that of the crossbow with it also being able to fire five times more arrows per minute. This development in weaponry changed the nature of warfare massively because armour had to be improved to prevent arrows piercing the chainmail and the cavalry charge, a once dominant force on the battlefield, was now useless to the bombardment of arrows, as was the schiltrons. We see the decline of the schiltrons first in 1298 when Wallace's organised schiltrons had their front line broken by the archers of the English at Falkirk, allowing for a cavalry charge to kill the Scottish.

Some may say that the recruitment changes and professionalisation improvements of the army was a large factor however there was very little improvement between 1250 and 1500 so no change was created enough to alter the nature of warfare, it wasn't until the late

16th century that armies were professionalised.

In the early 14th century, gunpowder arrived from Asia and the matchlock musket was created. This was then developed further and further until the reliable flint-lock mechanism was introduced and cavalry were equipped with muskets and wheel lock pistols. This resulted in warfare becoming much ~~more~~ less hand to hand combat and more fighting through gunfire in close quarters.

Other inventions such as cannons led to castles having to be developed and fortified. ~~And~~ Also, bayonets negated the need for pikemen. So pikemen were given muskets and bayonets, they were renamed musketeers.

In conclusion, I agree with the statement as weapon development was the most significant factor in the change of the nature of warfare from 1250 - 1500.



The answer makes good points about the longbow, supported by valid details. There are also valid points about gunpowder and cannon but muskets, bayonets and dragoons are all out of period.

Overall, AO2 is low L3; AO1 is L2 but the judgement on the statement in the question is merely stated – L1.



Make sure the details you include are used to support your analysis and explicitly linked to the question; don't just offer them as information.

Question 6

Many candidates provided detailed accounts of developments in artillery and also discussed developments in muskets and rifles, showing how weapons moved towards artillery. However, a number of answers failed to recognise the term 'composition of the army'. This term appears in all four time periods of the specification so it should be understood but students seemed to confuse it with the deployment of the army and the nature of the fighting. This severely limited those answers as they failed to address the focus of the question.

Where the question had been understood, answers tended to concentrate on the decline of cavalry, usually citing the Charge of the Light Brigade. Other answers identified the creation of the New Model Army and the use of dragoons as a key factor in the changing composition of the army. The best answers explained the changes following the increased use of artillery such as the decline of cavalry but also the consequent need for more engineers, logistical and support troops. These points were weighed against changes in the composition of the army as a result of the use of dragoons, professionalisation, and Cardwell's reforms.

Some answers included details from the medieval period or the First World War, which were outside the period in the question.

the battle of Marston to ~~success~~ succeed and led to a decrease in cavalry.

Furthermore a development in muskets led to a new unit - dragoons - being implemented and used in the British army, in battles such as the Battle of Marston, this allowed for the flexibility and movement of musketeers/pistols (as dragoons were men mounted on horses that used pistols to fight).

These dragoons in Oliver Cromwell's army played a major role in taking down the Royalist army as they allowed ~~Oliver Cromwell~~ Oliver Cromwell to swiftly win the right flank allowing the Parliamentarians to win the battle. ~~Moreover~~ Moreover cannons were quite insignificant in this battle as they only got to fire one round before the infantry were too close for the cannons to be effective.

Finally, the development in the New model army led to the creation of the first ~~professional~~ professional standing army who were regularly trained, creating a formidable and disciplined fighting force for Cromwell at Marston, with this being the first implementation of a paid professional standing army (based on a mercenary system after Cromwell abolished the purchase system around the early 1660's, creating ~~more~~ better officers to lead the army). I believe it is one of the most significant changes to the composition of the army in "the ~~years~~ years c.1500 - c.1900.

Therefore, although cannons played a major role in the ~~the~~ Battle of Marston, it was proved to be quite useless in other battles such as Marston.

and the creation of ~~as~~ the new model army allowed for professional groups of disciplined soldiers to be formed, which was often the deciding factor of many ~~later~~ battles such as Naseby. Furthermore, the introduction of ~~the~~ percussion caps and the development of rifling for muskets led to the ~~the~~ decline and end of cavalry, completely overhauling a troop which was seen as a powerhouse and problem on the battlefield for hundreds of years. ~~Therefore~~ Therefore, I ~~therefore~~ mostly disagree with the statement that 'developments in artillery were the main reason for changes in the composition of the army in the years c1500-c1900' as there were many more significant changes which effected the composition of the army such as ~~the~~ the new model army, ~~the~~ changing the purchase system, ~~which~~ creating a new troop - dragoons - and developments of the musket and rifling leading to a decline and end in the use of cavalry.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer makes a consistent argument, evaluating a range of factors and emphasising the decline of cavalry and professionalisation of army as aspects affecting the composition of the army. It is a secure L4 for all the Assessment Objectives.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Be explicit about the criteria being used to make a judgement.

~~I believe that I greatly agree with this statement because the development of artillery had greatly changed the composition of the army as shown by the battles of Waterloo, and + Balaclava and The Somme. Use of cannon, professionalisation of the army and technology.~~

~~I agree with this statement to a large extent due to the composition of Napoleons army during the Battle of Waterloo. This is because Napoleon had almost completely relied on his artillery to defeat the British and Prussian infantry and cavalry. However, due to the placement of the British troops and use of terrain, placing them on a ridge, meant that~~

I agree with this statement to a large extent because of the use of cannon greatly impacted the composition of the army in the years 1500-1900. This is because, ~~cannon had proved themselves to be extremely useful~~ during the Battle of Balaclava, cannons were the main focus. This was because they were superior against cavalry as shown by the ~~the~~ charge of the Light Brigade, in which over 600 men rode in for a direct attack on Russian cannons which led to over 250 + 100 deaths.

and over 130 injured. This attack was infamous and showed the superiority of artillery over cavalry. This showed that artillery was the main reason for changes in the composition of the army from 1500-1900.

Furthermore, I also agree with this statement because of changes in technology. This is because, near the end of the 19th century, industrialisation developments in technology had significantly improved the usefulness and effectiveness of the artillery in the army. This is because they were lighter and had an increased fire rate. This meant that ~~then~~ they caused more damage on the battlefield and therefore made up more of the composition of the army.

In addition I also agree with this statement because of the professionalisation of the army. This is because of the introduction of the New Model Army ~~to~~ created by Oliver Cromwell, which saw full-time paid soldiers being recruited. ~~The fact that this meant that~~ Furthermore, the NMA had superior



The basic argument is made that as cannon became more important cavalry declined. There are also brief comments about the professionalisation of the army under Cromwell. However, there is little analysis of the actual composition of the army; it is more about improvements in technology. It reaches level 2 for all the Assessment Objectives.



Check the focus of the question as well as the topic, so that you can make sure the detail you include is relevant.

Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there was a number of impressive answers where candidates seemed well prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation. In particular, students seemed well prepared for the 12 and 16 mark questions, with most answers having a clear structure and good use of specialist terms (although 'morale' was frequently confused with 'moral').

A poor standard of handwriting made a number of answers difficult to mark and exacerbated the difficulty in understanding a badly expressed answer. Also, a failure to structure answers in paragraphs made it difficult for the examiner to identify a line of reasoning and to check whether three different aspects of content have been covered.

If extra paper is taken, candidates should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued on separate paper and this should be clearly labelled. However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided rather than on the extra paper and candidates should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, candidates taking extra paper sometimes ran out of time on the final, high mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves.

Where there has been weaker performance, the following points can be made:

- Candidates need a secure understanding of the chronological periods and terms used in the specification as well as how the term 'century' is used, for example the nineteenth century refers to dates within the period 1800-1899
- Candidates need to understand the themes within the specification – the nature of warfare and the experience of war
- A number of knowledgeable answers failed to reach the highest level because they were not focused on the specific question being asked or did not deploy precise detail to support the analysis
- It is not necessary to use the question's stimulus points and candidates should not attempt to do so if they do not recognise them; however, candidates should aim to cover three aspects of content
- While there was good knowledge of some topics, candidates cannot rely on knowing just a few key topics and hoping to use that information whatever question is asked

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>

