



# **Examiners' Report June 2023**

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



## Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

## Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2023

Publications Code 1HI0\_12\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see how well candidates responded to the examination paper and they had clearly been well-prepared in terms of both knowledge of content and the skills required for this paper. Candidates seemed confident on both sections, the Historic Environment and the Thematic Study, and there seemed to be relatively few unfinished papers.

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:

- The nature of warfare
- The experience of war
- governments and individuals, science, technology and communications and attitudes in society.

It is also important to remember that this is a Thematic Study in British history. Comments about the war in Vietnam 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 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 need to be explained and the judgement needs to be consistent with the overall answer. 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 etc. 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.

## Question 1

Question 1 asked candidates to identify two key features of Anderson Shelters. Extended details are not needed here but candidates should be aware that this question can be set on anything named in the Historic Environment specification.

Candidates should identify two features and, in each case, add a further detail which will 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 a maximum of two marks were rewardable.

Most answers offered details about the purpose and construction of Anderson shelters with details about what conditions were like inside, the materials involved in the construction and the protection they offered. Many answers also offered details about the government distribution of the shelters with examples of how this differed depending on whether people were on a low income.

There were very few blank answers, but some answers confused Anderson and Morrison shelters or talked more generally about public shelters like the underground.

1 Describe **two** features of Anderson shelters.

Feature 1

Anderson shelters were provided by the government ~~to~~ <sup>beginning</sup> from 1938. Anderson shelters were distributed by the government and paid for for those with incomes belows £250. Those with income above £250 had to contribute £7 for their anderson shelter.

Feature 2

Anderson shelters were designed for outside the house. They were built underground, reinforced with metal sheets and mud and earth around them. They were often built in gardens of homes.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Two valid features of Anderson shelters are identified with additional supporting information linked to the identified features. This answer received 4 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Use separate sentences to identify the feature and to provide additional information.

**Feature 1**

Anderson shelters were built in people's back gardens  
or on the streets

**Feature 2**

Anderson shelters were dug into the ground, ~~in~~



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A valid feature is identified for feature 1 and 2: shelters were constructed in peoples' back gardens and shelters were dug into the ground. 2 marks were awarded.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Remember to provide additional supporting detail for each feature.

## 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, but it is nested within the context of the Thematic Study and therefore knowledge of the specific 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 the impact of the attack on the docks in East London on 'Black Saturday'. The focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned – sources were not produced with the intention of being useful to historians and they should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation. If the answer identified omissions from the source as limitations on its usefulness, there should have been an explanation of why these details could have been reasonably expected from that source.

Candidates found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. They could also make a number of points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, although sometimes this consisted of simple statements. When considering provenance, generic comments about a source being biased (with no explanation of how that bias could be detected or why it occurred) or about the source being reliable because it came from the time under investigation, could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1. This type of generic assumption was also seen when some answers noted that the recollections of T L Mackie would not be reliable as he would have forgotten what had happened.

At Level 2, developed comments were made about the usefulness of the recollections showing the range of destruction witnessed in the docks, the damage caused by bombs and the civilian casualties that day.

When considering the content of Source B, candidates commented on the extent of the fires that could be seen from a great distance and that iconic areas like Tower Bridge were threatened by attacks. Comments about the provenance considered its nature, as a photograph of a single event, a photograph that was published in a newspaper and that photographs were likely to be censored.

Contextual knowledge is mentioned at every level of the mark scheme and failure to include it continued to impact marks available for reward for some answers. Candidates should recognise that it is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the candidate's own knowledge – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. Contextual knowledge should be relevant to the enquiry and used to assess the source, for example, to add detail about 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 gave an accurate view or showed a typical situation.

At Level 3, comments need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and contextual knowledge should be integrated into the process of reaching a judgement, not simply provided as information.

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, listed limitations in the content coverage or asserted that a source was reliable because of the date it was produced, or limited because it is biased. Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness for the enquiry of the sources, weighing the value of the content in the light of the provenance and 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, how representative the source is etc.

There were some impressive answers which had good knowledge of the impact of 'Black Saturday', recognising that this was the start of the Blitz on London with details about the bombing that took place and the difficulties firefighters experienced controlling the blaze. There was also good knowledge of the strategic importance of the docks, the destruction of goods that were stored and the economic impact the attack would have.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, 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.

(8)  
Source A ~~is~~ could be useful because it is a 1st hand account ~~to~~ from someone who was there when it happened, and has published their experience ~~with~~ just to share, not to persuade. However, it could be less useful in its provenance because it wasn't published until 1997, which means memories could have faded or become twisted.

It's content is useful because it describes the destruction that the bombing brought in detail, showing the impact of weapons like sapper bombs. However, the content could be less useful as it doesn't show the impact it had on survivors and the poor people in the East End had, which ultimately were catalysts of events like the Bethnal Green Station crowd crush. Overall, source A is a useful source.

Source B could be useful because it

is a photograph, which gives a snapshot of what Londoners saw on that day. However, it could be less useful as it was made to be used in newspapers, meaning it could be dramatised and not really as accurate to be eye-catching. It's content is useful as it shows the massive cloud of smoke, helping to show how intensely the docks were bombed on Black Saturday. However, it's content is less useful because it was taken far away, and all we can see is smoke. When in reality the main impact of bombing would be fires from bombs like the Stammenbombe filled with flammable liquid. Overall, it is less useful than source A.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer considers the content and provenance of both sources in relation to the usefulness of the source for the enquiry. The contextual knowledge is not always relevant to the enquiry. The answer partially meets the descriptor for Level 2 with some developed comments relating to the content **and/or** provenance of the sources.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Try to include contextual knowledge to directly support comments on the usefulness of the content of the sources and/or their provenance.

Source A is usefull <sup>for</sup> into an inquiry into the impact of the attack on the docks but has limitations. In the source, it says 'damaged by the fires'. What this means is that the boats had been affected by the fires made by the German incendiary bombs such as: ~~flamers~~ Flammerebombers and Brandbombers. These bombs were dropped started huge fires and evidently created more destruction as the fires spread, even damaging boats. There are however limitations to the source's <sup>content</sup> ~~and purpose~~. <sup>The ships</sup> ~~the~~ which had been unloading? would've had to go back to docks before night. The provenance of Source A also helps with the inquiry. This is because the author was actually there at the docks when it happened meaning it was a first hand account. However, it was published in 1997, meaning he had hindsight of what happened and it was 57 years later, meaning that their views may have been altered or he can't remember clearly.

Source D is also useful for an inquiry into the impact of the attack on the docks, but again it also has limitations. This source's content is useful as it shows the smoke coming from the docks. The docks were a huge target for German bombers

us it controlled the ~~all~~ food and supplies coming in and out of England. This shows the source is reliable as it is shown that smoke is coming from the docks after it has been destroyed. However, this photo also has limitations. This is because morale was a huge factor during the Blitz as people needed to maintain morale. So this photo can clearly be seen as propagandous as it shows Tower Bridge 'standing strong' and the same with another dock. This limits the use of this in an inquiry as it doesn't tell us what was destroyed, only what wasn't destroyed. The provenance here can also help us. The fact it was taken on the day it happened shows us that it was really what happened and we can see for ourselves the destruction. However, it was printed in a ~~the~~ newspaper, so it can be seen as a way to keep morale high and so could be hiding something, especially as 'Black Saturday' was known as being the worst day for destruction and loss of life, but the newspaper would want to hide that.

Overall, these sources are helpful for an inquiry into the impact of the attack on the docks on 'Black Saturday', but they both have limitations.



The analysis of both Sources A and B reaches Level 3. There is a clear focus on the enquiry on the impact of the attack on the docks in East London. The answer assesses the usefulness of the source content, by taking into account the provenance and uses contextual knowledge in the process of interpreting the sources' usefulness. Criteria for judgement are also applied when assessing each source and a judgement is offered on the usefulness of both sources.



Link the content to the provenance and to contextual knowledge to judge the usefulness of the source.

## Question 2 (b)

This question should be treated as a package linked to the enquiry that was identified in question 2a (the impact of the attack on the docks in East London on 'Black Saturday') and the aim is for candidates to show that they understand how historians work. The first sub-question simply asks them to identify a detail from the source – this was most commonly done by quoting a phrase from the source; candidates should be aware that a detail from the provenance cannot be rewarded.

Candidates then had to propose a question they would ask to follow up Source A in relation to the overall enquiry. Consequently, the proposed question should be broader than following up a very specific person or event in the source and it should not be a question they would ask the author of the source. Questions about T.L Mackie failed to recognise the link to a broader enquiry and impacted the marks available to these candidates for this question, since it also affected the source they suggested that would help with their enquiry.

While it is recognised that candidates cannot have detailed knowledge of all possible sources, the specification states that candidates should be aware of the types of sources available and the nature of the information they contain. Answers such as 'obituaries' or '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 but if the explanation was not clear, or the suggested source would not contain information that would help answer the proposed questions, then marks could not be awarded for either of these sub-questions.

Candidates 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 contemporary source from the period in question – history books, the internet, documentaries were all unsuitable answers. Instead, it would be more appropriate if they tried 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 counter-productive. Offering more than one detail or question meant that the follow-up sections were not clearly linked, while offering multiple sources 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 simple approach was most effective, for example, questions about the number or types of casualties, or the damage and devastation were most popular, which could be followed up through analysis of local newspapers, emergency service reports or records from the Port of London Authority.

Detail in Source A that I would follow up:

- ~~THE BOMBS AND FIRES~~  
The bombs and fires had taken human lives.

Question I would ask:

How many lives were lost including children?

What type of source I could use:

information I already knew and searching it up.

How this might help answer my question:

This might help even if its not exact answers



A valid detail has been selected from the source with an appropriate follow up question about the number of lives lost. A specific source is not identified, and the explanation does not make clear how the evidence could be used to answer the enquiry. 2 marks were awarded.



Ensure that the source that you identify is a specific source.

Detail in Source A that I would follow up:

~~" huge warehouses were completely ruined "~~

" The bombs and fire had taken human lives "

Question I would ask:

~~Was the damage caused on the docks on 'Black Saturday' repairable?~~

How many people had died or due to the attack on the docks in East London on 'Black Saturday'?

What type of source I could use:

News articles in E London following 7<sup>th</sup> September 1940

How this might help answer my question:

They may contain numbers of casualties once the bodies had been recovered from the rubble



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A detail has been selected from Source A which is then the starting point for a broader enquiry into the impact of 'Black Saturday'. News articles following the 7th September attack is a specific source, and the explanation makes it clear how the evidence would be used to answer the enquiry. This answer received 4 marks.



Make sure the final section explains **how** the information in the suggested source could be used to answer the proposed question; don't just say that the source would provide information to answer the enquiry.

### Question 3

In this question, candidates needed to identify a difference in the impact of warfare on civilians and then support this with details taken from both periods. The most common similarities that were identified were the differences in the organisation of resources, mobilisation of forces, communications or the ways civilians were directly affected by warfare. The use of requisitioning during the Civil Wars and mobilisation of the nation during the World Wars were the most common supporting details used in answers. Supporting detail about the use of weapons by soldiers in battle were not relevant and some candidates did not pick up on the focus on civilian experience instead talking more generally about warfare.

It is important to note that the focus of this question is to identify a difference; detail 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.

While many candidates scored the full four marks, some wrote far too much. Such answers demonstrated excellent knowledge in support of a valid comparison, but it 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 the impact of warfare on civilians in the years c1500–c1700 was different from the impact of warfare on civilians in the period c1900–present.**

In the 1500-1700, kings used the feudal system to raise an army. ~~They were for 40 days~~ their army was mostly made up of peasants who didn't know how to fight, as they had no choice in whether they wanted to fight or not.

However in 1900-present, propaganda was used to recruit soldiers, and if you were forcefully recruited you could pay money to get out of fighting. This army was mostly made up of trained soldiers and experienced generals.



There is some relevant general information about the recruitment of civilians in the later period. This answer lacks specific support, and a valid difference has not been identified. 1 mark was awarded.



Make sure that specific examples are provided from both the time periods in the question to support a difference that has been identified.

- 3 Explain **one** way in which the impact of warfare on civilians in the years c1500–c1700 was different from the impact of warfare on civilians in the period c1900–present.

One way the impact of warfare on civilians was different was civilians' awareness of the events of war. During the Early Modern period, the English Civil War was taking place on English soil, meaning many got a first-hand experience of the war, however, during the Modern period, civilians got information about the war from newspapers, which published photographs, and later on from live news coverage, during the Iraq War for example.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A difference in the impact of warfare on civilians is explained. Supporting detail is provided from both time periods with examples of the civilian experience of war being first hand during the civil war contrasted with the experience of war via coverage in the media during the Iraq War, fulfilling the descriptor for level 2.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Make sure supporting detail is offered about each of the time periods named in the question.

## Question 4

Most candidates wrote confidently about the decline in importance of the feudal army c1250-1500. However, answers were sometimes descriptive rather than focusing on explaining why the examples led to decline.

Candidates often had good knowledge about the use of mercenaries with explanations often referring to knights only being obliged to serve for limited time and the payment of scutage. Better answers also explained the role of indentures and the fact that earlier victories at Falkirk or Agincourt meant that commanders placed less value on the feudal levy. A number of answers also commented on the importance of the Longbow at Agincourt leading to the decline of the mounted knight. The stimulus point of gunpowder often prompted descriptions of the development of the professional cannoneer, some answers failed to focus on the time period in the question often providing examples of gunpowder weaponry influenced from later periods, which was not relevant. Strong answers clearly explained how each development outlined led to a decline in the importance of the feudal army with examples carefully selected from the time period in the question.

The stimulus points were well used but candidates sometimes struggled to provide a third aspect of content often trying to include the New Model Army as an example.

Other aspects of content that were frequently used included the Assize of Arms, the impact of the Black Death, and the changes highlighted by significant battles like Falkirk and Agincourt.

It was pleasing to see that many answers were awarded full marks. 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 or recruitment, did not develop the analysis of causation.

4 Explain why the feudal army declined in importance in the years c1250-c1500.

(12)

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

- mercenaries
- gunpowder

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

One reason why the ~~the~~ feudal army declined in importance in the years 1250-1500 was because of mercenaries. This was because training of soldiers from ~~the~~ the feudal army was difficult and ~~often~~ often didn't even happen. Therefore it was easier to hire mercenaries for money who ~~were~~ were already well trained. This led to less ~~soldiers~~ men from the feudal army being needed.

Another reason for the decline of importance of the feudal army from c1250 - c1500 is because of gunpowder.

Gunpowder was difficult to work with and could be unpredictable, for example James II of Scotland was killed by his own cannon exploding. Therefore it required well-trained troops, which those in the feudal army were not.

So as a result of this the importance of the feudal army declined.

~~Another~~

One final reason for the decline of feudal duty was because of the decline of the mounted

Knight, largely due to pikemen and schiltroms,  
noblemen were less likely to gather up men for war  
if ~~they~~ <sup>as they</sup> could not be mounted knights like they  
wanted, and were trained to be. So would not  
recruit men for the feudal army, which saw  
a decline as a result.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer demonstrates Level 3 for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) with reasons for decline of importance explained for three examples: the increasing use of mercenaries, gunpowder and the decline of the mounted knight.

Assessment Objective 1 (knowledge and understanding) also reaches Level 3 with some good knowledge and relevant detail but the knowledge is not always wide ranging or detailed. Best fit Level 3 8 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Ensure each point being made is supported with precise and wide-ranging knowledge.

4 Explain why the feudal army declined in importance in the years c1250–c1500.

(12)

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

- mercenaries - indentures - long bow
- gunpowder - flintlock - feudal + general summons bad

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

The feudal army declined in importance between 1250 to 1500 due to mercenaries. Mercenaries were paid soldiers who had experience in battle and after hired in contracts and indentures. Indentures became more greatly used through the medieval age as the printing press was ~~the~~ invented in the late 15<sup>th</sup> century and ~~gave~~ ~~to~~ ~~kings~~ a reliable method (technological advances) and ~~gave~~ ~~advances~~ more money was spent in battles. Money played a role in the increase in use of mercenaries because indentures were expensive, ~~as~~ they were ~~paid~~ ~~more~~ and would not have been affordable in the earlier part of the period.

Secondly, the rise of the longbow played a role in the decline of the feudal army. In 1363, Edward III created a law that ~~said~~ ~~it~~ the saying able bodied men must practise the longbow every Sunday. This, as well as greatly impacting the composition of the army, impacted ~~the~~ recruitment. ~~As~~ By the 15<sup>th</sup> century, longbows played a significant role in battles such as in Agincourt

and (where the English shot French cavalry) and by this time, most indentures were hiring longbow men, due to the commitment and training it took to be proficient with a longbow (this often took years and deformed men due to the strain). Therefore, because of the importance of longbows in battle, the king had to hire more longbow men particularly through indentures.

Lastly, the decline of the feudal army was partly due to the limitations of feudal and general summons. Feudal summons involved compulsory 40 day service to the king in a campaign to any noble that had received land. The pay was minimal and knights were expected to gather their own men to fight alongside. This was not reliable as many simply deserted and were inexperienced and unwilling. General summons involved voluntary service to battle, however this was similarly unreliable as battles fought in France were more favourable for looting (due to more wealth) than in perhaps Scotland, meaning it was <sup>hard</sup> not possible to know how many men would be fighting. This meant that indentures were more reliable and brought more skilled men to fight.



Examiner comment: This answer reaches Level 4 for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) with a sustained focus on reasons for the decline the importance of the feudal army in the first two paragraphs. There is evidence of analysis of the reasons for decline with a clear focus on the overall decline from c1250 – c1500. This is supported by relevant detail about the role of mercenaries, indentures, the significance of the longbow and the limitations of the feudal summons. Assessment Objective 1 (knowledge and understanding) is also Level 4 with some precisely selected examples. There are three clear aspects of content clearly selected to exemplify the decline in importance of the feudal army. Best-fit Level 4 11 marks.



Make sure that all the examples you provide are relevant examples for the specified time period.

## Question 5

This question was chosen by fewer candidates and many candidates did not recognise the conceptual focus of the question. Some answers that identified a range of different features of warfare in the period did not address the extent to which the Battle of Naseby was a key turning point. The stimulus point of dragoons was well used and there were some excellent answers that developed this point explaining how the battle had a significant impact on the nature of warfare. Some answers attempted to explain the use of siege warfare as a key tactic during the Battle of Naseby, lacking a detailed understanding of the battle as a case study.

Most answers provided details about the use of dragoons as a mobile infantry force and the impact they had on tactics. Other examples which were considered included the effectiveness of the New Model Army's training and tactics and the Battle of Naseby seeing the first professional standing army in Britain. Many candidates also countered the statement with examples of the infantry and cavalry remaining key elements of the army which demonstrated that the use of dragoons was not that significant. The creation of a standing army being resented and officially ended in 1688, although renewed each year, was also used to demonstrate that the Battle of Naseby was not a significant turning point.

Strong answers had a detailed understanding of the Battle of Naseby, not just explaining the case study of the events of the battle but also evaluating the extent to which it was a turning point. There were some excellent answers which included an evaluation of the effectiveness of the New Model Army's training in new tactics at Naseby and the impact this had in subsequent battles. The role that gunpowder and cannon had in reducing the number of long sieges that took place and the use of the musket replacing the longbow was also used effectively to counter the idea that the battle was the key turning point. In stronger answers a sense of an argument and evaluation developed consistently throughout the answer and then in the conclusion, explicit criteria were applied to explain the final judgement on the extent to which the Battle of Naseby was the key turning point in the nature of warfare.

The battle of ~~Asby~~ <sup>Naseby</sup> was a very important turning point in the nature of warfare & for a few different reasons. The battle of ~~Asby~~ <sup>Naseby</sup> <sup>1645</sup> was the war between Oliver Cromwell's army (The Model Army) and the royalist army of King Charles I. The battle of Naseby was very significant in the outcome of the English Civil War, because this is where the New Model Army defeated the King's royalists. The NMA defeated the Royalists because the royalists were ~~they~~ <sup>very</sup> overconfident that they were stronger and more powerful than the NMA. In the years afterwards the NMA learnt a few lessons from the battle of Naseby. One thing they learnt is Siege warfare. Siege warfare is a very good type of warfare as it causes the enemy's civilians to give up and lose hope. When the civilians give up due to lack of food this makes the opposing army also give up because they are fighting for these civilians, if they don't have backing they won't win. If there is more than one army in a country that is going to cause problems because there will be a power struggle between the two armies. If there is war between ~~the~~ the two armies there is unrest amongst the citizens of the country and this also results in food and produce being stolen by

the army for their use. The battle of Naseby should have a bigger more well trained army like the New Model army was the best thing ever. The New Model army was made up of around 22,000 soldiers. All the soldiers were well trained. In the New Model army soldiers got promoted based on performance not nobility. This ~~was~~ <sup>was</sup> the way that most ~~armies~~ <sup>armies</sup> now started operating copying what they saw from the ~~New~~ New Model army during the battle of Naseby. In conclusion the battle of Naseby was a very good learning curve for the rest of the worlds armies too copy.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer provides some evidence of Level 2 for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) with some limited analysis of the impact of the New Model Army on the nature of warfare at the Battle of Naseby. There is some knowledge and understanding of the Battle of Naseby and siege warfare, but this is not well developed. The judgement is stated but not developed. Overall, this produces a best fit mark of L2 6. SPaG 3 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Try to include precise details to support your examples.

I agree with the statement as the Battle of Naseby was foundational in showing the effectiveness of a well-trained standing army and intelligent tactics.

Firstly, I agree because of the use of a standing army. The New Model Army used by Fairfax at Naseby in 1645, showed the benefit of paying troops and training them well. Fairfax's infantry were paid 8p a day and the second line of infantry was monumentally important in holding back Royalist forces. This ~~is~~ was significant for changing the nature of warfare as it demonstrated the effectiveness of the standing army structure, which then became implemented for the rest of the period and beyond. It is ~~the most~~ <sup>highly</sup> important as it ~~demonstrates~~ showed that the militia system was no longer necessary, ~~the~~ the most significant change between this period and the previous one, so, is therefore, very impactful on the nature of warfare and a turning point for the period.

I also agree because of the use of dragoons. Dragoons were a very important part of the battle because Colonel Okie's 1000 dragoons offered great strength and support to Cromwell's cavalry when they performed their counterattack. The dragoons were able to use their arquebuses to push the Royalist army back, and also fought on foot. The dragoons were an important reason for the significance of the battle, as they fully replaced the role of the mounted archer which was a more prevalent role previously, and led to a further decline in the role of the cavalry with the dragoons taking on their responsibilities like the charge. However, they are not as important as the impact of the NMA as the dragoons were only a small unit and still made up less than 10% of the army and so were only able to have a limited impact on the ~~new~~ NMA, which showed itself\* to be, overall, a more significant turning point for the period.   
 ~~than~~ the Battle of Naseby 1\* - at Naseby

However, some may disagree, arguing that the rise of <sup>muskets</sup> ~~gunpowder~~ weapons had a more significant ~~effect~~ as impact or change in the period.<sup>2\*</sup> The use of matchlock muskets greatly impacted the nature of warfare in this period.

as musketeers began fighting alongside pikemen, until the 1690s when socket bayonets were used more frequently, replacing the pike. While they only fired one every two minutes, they still impacted the nature of warfare massively. This is an important factor for change in this period, as it introduced firearms as the primary infantry weapon and led to a massive reduction in armour, given its ~~lack~~ lack of effectiveness against musket balls. However, the NMA is more significant as it had a larger impact between ~~1700~~ 1500-1700: whilst muskets were important at this time, it is only after 1700, and the invention of technologies such as rifling and percussion bullets, that muskets became the most impactful change ~~or~~ to the whole of the nature of warfare. Whereas, in this period, the NMA is clearly very important ~~reflecting~~ ~~social change~~ during the Battle of Naseby and afterwards, causing an overhaul in recruitment and training. Therefore, the battle is still the most important turning point because of the NMA.

In conclusion, the Battle of Naseby was the key turning point in the nature of warfare in the early modern period, due to the radical use of the NMA and dragoons. Based on the significance, the NMA is the most important factor for change as it revolutionised the structure of a standing army, which remains significant even today. When focusing on the period, whilst muskets were an important change, their truly significant impact comes after 1700 and therefore, the Battle of Naseby remains the definitive turning point in the nature of warfare between c. 1500 and c. 1700.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer demonstrates Level 4 for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) There is a clear line of reasoning and consistent analysis. It is supported by wide-ranging knowledge and covers three aspects of content. The answer argues the Battle of Naseby was the key turning point explaining the significance of the composition of the New Model Army and the use of dragoons, it then develops a counter argument exploring the role of muskets. For assessment Objective 1 (knowledge and understanding) this answer also reaches Level 4 with wide ranging and precisely selected examples. There is evaluation throughout the answer reaching an overall judgement with criteria established. SPaG 4 marks.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

To help to reach and justify your overall judgement establish your valid criteria for judgement at the start of your answer.

## Question 6

This was a popular question and candidates were clear about the focus of the question presenting a variety of examples to evaluate the extent to which the rifle had the most significant impact on warfare from 1700. The stimulus points of the Enfield rifle and nuclear science were used confidently by candidates to support and counter the idea that the rifle had the most significant impact on weaponry and tactics. Candidates were well-prepared for this question and often very knowledgeable about the evolution of weapons from 1700 to the present day with impressive analysis of rifles, machine guns, nuclear weapons and heavy artillery. There were in-depth examples from across the period being used, with the Crimean War, First World War and Iraq War often being drawn upon.

Some answers missed the focus on the significance of the rifle, going into great descriptive detail about the different types of weaponry. It should also be noted that this is a British Thematic Study and therefore details that were not linked to the impact on warfare and British Society were not relevant.

The focus of this question was the extent to which the rifle had the most significant impact on warfare and many answers discussed the impact the rifle had on weaponry and tactics with improvements in rifles such as percussion bullets, breech loading and smokeless powder. The role of machine guns or tanks was often offered as an alternative aspect of content. Other aspects that were considered, included the development of nuclear bombs, the significance of the machine gun in the Crimean War and the way the rifle influenced tactics and deployment at Waterloo, and it was common for candidates to cover at least three aspects of content.

Some answers remained descriptive, with little analysis but many answers were able to evaluate the extent to which the rifle had the most significant impact on warfare.

~~The~~ I agree with the statement "In the years c.1700-present, the rifle was the weapon that had the most significant impact on warfare." because it ~~was the first to a line of weaponry that~~ kickstarted a line of weaponry that is the most deadly and ~~is still the~~ the most used weapon today.

The rifle was a massive step in ~~weapon~~ technology and weaponry advancement. The ~~gun~~ <sup>musket</sup> could shoot far and with good accuracy like a longbow and was powerful like a crossbow. At the start it wasn't great but it had huge impacts on warfare in the ~~Middle Ages and~~ Early Modern periods as it allowed for new tactics like the Swedish Salvo to develop. It had huge potential and this meant it was focused on for development and technological advancement. ~~In~~ In the Early Modern period, it inspired more weapons like the development of ~~the~~ rifling and brass cartridges in the Industrial period.

The rifle was created in the Industrial period and was far more advanced than the musket and pistol. It had range, power and with the development of brass cartridges later on a much quicker reload. In warfare it was very effective and changed how war was fought. It changed tactics and how armies were composed and ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup>

formations they fought in. This shows the impact it had on warfare as ~~the~~ warfare changed around the creation of the rifle and to compliment it.

In the Modern era ~~the~~ the Lee Enfield rifle was used in WWI and was a prominent weapon because it was accurate and powerful. The Enfield rifle changed how war was fought ~~by~~ ~~introduced~~ in trenches. It allowed for long range combat and created ~~more~~ trench warfare because it forced soldiers to sit/stand still for away from opponents and shoot from distance. This led to change in weaponry as it was pushed to be developed further. Further development led to guns being advanced ~~from~~ from rifles to machine guns in under a century, clearly showing the influence of rifles.

Some may argue against this statement and say it was nuclear weapons that had the biggest impact on warfare as they ~~caused~~ <sup>caused</sup> MAD (Mutually Assured Destruction) but I disagree as ~~the~~ the rifle meant that guns were developed and guns ~~had~~ <sup>had a larger impact</sup> on warfare as a whole because they became the most used weapon and also nuclear weapons were only developed until very recently.

In conclusion, I agree with the statement because the rifle inspired the advancement of guns and artillery and have been the most important weapon in warfare from 1700 to currently and they changed how war was fought and who was affected by it.



This answer reaches Level 3 for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis). The analysis is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question explaining the significance of the rifles impact on warfare.

There is some good knowledge offered about the significance of the rifle to developments in weaponry with examples from the both the Industrial and Modern period. There is more limited knowledge to counter the statement with information about the role of nuclear science, meeting the descriptor for Level 3 for Assessment Objective 1 (knowledge and understanding) The overall judgement is given with some justification meeting the descriptor for Level 3.

Overall, the answer relies on the stimulus points with a limited third aspect so this answer was awarded Level 3 11 marks. SPaG 4 marks.



Make sure that you include three aspects of content in your answer.



to have a huge impact on warfare as it meant the soldiers were able to ~~fire~~ kill more people with much more ease at all ranges on the battlefield. This means rifles were the most weapon that had the most significant change as they allowed warfare on a battlefield to be much more gruesome.

Technological weapons also played a huge part in advancing warfare. This can especially be seen in the Iraq War of 2003. The technological weapons are mainly ~~drone~~ UAVs (Unmanned Aerial Vehicles) and PGMs (Precision Guided Missiles). The use of UAVs ~~was~~ played a key part during the Iraq War as it meant the soldiers themselves didn't even have to be at the ~~post~~ place they went to attack just nearby in safety. This showed a huge advancement in warfare as it meant soldiers didn't even have to put themselves in immediate danger, they could be nearby and still kill their opposition. However, the technology ~~isn't~~ just used for attack, it is vital in recon. More specifically having thermal cameras on the drones allows the soldiers to pinpoint ~~opposing~~ opposing soldiers precise locations, allowing the drone to know exactly where to go and who to shoot with perfect accuracy. This shows how technological weapons played such a huge part as it showed how soldiers wouldn't be safe anymore as the drones could use their thermal cameras to go to the soldiers and kill them. This shows technological weapons were the

Weapons that had the most significance as they made ~~the whole~~ <sup>the whole</sup> area a battle field - not just the middle, meaning people wouldn't even be safe under cover as they'd be found instantly, meaning more deaths without the person even being there.

However, the ~~most significant~~ <sup>weapon with</sup> the most significant impact on warfare are bombs. More specifically, during the Battle of the Somme in 1916, basic bombs were used by both sides to attempt to kill as many people on the battlefield as possible. However, by the end of World War Two in 1945, nuclear bombs had been developed by the USA with the Manhattan project, in which scientists discovered a way to create a bomb that caused almost 100x more destruction. The power of this was shown on the 6<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> August 1945 when the USA dropped the 'little boy' and 'fat man' bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This shows just how significant bombs are as a change for warfare as it meant that soldiers didn't even have to be anywhere near the ~~place~~ <sup>place</sup> they were attacking, they just had to ~~be~~ have an order to launch. This shows such a significant impact of warfare as in one foul swoop, a country could have 0 casualties but the opposition have hundreds of thousands just because of one singular bomb. This is also significant as it put <sup>civilian</sup> people in the firing line. When the

Bombs were dropped in 1945, hundreds of thousands of civilians were killed. The ratio of soldiers to civilians killed due to those bombs wasn't even close as Japan were mainly fighting to save their islands at the time, and so the US dropping the bomb was for the sole purpose of killing all the civilians. This shows how nuclear weapons were the most significant in warfare as if used properly, no soldier in the battlefield would be safe meaning 'easy' victories for superpowers, but also because it put civilians at the forefront of wars and made them targets for the fighting governments.

So overall, while rifles and technological weapons played a huge impact on warfare, they had none more so than bombs, especially nuclear ones, as they meant the person who fired the bomb didn't have to even be in the same country as the ~~person~~<sup>target</sup> but they could still kill so much more people.



This answer reaches Level 4 for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis), offering a line of reasoning and consistent analysis. The explanation consistently focuses on the conceptual focus of the question with an analysis of significance of the rifles impact on warfare.

Accurate and wide-ranging knowledge covering three aspects of content is included with details of the establishment of the development in rifles from 1800, technological developments in weaponry in the 20th Century and developments in nuclear bombs. Therefore, this is Level 4 for Assessment Objective 1 (knowledge and understanding).

There is some explanation of judgement and some criteria for the required judgement is justified. This answer has met the demands of the Level 4 mark scheme for AO1 and AO2 and received 15 marks as a more thorough explanation of judgment could have been included. SPaG 4 marks.



Plan your answer before you start. This will help you to identify your line of reasoning and the criteria for judgement you wish to include.

## Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there were a number of impressive answers where candidates seemed well-prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation. In particular, candidates seemed well prepared for the 12 and 16 mark questions, with most answers having a clear structure and good use of specialist terms.

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

- Candidates need a secure understanding of the chronological periods and terms used in the specification as well as the term 'century'
- Candidates need to understand the themes within the specification – the nature of warfare and the experience of war.
- A number of answers failed to reach the highest level because they were not focused on the specific question being asked or did not precisely select accurate and relevant information from the correct time period.
- 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.

If extra paper is taken, candidates should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued and where the rest of the answer had been written; this should be on an additional sheet rather than elsewhere in the paper and 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 students should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly.

Examiners reported that 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 have been covered.

## **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>

