

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2010

GCE History 6H101/C

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022869

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

Option C – The British Empire: Colonisation and Decolonisation

6HI01 General comments

Once again most candidates for each option in Unit 1 appear to have been well prepared for the examination. There was, as is to be expected, a wide variety of responses but, as indicated in the reports for 2009, most candidates approach the questions with some attempt to focus on the question set and to attempt an analytical response. Considering the time limit for the examination it is commendable that candidates can produce two well structured answers, with little evidence of mismanagement of their time. Interestingly, most candidates answer the questions in the order in which they appear on the question paper even if they are less confident with the first topic covered. However, there are some areas (discussed below) that centres should consider when preparing their candidates for the Unit 1 examination.

The first two examination sessions of this new unit were complicated by the fact that a minority of students did not write their answers on the pages allocated in the answer booklet. A minor redesign of the booklet has, thankfully, eliminated this problem completely.

It is perhaps worth reminding centres that Unit 1 tests AO1(a) and AO1(b). AO1(a) is concerned with the recall, selection and deployment of historical knowledge, and the communication of knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner. AO1(b) tests the ability to demonstrate an understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and making judgements (the objectives are printed in full on page 10 of the specification). Examiners reported that candidates are becoming increasingly expert in developing some form of explanation or analysis and can, with varying degrees of effectiveness, frame their answer on the question. This skill alone, however, is not in itself sufficient to allow access to Levels 3 and above. The explanation must be supported and developed with a **range of relevant and accurate material** which allows the points made to stand up effectively. While some candidates still rely on extended passages of free-standing narrative, there were many whose limited or generalised knowledge, or even a considerable amount of incorrect information, affected the quality of their answers overall.

A welcome development is that planning of answers was much more apparent during this session than previously. Candidates should be encouraged to write brief but focused plans; some covered two pages and reduced the amount of time available for the answer itself. Planning will not be effective, however, unless candidates have studied the question and have understood precisely what is being asked of them. Answers at Level 4 require the response to relate well to the focus of the question and to show understanding of the key issues, and must be supported with a range of accurate relevant information. Once again, an appreciation of the time span set in the question is vital, but this links with an understanding of the whole question. This matter will be dealt with in greater detail in the reports on each question, but three examples highlight this point. Question D6 asked 'How far was Lenin responsible for the Bolsheviks' growing hold on power in the years 1917-24?' The phrase 'growing hold on power' suggests that the period under discussion is from the October/November coup of 1917 to Lenin's death in January 1924, since Lenin and the Bolsheviks did not exercise state power before this time. Several candidates, however, apparently saw the key words 'Lenin' and '1917' and wrote extensively on the Provisional Government before ending up, briefly, on the years to 1924. A few did not get beyond October/November. Many of the answers to C6 selected supporting evidence more relevant to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 than the abolition of slavery in 1833. As indicated in 2009 there are also still many answers to F7 that confuse the hyper-inflation of 1923 with the Wall St. Crash of 1929.

Some of the most effective answers are those which produce a succinct introduction clearly focused on the question asked and four or more well focused, analytical and evaluative paragraphs, with a clear conclusion answering the question asked. The long contextual introduction of the 45 minute essay is not necessary for the extended answers of a 35-40 minute response. Introductions which show an understanding of the contribution of the highlighted factor/event/individual/concept and refer to its relative importance compared to other factors or relative success/significance give some indication as to whether the candidate has understood the focus of the question; as does some indication of the time span involved. The questions require a judgement to be made but it is important that the conclusion sums up the argument made in the body of the essay.

Several questions invited a consideration of economic factors in determining an outcome. It was clear, across all six options, that many candidates are not comfortable addressing economic issues, and seemed uncertain of just what constituted an economic factor or economic conditions. In some cases, notably Questions B1 and C6, many simply ignored the given factor in the question in favour of other material with which they were familiar.

As always, the quality of written communication can have a marginal effect on candidates' attainment. Written communication is an assessed element of Unit 1 and this is clearly outlined in the mark schemes. Effective communication depends on a number of skills being deployed, and it is regrettable to record once again that very many candidates do not use capital letters appropriately, fail to spell common historical terms correctly, and do not shape their answer into appropriate and coherent paragraphs. Some only use capitals for inappropriate abbreviations. Naturally, developed literacy skills are a whole centre issue, but it might be worth pointing out to candidates that their communication will be taken into account, however marginally, in determining their final mark. Some examiners expressed concern about the way in which many candidates refer to people from different cultures.

Option C - Comments

There were over 300 candidates entered for Option C and it was very pleasing to see that all the topics are now being taught by centres. There were some excellent answers showing clear understanding and using well selected relevant and appropriate supporting evidence. However, there are still many answers which give generalised responses to the themes of the topic rather than focusing on the question asked and which are supported by very limited factual knowledge. By their nature, many of the questions in Option C do cover a very broad range of time which enables candidates to produce effective analysis but this means that the need for well selected accurate factual evidence in support is vital if judgements are to be substantiated. As referred to in the General Comments access to the higher Levels requires some attempt to balance analysis and evaluation with the ability to select and deploy accurate factual knowledge. An area of generalisation which does need to be addressed in several of the topics is the apparent arbitrary listing of goods, raw materials and resources traded between various parts of the Empire with little awareness of accuracy or geography.

Introductions and conclusions are important aspects of writing the well constructed answers required for the higher Levels. Introductions should attempt to show an understanding of the focus of the question with acknowledgement of the key issues and the time period giving some indication of the factors to be discussed. Below is an example of a relevant but generalised introduction followed by a more focused introduction:

"The needs of British manufacturers drove the expansion of the slave trade and slavery. However this was not the only cause of the expansion of the slave trade. The slave trade expanded for many reasons especially in the later years c1760-c1800. These will be explained throughout to show that the needs of British manufacturers only caused the expansion of the slave trade to a certain extent."

"The trading companies were very successful in stimulating the expansion of the British Empire in the years 1680-1783. The trading companies helped in the expansion of the British Empire through economics, land acquisition and the acts the government passed to allow them to have their own powers. However, war, slavery and the government all played parts in the expansion of the Empire."

This introduction is directly focused on the question asked

"To a certain extent the growth of African independence movements did speed up the process of decolonisation. The activities of nationalist movements in some countries such as Kenya, Uganda and Nigeria did speed up decolonisation because Britain could not control them. However, the Empire was in decline after World War II which meant they depended on the USA which did not support the Empire and with the Suez Crisis Britain no longer had confidence as an imperial power which meant that they were declining without the African independence movements anyway.

Conclusions should sum up the issues discussed in the main body of the answer with an evaluation of the extent, significance, responsibility etc. of the identified factor/event/issue. Below is a more generalised conclusion which attempts some evaluation

"British manufacturers were one of the main cause of the expansion of the slave trade. I believe that the extent was about 80% as it affected a lot of other causes as well. The demand for raw materials saw the increase of slaves and the expansion of the slave trade. They had a major affect which drove the slave trade to constantly expand c1760-c1800."

These conclusions attempt to give a more evaluative answer

"In conclusion, though most of the trading companies collapsed ultimately, they did so after having stimulated imperial expansion. The other factors that played a role, such as government and the expansion of the navy, while successfully boosting growth were not as effective as trading companies which made an impact across the whole spectrum and encouraged imperial expansion."

"It is clear that by the start of the 1900s jingoism had seen its peak and was on the downfall. However, that patriotic feeling was still embedded in the British people – just not as strongly as before. They were obviously not fully against imperialism as they didn't begin to decolonise until the 1950s. Britain had become increasingly jingoistic since 1875 – but had begun to decline again by the 1900s."

This conclusion clearly sums up the issues discussed in the answer with an evaluation of the identified factor

"Overall, therefore, I would argue that the needs of British manufacturers played only a marginal role in the boom of the slave trade during this period. However, I believe that indirectly, they fuelled the increase in sugar consumption, for the reasons I have outlined above. I would, therefore, conclude by saying that it was not the needs of the British manufacturers which drove the expansion of the slave trade,, but rather the desires of the public, and paid for in part by the relative prosperity of the Industrial Revolution."

Please note: further general comments are made below in reference to specific questions. It is suggested that centres read all the feedback below, not just those which refer to those topics being taught.

C1 – The Origins of the British Empire, c1680–1763

Question 1

This question was by far the most popular choice of those candidates studying topic C1. The question gave candidates a chance to show their knowledge and understanding of the role of trading companies in the expansion of empire c1680-1763. The best answers were able to weigh up the success of trading companies with reference not only to the physical growth of the Empire but also the wealth and prestige of empire across the entire period. These answers also attempted to counter this 'success' with reference to failures, such as the South Sea Bubble, and/or the integration of other factors such as government intervention and war. Some excellent answers were able to suggest change over time with the Atlantic trading companies becoming less important by 1763 and the East India Company about to embark on the expansion of influence over a whole sub-continent. Answers which approached the question through a general discussion of the trading companies or by providing case studies of the East India Company, the Royal African Company, the South Seas Company and/or the Hudson Bay Company were equally valid. However, when using case studies it is important to note that the topic begins c1680 and long narrative descriptions of the foundation of the trading companies over the previous century only serve to waste time through irrelevance. This question is also a good example of the need to read the question very carefully. The question did **not** ask whether the trading companies were the 'most important' factor in the expansion of the Empire but 'how successful' the companies themselves were in stimulating the expansion. 'Success' and 'significance' questions do not automatically require a discussion of other factors, although they can be successfully built into such an answer.

The British Empire became a flourishing empire primarily because of trading companies and their links with other factors. Between the years 1680-1763 the trading companies were at the heart of warfare, government policies such as the Navigation Acts and were directly involved with the Navy but more importantly with the colonies. All of this ensured that trading companies were what influenced Britain's imperial growth which was undoubtedly dominated by trade and commerce.

The first major joint-stock trading company to develop success was the East India Company, chartered in 1600. It devoted itself to trade with India, trading in various textiles such as calicoes, silk, ~~wool~~ and spices as well as tea.

(This page is for your first answer.) ~~It~~ It became an incredibly profitable company with profits of 3.2 million which ~~addadada~~ ~~Britain~~ developed Britain into a commercial power. As a trading company, the East India company helped create footholds in India which ultimately commenced a British Empire. It created forts in Bombay, Madras and Calcutta gaining more and more commodities to sell on a world wide scale. The EIC however faced continental rivals such as the Dutch and fought 3 wars against them and succeeded in giving the Dutch the spice industry but ~~in~~ keeping the more profitable textiles industry in India. This meant that the ~~the~~ East India company could trade more efficiently and successfully without threats from other rivals.

Britain further gained profits from ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~important~~ ~~trading~~ company companies trading across the Atlantic following the Dutch, Portuguese and Spanish. Britain realised extensive profits could be made from commodities across the Atlantic. In 1672 the Royal African Company was formed, with a monopoly, allowing it to trade in the Americas. After the realisation that white labour was not productive or successful all the major powers moved to black slave labour from West Africa, including the Royal African Company. It ~~to~~ created 8 forts

(This page is for your first answer.) In West Africa and traded 100,000 enslaved Africans across the Atlantic. At first it seemed an increasingly lucrative trade with new commodities including coffee, indigo, rice and more importantly sugar being transported back to England to be consumed or re-exported. Products such as tea, coffee and sugar soon developed into necessities rather than luxuries ~~present~~ creating incredibly high demand. This led to further demand for slave labour in order for colonies to develop and so, more and more Africans were captured to fulfill these demands. The Royal African Company was at the heart of this and similarly to the East India Company, secured footholds in the Americas, transporting slaves there. However, as demand for commodities increased it seemed that the Royal African Company simply ~~could~~ couldn't supply, ^{due to interlopers} and so plantation owners turned to ~~via~~ private merchants who promised to deliver on time and ~~and~~ ^{were} not held back by maintenance of the fort. The Royal African Company's loss of monopoly in 1698 simply showed the growing demand for goods across the Americas and allowed Britain to establish that this trade was incredibly lucrative and beneficial to Britain and its growth as an Empire.

The trading companies had further links with other factors influencing Britain such as warfare. The ~~East India Company~~ ~~in the wake~~ ~~of~~ ~~Spanish~~ ~~succession~~ ~~in~~ ~~1701~~ ~~the~~ ~~war~~ ~~of~~ ~~1701~~ ~~the~~ ~~most~~ ~~important~~ ~~was~~, the seven years war in 1756-1763 involved the trading companies heavily. The East India company became more than just a trader with its own settlements, ~~and~~ ~~diplomats~~ ~~and~~ ~~army~~ it became more of a government. This meant that from its profits it was able to develop a successful land army which defeated the French and completely cleared them out of India ~~&~~ and Bengal. The battle of Plessey in 1757 won by ~~one~~ of India, showed the EIC as being a strong, dominant land power threatening rivals and maintaining a monopoly for its trade, increasing its profits and securing Britain as the most imperial economic power. From these victories it was clear Britain ~~&~~ had the psychological and material wills to expand its empire.

As well as that, following the war of the Spanish Succession, the treaty of Utrecht in 1713 was also arguably an imperative success for Britain. It gained colonies in North America such as ~~at~~ ~~Watts~~, Hudson Bay, Nova Scotia as well as taking

control of the ~~area~~ Gibraltar and minor ~~islands~~ in the Mediterranean. More importantly however it gained the *Asiento de Negros* allowing it to trade with Spanish colonies. This led to the creation of the South Sea Company ~~and~~ which was key in putting the *Asiento* into full effect, trading in vast amounts of slaves and goods and gaining even more money for Britain's ~~overall~~ empire to develop as well as establishing Britain as an economical, ~~and~~ commercial power.

All the trading companies linked with Government policies such as the Navigation Acts also helped the empire to expand. ~~It~~ ^{they} allowed only goods in British ships, manned by British seamen ~~trading~~ to trade with just Britain and British colonies. Of course, those trading were the trading companies and so without them the Acts would have been pointless and ineffective. These Acts based around the framework of mercantilism and executed by the companies meant that rivals trade would decline, making Britain more profitable. As well as that ~~the Government~~ under the Government of William of Orange in 1688, a 'fiscal-military' state was developed. ~~in this way~~ this was directly involved with the East India Company as it

was what funded the Navy
Britain's Imperative Navy through custom taxes
and Revenue acquired from the colonization on
Bengal. Under Charles II the "Blue-water war policy"
both the Navy and trading companies were
mutually sustaining this symbiotic relationship
meant that the EIC would fund the Navy in
return for it guarding existing markets and
making its trade more safe and efficient. It
is therefore the EIC who ~~created~~ helped create
the British Navy into a highly valued power.
^{Hence} ~~Also~~, in a stronger Navy which was meant a smaller
land based army, but this also allowed the
EIC to come into ~~map~~ effect as it had its own
land based military who were also able to defeat
rivals such as the French and Dutch.

~~the "land strategy" was also important as it followed~~
~~through~~ Overall, the trading companies all
benefitted the British Empire, helping to establish
footholds in both India and the Americas, and
trading in vast amounts of slaves and goods such
as sugar, tea, cotton, textiles and spices, all of which
created a financially strong Empire and made Britain
the foremost, imperial Empire in the world. The
companies links with government such as etc

connections with helping follow through the Navigation Acts and funding the Navy which went on to defeat ~~was~~ other continental powers across the world, also helped secure Britain as the most dominant European power.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a level 5 answer. The answer clearly addresses the focus of the question which is the success of the trading companies rather than the trading companies as the most important factor in expansion. There are still some aspects which are weaker such as lists of commodities and the chronological order of wars but the trading companies are dealt with in detail to establish both land and economic expansion. Other factors are established but as part of an integrated response rather than separately.

Question 2

This question was answered by only a very few candidates. This was possibly due to a combination of the type of question and candidate confidence in their knowledge of the government intervention in comparison to trading companies. 'Why' questions are a feature of the 6HI01 specification and require a causative analysis which comes to a judgement of the question asked. Most of the answers which were attempted tended to access Level 3 with weak references to the different reasons for the expansion of the British Empire during this period and only some understanding of government intervention. For example, some answers dealt with the impact of the Navigation Acts separately from government intervention without reference to any links between the two. A few very good answers were able to show how government became increasingly involved in the expansion of Empire in both intentional and unintentional ways.

C2 – Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740–89

Question 3

This question was both popular and generally well answered. Candidates are well prepared for a question concerning the build up in tensions before the outbreak of conflict in 1775 and, unlike in many of the Option C topics, in general have a good grasp of the chronology of events. Most candidates were aware of the potential impact of the removal of the French threat although there were some who were unable to make the connection with the victory in the Seven Years' War treating it as a separate reason. The most successful answers were able either to show a chain of events resulting from the removal of the French threat leading to greater tension or to challenge the given factor by reference to more important economic and political grievances. However, it is important to note here that many answers were only able to access low or mid Level 4 because of a lack of balance in the response. Too many candidates briefly glossed over the given factor before launching into a discussion of the alternative factors without reference as to why these other factors were more important. Successful answers are those which refer directly and accurately to the contribution of the given factor thus enabling the candidate to weigh up the contribution in comparison to alternative factors. Answers which ignore or fail to develop the given factor will only access Level 3.

Question 4

This question was also popular and once again candidates were well prepared for a question concerning the outcome of the War of Independence. With this question however, even more than for Q3, many answers were unable to access high Level 4 and above because of an unbalanced response. Many responses were focused more on the failures of the British military commanders than evaluating the contribution of the military skills of the American colonists. However, some of the most effective answers were able to substantiate the argument that British failures were more important than American military skills by contrasting the relative failure of American regular fighting with the inability of the British commanders to follow up their potential successes. The role of foreign intervention, particularly from France, was also used successfully to counter the statement in the question. A significant number of responses interpreted American military skills as being almost wholly related to the ability of Washington as a commander. At the highest Level there were some outstanding answers which were able to produce an integrated answer showing change over time, suggesting that early American defeats were steadily overcome by the arrival of French support and the use of military tactics more suited to American topography and organisation.

(This page is for your first answer.) Plan - War of Independence - Military skill of American

Washington - Colonial army - 30,000 men

Battles - surprise attack - April, 1775 - Concord - General Francis Smith / Saratoga

Yorktown - Comte d'Estimongis help - Clinton's lackness - Peninsula

Help - France + Spain - European threats - Russia, Denmark + Sweden

British incomp. - Howe, Clinton, Cornwallis, Burgoyne

Territory - home soil - 3,000 miles away

The War of Independence was fought between the American colonies and the British forces between 1775 and 1782, the result of which was an American victory. There are many reasons that this was the outcome, the strength and skill of the colonial military was not the only factor.

In 1774, a colonial army was agreed by delegates from the American states. The Army would have 30,000 men and be led by the Virginian, George Washington. Washington proved himself to

(This page is for your first answer.) He was an excellent tactician, defeating British forces on several occasions. One of Washington's most vital tactics was the use of 'guerrilla' warfare, which means surprise attacks on the enemy in order to hurt their morale and confidence, and to attack the opposition when they least expect it, making victory easier. The 30,000 strong Continental Army maintained high morale thanks to Washington and leaders such as Gage. With each victory their confidence grew and their organisation and fighting skills also improved.

The colonial ~~not~~ victory at Concord ~~was~~ was one of the four major battles won by Washington's men. Another was the recapturing of political centre Boston. Thomas Gage, Commander-in-Chief in America, had fortified the city with British men but the bravery of the Americans saw them to victory.

On the 4th July, 1776, the Americans declared their independence. This was the sign for France to join the side of the colonists in the fight against the British, promising they would if independence was declared. Up until this point, French Captain Comte d'Estaing had been supplying arms secretly to the colonists in the guise of a clothing company, but now they would openly fight the British. Their help was invaluable, not least because of the skilled military they had.

(This page is for your first answer.) Along with Comte de Ensling, Comte de Rochambeau and Comte de Barron were not over taking thousand of men and a sizeable navy. Not only did they provide the extra man power, but they also enlisted the help of the Spanish, promising them Gibraltar from the British as a result. The Spanish and French threatened Britain itself, being only a short boat ride away, and also other British colonies like India, the West Indies and Gibraltar. This meant that Britain had to spread its forces across the world instead of focusing them in America.

British tactics played a part in their downfall, they tried to stop merchant ships from reaching America and as a result the neutral countries of Russia, Denmark and Sweden declared their opposition against them, heightening European tensions and need to be prepared in Europe.

The incompetence of British leaders was also a key factor in their defeat. During the first 3 years of the war, ~~Admiral~~ Commander-in-Chief Admiral Howe only won minor victories against the American, and despite taking almost every urban centre, had little to show for it. He quit his job in 1778 and Henry Clinton, his deputy, took over. Clinton remained in his role till the end of the war but was completely at a loss.

(This page is for your first answer.) on how to defeat the colonists.
He failed to back General Cornwallis up at the last major battle of the war, Yorktown, and sent ~~him~~ his troops in days to late. Cornwallis was outnumbered 16,000 troops to 8,000 with the French Navy blocking their exit. He surrendered and the British fight was over from there. General Burgoyne was another British general who didn't understand guerrilla tactics and was defeated in the turning point of the war, Saratoga, 1777.

British forces were demoralised and questioned why they were fighting a battle 3,000 miles from home. The Americans knew their home terrain but the British had no experience of it.

The strength of the American military, in particular the way Washington organised and deployed them, was vital to their victory, but, it was the help of France and Spain and the incompetence of the British which helped them secure independence. Had that the European threat on Britain, meaning they had to stretch their forces, in the a key aspect as the British were not strong enough to cope.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 answer. The candidate has given a secure analysis of the different reasons for the expansion of the slave trade. There is a range of different factors discussed and despite a lack of detail the information is secure and it is clear that the candidate is aware of the separate aspects of the trade and the role of manufacturers and consumers. However, the different factors are not clearly interlinked, reference to the specific situation in the time period is not made directly and there is no reference to change over time.

C3 – The Slave Trade, Slavery and the Anti-Slavery Campaigns, c1760–1833

Question 5

This question was answered by a significant number of candidates but was less popular than Q6. The responses to this question on the expansion of the slave trade c1760–c1800 raised a number of issues with relevance to several of the topics in Option C. Many of the answers gave a generalised overview of the slave trade with very little reference to the time period involved and with little clear understanding of the potential contribution of British manufacturers. There were many L2 and low Level 3 answers which gave a brief overview of the foundation of the slave trade in the preceding century and a description of the Triangular Trade with vague references to British traders. Many responses also contained irrelevant passages describing the treatment of slaves during the Middle Passage. A small, but worrying, number of candidates also seem to believe that large scale slave ownership occurred in Britain itself. Candidates need to be provided with information about the growth, and potential decline, of the slave trade during the specific period of the topic and the vocabulary connected to the various people involved in the different stages of the slave trade such as manufacturers, merchants, plantation owners etc. if they are to write more than general analysis. This is particularly so for those centres which combine topics C1 and C3. The candidates must be aware that the two topics cover different time periods and centres need to ensure that a clear break is made between the two. There were, however, some excellent answers which were able to evaluate the contribution of British manufacturers in comparison to the needs of British consumers, plantation owners and the slave traders themselves.

It is fair to say that the needs for British manufactures drove the expansion of the slave trade in the years 1760–1800. A decent amount, however, there were other reasons such as the demand for slave-made products, the profits that were made from the trade and the efficiency of the trade itself which also contributed greatly to the expansion of the trade.

British manufacturers were need^{ed} because slave traders needed the products that the manufacturers made, such as: pottery, silk and guns etc. to trade with the West Africans for slaves. These manufacturers led to an expansion in the trade because more people were demanding slaves so more products needed to be made in order for the British to trade with the West Africans.

However another factor which led to the expansion of the trade was Britain's demand for slave made products. Sugar was craved by the British which was grown on British islands such as Barbados and as years passed the amount of tons of sugar that was ~~imported~~ imported into Britain increased greatly. At first sugar was expensive, but as the trade expanded, the price of sugar dropped, meaning it was more easily ~~accessible~~ accessible by poorer communities in Britain.

Profits were made in many other areas of the trade which led to its expansion. The profits ⁱⁿ ship building and any areas that were involved with the manufacturing of ships increased greatly as materials were needed to build slave ships which would carry slave to America and slave made products back ~~from~~ to Britain.

It is crucial to mention the efficiency of the slave trade itself when discussing the expansion of the trade. The trade was so efficient simply because the slave ships were literally never empty. The ships would travel to Africa ~~with~~ with a ship full of British products to trade with the Africans. Then the ship would be full of 'cargo' (slave) which would be taken to the West Indies. Then finally on the return back to Britain the ship would be full of slave-made products ready to be sold.

The profits made by slave ports such as London, Liverpool and Bristol also contributed to the ~~the~~ expansionⁿ of the trade. Liverpool especially prospered from the trade as it would send out ships with the guarantee that they would return full of cargo that would be sold in Liverpool at the ports and across the country.

In conclusion, although the need for British manufacturers did contribute to the ~~expansion~~ expansion of the slave trade, I believe that there were more influential reasons for the expansion, especially the demand for slave made products.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 5 answer. The introduction does address the question but does not necessarily suggest a Level 5 answer. The main body of the answer does, however, address the question directly through a discussion of the slave trade during the period being discussed with reference to trade with the American colonies and a suggestion that the given factor is not necessarily the strongest due to the continuing growth of the slave trade after American independence suggesting that the consumption of Caribbean commodities by the British public was more important. The conclusion gives an evaluation of the role of British manufacturers.

Question 6

This question was by far the most popular but many of the responses were disappointing. The question required an understanding of the reasons for the abolition of slavery in 1833. The specification clearly shows a need to understand the circumstances surrounding both the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 and slavery in 1833. A large number of answers not only found it difficult to address the possible underlying economic causes for abolition in 1833 but wrote generalised, and poorly exemplified, explanations of why the abolition campaigns were successful in bringing an end to the slave trade. Much exemplification centred around the early work of Wilberforce and Clarkson, the importance of the Zong Case, the slave revolts of the pre-1807 period and the political influence of Pitt. However, some excellent answers were able to identify 1833 as the key date with specific references to potential economic causes, such as the consequence of the abolition of the slave trade, soil infertility, competition, boycotts and the cost of later slave revolts, the role of women in the later abolition campaigns, the role of Foxwell Buxton and the contribution of political reform in Britain in 1832. Most of the increasingly large number of textbooks and books on slavery do refer to the economic conditions in the West Indies at this time. It is vital that candidates are prepared to answer the specific question asked rather than write a generalised answer about the abolition campaigns and the individuals involved.

Slavery ~~was~~ has been argued to kick start Britain's industrial revolution, however within the West Indies, they were now struggling with economic difficulties. ~~In~~ some argue this is the primary source to the abolition of slavery in 1833, but there are many other factors, and in this essay I intend to examine the points to see if it was the primary source.

Slavery was profitable all over the world, had had changed many countries, especially Britain. However within the West Indies there was economic difficulties to keep to the demand and the cost for products such as ~~rice~~ ^{rice}, sugar, tobacco were now highly expensive. This of course meant that many

countries were deteriorating and the slave trade was becoming pointless. Lord Canning stated that it was now cheaper to buy tobacco of a free man than import slaves. For this reason you could say this was the primary reason.

However another important factor were the evangelicals in the abolition to slavery. They opened the eyes to freedom, for slaves. The missionaries travelled abroad spreading the word. Christianity was highly not acceptable for slaves to worship as this also showed freedom, and

many moral stones come out from ~~this~~ ^{this}. For this you could say the ~~evangelical~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~primary~~ ~~reason~~. As ~~people~~ ^{slaves} were hearing about the morals and the idea of freedom many people started to revolt. The Tacky's revolt in 1760 showed the instability slaves had, and how they can all work together, as Bussa's revolt did ~~in~~ in 1816, as this showed that the slaves ~~were~~ were now rebelling against the masters. The Christmas revolt in 1831, again showed the instability and it also brought in the morals as ~~Bussa~~ Sam Sharpe made the group swear an oath they wouldn't work until better treatment. This opened MP's eyes to what was

right and what was wrong. For this you could say the evangelicals were the primary reason.

Another reason: are the key abolitionists such as Wilberforce. He was able to press forward the motion and Bulo to parliament, especially as he was friends with William Pitt, who was Prime Minister. Also the people such as Olaudah Equiano and John Newton who were able to give evidence after Olaudah experienced being a slave to Henry Pascal and sharing it to everyone in his book 'The interesting narrative' and John Newton as he was a captain on the slave ship Duke of

Argyll. Because of this he got to show and illustrate the conditions and horrific times the slaves had to go through. There were also cases such as the Zong cases which again illustrated the obscurity of slavery. For this reason you could say that these ~~are~~ key abolitionists were the key to the abolition in 1831.

Another reason was the reform of Britain. In 1832 the Great Reform Act was passed creating a new wave of MPs. ~~The~~ It was a whig government as well, as before the times were very based on land owning profit making aims.

This therefore allowed the Bill to be passed through by people who were every day people, as more people were allowed the vote.

To conclude I feel the West Indies economic problems were not the primary factor to the abolition movement, it was the evangelicals and key abolitionists who pushed for it to be abolished. They kept the message alive, and got to spread the message across to the slaves, for the slaves to revolt and press for change. Overall it was the evangelicals and the key abolitionists which were the primary factor.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a typical Level 3 answer to this question. The answer attempts analysis and shows some understanding of the issues involved in the question. There is some understanding that the slave trade was abolished in 1807 and reference to the circumstances in 1833 but the majority of the answer is made up of a variety of factors which contributed to the abolition of the slave trade wandering over a wide period of time and including many events/individuals which are not focused on 1833.

C4 – Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760–c1835

There were very few entries for this topic but it is a pleasure to see that there an increasing number of candidates. We are hoping to be able to provide more information for centres teaching the smaller entry topics in 6HI01 and would encourage centres to use the Communities section for History on the Edexcel website to post any issues or enquiries which they might have and to look out for any potential curriculum development information. Q7 produced some interesting answers on the significance of Anglo-French rivalry and several responses were able to deal adeptly with a chronological range which required an understanding of the significance of Anglo-French relations at the very beginning and end of the time period involved. There were also some good attempts to explain the significance of the activities of Clive without the need to stray too far out of the time frame involved. Q8 also produced some interesting answers in which the complexity of the relationships between the Indian princes and the nature of British rule were clearly established. However, there were some generalised responses which although analytical in nature require more specific examples of the actions of Indian princes.

C5 – Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815–70

There were very few entries for this topic but it is a pleasure to see that there an increasing number of candidates. We are hoping to be able to provide more information for centres teaching the smaller entry topics in 6HI01 and would encourage centres to use the Communities section for History on the Edexcel website to post any issues or enquiries which they might have and to look out for any potential curriculum development information. This topic in particular can lend itself to more generalised responses which show a clear understanding of the issues involved but provide limited factual examples to substantiate judgements. It is important for centres teaching this topic to ensure that candidates are able to select specific examples of formal and informal influence, missionary activity (other than that of David Livingstone as a generic example), trading activity and naval action. These do not need to be covered in great detail but provided as specific examples of particular activity. For example, the specific raw materials being traded with India at the time or when gunboat diplomacy was used in the Far East or West Africa. This was particularly the case for Q9 where some answers showed very good understanding of the concept of moral consideration with reference to religion, British civilisation and the Pax Britannica but were unable to provide accurate examples. Responses to Q10 attempted to show the relationship between the Empire and British industrialisation with reference not only to the need for raw materials but to potential consumer markets and the creation of an imperial infrastructure. However, some answers concentrated on describing industrialisation in Britain often with reference to the period before 1815. As with the topics which cover the slave trade it is important that candidates are aware of the developments within the time period involved. This is particularly so with centres who combine C5 with C6. Some candidates confuse the two with answers to C5 referring to the Scramble for Africa.

C6 – Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875–1914

Question 11

This question was less popular than Q12 and produced a variety of responses across the Levels. Most candidates were aware of the concept of 'jingoism', indeed many spent too much time describing its origins and meaning, but there were a few candidates who appeared to believe that it referred to a growing hostility towards Empire. The reference to 'attitudes in Britain' allowed candidates to discuss the responses of British officialdom and/or British society to the growth of Empire in Africa. Level 3 answers often accepted the given statement explaining how initial reluctance and/or apathy led to increasing interference/interest in imperial ventures whilst others concentrated mainly on the effects of the Second Boer War in questioning imperial attitudes. A few responses assumed that this was a question requiring an explanation of the Scramble for Africa. The best answers, however, were able to show the complexity of the situation with different political and social responses to Empire within Britain from the 1870s, attitudes towards expansion in the Nile Region in the 1880s and 1890s and the ups-and-downs of the Second Boer War. At Level 5 there was direct evaluation as to whether 'jingoistic' attitudes increased during the time-span of the question.

Question 12

This question was the most popular in C6 and most candidates were able to reflect upon the role of men-on-the-spot in relation to the expansion of the African Empire. Most candidates understood the concept in general and were able to refer to examples of the activities of individuals in Africa that affected the growth of the Empire in Africa with frequent mention of Rhodes, Goldie, MacKinnon, Milner and Gordon. However, a few responses assumed that men-on-the-spot referred to British politicians with discussions of the roles of Gladstone, Disraeli and Chamberlain. At Level 3 and low Level 4 answers were often well-rehearsed explanations of the reasons for British involvement in the Scramble for Africa which although showing some focus on the question were not clearly attempting to evaluate the role of the man-on-the-spot. It was pleasing to see, however, that there were far fewer descriptions of the different theories of imperial expansion and more consideration of the specific question asked. The best answers were able to show the contribution of certain individual actions at different times and in different areas of Africa and to compare these with other factors which were more or less important. Finally, a small number of candidates seemed to approach the question with reference to European expansion rather than British expansion. Many of the textbooks do approach the Scramble for Africa from a European perspective and European rivalry is a key aspect of the specification but the candidates need to be aware that the focus of the topic is British involvement. There were, however, a number of good answers which were able to establish that it was the activities of men-on-the-spot from other countries, such as Karl Peters, who encouraged British interest.

(This page is for your first answer.) Expansion of the British Empire during the years 1875-1914 can be put down to many factors, men alone is one of them. Benjamin Disraeli can be ~~one~~ one of those those men. Since the opening of Suez canal in Egypt 1869 Britain was interested in the country because who ever controlled the canal controlled trade to Britains empire in Asia especially India. That is why Disraeli bought shares in canal and when Egypt went into a national revolt against Britain because Egypt owed large sums of money to Britain and did not want to pay it back. That is why in 1882 Britain took control of the country to mainly protect the canal, another factor in Britain taking over the country was the increasing danger of Sudan led by the Mahdi who had called for

(This page is for your first answer.) holy war. Scared Britain into getting involved in the conflict between Egypt and the Mahdi. It took Britain thirteen years since the death of Charles Gordon at Khartoum 1885 to 1898 when they finally destroyed the Sudanese rebels at the battle of Omdurman. Cecil Rhodes can also be seen as a man who expanded the empire. His famous idea was to build a British empire in Africa

stretching from Cape to Cairo. Rhodes could be seen ^{as} the man who started the Second Boer War. When large amounts of gold were found in the Transvaal and Orange Free State Rhodes a man who made his money from diamonds worked ^{it} a opportunity arose when foreigners or 'Uitlanders' who lived in Transvaal trying to make their fortune seemed to be ~~of~~ treated unfairly when they were being taxed very heavily ~~hardly~~ by the Boer government. Rhodes set up the infamous Jameson Raid 1895. This supposed ~~to~~ to make the Uitlanders rise up and take down the ~~the~~ Boer government but it was a complete disaster.

Another ~~and~~ reason Britain expanded their empire so rapidly was to limit their imperial rivals gains. For instance the French who wanted to build an empire from east to West Africa. A ~~is~~ incident arose 600 km east of Khartoum where a small expeditionary force wanted to occupy the upper Nile for France. Britain saw the upper Nile as part of Egypt so their so Lord Kitchener with his army ~~to~~ twice as big as the French met them. A diplomatic ~~is~~ ^{crisis} ~~incident~~ arose which came known as the Fashoda crisis. A treaty finally came about because both were worried about the new danger Germany.

The Second Boer War could also be seen as his limit imperial rivals. Britain wished to take the Transvaal and the Orange Free state before Germany could because Germany had colonies bordering these two states. ~~Suppression of~~ Spread of Christianity could be factor of Britain's expansion with Dr David Livingstone travelling the continent preaching. ~~Suppression of~~ the slave trade could be another Britain invaded both the Sudan and Zanzibar ~~for that~~ ~~to~~ the countries who

(This page is for your first answer.) will rising steadily. National Prestige could be another with growing ideas such as Socialism ~~Britain~~ and national schooling in place Britain thought it was a good idea to show young school children everywhere colored in red is Britain's ~~and~~ this would make them feel more patriotic.

In conclusion I think Britain's main reason ~~was to~~ ~~safe~~ for expansion was to safeguard the Suez canal but individuals such as Disraeli and Rhodes played a key part in keeping it safe.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 3 answer. The answer attempts to answer the question asked and shows some understanding of the issues but lacks clear understanding of men-on-the-spot. There are examples of British expansion with mention of Rhodes, Kitchener and Gordon but not always explicitly. There is acknowledgement of other factors. The candidate is aware of the issues involved but the organisation of material and some confusion about the key factor puts this into Level 3.

C7 – Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c 1957–81

Question 13

This question was overwhelmingly the most popular choice in C7 and most candidates were able to discuss the role of African independence movements in the process of decolonisation. Only a few answers dismissed the given factor without reference to African nationalism and most were able to identify the role played by independence groups in different countries. However, many candidates confused the names of both organisations and individuals in different countries, for example, suggesting that Mugabe was the leader of KANU in Tanzania and this lack of accuracy is an area which some centres need to address. Some very good analytical answers were affected by this lack of accuracy. Many answers at Level 3 and low Level 4 were focused on the reasons for decolonisation in general rather than focusing on the speeding up of process during this period. It is important that centres address the predicted time-scale for independence for African colonies at the beginning of the period in order to establish an appreciation of to what extent and why the process did speed up. The best answers were able to use different examples selectively and accurately to suggest that the growth of African independence movements were integral to the decisions to speed up the process or to suggest that despite being influential it was the domestic and/or international situation in Britain which was more important.

How far did the growth of African independence movements speed up the process of decolonisation 1957-65?

Mau Mau

Suez

Nkrumah

other nations decolonising

TANU

Failure of CDD-EEC talks

Audit of Empire.

The growth of independence movements in Africa cannot be ignored as a major factor affecting decolonisation. However it should not be overstated, as many factors such as the Suez Crisis, Macmillan's audit of Empire, the decolonising ^{by} other nations and the failure of the Colonial Economic Development scheme should also be taken into account.

Jomo Kenyatta of the Kikuyu tribe in Africa, began the National African Union in 1948, in

attempt to rid of the "White Highlands" from British control. However, this nationalist movement soon coalesced into the terrorist group, the Mau Mau. The Mau Mau ~~became~~ were a violent terrorist organization intent on ridding Kenya from white rule. They were most potent between 1952 and 56 and caused Britain to call a "state of emergency" in Kenya. They began taking ritual oaths, which bound them to fight against white rule and loyalist collaborators. In the early 1950s, they attacked a police station, and burned a village of 3000 people as it was suspected that they were led by a loyalist chief. The effect they had was quite clear ~~as~~ as Britain ordered martial law, and began ~~employing~~ ^{employing} the use of ~~pseudo~~ pseudo gangs to oust the terrorists, as well as concentration camps for those captured. Furthermore even after the uprising was suppressed, 4 years later in 1960, when the governor of Kenya announced that their hero, Jomo Kenyatta, would never be released from prison, ~~the~~ on uprising occurred, displaying their ongoing potency. In addition to this, by 1955 it was costing the British taxpayer £10,000 for each Mau Mau member captured.

However, this cost could also be linked to Macmillan's cost benefit analysis scheme, thereby

emphasising a British desire to no longer be a catalyst of this economically impenetrable region. This uprising, also was not ~~as~~ a nationalist movement, it was regionalist, based upon the Kikuyu tribe. Furthermore although a state of emergency was called, the Mau Mau could not have been that dangerous, otherwise evacuations would have been ordered. As it was, only 32 white people were killed, which is less than those killed in accidents on the streets of Nairobi in the same four year period. In addition to this, ~~the~~ the British began considering decolonising the area in 1960 at the first Lancaster House conference, four years after the uprising.

However, ~~the~~ ~~former~~ Ghana, was ~~seen~~ portrayed by Britain as a 'model of decolonisation'. It was the one of the first to gain independence on the 6th March 1957, under the ~~new~~ CPP, Convention people's party, led by Kwame Nkrumah. He on release from prison in 1949, created this party and campaigned immediately, using the slogan "self-government now" urging Britain to shape an appropriate timetable for decolonisation in the area. The Coasey Committee in 1951 allowed for elections, and Arthur Clarke, the British governor, even supported Nkrumah, seeing him

as the ~~the~~ most peaceful route to independence, ^{as} even after the National Liberation Movement of the North had attempted to suppress his rule, he ^{still} won the elections of 1957.

A similar process can be seen in Tangika, however, here Britain was also forced to decolonise the area, due to a UN charter of ~~1948~~, as they claimed it for Germany after WWI. Julius Nyerere joined the nationalist movement, TANU, Tangika National Africa Union, and ~~joined~~ his through popularity was voted into the legislature and in 1960, became chief minister and due to his campaigns Britain was forced to ~~the~~ independence in 1961.

However, these nationalist movements should not be overstated. After WW2, Britain attempted to rebuild her power through colonial exploitation. This is clear as Britain increased the ~~size~~ of the colonial office by 45% between 1945 and 48, when attempting to join the CDC. The war had crippled Britain, and the gold standard set the pound ~~high~~, destroying British trade with Europe, and furthermore the USA had taken over as the world's leading shipbuilder and the Far East were undercutting the British textile trade. Therefore Britain had to

empire and tried to export it but this failed, and only cost Britain money.

In 1956, the Suez Crisis emphasised a British need to decolonise. Britain were caught behaving like an old-imperialist nation and neither Europe or the USA approved. Eisenhower in particular had his back to Eden. This crisis ^{occurred} and Britain were trying to forcefully claim Lad, whereas ~~the~~ states such as Germany and France, were happy to relinquish their territory after WW2, De Gaulle in particular was quick to decolonise.

Macmillan's audit of empire, emphasised, how little Britain required an empire. ~~The~~ Macmillan ~~in~~ in 1957 asked for a cost benefit analysis of all of Britain's colonial ~~possession~~ possessions. From this he discovered that the cost of maintaining the empire was simply not worth the effort. This in itself was the catalyst that triggered a more rapid rate of decolonisation by Britain. Furthermore, he was attempting to rebuild Britain's power, and ~~so~~ as the empire had already failed to complete this objective he had to Europe the the European Economic Committee, in attempt to boost Britain's economic profits through Europe.

There, all though nationalistic movements placed pressure upon Britain to decolonise. A fear of appearing as an old-capitalist power, a desire to improve trade markets, and Macmillan's cost benefit analysis cannot be ignored.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a high Level 4 answer. It is well focused on the question asked with clear detail, not always completely secure, outlining the role of independence movements and other factors. There is good coverage of different independence movements in different parts of the African Empire. However, the organisation of the answer leads to some imbalance and the issue of 'speeding up' decolonisation is more implicit than explicit.

Question 14

There were very few answers to this question. The events surrounding the process of decolonisation in east and west Africa are clearly indicated in the specification. Most responses focused on the actual events surrounding decolonisation itself but answers which referred to the period of political transition up to the early 1970s, as suggested by the specification, were valid. The best answers suggested that in theory the 'planned' decolonisation of the administrative colonies of west Africa were likely to be more orderly than in east Africa where there were settler colonies but that in reality the orderly nature of decolonisation tended to depend on a combination of factors in specific colonies.

6HI01 C Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
60	34.4	11.9

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	46	40	34	28	23
Uniform boundary mark	100	80	70	60	50	40
% Candidates		19.6	37.4	55.6	72.2	84.8

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022869 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

