



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE
In History (8HI0) Paper 1D

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

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

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

Summer 2019

Publications Code 8HI0_1D_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the fourth year of the reformed AS Level paper 1D which deals with Britain, c1785-c1870: democracy, protest and reform.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

8H10_1D_Q01

Question 1 asked candidates whether an increase in respect for trade unions was the most important consequence of New Model Unionism in the years 1850-70. Most candidates understood that there was an increase in respect for trade unions shown by employers and the government. Successful candidates compared this to other consequences such as the solidarity shown to other trade unions. Less able candidates offered general information about the New Model Unions.

8H10_1D_Q02

Question 2 asked candidates whether effective leadership in the years 1831-47 was the main reason for the success of the Ten Hours Movement. Most candidates knew about the fundamental features of the Ten Hours Movement and the role of leaders such as the MP John Fielden. Similarly there was accurate information offered on factory legislation in these years. Some discussion was offered by making a comparison of the leaders of the Ten Hour Movement with some Chartist leaders. Less able candidates tended to offer general information about the working conditions in mines and mills.

8H10_1D_Q03

Question 3 asked candidates about the extent to which campaigning for electoral reform changed in the years 1785-1870. Most candidates were able to refer to some different campaigns for electoral reform, however only a minority dealt with the second order concept of change and continuity. Most candidates offered material on campaigning for the 1832 and 1867 reform acts and tended to frame their answers around external and internal (to parliament) drivers of change. A small minority of candidates were able to address change

across the whole time frame. Less able candidates offered general information about one or other particular campaigns such as the Chartists.

8H10_1D_Q04

Question 4 asked candidates whether increased regional economic diversity was the most significant feature of industrialisation in the years 1785-1870. Most candidates offered solid information about some aspect of regional economic diversity. This kind of response was framed mainly around the concept of a North-South divide. A minority of candidates had a grasp of the wider concept of industrialisation and referred to laissez faire economics, banking and the development of an industrial middle class. Many candidates were concerned largely with the levels of human misery generated in the industrial heartlands and offered judgements on the significance of this without comparing it to other features of industrialisation. Less able candidates offered general information about industrialisation.

8H10_1D_Q05

Question 5 asked candidates to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider how far they agreed that the slave trade ended due to the political talents of William Wilberforce. At the top end candidates saw two differing historical interpretations, while at the bottom end a simple Wilberforce versus other factors analysis predominated. Successful candidates understood that extract 1 was a powerful argument in support of the view in the question and were able to offer some development of the interpretation therein, often showing some knowledge of Wilberforce's efforts in the House of Commons or his relationship with Pitt. Candidates were much better at dealing with extract 1 than extract 2. When dealing with extract 2 candidates largely picked up on the issue of humanitarian campaigning and used this to write about Clarkson and his campaigning activities. A minority of candidates challenged the pro-Wilberforce arguments in extract 1, often by reference to the changing political climate in 1807. Less successful candidates tended to use selected quotations to explain the views in the extracts and then offer a judgement as to the merits of that view. This took them away from the discussion of interpretations. At the bottom end candidates denounced the sources for being secondary and preferred an explanation of the ending of the slave trade based on their own knowledge.

Paper Summary

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

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- A careful focus on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes or consequences, with only limited reference to that given in the question)

- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors

- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground