



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

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

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_1F_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, AS Level paper 1F.

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 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 the within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

8H10_1F_Q01

Question 1 was a popular choice with candidates in Section A of the paper. The vast majority of candidates were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question sufficiently, and apply appropriate knowledge in order to allow them to access the higher levels. The main discriminator in the quality of responses was the knowledge offered, particularly on the given issue. In some cases, responses offered very limited material on the women's liberation movement, or interpreted this to mean any effort by women to improve their position, e.g. including the suffrage movement of the early 20th century. Thankfully, such cases were in a small minority. Those who were able to precisely examine and substantiate arguments as to the extent to which the movement, or other factors, did actually contribute to an improvement in the position of women, were best placed to reach the highest levels. Other issues which featured regularly were the actions of government, the impact of work in the Second World War and wider socio-economic changes such as the rise of suburban living or the development of the contraceptive pill. Many were able to give detailed knowledge on these issues; stronger responses were clearer in shaping this material towards changes in the position of women. The strongest offered convincing attempts to ascertain the way in which such reasons contributed and their relative importance, e.g. placing the relationship between dissatisfaction with supposed gains resulting from suburban living and how this was articulated by the women's liberation movement, or the exploring the contribution the movement made to bringing about legislative change. Such responses tended to show clear critical reasoning, e.g. offering judgements such as that the movement perhaps lacked the widespread tangible impact some other factors may have had, seeing it as more confined to white middle class women, but was significant in actively challenging attitudes.

8H10_1F_Q02

This was a popular question within Section A, and it produced a range of responses which were usually well-informed, and in the main offered some degree of analysis. Most candidates were able to consider the role of the Vietnam War played, and commented on a range of issues, such as the longevity of the war, the escalation of the war under President Johnson, the introduction of the draft, the growing death toll, the significance of the age and racial balance of those drafted, the revulsion of methods such as the use of Agent Orange, student and veteran protest and the spiralling cost. Fewer candidates considered later issues, such as President Nixon's escalation of the war, or the shambolic fall of Saigon. Many stronger responses explored the relationship between reasons, in particular the role of the media in exposing the difficulties in Vietnam, through events such as the Tet Offensive and Mai Lai Massacre, and LBJ's comments about losing Walter Cronkite was cited by several. With regards to other factors beyond Vietnam and the role of the media, popular examples included scandal (primarily Watergate, although other issues, such as Carter's brother and 'Billygate', did feature), economic issues, and the personality and suitability of individual presidents, notably Nixon and Carter in their different ways, although many candidates also pointed to the role of President Ford in pardoning Nixon. A small minority demonstrated chronological confusion in discussing earlier presidents, such as Kennedy or Eisenhower, but in the main, knowledge was secure. Where candidates were more successful, their ability to securely relating this wealth of material to the decline of the presidency was often a significant discriminating factor.

8H10_1F_Q03

This was a popular choice of question within Section B. The vast majority of candidates were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question. The primary discriminator in the quality of responses was the range and depth of knowledge. A minority of responses offered limited material on the civil rights movement in the given period, and in some cases limited material on other aspects of the lives of black Americans in the years 1917-55. There were also cases of chronological confusion, with a small minority of responses attempting to include material on Martin Luther King's activities in the 1960s, Malcolm X, and the Black Power movement. A number did have some degree of success by inclusion of material on the black civil rights movement from the very end of the period only, e.g. *Brown v Topeka* and the Montgomery Bus Boycott, although it was those who were able to set this in context and qualify the success (e.g. appreciate *Brown* was the culmination of previous efforts, or that the impact of the bus boycott was limited by the end of 1955), as well as supplement this with

consideration of other factors in the given period. Some candidates were able to give evidence of the role of the civil rights movement starting from 1917, citing the Silent Parade in New York, the role of National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and its legal fight to protect rights, with cases such as *Smith v. Allwright*, *Morgan v. Virginia*, *Shelley v. Kraemer* and *Sweatt v. Painter* featuring in a significant number of responses. Other legal cases, such as the Scottsboro Boys or the Ossian Sweet Trial were also featured, as did other events and developments in the period, such as the Journey of Reconciliation 1947, the development of CORE, and the role of Philip Randolph in influencing President Roosevelt issuing Executive Order 8802 in 1941. Where responses approached the question by means of evaluating comparative significance, the New Deal, the Great Migration and the impact of the Second World War were the alternatives most commonly offered by candidates. Where responses kept to the timeframe, and were able to offer valid material, there were many examples of strong responses, which explored the importance of these issues, with reasoned comparison and consideration of their relative importance.

8H10_1F_Q04

Question 4 produced a broad range of responses, and the majority were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question, focusing to some extent on the extent to which the experience of travel changed. Where responses were less successful, they tended to either be hampered by limited knowledge of the relevant issues, or were less able to develop what they did know within a chronological framework suited to an analysis of change over the period 1917-80. More successful responses were able to make use of accurate and relevant knowledge from a range of issues. Common issues referred to included the development of the automobile, with increasing affordability leading to wider use over time, and the related changes in the nature of travel for leisure and work. Travel by air was also frequently mentioned, with a relatively common argument being by how it developed from being the preserve of the rich in the earlier part of the period, to the expansion of commercial travel became cheaper and opened up from the 1950s onwards, through to the deregulation of 1978. Buses (and to a lesser extent rail) also featured in many, with some candidates broadly arguing that access to cars was limited to certain socio-economic groups – and remained so to some extent throughout the period – and thus the reliance upon on bus services continued, and that the experience of those who could not afford cars were increasingly degraded over the period. Some candidates took time within these areas to explore different aspects of travel, such as the extent to which travel for different purposes changed, and the impact that developments such as the growth of suburbia related to the experience of travel. Within these issues, as highlighted above, more successful responses could securely locate their explanation and analysis of change with the chronology of the period, and thus, for example,

candidates exploring the extent to which the car changed the experience of travel typically used knowledge of the growth of mass motoring in the 1920s, the further growth in car ownership and use in the 1950s, including the expansion of the highway network, through to the experience of the end of the period, with many examining the impact the oil crisis had on motoring. Such responses, when clearly related to the experience of travel, were well placed to demonstrate and analyse the extent of change.

8H10_1F_Q05

Most candidates were able to access the higher two levels, generally by recognising and explaining the arguments in the two extracts, and building on this with own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, such as the emphasis Norton places on the growth of the national debt and collapses in the savings and loans sector, set against the emphasis Wallinson places on the positive turnaround from 1970s stagnation. It was pleasing to see that few responses became side-tracked in an attempted analysis of the provenance of the extracts, although a small minority went into issues of reliability of the extracts as 'sources', without fully exploring them as interpretations. Where candidates were less successful, this tended to be down to insufficient use of one or other of the extracts, or more commonly, limited integration of contextual knowledge. A minority of candidates at times tended to select quotations from the extracts which were to some degree removed from the wider context of the argument offered, and thus in some cases suggested the extract argued something it didn't. In the main though, candidates generally explored both interpretations and considered some of the key points included in these, such as increased inequality, the racial divide, the increase in the national debt, fraud, and the federal bailout, versus increased economic growth and end to stagnation, Reagan's economic model being a model of reform and the restoration of national confidence. Many candidates also commented on the different views over the federal deficit and national debt, and the significance of these, e.g. exploring the extent to which it was of negligible impact as claimed, in the light of the priority given by subsequent presidents in reducing this, whilst also acknowledging the extent to which Reagan's economic model was followed by them. Many candidates seemed well prepared to offer arguments as to the negatives and positives, e.g. that from a business point of view, deregulation and other measures led to increased efficiency, offset against negatives such as the frequently cited Savings and Loans collapses, or how Reagan's boom produced prosperity for many in middle America as well as the wealthy, whilst arguing that his presidency contributed to the widening gap between these and the poorest.

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