



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCE

In History (9HI0/1B)

Paper 1: Breadth study with interpretations

1B: England, 1509-1603: authority, nation and religion

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

Summer 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_1B_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

PE report 9HI0 1B

Paper Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, Advanced Level paper 1B.

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. This was most evident on Section C, as would be expected. Whilst the impact of this cannot be fully mitigated against, and the best advice is thus to plan time accordingly in the first place, the responses that appeared to experience such timing issues yet overcame them to some degree were those who offered more direct responses. To wit, those who wrote abbreviated question 5 responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given views, rather offering extensive explanations and quotes, were more likely to still produce a reasonably effective response, than those failing to reach any comparative analysis and evaluation. Finally, examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. 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.

9H10_1B_Q01

Question Introduction

Question 1 was the less popular choice within Section A, by a very slight margin. The question produced a broad range of responses. The majority of candidates were able to offer responses which were largely focused on the demands of the question, supported by relevant material, and were thus able to attain the middle and higher levels. Candidates took different approaches to how they organised their responses. Some favoured a broadly chronological approach, detailing examples of resistance in turn, emphasising change and/or continuity within this; whilst this approach could be successful, some did lapse into description, with less focus on the analytical demands of the question. Another approach was to attempt to structure response around main areas of change and continuity. A further popular approach, and arguably the most successful in general, was where candidates identified key issues, e.g. the various motives for resistance, their nature, their success, etc, and within these explored the extent to which each theme saw change, drawing on material from examples across the period. Greater emphasis tended to be placed on an analysis of what caused resistance, and whether this saw change. Such responses tended to be effective in allowing candidates to develop and explore, balancing impressive knowledge with a clear focus on exploring change across the full period. For example, stronger responses were more likely to identify and explore areas where there was significant continuity, e.g. the importance of religion as a motivation, but perhaps develop this to argue that the exact nature of the religious motivations did see significant change across the period. This question also tended to produce considered and focused conclusions examining the extent of change. In stronger responses, these were often a product of reasoned evaluation within the individual themes examined. A number of candidates also sought to weigh the extent of change in the different themes they examined.

Where some candidates were less successful, it tended to be due to either, or both, of the following three factors. Firstly, responses which offered a considerable amount of knowledge, but with less focus, analysis and evaluation of change, with some responses offering detailed narrative with limited reasoning and judgement. Secondly, a minority of responses did not sufficiently cover the period in terms of the reigns of the different monarchs. Thirdly, some responses offered sound argument backed with some knowledge and understanding, but lacked the depth of detail to expound on the extent of change. In general, candidates seemed more secure in their knowledge of

resistance during the earlier monarchs, particularly the Pilgrimage of Grace, and were less secure on the Elizabethan era.

9HI0_1B_Q02

Question Introduction

Question 2 was the more popular choice within Section A, by a slight margin. The question produced a broad range of responses. At the higher end, these were often typified by the ability of candidates to draw upon a diverse range of interesting material, clearly relating this to an analysis of the significance of the gender of Mary and Elizabeth, offering a balanced analysis of both monarchs, covering a range of issues, with coverage of marriage, succession, authority over the church and military control proving popular.

Most were able to say something about prejudices against female leaders generally, and the pressure to marry, whilst also offering material on specific issues, such as the controversy arising from Mary's marriage to Philip, or Elizabeth's difficulties with the parliament of 1566. Many were confident in arguing that whilst gender was indeed an issue, it was not one that proved insurmountable. A significant number explored how Mary had effectively paved the way for Elizabeth, and that both had achieved their main goals (e.g. citing Mary's restoration of Catholicism) or that supposed issues did not seriously impact upon their leadership (e.g. arguing that Elizabeth being deemed 'Supreme Governor' had little impact to her authority over the Church). Candidates also argued that there were times when they were able to use their gender to their own advantage. There was also impressive analysis pursuing the line that issues that might appear related to gender were ultimately more shaped by other factors, e.g. how the need to produce an heir and issues regarding succession also plagued male monarchs, or how opposition to Mary's marriage was primarily driven by political reasons.

The strongest responses were often able to critically explore the relative significance of different arguments raised, and where pertinent, make valid comparisons across the two reigns. Less successful responses tended to be limited by one or more of the following issues (i) straying from the question's focus, e.g. lengthy consideration of Henry's reign or other issues outside of the question's parameters, (ii) limited knowledge and depth on one or both reigns, and (iii), uncertainty over organisation of argument and focus on the second-order concept of significance. What was important as far as reaching the higher levels was concerned, was an ability to shape sufficient knowledge to a reasoned analysis and evaluation of the significance of gender.

9HI0_1B_Q03

Question Introduction

This was the more popular question in Section B, and the vast majority of candidates demonstrated sufficient focus on the question's demands, along with knowledge and understanding of appropriate issues – with most offering good material on religion in the reign of each monarch - to produce responses which were able to achieve the middle and higher levels. Many candidates followed a broadly chronological approach but were able to use this as a framework for a focused analysis. Higher scoring candidates tended to focus their discussion around the level of change over time, and were able to fluently emphasise both sides of the argument. The main factor limiting responses tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, although there were well-informed responses which did not consistently focus on the demands of the question.

Most candidates argued that Henry's break with Rome advanced Protestantism, citing issues such as the rejection of Papal authority, the dissolution and changes in doctrine. Candidates who explored further examined how whilst this may not have reflected popular opinion at the time, significant elements of this proved irreversible. Many also highlighted how Henry's own conservatism checked or reversed elements of change. The majority also identified Edward's reign as being more radical, typically citing examples such as the Book of Common Prayer, the Forty-two Articles and the dissolution of the Chantries' dissolution, or the reaction as seen through events such as the Western Rising. Many responses highlighted the widespread popularity of Mary's attempts at counter reformation, but also accepted the limited progress this was able to make, often recognising the length of her reign and lack of a Catholic heir as the reason for this. Most argued that Elizabeth's reign saw Protestantism firmly established. There was generally good material on this, although at times some were perhaps not as convincing as when dealing with earlier periods. In some cases, references to *via media* were not fully squared with arguments that England ultimately became Protestant in this time. Some responses did go beyond this, emphasising how Elizabeth was a committed Protestant, and that her settlement, particularly from the 1570s, demonstrated this, both in the finalised doctrine and the treatment of Catholics from this time. Most did recognise that Elizabeth's longevity was significant in establishing Protestantism, and there was reasoned debate over the extent to which the continued existence of a Catholic minority challenged the proposition in the question. A small number of candidates also examined the significance of puritans at time, with some noting they advanced the cause of Protestantism at the local level. Whilst most offered good focus across all of this, a small number did drift away from the demands of the question to related issues, such as the motivations for change, particularly Henry's need for an heir, or foreign relations in the reign of Elizabeth.

The strongest candidates were able to find and discuss the nuances behind the main events and use their extensive knowledge to really explore issues, e.g. to demonstrate that although change might have appeared to show a move from Catholic to Protestant, 'top down' changes took considerable time to be felt by ordinary subjects. Such responses also highlighted the variations, e.g. across

sections of society, geographically, and across the period. For many – often in the higher levels – responses were broadly structured around arguments of the ebb and flow of change, reversal and continuity. Some candidates also had success in structuring responses around clear themes, e.g. the doctrine, practices and structure of religion and the church.

9HI0_1B_Q04

Question Introduction

This was the less popular question in Section B of the exam. Most of the candidates who did opt for this seemed well prepared, both in terms of their knowledge and understanding of the topic, but also their ability to relate this to the analytical demands of the question.

Responses covered a wide range of themes, such as changes in education, the impact of grammar schools, literacy rates, the printing press, the reformation & English nationalism, humanism, developments in art, literature, music, drama and architecture. Stronger answers were able to focus on the second-order concept of 'similar' (and different). In terms of similarity, arguments tended to focus on issues such royal patronage, the continuation of illiteracy for the poorest, the establishment of grammar schools, and development of portraiture were typical, although many were able to explore the differences that existed within these. Responses tended to emphasise more the differences when examining the growth of nationalism, developments in theatre and music, and the wider impact of the reformation. Less successful responses tended to focus on explaining the main issues without offering much by way of an examination of the extent of similarity/difference. There were also cases where candidates attempted to include material of varying degrees of relevance, e.g. the influence of overseas trade, or religious changes, but were less successful in relating this to cultural change. Thankfully, the majority were largely successful in doing so, and produced responses that were both varied and of good quality.

Some candidates did tend to approach this as a change/continuity question. Whilst such responses had some success, due to the related nature of the demands of these second-order concepts, it did mean in some cases responses lost focus. Stronger responses offered sufficient coverage of issues, and the necessary detail to substantiate arguments; an exploration of similarity and difference, with the strongest responses tending to explore the extent of these within a particular passage; a clear and critical focus.

9HI0_1B_Q05

Question Introduction

Most candidates were able to access the middle and higher 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, e.g. identifying how whilst the former acknowledges the extent of

the problems Elizabeth's government faced, Elizabeth's government remained strong in the face of this, in contrast to how Extract 2 emphasises the struggles, the limitations of the government response, and the growth of opposition that went side by side with this.

Candidates took various approaches to their analysis of the extracts. Most took one of the following two approaches. Firstly, some assessed Extract 1, then Extract 2. An alternative approach was to examine both extracts together within the same paragraphs, generally doing so by focusing on a particular theme for each section, such as Spain and Ireland, advisers and faction, exploring the arguments of the extracts on these issues and assessing the extent to which Elizabeth's government was successful in each section in turn. Either of these could prove valid and successful, although those who sought to use the extracts together tended to be more successful, allowing for more direct comparison.

Most used Extract 1 effectively, identify and developing from a range of issues, such as avoiding a debasement of the currency, Essex's 'ridiculous' revolt, the actions of the Privy Council, successes in defending the country, the lack of major revolts, and the impact of nationalism. These issues were typically explored with reference to Elizabeth's handling of the 1601 parliament, the poor laws, how Elizabeth's approach towards the war drained Spanish resources, and the eventual victory in Ireland. In general, responses were less convincing in their analysis of Extract were weaker on Source 2, perhaps partly related to most candidates' overall preference for the interpretation given in Extract 1. Nevertheless, most were still able to identify and explore issues such as the impact of war, monopolies, the loss of key advisers, trouble in Ireland, and factional rivalry. A fair number of responses went into considerable detail on the various social and economic problems.

The following issues tended to be important in determining the quality of responses. The vast majority of responses demonstrated understanding of the views, although a minority did treat them as sources of information, and thus offer limited engagement with the views. Some responses demonstrated secure understanding, but tended to describe and explain them, with limited attempts at discussion and evaluation of their arguments. Stronger responses engaged more in the discussion of the arguments, with comparison and evaluation of these. Some otherwise strong responses focused excessively on narrow aspects of certain extracts to the detriment of other aspects, although the vast majority managed to cover the core issues raised by the two interpretations. As far as the use of contextual knowledge was concerned, most managed to offer some valid evidence with which to examine the given views, with monopolies, Essex's failure and the lack of popular revolt featuring most heavily. Most were able to securely link this to the arguments within Extract 1 and 2, and thus reach at least the middle levels. However, some tended to use this to explain and expand on the material from the extracts, and thus were less well positioned to reach the higher levels. Stronger responses were more able to carefully select evidence to examine the merits of the given arguments. The very strongest tended to thoroughly discuss the arguments and reach reasoned and substantiated judgements.

A discriminating factor in success was to some extent was the deployment and development of knowledge offered, i.e. the difference between referencing an issue with contextual knowledge linked to the extract, and, at the higher levels, exploring this in relation to the precise focus of the

question, and assessing the validity of the argument put forward by the extract. With regards to judgement, some candidates appeared to come down too easily on one side or the other, without sufficient consideration of different views. Whilst it is perfectly valid for to reach a judgement which is firmly one way or the other, candidates should seek to ensure they consider the merits of different views in the light of evidence. Examiners are looking for reasoned argument. Overall conclusions may be forceful and come down one way or the other, but discussion and analysis requires some degree of balance.

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:

- 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
- Focus carefully 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, consequences, etc, 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.