



Examiners' Report

June 2022

GCE History 9HI0 1H

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_1H_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

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

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 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 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.

Question 1

This was marginally the more popular of the two questions on Section A of the paper. The majority of candidates were able to offer responses which were largely focused on the demands of the question, supported by relevant material.

Most candidates were seemingly well prepared on the given factor, and were able to draw from a range of material to explore the role played by the Liberal Party. Commonly addressed issues were their prosecution of the war and the Maurice debate, the sale of honours, the Chanak incident, and divisions over the coalition in the post-war period. A smaller number of candidates also addressed the Liberal response to political developments in the period, such as their relative organisational weaknesses or lack of distinct identity when compared to Labour or the Conservatives in the face of the widened franchise. Such responses tended to be those who sustained an exploration of the relative contribution played by different factors in changing party fortunes across the period, and thus scored highly. In general, the biggest determinant in the success of responses, both when dealing with the Liberal Party and other factors, was how securely responses related given material to an analysis of changing party fortunes.

Commonly offered other factors were the extension of the franchise, the rise of the Labour Party, the economic background against which elections and party politics took place, and the Conservative Party. Most responses had a strong grasp of the issues they chose to pursue, with some very impressive understanding and reasoning on issues such as Baldwin's appeal, or the benefit trade union organisation gave to Labour. As with the Liberals, what separated more and less successful responses was how well responses explored causation, eg some tended to see Labour's rise or Conservative continuity as self-evident, and thus largely asserted points, whereas stronger responses tended to explore the extent to which Labour did benefit from the broader franchise or the extent to which their policies did appeal to working voters, or carefully examined the Conservative response to the changing electorate.

A number of candidates did seem less secure on aspects of the franchise, and it was not uncommon to see candidates assert that the first-past-the-post disadvantaged solely the Liberals, rather than convincingly demonstrate the magnifier effect it had on parties receiving a greater share of the vote, and thus how any disadvantage was related to being a party receiving a lesser share of the vote. One final point of note was that only a minority of candidates were able to offer clear and detailed substantiation of the relative fortunes of the three main parties across the period in question. Although candidates were not expected to consider a detailed analysis of every election result within this period, those who could give some specific exemplification to support their understanding and arguments, eg through election results, who formed governments at particular times, etc, tended to perform the best.

It could be argued that the Representation of the People Act was ~~the~~ mainly responsible for the changing fortunes of political parties from 1918 to 1931, as it changed the make-up of the electorate. It could also be argued that the Labour Party was most responsible, as its support grew massively. However, it is most convincing to argue that the Liberal Party was mainly responsible, as the ~~leaders made~~ decisions of its leaders ultimately led to its downfall.

Some may argue that the Representation of the People Act was mainly responsible for the changing fortunes of political parties from 1918 to 1931; it inflated Labour support, while deflating Liberal support. The Representation of the People Act ~~was (1918)~~ was passed in 1918, and ~~has~~ tripled the electorate from 7 million votes to 21 million, ~~by enfranchising all men~~. As a result, 80% of the electorate was now working class, and the Labour Party gained 1.8 million voters. Meanwhile, the Liberal

(Section A continued) Party gained only 1.4 million votes. This shows that the Representation of the People Act contributed to changing party fortunes, as by adding more working class voters to the electorate, it inflated Labour support. While the Liberal Party did gain more votes, it proportionally gained a lot less than Labour, so was ultimately weakened. In ~~addition~~ addition to extending the franchise, the act introduced constituency reform, making all constituencies relatively even sizes, or with a population of around 70,000 each. ~~then~~ Labour gained many seats from this, for example Warrington was split up into 5 constituencies, and Labour won all 5 of these seats in the 1918 election. Generally, Labour had concentrated support in industrial regions, so benefitted from the 'First Past the Post' electoral system - as did the Conservatives, who had concentrated support in rural areas. Meanwhile, Liberal support was more widespread, so they were disadvantaged. Therefore, the Representation of the People Act contributed to changing party fortunes, as by introducing ~~even~~ boundary reform, it further benefitted the Labour Party, who had concentrated support in many of the ~~newly~~ newly-formed constituencies, helping them to achieve electoral success. Overall, ~~the~~ the Representation of the People Act was ~~the~~ arguably mainly responsible for the changing fortunes of political parties, as it gave the Labour

(Section A continued) Party both new voters and new constituencies, allowing them to overtake the Liberal Party, who barely benefited from the Act. However, this argument is unconvincing, as without the Labour Party becoming more attractive or the Liberal Party becoming less attractive, the new working class voters may have voted for the Liberal Party.

It could be argued that the Labour Party was mainly responsible for the changing party fortunes from 1918 to 1931; ~~as~~ it broadened its appeal during the war, and continued to thrive in post-war years. During the ^{First World} War, Labour Party Leader Arthur Henderson served on the war cabinet. However, he dropped out ^{of it} in 1917 in order to focus on reforming the Labour Party and ~~making~~ make it more attractive to the electorate. He wrote a new constitution for the party, which included socialist values. For example, 'Clause IV' committed the party to nationalisation of industry. This shows that the Labour Party was somewhat responsible for changing party fortunes, as, by proposing ~~the~~ socialist solutions, Henderson drew in much of the electorate, who were disillusioned by the Liberal Party's lack of ^{social} reform, and wanted their quality of life to improve. Furthermore, the Labour Party's success in the post-war years contributed to the downfall of the Liberals. In 1924, MacDonald formed the first Labour

(Section A continued) government, cementing the Labour Party as the 'second party', after the Conservatives. A second Labour government was formed in ~~1923~~ 1929. This ~~was~~ meant that the Labour Party contributed to changing party fortunes as by keeping its appeal ~~at~~ high, it continued ~~to~~ to thrive, ultimately pushing the Liberal Party out of their dominant position within the electoral system. Overall, it could be argued that the Labour Party was mainly responsible for changing party fortunes from 1918 to 1931, as ~~the~~ ~~Labour~~ Henderson's reforms drew in voters, allowing it to succeed in the years to come, ~~and demonstrating~~ ^{and demonstrating} winning over ~~the~~ the Liberal Party in elections. However, this is an unconvincing argument, as, even if ^{Labour} reforms had not taken place, the Liberal Party would have struggled in these years due to its own issues.

~~Work~~ In the years 1918 to 1931, the Liberal Party was mainly responsible for the changing fortunes of the political parties; the party became divided during the war, and struggled to retain its appeal in the post-war years. During the war, the Liberal Party became divided, ~~to~~ to the point where Lloyd George presented a successful leadership challenge to Asquith. These divisions ~~was~~ were then cemented in 1918 during Asquith's failed vote of no confidence in Lloyd George. Ultimately, the party was split into the 'Coalition Libs' - the Liberals who stayed loyal to Lloyd George and the coalition government.

(Section A continued) and the 'Asquithian Liberals' - the Liberals who stayed loyal to Asquith. The two sides of the party campaigned separately in the 1918 election, and ~~both~~ only gained around 15% of the vote each. This shows that the Liberal Party were responsible for changing party fortunes, as their own divisions ~~an~~ made ~~the~~ party appear weak and unattractive, and they were unable to campaign together, so could not form a coherent government together. This ~~led~~ led to the Liberals losing support, and the Labour Party gaining support, as it collected many of these disillusioned votes. Furthermore, the Liberal Party struggled in the post-war years. Lloyd George was involved in a series of scandals. In 1922, the 'Cash for Honours' scandal involved him being exposed for selling over 100 peerages, and over 1800 knighthoods. Also in 1922, the 'Chanak Affair' involved him being heavily criticised for an aggressive intervention in Greece and Turkey. ~~Furthermore~~ ^{In addition}, in the post-war years, the Liberals failed to deliver the 'Home Fit for Heroes', which they had promised to the electorate. For example, 'Geddes Axe' in 1923 involved ⁱⁿ £87 million in spending cuts, including £23 million in cuts to welfare spending. Therefore, the Liberals ~~also~~ contributed to changing party fortunes as, in the post-war years, they disappointed the electorate, who lost ~~for~~ trust in Lloyd George after his scandals, and were disillusioned by the ~~both~~ harsh spending cuts. This meant that

(Section A continued) the Liberals lost even more electoral support. Altogether, the Liberal Party was mainly responsible for changing party fortunes in the years 1918 to 1931, as its continuous blunders disillusioned voters, who dropped their support for the party, and moved to the Conservative or Labour Party. This is the most convincing argument, as if the Liberals had continued to appeal to the electorate, they may have retained this support, and even gained more support from the Representation of the People Act.

In conclusion, it could be argued that the Representation of the People Act was the main factor contributing to changing party fortunes in the years 1918 to 1931, as it added many new working class voters to the electorate and introduced boundary reform, massively benefitting the Labour Party, allowing them to overtake the Liberals in electoral success. It could also be argued that the ~~Liberal~~ Labour Party was directly the most important factor in changing party fortunes, as it overtook the Liberals by becoming more appealing to the electorate, and

(Section A continued) continuing to thrive in post-war years. However, both these arguments are unconvincing, as if the Liberals had retained their electoral appeal in these years, there would have been little reason for votes to move to the Labour Party, and they may have gained more votes from the Representation of the People Act. Ultimately, the divisions and failure of the Liberal Party in these years caused its own downfall, allowing the Labour Party's fortunes to improve, while theirs declined. Therefore, it is accurate to say that, in the years 1918 to 1931, the Liberal Party was mainly responsible for the changing fortunes of the political parties.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. The response offers a range of detailed examples which are used to demonstrate the role played by the various factors, including the Liberal Party, demonstrating knowledge and understanding of what brought about changing party fortunes. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is a well-reasoned evaluation of the different causes.

Question 2

This was the least popular option in Section A by a small degree and it produced a range of responses, with the vast majority being able to access the middle and higher levels. Where responses were less successful, they tended to either lack clear focus and in some cases understanding on the key issues and demands of the question, namely immigration, its impact, and the extent to which these changed, or were hampered by limited knowledge of the relevant issues concerning immigration. On the former, there were a number of candidates who could cite a range of relevant material from across the period, but could not consistently direct this towards a consideration of change. In contrast, more successful responses offered both detailed material on changing origins and patterns of immigration, government policies, societal attitudes and reactions, and contributions by immigrants in the social and economic spheres. Surprisingly, the cultural impact of immigration only featured in a very small number of responses.

Most took a broadly chronological approach, commonly starting with post-war immigration, with the majority citing the British Nationality Act 1948. Most appreciated the change this marked in itself, with some offering valid comparisons to the preceding situation. The majority demonstrated knowledge of legislation across the period, including relevant aspects of race relations legislation, and whilst there was at times some confusion over precise dates and minor details, this largely did not obscure an understanding of the main aspects of these. Similarly, most responses were able to offer material on relevant events, most commonly Windrush, the Notting Hill Riots, the Smethwick by-election, the exodus of Kenyan Asians and Enoch Powell's contribution. The most significant factor in determining the success of responses was the ability to shape this material towards the precise demands of the question. Some responses offered a range of relevant knowledge, but were not less convincing in exploring this in relation to change over the period. In some cases, detailing examples of racial tension in the events listed above dominated at the expense of sharply focused analysis.

Those that were most successful tended to have a clear focus, well selected examples, and went some way to exploring change. A minority did attempt a thematic approach to the question, eg legislation, public attitudes towards immigrants, social and cultural impact, etc, and although this did not guarantee success, there seemed to be a greater correlation between this approach and achieving the higher levels. Although a few candidates offered chronological and descriptive accounts, most were able to offer some shape towards the question, and at the higher levels there was effective analysis, and discerning selection of supporting knowledge. Stronger responses were more likely to recognise variation and complexity within the overall picture, eg recognising changes were not linear, appreciating differences geographically within Britain, and across immigrants from different origins.

It could certainly be argued that in the years 1945-79 immigration and its impact changed significantly as it ~~marked a huge growth in~~ was a period of significant growth. However with the Commonwealth Immigration Act, however and governments attempting to improve race relations. However, it could also be argued its impact hadn't changed due to continuity in racism people faced.

Firstly, immigration changed after 1945 with the Commonwealth Immigration Act 1948 which gave all people in the colonies a right to live in Britain, this act was arguably a result of labour shortages during the war and invited people, for example Caribbean nurses to join the NHS. The act saw the arrival of the SS Windrush

(Section A continued) jobs, marking a clear continuity of anger people had about immigrants taking 'British jobs' following world war 1. As well as this MPs received letters from black people complaining about racism as encouraged by Black rights groups. Furthermore, these racist attitudes were seen in government, with some politicians trying to get votes by appealing to popular racism and Immigration Acts introduced in 1962, 1968 and 1971 which gradually made it harder for immigrants to arrive in Britain, especially the 1971 act which created passport and non-passport, with non-passport (mainly black people) being denied having limited entry rights, in an ~~Therefore this demonstrates~~ aim to end the multi-cultural society. Therefore, this demonstrates while there was clearly significant immigration, it had little impact on changing people's attitudes towards it and people continued to have hostile attitudes towards black and

(Section A continued) Asian people, and an attempt by the British government to end and reduce its impact. Finally, it could be argued immigration and its impact did change significantly towards the late 1960s and early 1970s with the introduction of Race Relations Acts to try and improve life for immigrants living in Britain. The Race Relations Act were a result of concerns over violence and hostility towards the black and Asian community and ~~years of an~~ ^{years of an} ~~outbreak of violence and~~ ~~rebellion.~~ The 1965 act outlawed racial discrimination but ~~which~~ ~~discrimination~~ was not outlawed in housing until the 1968 act. This suggests immigration impacted society as it caused such violence and concern among the government they had to act to improve the situation. Further racist policy, such as the policy of dispersal which meant black children weren't allowed to move

(Section A continued) up more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of a school's population were abandoned in the late 1970s, reflecting a change in attitudes towards immigration, demonstrating how it did eventually have an impact on creating more acceptance of black and Asian people, despite it being a gradual process.

Overall, it can certainly be argued that immigration 1945-79 had a significant change and impact as it dramatically increased immediately after the war, leading to ~~an increase in~~ racist attitudes, however, this could be argued to be a continuity of the past. It definitely had large impacts as despite the government attempting to reduce it through the Immigration Acts of the 1960s, it continued to ~~and~~ ^{change} British society through a gradual acceptance demonstrated through race relation laws.



This response demonstrates some of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with good knowledge to explore these. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, with confident and substantiated judgement being offered as to the extent of change. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 3

This question was the more popular choice within Section B by some margin. This question produced a range of responses, and the majority had the necessary knowledge and focus on the conceptual demands of the question to achieve the middle and higher levels.

A range of relevant material was offered, and whilst candidates were – as might be expected – able to offer more on the latter period, this did not in the main inhibit candidates from producing responses in the higher levels. Indeed, there were well organised and carefully explored responses which may have been seen to have lacked a weight of detail on the years 1918-43, but were nevertheless sufficiently secure in their grasp of the key issues that they were able to convincingly anchor points in this period, with more detailed development in the latter period to explore the extent to which education was similar or different.

With regards to other significant developments, a range of issues were offered, with the most commonly featured being the Butler Act and the tripartite system, the Crosland Circular and the development of comprehensives, the Fisher Act, the Hadow Report, and the Plowden Report. Many responses also dedicated space to university education, typically covering Oxbridge and the limited expansion prior to 1918, and the stages of development in the post-war era, commonly referencing the Robbins Report and the Open University. Most were secure in their knowledge, and minor missteps over dates or details of legislation or other developments did not tend to significantly undermine the substance of otherwise well-developed analysis.

Candidates took a variety of approaches. A number structured paragraphs around major points of difference or similarity; others organised around the stages of education, eg secondary, elementary/primary, and university; others still established themes, such as the breadth of access, across class and gender lines, what was taught to who, and the level of state involvement. All of these proved suitable for producing high quality responses. Where candidates were less successful, they tended to describe features of education. 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; and a clear and critical focus.

British education provision altered significantly throughout the twentieth century with developments including extension of secondary school provision and funding. This debate surrounds whether the education provision in 1944-79 was similar to provision in 1918-43. The criteria for such a judgement is that the factors regarding provision must not have changed the reach ^{socially} and accessibility to education within society. ^{to be similar} Overall, when considering the factors, the provision of education in Britain in 1944-79 was not similar to the provision of 1918-43 to a substantial extent.

However, whilst that judgement may be valid, it could instead be argued that there were similarities in education provision citing continuing issues as a factor. The provision of 1918-43 was dominated by local government control with differences regarding provision to secondary education ~~and~~ and class sizes - which had to be fought, with

(Section B continued) ~~From~~ classes being as large as 50 within the 1930s. This could be argued to be an important factor because such inefficiencies regarding provision are also commonplace between 1943-79. For instance, the Newsen Report of 1963, infamously titled 'Half Our Future', denounced poor standards in half of Britain's secondary comprehensive schools. Therefore, demonstrating that throughout the 1918-79 period, there was a persistent failure to amend the issues of education, with clear similarities in education provision. However, it is stronger to argue such similarities are both misunderstood and limited because in the period of 1918-43 the provision for secondary education were insufficient due to a ~~lower~~ low school leaving age of 14 as established in the 1918 ~~Butter~~^{Fisher} Act, yet by the period 1943-79, the school leaving age had been raised to 15 in 1947 due to the 1944 Butler Education Act. Thus, despite this factor failing the criteria of not changing the reach and accessibility of education provision within society as a result of its changing school leaving age and differing issues within education provision. Moreover, as will be discussed in the following factor,

(Section B continued) The nature of who provides education provision also changed between periods. Therefore, whilst it can be argued that education provision across the period was similar due to a common pattern of issues within secondary education, this is outweighed by the changing circumstances and length of education provision.

Whilst common issues in secondary education provision is a valid counter argument, it is stronger to argue provision of education in 1918-43 was ~~not~~ different to that of in 1944-79 citing the increase in state provision. The 1944 Butler Education Act implemented part of the recommendations of the 1942 Beveridge Report by introducing state secondary education provision - free for all social classes for the first time and even provision and its structure was amended by further measures including ~~the~~ Crossland's Circular 10/65 and Circular 10/66 to establish the comprehensive system. This is a significant factor because the secondary provision of 1918-43 was only free to the brightest working class children who achieved scholarships to grammar schools. Indeed, prior to the Butler Act it was estimated that only 13% of

(Section B continued) working class children aged 14 and above remained in school. Consequently, this demonstrates that education provision in 1949-7 was far more open and accessible than 1918-4 and defied the previous societal mantle of secondary education simply being the preserve of the middle class. Furthermore, this factor ~~meets~~ ^{fits} the ~~criteria~~ criteria of a lack of change in reach and accessibility to education provision because - despite the aforementioned increase in school leaving age in 1947 - secondary education became the preserve for all classes ^{thus showing a lack in consistency}. However, it could instead be argued that - in spite of secondary education's expansion - its effect on the working class and opportunities were just as limited as they were in 1918-43 as a result of the top 20% only taking O-levels and ^{2/3 of} grammar school places going to middle class children after the 11 plus exam. Though that may be valid, such arguments can be countered by the introduction of the Certificate of Secondary Education in 1965 giving those not in the top 20% a potential qualification for the job and the decline of grammar schools in favour of comprehensive from ~~1950~~ ¹⁹⁵⁴, indeed by 1975, there were only 566 grammar

(Section B continued) Schools Act in Britain. Therefore, whilst it can be argued there was a similarity in a lack of opportunities across the period for working class children in education provision, this is outweighed by the expansion of secondary education and qualifications from 1944.

Moreover, the argument in favour of education provision in 1944-79 not being similar to 1918-43 ~~is~~ consolidated when evaluating university education provision. In 1919, there were just 20,000 university students and Oxbridge remained an elite membership due to lack of funding, the only opportunity for working class children to attend university was through grants from LEAs to municipal universities. This is highly important because this is in stark contrast to university provision expansion in the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, by 1962 4% of 18-24 year olds attended university versus just 0.4% in 1919 as a result of the implementation of the recommendation of the 1963 Robbins Report which stated Britain required five times more places by 1980. This factor clearly adds the evidence of net expansion, reach and accessibility to provision in the

(Section B continued) expansion of provision saw the number of universities double to 46 between 1962 and 1970 and the number of first degree increases from 9,129 in 1919 to 68,150 by 1980 thus demonstrating a clear boom in university education in Scotland to the extent of university between 1918 and 1943. However, it could instead be argued that such differences are limited due to retrenchment in the 1970s which saw support for students fall. Therefore, this is limited as funding for universities actually increased from £1 million in 1919 to £80 million in 1982. Therefore, whilst it may be argued 1970s retrenchment saw similarities in level of university provision support, this is outweighed by the growth in access to university education showing a clear difference from 1918-43.

Therefore, to conclude, provision of education in 1944-79 was not similar to that in 1918-43 to a substantial extent. This is because the expansion of state secondary provision in 1944-79 contrasts significantly with the fragile and narrow provision of 1918-43. Furthermore, the university provision in 1918-43 was an ^{exclusive} elite.

(Section B continued) programme which in 1944-79 its expansion saw more opportunity. Both these factors put the onus of accessibility and reach to provision remaining the same, meaning it is not similar. However, though this may be to a substantial extent, the common patterns of inequalities in provision across the period must be accounted for.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. One of the strengths of this response is the quality of specific exemplification, and the deployment of this – the response offers a range of detailed examples which are used to demonstrate the extent to which education was similar across the two periods. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement.

Question 4

This was the less popular of the two Section B questions, and a wide range of responses were offered. In the main, understanding of the period and of the issues relevant to the question was strong enough to attain the middle and higher levels. What tended to discriminate in candidate performance was the ability to focus on the second-order concept, or having adequate knowledge with which to analyse these issues. Some candidates were also limited by a failure to cover the chronological demands of the question, usually found where there was little or no coverage of issue in the period before the post-war era. A significant minority of candidates lacked a consistent focus, at times describing developments in popular and/or youth culture, without clear consideration of what the question was asking.

That said, the majority were able to shape their knowledge of youth culture towards the demands of the question. The rise of the 'teenager', the significance of disposable income, fashion, music and coffee bars featured heavily. Candidates on the whole appeared stronger on youth culture in the 1950s and 1960s than later in the period. As small number did get carried away with detail of certain aspects of this, without clearly focusing this, although the vast majority who were well-informed were also well-directed. Many candidates also offered reasoned analysis of the relative significance of a range of other issues, such as television, cinema, radio and the liberalisation of society. Many responses explored the how youth culture related to the different developments in culture and entertainment, particularly music, fashion, and television, as well as exploring the variation in this across the period. Strong responses successfully building on this to evaluate their relative significance. A common judgement was that youth culture was not the most important development, with reasoning along the lines that it was transient, whereas TV and other media had a wider impact, eg TV's exploration of social issues, and that these other developments were also more enduring.

It is inaccurate to say that the development of youth culture was the most significant development in popular culture and entertainment between 1918-79. This is because other new introductions such as television, radio, and sports and music completely transformed the entertainment industry and changed popular culture. Whilst the introduction of youth culture was important, when compared to these other factors it is clear it was not the most significant. Therefore, I would argue that instead of youth culture, the introduction of television was the most significant development.

The idea of 'youth culture' was introduced after World War Two when the term 'teenager' was coined. As a result of the 1944 Butler Act, children stayed in school for longer before continuing on to the world of work or higher education. This left teenagers with more free leisure time. Furthermore, British Society was becoming consumerist as the country

(Section B continued)

experienced a period of prosperity after a long period of austerity due to the 'total war' approach of Churchill and the continuation of rationing and spending cuts carried out by Attlee. This aided youth culture as teenagers with jobs had increased disposable income. The new fashions and trends ~~was~~ ~~are~~ introduced as a result of youth culture changed the popular ~~advised~~ culture and entertainment industry and widened opportunities for businesses to appeal to these teenagers. Whilst youth culture did have an impact, there were more significant changes taking place which had a much larger impact. It can even be argued that the introduction of these other changes such as TV and radio ~~to~~ encouraged youth culture to happen. Therefore, it is inaccurate to say youth culture was the most significant and I instead argue that it was television which caused the most change and developments.

Television was introduced and became more widespread in the 1950s. This had massive impacts on ~~the~~ people's leisure time and made popular forms of entertainment more accessible to

(Section B continued)

people such as the working-class who rarely enjoyed the luxuries of high-brow sports which middle and upper classes had available to them.

~~Not only did~~ ~~televi~~ Television closed the gap between social classes and people began to enjoy the same shows and films aired.

Furthermore, television shows often addressed significant social problems and had a key impact on opinions of the public. For example, shows aired in the 60s such as

'Cathy Come Home' which explored homelessness and 'Up the Junction' which explored

backstreet abortions, influenced the way the public viewed these issues. It can be

argued that television created a more

liberal society ~~and~~ which meant the public were more accepting of things such as the

legalisation of abortions in 1967 and the

introduction of the charity 'Shelter' who provided help for the homeless. Most of the

populations leisure time was taken over by

television and almost all homes owned one by

1979. Therefore, TV is the most significant

development as it massively shaped society

~~Sports played~~ and then transformed the

(Section B continued)

entertainment industry. This shows that whilst youth culture was a key change, it is not the most impactful.

Sports played a massive role in the popular culture and entertainment industry from the beginning of the time period (1918-79).

Football and cricket became increasingly popular throughout the years and ~~only~~ grew with the introduction of TV and radio. In the early 1930s, tickets to attend football matches were cheap due to the fact that footballer's wages were capped. This enabled the working-class to be involved in this form of entertainment and was a one reason attendance was so high. Whilst sport played a role in the development of popular culture and entertainment, there were limitations to it which meant the impact wasn't as significant. In the case of sport, mainly men ~~be~~ benefitted from it as ~~they~~ 70% of men were involved compared to few women. This suggests that whilst sport was an important development, its impact was limited. Therefore, the introduction of television is more significant because it changed the lives of many more

(Section B continued)

people, broadcast

In conclusion, it is inaccurate to argue that the development of youth culture was the most significant development in popular culture and entertainment in the years 1918-79. This is because television played a much more impactful role, changing leisure for the nation. Therefore, it is more accurate to say that television was the most significant development.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates most of the qualities of level 4. There is a clear awareness of the demands of the question. Sufficient material is used to examine a range of relevant issues, and in doing so, the response explores key cultural issues, and there is some attempt to consider the extent to which youth culture was the most significant, although these could be developed further. The response is effectively organised, with logical argument.

Question 5

Most candidates appeared to understand the demands of the Section C question, and thus were able to engage with an analysis of the given views in relation to the proposition in the question. Responses typically identified and developed points from the extracts, with inflation, unemployment, deregulation, the relative competitiveness of different sections of the economy and the performance of the economy compared to the 1970s, industrial relations, privatisation, the government deficit and cuts in Thatcher's welfare spending being commonly considered issues. The concept of monetarism and supply side economics and the Lawson boom also featured in a significant number.

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 economic theme for each section, typically unemployment, inflation and then other issues such as privatisation and deregulation, exploring the arguments of the extracts on these issues and assessing the extent to which Thatcher's economic policies were a 'major achievement' in each theme 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.

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. 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.

In terms of the knowledge and understanding displayed, in the main candidates seemed secure on most issues. The issues and arguments set out in the two extracts were largely understood, and most candidates were able to cite relevant material in relation to these issues. Even where candidates clearly favoured one interpretation over another – and most did favour Pollard – many were able to acknowledge and offer their own evidence in relation to the achievements of the Thatcher governments, although candidates as a whole seemed more readily armed with facts and figures with which to counter such a view. There were certain issues where candidates seemed less secure. Many recognised that inflation was brought down, but few were able to explore the significance of this. Many cited unemployment figures, but these tended to be particular highs or lows, and few had a commanding grasp of these over the whole period, and thus did not recognise Extract 1's reference to the sharp decline in this after 1986. Additionally many cited Thatcher's polarising impact on the rich and poor; fewer were able to explore the impact on the mass of Britain's who existed in between these extremes.

One further issue that should be noted is that of candidates' pre-conceived views on the controversy. It is perfectly valid for candidates to take a view, and reach a conclusion which is firmly for or against the given proposition. In the case of this particular question, the vast majority disagreed with the proposition, and thus sided with the views put forward by Pollard in Extract 2. Doing so did not stop candidates achieving high marks, as long as they ensured this was the result of genuine discussion. Sadly, there appeared to be candidates who did not do as well as they perhaps could have done, as a result of an imbalanced analysis of the two extracts. For example, some gave the impression of analysis, but tended to select only evidence to support their favoured view/extract, and select only evidence which countered the view they did not agree with. Some other responses were outright dismissive, calling arguments unfounded, untrue or inaccurate, with little evidence to back such claims up. Such issues were seen in various forms, in essays which attained across the range of levels, and thus did not necessarily stop these from achieving higher levels, depending on the particular manifestation of the issues described. That said, there is little doubt that more successful responses tended to be more measured in their language, analysis and judgement, and were able to subject both extracts to the same level of scrutiny.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the economic policies of the Thatcher governments should be seen as a 'major achievement' [Extract 1, lines 18-19]?

To explain your answer, analyse and evaluate the material in both extracts, using your own knowledge of the issues.

(20)

Extract 2, by Minford, takes a glowing approach of Thatcher's governments, writing how Thatcher caused the government to 'escape' from the ~~pen~~ previously in-effective policies brought in ~~by~~ by other governments and ~~it~~ produced a 'major achievement'. Extract 2, by Pollard, takes the opposing view that Thatcher's 'experiment' ended in 'unmitigated failure', presenting his negative view to Thatcher's governments and his view that Thatcher did not cause 'major achievement'.

I ^{partially} ~~strongly~~ agree that Thatcher's governments should be seen as 'a major achievement'.

To begin, Minford begins by presenting how Thatcher came in to ~~the~~ government power at a time where policies caused 'high inflation' and 'misguided attempts to prop up the economy, such as subsidies'. Minford is undoubtedly bringing up the main concerns of Thatcher when she came into power in 1979 as her main goal was to reduce inflation, through a series of cut backs and roll back. Minford goes on to write that

The economy did ~~manage~~ manage to 'escape' ~~through~~ from the 'disease of high inflation' through Thatcher which is convincing as Thatcher successfully curbed inflation at a yearly rate of 5.2% in 1989, ~~leading to both~~ further conveying how convincing Minford is in his view that Thatcher 'brought 'major achievement'. The convincing nature of this point that Thatcher reduced inflation, especially through the impact of monetarism, is enhanced by Pollard in Extract 2, who agrees that Thatcher 'did help inflation come down'. Minford's point on how 'subsidies to large manufacturing industries' was 'poor' is also thoroughly convincing as Privatisation saw the reduction of subsidies in Britain in 1984 causing a loss of £1.1 billion, to ~~£~~ in 1988, ~~£~~ ~~the~~ nationalised industries making a profit of £1.3 billion. Thus conveying correctly Minford's point ~~in~~ that these ~~state~~ in-efficient subsidies were 'removed', thus further adding to how convincing he is. Privatisation ~~for~~ caused a gain of £19 billion for the government, which successfully allowed them to reduce 'high inflation' and balance 'large budget deficits', adding to how convincing Minford is. However, Minford writes that 'unemployment... melted away' which is not convincing as we know from Thatcher's move away from consensus politics, that full employment

was no longer a priority, therefore it is of no surprise that unemployment actually grew by 6% from the period 1974-79 to 1980-90, which in turn limits how convincing Minford is in his assessment that the Thatcher governments should be seen as a 'major achievement'. This is reinforced by Pollard in Extract 2, where he writes that 'jobs' were 'lost', which adds to how convincing Pollard is but takes away from how convincing Minford is.

Pollard, in his anti-Thatcher and perhaps left-wing politically view, describes how Thatcher allowed a 'Financial free-for-all' which was caused by the removal of all restrictions' which led to 'ruinous consequences', perhaps referencing the 1987 Stock market crash, entitled 'Black Monday' where £50 million was wiped off of the value of shares.

This is convincing as Thatcher, with her ~~then~~ Chancellor Lawson, allowed for deregulation to occur after the implementation of supply side economics. Lawson dropped interest rates to ~~around~~ 7.5% and released the 1986 Financial Services Act, which encouraged the purchasing of stocks in Thatcher's new 'popular capitalist' society that she was fostering. The impacts of the 1987 crash were so damaging ~~as~~ and undoubtedly caused 'ruinous consequences' as the number of owners of shares increased from 7% of

the nation owning shares in 1979 to 25% in 1988, therefore the crash impacted millions more people financially, especially the 9% of the 25% of owners who were working class not having as much capital as

richer people, ~~forcing~~ causing them to face the brunt of the impacts. This ^{further} adds to how convincing Pollard is in his view that Thatcher's governments should not be seen as a 'major achievement' in their

economic policies. Moreover, Pollard writes how Thatcher caused a 'significant transfer² of income² from the poor to the rich' which is ~~also~~ thoroughly convincing due to the fact that Thatcher cut the top rate of income tax to 40% but raised VAT from 7.5% to 15%. This impacted the poor more as they spent a higher percentage of their income, therefore were taxed more and the rich payed less than before.

The average tax bill also went up by 6% with Thatcher, ~~the~~ further reinforcing how convincing Pollard is as Thatcher subsequently impacted the poor negatively, economic wise, leading her 'achievement' to not be widespread.

However Pollard is unconvincing in his view that 'economic growth' was ^{not} 'thwarted' as ec. the growth of the economy doubled from 1.1% to 2.2% per year with Thatcher. This is reinforced by Minford in Extract when

he writes how Thatcher caused a 'Average growth' to be ~~the highest~~ among 'the highest' of the major countries, adding to how convincing Minford is.

In conclusion, I find Minford to be convincing in his view that inflation was 'no more' as it was capped at 5.2% yearly rate in 1989, as well as in his ~~the~~ perspective that 'subsidies' that were 'poor' were removed, expressed in the subsequent £1.3 billion in profits made by nationalised industries in 1988, as opposed to the loss in 1984. Minford is unconvincing though in his view employment decreased, which is backed up by Pollard in Extract 2 where he writes about how 'jobs' were 'lost'. Pollard is convincing in identifying the negative effects of deregulation, perhaps made even more convincing by the 2008 financial crash that displays the negative impacts of deregulation. However he, is unconvincing in his view that ~~growth was~~ economic growth was 'thwarted' which is also backed up by Minford. Overall, I find for these reasons, ~~Minford to be more convincing~~ Pollard to be more convincing in his view that that Thatcher's governments did not cause economic 'achievement' in Britain, though ~~at the same time~~ I do find Minford to be ~~convincing~~ somewhat convincing, just not to the extent of Pollard. Therefore, I partially find

it partially convincing that Thatcher's government's
caused there a 'major achievement' economically.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Question 5 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) It offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views. (2) It uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views. (3) It is focused on the precise issue (whether Thatcher's economic policies should be seen as a 'major achievement') rather than the general controversy and (4) It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue, which weighs up the views.

Paper Summary

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 (eg 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 – eg 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, eg 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 (eg looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg 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, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg 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, eg 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, eg 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, eg 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.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

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

