

# ResultsPlus

## Examiners' Report June 2009

GCE

## GCE History 6HI01 Option C

**ResultsPlus**  
Helping you to raise attainment  
[www.resultsplus.edexcel.com](http://www.resultsplus.edexcel.com)

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

It helps you to:

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

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit <http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

June 2009

Publications Code US021421

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2009

## Contents

### *History 6HI01 Option C*

General Comments	2
C1 – The Origins of the British Empire, c1680-1763.	6
C2 – Relations with the American Colonies and the War of Independence, c1740-89	9
C3 – The Slave Trade, Slavery and the Anti-Slavery Campaign, c1760-1833	20
C4 – Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760-c1835	24
C5 – Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-70	24
C6- Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875-1914	24
C7 – Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957-81	29
Grade Boundaries	34

## 6HI01 - General Comments

Centres are to be warmly commended on the good preparation of their candidates for the examination. The range of knowledge deployed was quite substantial overall, and most attempted an analytical approach to the question. Answers were in the main relevant and substantial, particularly in relation to the time allowed. The main problems occurred when candidates did not read the question correctly or ignored or misunderstood the set timescale.

The quality of written communication was generally good across the whole range of scripts. Most answers were organised into coherent paragraphs and candidates made a real attempt to shape their answers into a balanced argument. Key marker words and phrases, such as 'however' and 'on the other hand' were regularly used in answer to those questions which invited a comparison. In most cases candidates did attempt a conclusion to their answers, though these were sometimes not very explicit. It was also encouraging to see many students jotting down some sort of plan before beginning their answer. Sometimes, however, these were very detailed indeed and covered two sides of the booklet; on occasions extensive planning seems to have worked to the detriment of the second answer.

Analysis was implicit in many cases. Candidates need to make sure that the points they are making are supported with sufficient historical knowledge to make the points stand up. There is a case for centres providing more guidance on the difference between choosing relevant examples and generalising. Above all, evidence has to be focused on the question, which means explaining the significance of the examples used. Although most candidates' knowledge was broadly accurate and relevant, there were many, even those who showed evidence of a sophisticated argument, who lapsed into tracts of descriptive free-standing material. In many answers, however, there were examples of very significant inaccuracies. In A12, some believed that Richard III came to the throne after defeating Edward IV in battle, while many in A13 and A14 were convinced that, since Henry Tudor had spent much of his life abroad, he was a foreigner. Several answers to D6 believed that Nicholas II was a leading opponent of the Bolshevik government, while others enrolled Martin Luther King as a member of Black Power. Some candidates in F7 were of the firm belief that the Wall St Crash occurred in 1924, and that hyper-inflation continued through the whole period of 1924-29.

Several answers were weakened by candidates' uncertainty as to the meaning of words and phrases in the question. In particular, there was a lack of understanding of key words and concepts commonly used by historians, such as 'economic', 'social' and 'political'. Many were unsure about the 'economy of mid-fourteenth century England' in A7, 'social change' in D4, 'personal dictatorship' in D8, and 'power and prestige' in D14. There were a small but significant number of candidates in E/F2 who failed to understand the concept of Bismarck's diplomacy, referring to his ability to be tactful with other politicians or his inability to maintain a calm situation.

Many candidates had been well trained to consider a range of relevant factors which contributed to a situation or outcome. It has been very pleasing to see that most candidates were able to access Level 3 which requires some attempt at analysis. However, there were several questions where such an approach was inappropriate and where considering other factors proved counter-productive. Question A14 required a focus on the significance of Spain and Scotland in strengthening Henry VII's security. Some answers dealt with these two factors, only to consider others, such as relations with Burgundy, tackling noble power and improving royal finances. Question D10 asked candidates to consider the extent to which Black Power hindered Black civil rights in the 1960s. Again, the significance of Black Power was considered, but other points were also mentioned, such as King's failures in the north and the growing alienation of white people and successive presidents. The relevance of these points was marginal. In question E/F1 candidates often penalised themselves by writing excessively long answers through assessing the positive and negative influences of the Catholic Church on Italian unity and then producing a list of other factors which hindered Italian unity when only the first part was necessary; this in turn led to less time being spent on the second question.

In questions where the focus of the question was based on relative importance many good responses were unable to achieve high Level 4 or Level 5 because of a lack of balance with reference to the given and other factors. In the majority of cases this occurred when the candidate dismissed the given factor as being unimportant and produced a list of relevant of other factors without assessing why these factors were more important than the factor given. In question E/F4 candidates often wrote a generalised statement about Republican divisions within the Spanish Civil War before giving a detailed account of the contribution of foreign intervention (which was the question set in January). A smaller number of responses referred exclusively to the given factor with little reference to other causal reasons.

One way in which centres might be able to improve candidate performance is to familiarise students with the different types of questions which can be asked in Unit 1. For example: 'How far do you agree that the Black Power movement hindered Black civil rights in the 1960s?' is a question focused entirely on the role of Black Power. However, 'How far do you agree that the Black Power movement was the most important reason for the failures of the civil rights movement in the 1960s?' is a question requiring consideration of a number of different factors, including Black Power.

Equally, the following examples require a consideration of several relevant factors:

How far was Harald Hardrada's invasion of the north responsible for William of Normandy's success at Hastings? (A3)

To what extent were disputes over religion responsible for the Dutch revolts? (B5)

To what extent were the weaknesses of their opponents responsible for the survival of the Bolshevik government in the years 1917-24? (D6)

However, the following examples require a narrower focus on the issue raised in the question:

How far did Henry II exercise effective control over his many territories? (A5)

To what extent did Luther's challenge to the Catholic Church change in the years 1517-21? (B1)

How far did the position of Black Americans improve in the years 1945-55? (D9)

An understanding of chronology is an essential quality for historians to display and this is perhaps the area of most concern in regards to underperformance of candidates. Many seemed unaware that 1489 saw both the Yorkshire rising against Henry VII and the conclusion of the treaty of Medina del Campo (A14); or that 1521 saw the Edict of Worms issued against Luther (B1). However, it was in Options C-F that there were many startling misunderstandings of the given timescale. D3 referred to the years 1949-57, but too many went on deal with the Cultural Revolution to no effect. A remarkable number failed to notice that D6 addressed the years of the Bolshevik government between 1917 and 1924. Candidates appeared to notice 'weaknesses of their opponents' and 'Bolsheviks', and wrote exclusively on the period of the Provisional Government. For D8 several wrote about Stalin's elimination of his opponents in the years 1924-29, though the question focused on 1929-39; and many answers to D9 went beyond 1955 to consider the outcome of the Montgomery bus boycott and the events at Little Rock in 1957. In the E/F Option many candidates failed to take into consideration the time parameters set in E/F1, E/F2, E/F3 and E/F6. There were a significant and worrying number of responses to Question E/F 13 which displayed little understanding of the chronology of events in Weimar Germany in the years 1924-29. There were also many examples of a lack of chronological security when using supporting evidence within paragraph construction. Candidates often gave different supporting examples out of chronological order with no references to dates and so undermining the contextual security of their responses.

Candidates should be reminded that they are assessed on their quality of written communication. It is important that as well as writing legibly, with accurate use of spelling, punctuation and grammar, the style

of writing is appropriate within the context of a history examination.

The best responses were those that answered the question set and made direct reference to key words or phrases in the question with clear understanding. For example, in question E/F5 the best candidates were able to address directly the 'appointment of Mussolini as Prime Minister'; in question C5 the 'effective operation of slavery'; and in question D7 the 'essential contribution' of collectivisation to Stalin's transformation of the Russian economy.

Interestingly there was often little difference between the quality of the first and second answer, particularly with stronger candidates. Most candidates answered the questions in chronological order even if they were less sure of their first response and as a result many of the second answers were stronger than the first. Very few candidates obviously ran out of time and it is commendable that so many candidates were able to apportion appropriate time to each question.

## 6HI01 – Option C – The British Empire: Colonisation and Decolonisation

Although the whole Option only attracted a relatively small candidature compared to some of the other options it was a pleasure to see so many centres venture into new areas of study at AS level. Answers were often well written and examiners commented on the stimulating nature of the responses. The majority of candidates answered questions on topics C1, C2, C3, C6 and C7 whilst a very small entry were prepared to answer questions on topic C4 on India c1760-c1835. The handful of candidates who answered questions on topic C5 – Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-1871 appear to have been prepared to answer topic C6 and this suggests that it is very important for centres to ensure that candidates know both the topic reference and the question numbers that they will need to choose from.

The nature of the topic themes in this Option often results in questions which cover broad themes and broad periods of time. As such questions often require a more general analytical approach than in some of the other options but centres need to ensure that candidates have enough accurate evidence to support analytical statements. Centres also need to be aware that some questions may be set on elements of the individual bullet points outlined in the specification and so may require more specific detail or cover a shorter period of time within the overall period.

Although there are not necessarily specific AS level textbooks covering some of these topics available at present the specification provides resource lists and the History Communities site is up-dated with possible resource material. The detailed mark schemes and the Examiner's Report also help to provide indicative content for questions.

## C1 – The Origins of the British Empire, c1680-1763.

### Question 1

This question focused on the expansion of British involvement in India and required an assessment of the importance of threats to East India Company interests as a reason for this involvement. Most candidates were able to outline the growth of British involvement in India to achieve Level 3 but found it more difficult to assess the importance of threats to EIC interests compared to other reasons such as the growing awareness of imperial prestige and power rivalry in Europe. Some weaker answers provided an overview of the growth of Empire in general over the period and a minority included information about the Atlantic slave trade. Centres should be aware that questions may be asked on the expansion of Empire in general or in specific areas such as the Americas, the Atlantic or India.

The paragraph below is an example of low Level 3 writing.

I think that the EIC had found a gold mine in the terms of profits. The ~~govern~~ British government clearly wanted to be part of this money making. The government provided charters for the ~~East~~ ~~India~~ Joint Stock Companies and in return the Joint Stock Companies would pay the government. France was also trying to take control of India, so British involvement naturally grew. Britain did not only dislike the French but didn't want imperial rivals and thought it necessary to protect the EIC.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The paragraph attempts to explain the reason for increased British involvement in India with some exemplification but lacking in detail and security of supporting evidence.



## Question 2

This question focused on the development of British colonies in North America and the West Indies and required an assessment of the role of the Atlantic slave trade in this development. Although candidates were clearly knowledgeable about the Atlantic slave trade, many answers were descriptive in nature, failing to refer to other influences on development such as emigration and North American trade, and as such could only access Level 2 or Level 3. However, there were some very good responses which assessed a variety of reasons and in the best cases differentiated between the development of plantation colonies in the West Indies and settler colonies in North America.

The paragraph below is an example of Level 2 writing.

The slave trade was set up as a triangle. ~~Britain~~ Britain traded goods with Africa for slaves, which were taken <sup>to</sup> the new world and west Indies to be traded for things like sugar. conditions for slaves were terrible. They were taken from their homes, chained together in ships laying in their own ~~own~~ pieces. Many of them became ill and didn't survive the journey and 10% of ships had some sort of rebellion. once they reached the new world they were destined to work on plantations, some rice or tobacco, but mainly sugar. It was this idea of plantations, and the profits ~~made~~ to be made that attracted people to the new world. plenty of British men owned plantations.

and made huge profits by buying  
slaves to work ~~at~~ there.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The paragraphs describe the Atlantic slave trade in simple sentences with some acknowledgment of the development of the colonies in the reference to profits.

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

### Question 3

This question focused on the reasons why the relationship between Britain and the American colonies strengthened during the years 1740-63. Most candidates were able to answer at high Level 3 and above suggesting a variety of reasons with variable supporting evidence. Candidates suggested reasons such as the impact of the French/Native American wars, trading opportunities, allegiance to the 'Mother Country' and cultural identities. To progress within the Levels in 'why...' questions it is necessary to provide some form of assessment or evaluation in terms of importance or significance and the better responses were able to come to a balanced conclusion on a range of factors with some even challenging the assumption of the question by discussing the underlying tensions and stresses in the build up to the American Revolution

The essay below is an example of a L5 answer to a 'why...?' question. Each paragraph directly and securely addresses the question with links and the writing clearly the integration of causal factors.

The Relationship between Britain and her American colonies was one that fluctuated throughout the 18<sup>th</sup> and much of the 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries; what initially was a strong relationship turned bitter - however, from the years 1740-1763, Britain and her American colonies had strong relations.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Intro – brief but shows that understands the question and that the 'strong relationship' between 1740-63 was part of a variable relationship over time.

One reason for this was the trade policies Britain sustained. Mercantilism - the policy of self-sufficient economy, was practised by Britain, which in turn meant the Colonialists were protected under Britain when it came to trade. Undoubtedly, ~~the~~ Mercantilism helped the ~~the~~ colonies and Britain maintain steady relations, and the colonies were happy under British rule. However, this factor was not wholly without some disadvantages. Whilst the Americans could rely on the protected trade, Britain's Navigation Acts through the 1600's and early 1700's meant that the colonies could only import directly to England or her colonies and  $\frac{3}{4}$  of sailors on board

must be Englishmen. As well as this, the colonials had to pay heavy duties on sugar imported from the West Indies and ~~also on sugar~~ and other commodities. As well as this, the Hat Act of 1732 and Molasses Act of 1733 also placed duties on molasses and sugar and forbade the exporting of colonial beer to the West Indies. Clearly, the British were enjoying taxes ~~at~~ from the Americans, who were unhappy at paying the duties. The reason the colonies did not refuse to pay the taxes was because of the flourishing smuggling trades that had emerged. The colonies did not have to pay tax and such acts were largely ignored. The ~~Iron~~ Iron Act of 1750 forbade colonials from producing iron, and again, the colonies ignored this, showing how the policy of Mercantilism was not the strongest reason for the growing relations between the two colonies, although it helped the colonies, they were largely able to get around paying tax.


**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Addresses first reason – trade – explains mercantilism – shows the complexities of the trading relationship with detailed supporting evidence making some attempt to evaluate.

Despite this evasion to tax, the colonialists ~~were~~ considered themselves as British citizens, and were guaranteed these rights from Charles given to them by the King. The American colonies were loyal to the King of England and so thought themselves British. This, I believe, is the most influential <sup>reason</sup> ~~factor~~ for growing of relations between 1740 and 1763, as even though the colonies had established their own systems of government and their army, they were happy to rule under the Governor, appointed by the King. The colonies had two houses – one which was elected (lower) and one which the Governor elected. The elite of colonial society were usually appointed by the Governor, who also had the power to veto acts, appoint/dismiss judges, pardon criminals and acted as

commander-in-chief of the army. This shows how the colonists were happy to be run under the commands of someone appointed by the king. However, thanks to the policy of salutary neglect, ~~and~~ which meant the colonists were left to govern themselves and the British being 4800km away, this system of governing had to be in place. Nevertheless, it does not take away from the fact that the colonies allowed Britain to impose the Navigation Acts and appoint Governors, because they did not want independence - they still thought themselves British.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

Links previous evaluation that trade may not be the strongest reason to concept of loyalty to the Crown - suggests that this loyalty is the main reason - shows the complexity of this relationship with reference to the establishment of local government structures and the concept of 'salutary neglect'.

As well as this, ~~the~~ most colonists were in favour of 'Old Whiggism, whereby the king and monarch had the power to rule over a country - not the Parliament'; as soon as Prime Ministers such as Grenville and North started issuing taxes and imposing rules, the colonists fought back. Again, this portrays how the relationship between Britain and her colonies grew because the colonies were content and felt loyal to Britain.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

Develops the theme of loyalty further with reference to 'Old Whiggism'.

This loyalty <sup>was</sup> is portrayed throughout the Seven Years War with France 1756-1763. ~~Thought out~~ Throughout the 1600's, Britain had fought many wars ~~with~~ ~~the~~, including the War of Spanish succession and the War of Austrian Succession; the colonists had thought of these mainly as European wars, but the Seven Years War spilled over into America. This threat on the colonies was defended by Britain, who also taught the American colonials how to fight, even if there was tension.

between the 'Stiff' British and 'loose' Americans. However, even though this war showed the ~~strong~~ relations between the two were strong, it also hinted at the potential break down of relations. In 1758 the British handed back Louisbourg, which the American colonists had ~~not~~ particularly ~~captured~~ captured. Also, they ~~say~~ saw the Paris Peace Treaty of 1763 as a peace which they did not agree with; they disliked the Proclamation Act of 1763 which created Quebec and also ~~it~~ created the Proclamation Line, stopping westward expansion.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Loyalty is then linked to a further reason in defending the American colonies against French attack in the Seven Years' War – the strength of the relationship is developed but also showing that the seeds of future discontent are being sown.

The Proclamation Act of 1763 was also disliked by the colonialists, who thought that to trade with the Indians was wrong – the Indians Native to America and the American colonialists despised each other. From this, we see how relations between British and her colonies had even started to take a turn for the worst by 1763, and was no longer growing. But the Seven Years War did show the loyalty the colonialists had towards Britain, despite many of them facing religious persecution from Britain. They had a common enemy in the Catholic French, and again they saw themselves as British, and so did duty by their country, showing how the overall mood and tolerance of the colonies was a strong factor in keeping relations strong.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Continues the themes raised in previous paragraphs by demonstrating the interaction between the concepts of 'salutary neglect', mercantilist taxation, loyalty to the Crown and the separatist nature of the individual colonies with detailed supporting evidence.

Britain was always lenient towards her colonies in America, not only because she was too far away to impose laws and taxes with ease. Salutory Neglect was one part of the reason, but the colonies had always enjoyed low taxes compared to others in the world; the average American paid just sixpence in tax per year - in Britain, that figure was 25 shillings. As well as this, they were never far from the colonialists' side. In 1753, Fort Duquesne was being held by the French, and the Americans had secured a Charter for land by their side; the British sent 500 troops ~~out~~ to America to secure the land, which perhaps had the British was always there for her colonies, indicating of the strong relationship. But even then, the colonials had the upper hand, in that they almost allowed Britain to keep looking after them ~~and~~. The Americans did not want to unite - the States were separate and loyal first to the King, then to themselves. When Franklin proposed the Plan of Union ~~to~~ at the Albany Congress, ~~he had no support~~ in response to the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, the Plan fell through. No colony wanted to unify, showing how the strength of relations lay in the colonies' separation and their loyalty to Britain.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Suggests that the relationship was only strong in the areas that benefited the colonies and that when these benefits began to be undermined 'cracks' in the relationship began to appear – evaluation of factors also taking place.

The colonies' protection under mercantilism and their help in the Seven Years War had broken - Smuggling saw that the Americans only complied to achieve what they wanted from Britain - evasion to tax completely. In the War, cracks started to appear in their relationship - so although these two factors explain why the relationship between Britain and her colonies grew between 1740 and 1763, ~~that~~ they also

Show how the colonies' loyalty to Britain and belief of being British citizens, as well as their loyalty to the King, were very decisive factors - they really held the colonists back from independence and rebellion to British authority. As well as this, Britain's policy of Salutary Neglect is another important factor, which meant that when Britain did try to get involved in 1763 onwards, the colonies fought back and resisted the change.

By looking at this, we see that the policy of Mercantilism, the help in the Seven Years War and the French and Indian War are all reasons why the colonies and Britain's relationship grew, and these factors are all part of the colonies' loyalty and Britain's policy of Salutary Neglect, which made the relations between the colonies and Britain grow from 1760-1763.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

Conclusion – brief conclusion showing the interaction of different factors.



### Question 4

This question focused on the importance of incompetent British military leadership in the victory of the American colonists in the War of Independence and was one of the most popular questions. Candidates were generally well informed and were able to access Level 4 with reference to a range of factors including foreign intervention and the role of Washington. However, to access Level 5 candidates needed to assess the role of British incompetence in comparison to the other factors. Some weaker answers were unable to differentiate between British military leaders and/or concentrated too much on the strengths of the American colonists. It was refreshing to see that very few candidates chose to write a narrative response but there were also many chronological inaccuracies.

The essay below is an example of a good Level 4 answer.

The ~~un~~importance of the British commanders in the American war of independence was a crucial factor in the victory of the colonists. Foreign intervention after the battle of Saratoga ~~at~~ in 1777 with the French alliance was another factor. George Washington was also important as he used all opportunities for example the military genius of Duquesne. Another important factor in the war independence was the <sup>distance from Britain</sup> ~~global conflict~~ ~~it~~ resulting in victory for the colonists.

The ~~un~~importance of the British commanders led to victory for the American colonists. Generals such as Howe became complacent in New York in the 1770s and failed to chase after the rebels, giving George Washington's army ~~time~~ time to regroup, raising their numbers to 6,000. Burgoyne also demonstrated military ~~time~~ incompetence when he decided to ~~the~~ march

to Albany alone with the support of loyalists, Canadians and Hessians. He expected ~~Britain~~ <sup>St Leger</sup> to follow behind. However, Leger was ambushed by rebels and Burgoyne was left isolated leading to military defeat at Saratoga in 1777. The lack of co-ordination and failing to take advantage of ~~British~~ victories meant that the rebels were able to regroup and resulted in American colonial victory.

However another factor involved in the victory of the colonists was how the fighting became spread out leading to colonial victory. The colonies were 3,000 miles away from Britain meaning that their supply line for troops was 3,000 miles away. After the British failed to gain any closer territory for a supply line they couldn't supply their troops. The foreign ~~aren't~~ <sup>aren't</sup> intervention meant that Britain had to spread her resources thinly. For example in the later years of the war of independence only 29% of the army were in Northern America compared with 55% who were defending the ~~British~~ defend ~~the~~ Britain itself. The spread of the war across the empire meant that resources were thinly spread against the rebels meaning that the British were defeated leading to

American colonist victory.

George (Washington) Washington was another factor in the victory of the American colonists in the war of independence. Washington was not a military genius but unlike the British commanders used any given opportunity. When Howe did not follow his army regrew to 6,000 and resulted in victories at Trenton and Princeton. Washington also rallied his troops behind the 'glorious cause' this was vital as his army suffered a bad winter at Valley Forge where 3,000 men died or deserted. Washington also able to maintain support from Congress and was head commander meaning that there was consistency for troops during difficult periods. The ability of George Washington to maintain morale and support of both troops and congress ~~was~~ meant that morale was high, meaning they were determined to ~~beat~~ <sup>defeat</sup> the enemy resulting in American <sup>colonist</sup> victory.

Foreign intervention was another crucial factor in the American colonist victory. After British defeat at ~~the~~ Saratoga in 1777 demonstrated to other countries such as France that there was no doubt the American colonists could be victorious. The French eager to defeat the

British were happy to join in 1778 to seek revenge for the French-Indian war and King George's war earlier in the 1760s. The French provide extra support and morale to troops. For example in the Battle of Long Island the French provided five battalions ~~for~~ increasing the amount of support ~~for~~ and morale of American colonial troops. At the battle of Yorktown there was a 18,000 strong American-French army which ultimately ended in defeat for the British. The foreign intervention of the French and other countries such as Spain increased both morale and numbers leading to American colonial victory.

The ~~the~~ incompetence of British commanders ultimately led to the American <sup>colonial</sup> victory. The failure to end in complete victory led to defeat after defeat, ~~but ultimately led to one defeat at Saratoga~~, as the most crucial point of the war the British commanders failed to co-ordinate attacks in 1777 led to defeat at Saratoga. This defeat turned the war into a global war meaning British resources were stretched ~~thin~~ meaning that the rebels could not be defeated resulting in American colonial victory.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The candidate clearly addresses the incompetence of British military leadership and other factors contributing to the victory of the American colonists with adequate but not always secure supporting evidence. However, there is some imbalance in the weaker development of the given factor and the factors suggested for colonial victory are only really linked in the conclusion.

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

Both of these questions were popular but many candidates, although knowledgeable about the topic, failed to address the specific question asked and/or found it difficult to select appropriate supporting evidence leading to unfocused answers.

#### Question 5

This question required an assessment of the importance of brutality as the primary factor in the efficient operation of slavery in British colonies. Many answers were only able to access Level 3 as they concentrated on a descriptive commentary on the brutality of slavery, with in-depth accounts of brutality at different stages of the slave trade often with over-emphasis on the Middle Passage. Better responses were able to argue 'how far' against other less violent methods of control and to address directly the concept of 'efficiency'. There were some excellent Level 5 responses which were able to refer to changes over time suggesting that different methods of control were necessary after the abolition of the slave trade in 1807.

Below is an example of a low Level 5 response.

5. The image in the common British consciousness of slavery, is one formed by abolitionists, who in their righteous anger were understandably keen to accentuate the cruelty of this barbaric system with the aim of affecting its abolition, an aim in which they succeeded in 1833. As such the common perception of

slavery is one in which the enslaved were forced to work almost without pause, and in which any failure to do so was punished violently. But would such a system really have been effective? Adam Smith's 'Wealth of Nations', published at the height of the slaving business, contended that people forced to work through coercion and fear would render a system less efficient than one which employed willing, paid workers. While the latter was clearly not the case on the slave plantation, recent evidence and revisionist perspectives have given us reason to reconsider the extent of our brutal image of slavery, so how big a role did brutality really play in the effective operation of the slave labour system?

Needless to say, the whole business of slavery was morally repugnant on every level, and the majority of plantation owners would have had few qualms regarding the ethics of corporal punishment and intimidation. Higher-ranking slaves, known as 'overseers' were employed to watch the line of workers, with the power and instruction to whip those who were not seen to be working hard enough. The situation was often similar when it came to punishment of offences; flogging was relatively common, though execution rare given the need to maintain a sufficient workforce. Similarly, rebellions, such as ~~those~~ that led in Jamaica by the baptist preacher Sam Sharpe immediately prior to the abolition of slavery, were often crushed violently, even in cases such as this where the ~~of~~ slaves' approach, theoretically, and initially, at least, was one of non-violent refusal to work. Certainly then the use of violent and brutal repression of slaves was a widespread practice and an integral part of the working of the slave trade, but is it realistic to believe that an effective and expansive workforce could have been maintained for so many decades by the use of violence alone? According to Smith's theory, incentivisation would have yielded a more productive system than sheer force. Indeed, it would have been possible for the slaves, armed with machetes, to have overcome their owners in a physical struggle. Insensitive as they were to the plight of their African subordinates, it seems unlikely that the plantation owners would have maintained an exclusively brutality-based system in the face of evidence of its inefficacy, driven as they were primarily by profit.

Indeed, there is a great deal more evidence than is generally acknowledged that supports the idea that concessions were made to slaves that can only have been conceived with the aim of keeping them motivated and increasing output. Slaves were allowed to maintain their own religions alongside Christianity, and to practice traditional dances as long as the noise was kept away from the owner's house. Later, there would often be churches reserved on a Sunday, and ~~one~~ resident priests would also preside over slave marriages, which, while often unsuccessful, were not altogether uncommon. Furthermore, the working hours of many slaves were, while unacceptable high, less than often claimed and in some cases

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The response directly addresses the extent to which the effective operation of slavery relied on brutality. The answer uses well selected supporting evidence to create a balanced answer and conclusion.



### Question 6

This question requires an assessment of the importance of the Evangelical Movement to the success of the anti-slavery campaign 1800-1833. Many candidates were able to give an overview of the anti-slavery campaign and address in general terms the role of Evangelicals along with other influences resulting in very few answers achieving less than Level 3. However, there were a disappointing number of high Level 4 and Level 5 answers due to a lack of real understanding of who the Evangelicals were (many confused them with the Quakers), a failure to note the time-scale of the question (1800-1833) and a failure to connect individual campaigners to the Evangelical Movement. There were some excellent answers which were able to focus on the importance of the Movement and suggest different degrees of importance at different times, for example, the differing support for the abolition of the slave trade compared to that of slavery.

Below is an example of a Level 3 paragraph.

The slave revolts in Jamaica and many of the other colonies also contributed largely to the success of the anti-slavery committee. The organised revolt by Sam Sharpe in 1831 having a major impact, as well as, the continuous and persistent acts of passive resistance which made it very hard for plantation owners and therefore politicians to gain full success from an already dying-out trade.



**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The candidate has highlighted an alternative contributory factor to the success of the anti-slavery campaign with some brief supporting evidence and showing some general understanding of underlying reasons for the abolition of slavery in 1833. However, the paragraph does not have the secure knowledge and clear explanatory connection to the question that might be seen at a higher level.

## C4 – Commerce and Conquest: India, c1760-c1835

There were very few candidates who answered the two questions focused on the limitations on the power of the East India Company and the relationship between the British and the Indian princes. Most of the responses were of a general nature producing an overview of events relating to the question themes but were lacking in analysis and failed to cover the whole time period required.

## C5 – Commerce and Imperial Expansion, c1815-70

There were only a handful of response to the two questions focused on the importance of territories acquired by the British in 1815 and the role of Christian missionaries in the development of the British Empire. It would appear that most of the candidates had mistaken this topic for C6 and so were unable provide effective supporting evidence. It is vital that centres make their candidates aware of the topics and questions that they have been prepared for.

## C6- Britain and the Scramble for Africa, c1875-1914

This was a popular topic but a disappointing number of candidates appeared to write pre-prepared answers which failed to address the specific focus of the question and which concentrated on describing, with some knowledge, the historiographical interpretations of imperialism. While it is interesting to see an historiographical approach in these answers, centres are reminded that historiography best belongs to Advanced level rather than AS level, where the temptation exists to describe the findings of historians. Centres should be aware that a descriptive overview of different theories of imperialism, without clear understanding and evaluation in relation to the question focus, will be assessed as an essentially narrative approach within Level 3.

### Question 11

This question is focused on the outbreak of the Second Boer War and requires an assessment of the British desire for raw materials in explaining the outbreak of war. Most candidates were show a broad understanding of the long term factors leading to the outbreak of war with particular reference to economic and strategic influences, and were able to assess the role of the British wish to seize raw materials. However, there was a disappointing lack of reference to the short term reasons for the outbreak of war, and there were often inaccuracies in details and chronology, for example, citing Gladstone as Prime Minister during the war and placing the Battle of Majuba Hill during the Second Boer War. A small but significant number of candidates chose to answer this question as a general explanation of the 'Scramble for Africa'. A few were able to use the historiography approach to evaluate and assess successfully with excellent supporting evidence. The best answers were able to refer to both broad factors and the immediate causes of war linking the wealth of the Boer republics to strategic concerns and the Uitlander controversy.

The essay below is an example of a Level 4 answer.

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer .  
If you change your mind, put a line through the box   
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Question 13	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 14	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		

It can be said that the main reason for the outbreak of the second Boer war was that Britain wanted to jeje control of the Boer republic's raw materials, which included gold & diamonds. However, many other important factors led to the outbreak of the second Boer war, such as international rivalry, strategic & political reasons, which are arguably more important.

During the great trek of 1835-1837, the Boers aimed to move inland into the Orange Free State & the Transvaal. At the time, no country had yet determined the economic importance of this area, as the gold & diamond materials were only found in 1886. This meant that the Boers now controlled the most economically prosperous area in South Africa, & threatened the significance of the Cape colony. Britain, being the world's strongest imperial power, could not afford to let the Boers benefit from this new discovery. Indeed the economic potential of the area did push Britain into the second Boer war to gain control of the raw materials, however international rivalry was the main driving force that pushed Britain as it could not afford to allow the Boer republic to threaten Britain's world power & prestige.

Another important reason for the outbreak of the second Boer War was that the Boers, being predominantly white, had still not abolished slavery, which the British were infuriated by. Britain had abolished slavery in the early 1800s, completely by the year 1834, so one can suggest that Britain had annexed the Boer region for moral reasons, and to step towards the freedom of the black community. This was also beneficial for the British as if they fought the Boers to abolish slavery, British colonies in Africa would appreciate this brave moral gesture.

From 1886, when gold & diamonds had first been discovered in the Transvaal, British prospectors believed that this would provide a great source of income, & therefore settled in the mining town of Johannesburg to make their fortune. However, the Boers who disliked these British & European prospectors, known as the Uitlanders, denied their right to vote & put heavy taxes on them. This reform, which in Britain's point of view is morally incorrect, encouraged Cecil Rhodes, the man on the spot in South Africa, to fight for the Uitlanders' rights. Negotiations with the Boer chiefs led to increasing pressure between the two forces, who both reinforced their armies & defences in their regions (Britain in Natal & the Boers in the Transvaal). Neither side wanting to back down, their stubbornness led to the outbreak of the second Boer war.

The "gentleman's club" that had been formed between the financial elite in Britain & the political parties in Britain was another factor that led to the outbreak of the second Boer War. This factor is significant for the scramble in general, but since the Boer Republic in 1886 became a strong economic region in Africa, these rich British investors, the "financial elite" believed that investment in the Transvaal could lead to explosive financial incomes. They had a strong political influence in Britain & therefore could encourage British government to expand its empire in the Boer Republic's.

Towards the late periods of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, propaganda was becoming more & more important. People in Britain were learning about the Empire in theatres & posters. In 1867 & 1884, the urban working class & the rural working class got the right to vote respectively. Therefore, they now had a say in Britain's foreign policy. In 1896, the first tabloid press was founded, "The Daily Mail" which allowed the people in Britain to know more about the empire in Africa & made political influence in Britain much stronger. The Queen's diamond Jubilee in Britain in 1897, two years before the Boer War, made the people in Britain feel more attached to their country than before, & therefore encouraged their government to fight in the second Boer war.

In conclusion, one can say that the British wish to seize control of the Boer Republic's raw materials was a strong reason for the outbreak of the second Boer War in 1899, however, not the main reason. International rivalry is without a doubt the main reason for the outbreak of the second Boer War, as Britain could not afford any other force prosper from the new findings in the Boer region, including Germany, yet alone the Boers. Britain's prestige & its ambition to world domination was the driving force to the outbreak.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The answer has a clear focus on the causes of the Second Boer War with adequate supporting evidence (although the paragraph 3 reference to slavery is not relevant) and a conclusion. However, there is a lack of balance with the counter-argument of international rivalry weakly developed and the interaction of factors is implicit rather than explicit.

### Question 12

This question is focused on the changing attitudes toward Empire in Britain during the period 1875-1914. Some candidates seemed to misunderstand the question with a small but significant number of responses giving an overview of the expansion of the British Empire in the year 1875-1814. There were also some responses that focused on British politicians and government policy rather than the broad attitudes suggested in the clarification content of the specification. Altogether the response was disappointing with few answers going beyond an analysis that the British were pro-Empire became 'jingoistic' and lost interest in Empire after the events of the Second Boer War. There were also many inaccuracies and chronological misunderstandings with particular reference to the actions and period of office of the British Prime Ministers. However, the best candidates were able to produce excellent nuanced answers linking popular and intellectual attitudes to the 'millstones' of the early period through the development of 'forward policy', Gladstone's 'reluctant imperialism', the 'khaki' election of 1900 and the adverse reaction to the events of the Second Boer War.

## C7 – Retreat from Empire: Decolonisation in Africa, c1957-81

### Question 13

This question focused on the decision to give independence to African colonies during the years 1957-65 and required an assessment of the role of African independence in influencing the decisions made. The best answers included causal focus, range and depth with specific reference to individual independence movements and other factors such as Cold War politics, the consequences of the Suez crisis and Macmillan's cost-benefit analysis. Weaker answers gave a range of causes of post-war decolonisation but made limited reference to independence movements. Many of the answers displayed weak chronological awareness and/or, although conceptually aware, ignored the specific time frame with simple generalisation about the state of the British economy.

The essay below is an example of a Level 5 answer.

In the years 1957-1965 Britain experienced a wave of decolonisation through Africa. African independence movements did play a major role in bringing about this decolonisation in many African countries. However, each African country in the British Empire also had specific individual reasons that brought about their independence. Moreover it can be seen that economic issues also motivated Britain to decolonise her African Empire, because African colonies turned out to cost Britain more to maintain than, in comparison to the profit Britain was making.

To start with in 1957 Ghana, ~~was formerly~~ <sup>previously</sup> known as the Gold Coast, gained independence. Ghana largely gained her independence because of independent nationalist movement and encouraged the NPP led by Nkrumah. Nkrumah mobilised public opinion <sup>in</sup> Ghana and set up his own party the CPP - Congress Peoples Party - in order to get an African majority on the legislature. This was largely motivated by the riot in Accra in 1948, over

The destruction of cocoa trees, Britain's attempt at a new constitution and the fact that Britain still had military in Ghana soon after the war had ended. Dr Nkrumah's party won elections in 1946, 1949 and 1957, establishing Ghana as an independent country. Therefore it can be seen that independent nationalist movement did largely bring about Ghana's independence. However, given the fact that Ghana suffered from inflation and didn't pose much economic benefit it can be argued to some extent that Britain decolonised from Ghana as it was no longer a benefit to her.

Moreover, in 1961 Tanganyika gained independence from the British Empire by winning majority election of the Tanganyikan African National Union, under Nyerere. Riots in Tanganyika over British involvement in Tanganyikan agricultural economy. The British had tried to get economic benefit by the groundnut scheme, and cleared out miles of land and failed to achieve its aim resulting in a £49 million losses. Riot led to Britain holding elections to appease the Africans and in 1961 Tanganyika became the independent state of Tanzania.

The country that can be seen as most motivated to gaining independence from British rule through nationalist independent movements is Kenya. In Kenya a group called the Mau Mau formed based on the Kikuyu tribe. They looked over issues like the white settlers who dominated the white highlands (best land in Kenya, most profitable), and



over the fact that Kenya should be independent of white rule because of the majority. Riots led to many killings, of Europeans, Africans and even Kikuyus themselves. Britain called a state of emergency, took control and stopped the Mau Mau revolt. However this largely encouraged her to hold elections where Kenyatta the leader of The Kenyan African Union won the election, therefore Kenya gained independence in 1963. However, on the other hand, it can be argued that the Mau Mau was not a completely ~~not~~ nationalist movement as it was fighting for the rights of the Kikuyu tribe not Kenya as a whole.

In addition it can be stated that countries such as Uganda who gained independence in 1962 and Nigeria who gained independence in 1960 ~~was~~ were given independence by Britain because of nationalist movements but to a lesser extent. In both these <sup>British African</sup> ~~African~~ colonies there was division because of ethnicity and linguistics. Therefore although there were nationalist movements such as those of the Yoruba ~~etc~~ and Igbo in Nigeria and the Bugandans under leadership of Mutesa in Uganda, they weren't representative of their country as a whole but more so over specific tribes and ethnicities. Therefore, in some African ~~countries~~ British African colonies ~~the~~ independence was achieved over split decisions with that colony. Either way Britain gave independence to them because she could no longer put up

with such riots, didn't have to be her problem, and the fact that the idea of Empire was no longer as favourable as it once was.

Although independent nationalist movement did play a major role in accelerating decolonisation and Britain's decision to decolonise there were other factors that encouraged British decisions as well. Firstly it must be stated that the process of decolonisation had already begun in earnest, even before nationalist movements began. After the Suez Crisis in 1959 all of Britain's weaknesses were exposed that suggested Britain no longer had the power to hold on to the Empire she once did. & The Suez Crisis exposed Britain's inability to influence African states, her dependency on the USA and was a huge humiliation. Therefore, Britain's decision to decolonise was also influenced by her ~~weakening~~ weakened status as a global power and her dependency on the USA.

Consequently, the Suez crisis led to Macmillan, then the British Prime Minister giving his "Winds of Change Speech" in 1960. The "Winds of Change" speech can be seen as the <sup>final nail in</sup> ~~first cut from~~ the British Imperialist coffin. Macmillan ~~exp~~ stated that Britain and the Conservative party had finally accepted that decolonisation had to happen now. They ~~were~~ accepted they could no longer hold on to an Empire that didn't want to be under the British rule.

Therefore, Macmillan's "wind of change" speech was Britain's decision.

Finally, Britain's decision to decolonise was also largely influenced by economic reasons. By the 1950's sterling area was not making Britain much profit and Britain made with it had decreased significantly. Macmillan's cost benefit analysis chart proved that the Empire was not longer an economic benefit but an economic burden, and that British economy would possibly increase if she decolonised. Britain was already in debt to America, so decolonisation was no longer a hated choice but seen as beneficial. Therefore, Britain's decision to decolonise was also influenced by economic issues.

Thus it can be seen that Britain's decision to give independence to colonies from 1957-1965 was largely influenced by nationalist independence movements. However, economic reasons and the fact that Britain was no longer the great power, as once was also had a large influence on this decision making.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

There is direct focus on role the African independence movements in the decision of Britain to decolonise during the years 1957-65. The essay refers to the variable influences of African nationalism in different parts of Africa whilst discussing the role of other influencing factors. Paragraph beginnings clearly build up a discursive answer using phrases such as 'to start with', 'moreover', 'in addition', 'although', 'consequently' and 'finally'.

**Question 14**

This question was focused on the extent to which decolonisation led political instability in the newly independent nations of east and west Africa in the 1960s and 1970s. Very few candidates answered this question and many of the response were weak overviews of the decolonisation process in Ghana and Kenya. The best answers were able to differentiate between areas of relative stability as well as instability and to suggest that other factors such as ethnic rivalry in Nigeria and lack of economic resources in Uganda, for example, also may have contributed to political instability.

**Grade Boundaries****6HI01 C**

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
6HI01 C grade boundaries	60	45	39	33	28	23
UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40



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

Telephone 01623 467467  
Fax 01623 450481  
Email [publications@linneydirect.com](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)  
Order Code US021421 June 2009

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

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

Ofqual  




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

