



Examiners' Report June 2011

GCE History 6HI03 B

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.

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/

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.



Get more from your exam results

...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code UA028154

All the material in this publication is copyright © Edexcel Ltd 2011

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the second session of the 6HI03 B examination. Indeed, at the end of two years of modular study, many candidates wrote with sophistication and insight.

The paper requires candidates to answer two questions (a Depth Study question and an Associated Historical Controversy question) in 120 minutes. Predictably, some candidates were able to write at considerable length in this time but their responses sometimes lacked focus on the question. Relevance rather than length is the key to high marks as 'kitchen sink' responses will take a candidate only so far. Examiners want to see that candidates can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the question set.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than we would expect any answer to take. It should not be seen as a recommendation of the amount candidates should write.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on Option B of students having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was wide but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched and the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination. There were also very few rubric errors. As expected, there were far more entrants for B1 (France 1786-1830: Revolution, Empire and Restoration) than for B2 (Challenging Authority: Protest, Reform and Response in Britain, c1760-1830). The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss the extent to which the army and the privileged orders were responsible for the collapse of absolute monarchy in France in 1789. The best responses offered a clear focus on the stated factors and an informed assessment of the role of other factors (such as the Louis XVI's failure of will, the financial problems of the crown, and popular pressure, particularly in Paris). Weaker answers tended to (1) offer unsupported assertions regarding the reasons for the collapse of absolute monarchy (2) lack focus on key events/developments in 1789 (3) produce narratives with weak links to the question (4) confuse developments in 1789 with those of 1792.

the time due to soveral reasons. The coason is their inclusion in the American has of Indopenhance arounds Britain. Although this ended in success or America it was discretening or the reneh occording as nor is expensive. The laws lifestife of Louis XVI and his prosector had also coated a rung gent with the cost of hoping the place in Versailles. This coursed page coentrary from the people of transe as they were struggling to surieve write to monarchy continued taking was with huge object rates that they coulant affect to pay to their expensive libertife. A common of realized of reactions throughout history is economic instruction as people are more accepting of a repressure scheme when anones is accommon that the economic situation courses, esentment is, the actual days when women marked to beautife and doced ouis XVI back to lars in potent of the breas pieces as they coulant affect to eat.

ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This low Level 3 response is broadly analytical but offers limited detail and development. Here, for example, the candidate's assessment of the French monarchy's economic problems lacks depth.



To gain high marks on the the Depth Study question, you must have a sound subject knowledge. Check the specification for the key topics.

The best responses to Question 2 had a strong focus on how far Napoleon's domestic reforms were 'conservative in intent', demonstrated a clear understanding of the phrase, and addressed both sides of the argument. Stronger candidates also considered a range of relevant developments or measures such as links with the Papacy, the return of émigré aristocrats, the Civil Code, reforms in education, secularisation of Church lands, and the legal and administrative reforms. Weaker answers fell into several categories (1) narratives about Napoleon's major domestic measures between 1799 and 1807 with few or no links to the issue of 'conservative in intent' (2) responses which focused overwhelmingly on just one or two areas such as the reform of education or restoration of links with the Papacy (3) essays with one side of the argument poorly developed. A significant minority of candidates did not understand what was meant by 'conservative' in the context of the question.

(Section A continued) By NOW MKET 188 1799, Napole on Nacl established wis place of took as leader of France as First cancer, this was trupicmed by a presiste in 1800. Historiams debate to what extent Napoleon's negligins on someonic parcy were revolutionary, or were conservative, a mere aide back to the ancien regime, whose a centralised authoratic government was in prace, but civil right and preclams were available and the curch and plate when the which can be examined as his policies in government, administration of law and and an his policies in government, administration of law and an his policies in government, administration of law and an his policies in government, administration of law and always the back to a more conservative time as he established lumberly as which a single, leader with intimate allowably as which a single, leader with intimate allowably and set up what many argue was a centralised dichaboracip.



This extract from a Level 5 response clearly sets out the terms of the debate and fully understands what is meant by the phrase 'conservative in intent'. The candidate then goes on to examine several of Napoleon's domestic measures in the light of this opening statement.

On Question 3, the strongest responses provided an in-depth assessment of the pressure to reform the political system before 1785. These answers usually focused on the impact of reform movement (e.g. Wilkes, Wyvill, the County Association Movement, and the Rockingham Whigs), the Gordon Riots, and the divisions among the reformers. Weaker candidates offered (1) answers with no real knowledge or development concerning the pressure for reform prior to 1785 - typically thin narratives or focused but largely unsupported responses (2) answers which drifted quickly from the time frame of the question to the politics of the 1790s (3) answers with a very narrow range (e.g. just the career of Wilkes).

Problems existed with the existing political system. For example, any \$1 of the population could note and even when voting took place, there were no secret bounds. Corruption was rife in Partiament and outside MPs would buy the votes off voters and patronage was common within Partiament Representation was unaqual and there were rotten and packet boraughs across England For example.

Durwich Sheffield had a population of \$2,000 but didn't have an MP. These problems were noticable inside and outside of government - pressure for reform was becoming exerging.



This Level 3 response lacks a consistent focus on the question. Here the candidate moves away from an assessment of the pressure for reform and begins a discussion of the inadequacies of the political system which is only weakly linked to the question.



If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.

The majority of responses were able to offer an explanation for the defeat of radicalism in the 1790s. Stronger candidates often demonstrated impressive range and depth by examining the role of government repression in detail and then balancing it against the impact of other factors (such as the growth of patriotism due to the conflict with France, divisions amongst the reformers, and the impact of religious revivalism). Low scoring responses typically offered (1) a descriptive account of radicalism in the 1790s with few or no links to the question (2) a narrow focus on some aspects of government repression which largely or wholly ignored the role of other factors.

Comparing Pitt's repressive (egistation at this time to the see on English version of the mench 'Temor' is unfair. Though the suspension of Habeas Copus did infininge on personal liberty, it was hardly in the same league as the events in france- and led to far less arrests and executions. Were Pitt and his legislation the only force against radication in Britain at this time, perhaps it could be credited solely with its defeat, but it was not. Evangelicism had reappeared in the 1490s, undersoing somewhat of a remial. The main group was the Clapham. Sect with its prominent member, William Wilberforce.

Advocating the moral reform of the governing classes, evangelicism costed howards a vital christianing. It (Section A continued) gotte of the ones in positions of power accepting their moral duly to look after those in the laver/ labouring classes - and in veturn those laver classes would objuve radicalism and be content with their lot. Though perhaps

objuse radicalism and be content with their lot. Though perhaps to rather simplishic and rosted in class hierarchy, pamplets such as Harrah Mare's Cheap Repository Tracks - a series of Lity panifiles that extolled a moral pathway and were aimed at the labouring classes - were actually very popular as an alternative to the wampingly extreme radicalism some fared was inflibrating Britain.



Here, in this Level 5 extract, the candidate makes an effective judgement about the role played by Pitt's measures before moving on to consider the impact of another relevant factor - evangelicalism. Note how the analysis is focused on the question.

This proved to be an accessible and popular question. Many candidates made good use of the sources and their own knowledge to develop a confident line of argument about the relative importance of Louis XVI's mistakes and misjudgements in bringing about the downfall of the monarchy. The best responses were firmly focused on the relative importance of the stated factor and examined the debate thoroughly in the light of the issues raised by the sources. At this level, candidates were also likely to recognise the interaction of factors (for example the links between the King's misjudgements and hardening republican sentiment). Weak answers tended to (1)generalise about the reasons for the downfall of the French monarchy in 1792 without offering specific development on the issue of Louis XVI's mistakes and misjudgements (2) describe (rather than assess) the evidence for the end of the monarchy presented in the three sources with little or no integration of own knowledge for support.

While the declaration of pilhite in 1791 had not little outrage the Brussnick menitests in 1792 had the opposite effect allow to be souse of crists' since then the module Leopold II had deed and been replaced by the younger implaces Francis who was for more likely to want a War when Autria alled its Prussia in early 1792 it increased tensions culminating in the Brussnick manifests by the Prussian commander. These "threatened with death any citizen spoorting the alled advance" their was a direct threat to their catety and as source 3 states "intensified irrational search and parnie". While Source a claims "Louis had specifically requested his fellow movements not to allow the content" the people were under the impression that (Section B continued) the King along with the Austrian Committee were supportion of the Soverign Kings and wanted a War

(Section B continued) the King along with the Austrian Committee were supportise of the Soverin Kings and marked a War & overthan the rendertion. The Grondin in the Essembly manted a near for this reason to draw attention to the knys treaching and to the we out other traites It is this which "deepened the galt between the modurates and extremists , who did not want was such as Robesspiere who delieved the greater throut was 5 rom Counter resolutionans which increased the for of " braiton Whing would every somer? the "gulf-created mentioned in source 3 was due to the Skight to Vaneries which is turn contributed to He huge mixtout of the king and suspicion one his implicant with Soreign Dowen brought about by the Brussmith manifesto. The king had seemingly betrayed the contitutional monorchy by flein & Varenes. His constients was inscontatable at his agreement to the outs of init contitution and he kelt bropped in Dans by the Assembly He hope that he could negotiate better Soom a position of Greedon and so fled or the 20th June 1791. This was a huge beloaged to the people and lost him a lot of trust and support it also undernied the constitution as Louis had left clear instructions that he did not agree with any aspect of the revolution. He had clearly misjudged He popularity of the measures and was greated by "sturned

(Section B continued) to King along with the Aastrian Committee
were supporting of the Sovering Kings and named a War
Assembly
Borethan the renderion. The Girondin is the Entered
worked a war for this was to draw attention to the Kings
knearborn and to the gulf between the modurates
and extremity: Who did not want have such as
Kobespiete who believed the greater through was 5 von
Counter resolutioners which increased the Gor of " fraitor



This candidate has produced a Level 3 answer by extracting some information from the sources and integrating a moderate amount of own knowledge. There is scope to offer more of both and to cross-reference the sources more effectively.

This also proved to be an accessible question. The strongest candidates offered a sustained source-led analysis with impressive range and depth to reach a judgement about the impact of the Russian Campaign of 1812 on Napoleon's fate. At this level, responses confidently weighed the stated factor against the unity of the coalition Bonaparte now faced and the weakening effects of the Peninsular War, integrating relevant own knowledge where appropriate. Weaker answers often (1) adopted a weak 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else include little or no own knowledge in support of their argument (2) uncritically accepted the view that the Russian Campaign ruined Napoleon and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the sources (3) relied on largely narrative accounts of Napoleon's later campaigns.

Source 4 shows that the Russian campaign was indeed a significant blow to Napoleon's power, calling it 'carastrophic', a conclusion correlated by source 5 which refers to the Idisaster of 1812' Indeed, the base figures of the compaign support his view - out of an initial force of 450 000 invading, only 25 000 remained by the end of the campaign and it can be assumed this had an effect on all later campaigns as experienced veterans were lost to an eventually fruit less endeavow. Zamoyshi's asserver mal this event 'staled Napoleon's fate' is expanded upon by cibing the corresponding blow to the Emperor's prestige - it 'tarrished [his] awa of superiorly to an extent that Napoleon never regained the status of 'master of Europe', and Source 4's assertion that 'every region which reserved his dominion... took hear' is supported by the fact that in 1813 and 1814 many of France's satellite states as the Duchy of wasaw and Holland began to abandon known conquert or rebollion. Another way in which Russia seen as a turning point for Napoleon was its

(Section B continued) contribution to the state of mulitary overex cervion which extited in the last years of the Empire - Napoleon choise to apen up another; largely unnecessary front which spread his armies even thinner than before and brought no additional military glory. However, in other ways it can be argued that Russia was not pivotal for Napoleon - Source 5 points out that after 1817.

Napoleon 'was able once more to resise a new army', suggesting the effects of the campaign in term of troop losses was not so serious considering the vast populations. Napoleon controlled by this point. Moreaver, Source 6's reference to 'dramatic... French victories in early 1814' shows that the decisive overt in Napoleon's ceveer was yet to come.



This Level 5 response has several strengths. In the extract shown about the Russian campaign (1) the arguments put forward by Source 4 are thoroughly examined (2) key points are supported by own knowledge (3) the other two sources are used briefly but effectively to qualify the impact of the Russian campaign.



During the planning stage, after you have identified the key issues raised by the sources, add your own knowledge to these points. That way, you'll find it easier to integrate the two elements in the actual essay.

Here, the strongest candidates demonstrated a firm grasp of the controversy and assessed the source arguments about the reasons for the 'danger of riot and revolution' confidently. At this level, own knowledge was often extensive but, more importantly, it was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources (which concentrated on lack of effective policing, radical attitudes and social and economic conditions). Weak responses typically offered (1) a largely unsupported commentary on the dangers of riot and revolution in the period 1815-30 which was inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach (3) a generalised narrative account of social disorder in the post-1815 period which barely addressed the question.

ious that the ford is tha (Section B continued) in times of protest righting etc. but back in the 1800s magistrates were seen as excercing important and authorized responsibilities. When looking backat historical information and author had occured we need to be sure to persurber the differences in ways of thinking from an 21st century minds to the past



This Level 2 response illustrates two common weaknesses in answers to the Associated Historical Controversy question. The candidate adopts a basic source by source approach with no cross-referencing and adds little own knowledge.



When planning your answer, read through the sources carefully and list all the support and challenge points you can. This will help you to cross-reference effectively in your answer.

On Question 8, the strongest candidates made good use of the sources and their own knowledge to develop a confident line of argument about the impact of economic change on the labouring classes from c1780 to 1830. At this level, responses offered a sustained source-led analysis with impressive range and depth. Indeed, several in this category extensively cross-referenced the sources to develop a nuanced analysis which emphasised that economic change brought poverty and opportunity to different groups. Weak candidates tended to produce (1) a largely unsupported commentary on the impact of economic change on the labouring classes between 1780 and 1830 (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach (3) a generalised narrative account of the British economy and/or working class life from 1780 to 1830 which barely addressed the question.

Summary

A general summary of the areas for improvement in the approach to the Depth Study question and the Associated Historical Controversy question on Option B may prove of benefit to centres.

Depth Study question

- 1. Candidates need to ensure that their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth. A few discussed a period or development which was not the focus of the question.
- 2. Candidates need to be more aware of the time frame attached to a question. Many lower scoring responses devoted much time and space to discussing the years either before or after the period targeted by the question.
- 3. In order to address the question effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis not a descriptive or chronological account.

Associated Historical Controversy question

- 1. Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.
- 2. Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.
- 3. Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation not historiography.
- 4. Candidates should not provide extensive and unnecessary accounts of the provenance of each source.

Grade Boundaries

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

http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx

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

Telephone 01623 467467 Fax 01623 450481

Email <u>publication.orders@edexcel.com</u>
Order Code UA028154 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828 with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE





