

Examiners' Report
June 2018

GCE History 8HI0 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 2018

Publications Code 8HI0_1H_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this AS Level paper 1H: Britain transformed, 1918-97.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section b questions covering broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from the within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

Question 1

Question 1 was marginally the more popular choice with candidates in Section A of the paper, and was generally well answered, producing a wide range of responses. Most candidates were able to offer some analysis and support on the importance of the given factor – the after-effects of the First World War, set against other factors. The most commonly examined aspects of the given reason were war debts and disruption to international trade, with stronger responses tending to explore the relationship between these and other factors such as global trading conditions and the decline of the staple industries, or the return to the Gold Standard, both of which were commonly considered, alongside factors such as the global collapse after the Wall Street Crash. The strongest responses were secure in their understanding of economic issues, with some exploration of what constituted economic challenges, offering sound coverage of both decades. One discriminating factor in the quality of responses was an ability to convincingly relate material to the conceptual demands of the question, e.g. less secure responses offered material relating to potential reasons such as government policy or the Wall Street Crash, but did not clearly link this to the given outcome of economic challenges. Aside from limited knowledge, the other main factor hindering performance was misunderstanding or confusion over economic concepts and their implications, such as inflation.

During the 1920s and 1930s, Britain experienced many economic challenges. Perhaps the main reason for this was the impact of the First World War, which severely and irreparably damaged Britain's previous position as the world's leading trading nation. The challenges faced included high levels of inflation and unemployment as well as massive debt, however ~~the~~ the war was not the sole cause; the Gold Standard and the Wall Street Crash also had a large impact on British society.

~~The~~ The war was very expensive for Britain. Spending on armaments, munitions and imports had, by the end of the war, accrued a debt of £850 million. ~~Initially, Britain~~ This deficit meant that significant cuts had to be made to government spending, which came in the form of the ~~£~~ 'Ceddes' Axe'.

(Section A continued)

which specifically targeted unemployment benefits and housing. ~~These~~ These were hugely unpopular, and the country's economic troubles persisted nonetheless. In addition to this, while Britain was more focused on the war, ~~the~~ ~~its~~ ~~major~~ ~~trading~~ ~~partners~~ ~~got~~ ~~set~~ it was replaced as a vital trading partner to many nations by rival countries such as the USA and Japan. ~~Also~~ Also, after the war, other countries in Europe were forced to modernise their industry, ^{due to destruction from the war} making them more competitive, whereas Britain was forced to lag behind with traditional technology. This led to Britain being far less competitive internationally and meant there was less income from exports, sending Britain into a period of greatly reduced trading, from which it would never truly recover. These factors, due to the impact of the war, caused great economic problems throughout the 1920s and 1930s. While it is unclear whether Britain would have been able to retain its prominent global position in ~~trade~~ ~~the~~ trade even if the war had never taken place, the war certainly left the country in a worse place economically than ~~it~~ ~~was~~ it had been in before 1914.

One problem through the ^{early} 1920s was inflation. Chancellor Winston Churchill sought to tackle this, when he put the country back on the Gold Standard in 1925.

(Section A continued)

This fixed the value of the pound at \$4.80, instead of roughly \$3.40, and made sure inflation was no longer an issue. However, this significantly higher exchange rate led to Britain being less competitive overseas, as their exports became more expensive. This led to increased loss of jobs in the industrial sector and unemployment soared. In this period (1920s and 1930s) unemployment never fell below 1 million. All this led to Britain being taken off the Gold Standard once more in the 1930s, as ~~the~~ Churchill's effort was essentially a huge failure. While it did tackle the problem of inflation, ~~the~~ Gold Standard caused more trouble than it solved, so was ultimately not worth it.

With the Wall Street Crash in 1929 came the onset of almost world wide depression. In the early 1930s, unemployment peaked at 3 million, and real income ~~plummeted~~ fell. Many families during this period had to subsist on less than \$5 a day. Despite this, it was not long before ~~cost~~ real income ^{once more} ~~and cost~~ began to rise, and cost of living fell. Although Britain certainly did feel the effects of the Great Depression, it ~~was~~ was perhaps not affected as much as other countries, such as the USA and Germany. This meant that the Wall Street Crash may not have been as significant a cause of economic challenges

(Section A continued)

in this period as the War, or the Gold Standard.

However, the Depression did have a short-term significant impact. The economic problems, coupled with colossal unemployment figures generated a crisis in government. Prime Minister Ramsay MacDonald and Chancellor Philip Snowden thought that by cutting government spending on unemployment benefits, the country's debt would reduce, but the rest of the Labour Party saw this as unacceptable. The resulting split meant that MacDonald went ahead with the cuts, and unemployment figures continued to sky rocket. This attempt may have reduced the financial problems of the country at the time, however ~~was~~ it was at a significant cost to the unemployed citizens of Britain, who continued to live in poverty through the 1930s.

In conclusion, the impact of the first World war caused the most problems for Britain in this period. ~~The~~ It generated a huge debt for Britain, and meant that it lost its vital trading partners. This impact was worse than that of the Gold Standard, which was rectified within 10 years, or the Depression, which had a fairly short-term impact on the country, as its effects lasted far longer (~~to~~^{to} this day, Britain is not the trading giant it once was).



This response demonstrates the qualities of a level 4 essay. The answer is clearly organised and focused, with a firm grasp of what the question is asking. The candidate is able to offer a range and depth of specific knowledge, and apply this to examine the role played by the after-effects of the First World War campaigners, sustaining an analysis which considers this, alongside other factors. The argument is logical and reasoned, and the candidate produces a well-developed judgement. Development is coherent and lucid, showing a firm grasp of both the period, and the demands of this particular question.

Question 2

Stronger responses were confident in exploring 'economic prosperity' and its relationship to changing leisure opportunities, usually through consideration of issues such as the rise in disposable income, the increased leisure time, or the interconnection between prosperity and the affordability and thus viability of other factors such technological developments. Other factors tended to be changes in technology, class and culture. Whilst not exhaustive in knowledge, secure responses were grounded in a clear grasp of what leisure opportunities were across the period, offering specific detail to substantiate claims, e.g. figures for wage rises, overseas holidays, television ownership or sporting attendances, clearly linked to demonstrating the role played by different causes. Where candidates were less successful, this tended to be down to one of the following limiting factors (i) limited material on economic prosperity, (ii) a failure to connect economic prosperity to leisure, e.g. drifting to description of how the economy and/or society changed, and (iii) accounts which attempted to shape towards the question, but were generalised, at times to the extent that arguments which were potentially valid could have equally applied to different time periods, or even nations.

I believe that economic prosperity was one of the main reasons for the changes in leisure opportunities from 1951-1979. Although other factors such as the effects of the second world war and the ~~what~~ increase in white jobs were also reasons for the changing leisure opportunities between 1951-1979, these all link to the economic prosperity of this period and it is due to the economic prosperity that most people were able to afford to go on holiday. Therefore, I agree that economic prosperity was the main reason for changes in ~~the~~ leisure opportunities from 1951-1979.

~~From the economy~~ The post-war economic boom lasted throughout the 1950s and for most of the 1960s. It enabled people to be able to spend more ~~money~~ money due to low inflation and caused people to have enough money to actually change their leisure pursuits. Due to the increase in wages for many due to the demand of labour throughout the second world war and due to the paid holiday which was implemented, people were keen on spending their time away from home and visit seaside resorts. ~~and places such as Butlin's~~ Due to the market being open for new holiday destinations, a rise in affordable holiday destinations increased, with the working class and middle class regularly ~~all~~ visiting places such as Butlin's. These

(Section A continued) Leisure opportunities were only available due to the increase in money people had to spend. ~~Therefore~~ More and more people could also afford things such as a television which meant that people, during 1951-1979, spent more time at home watching television than playing sports. Therefore, I believe that the economic prosperity was one of the main reasons for the change in leisure opportunities between 1951-1979.

However, the effects of the ~~B~~ Second World War were one of the reasons why people had more money to spend on holidays and consumer appliances. The total war meant that there was a demand for the labour and so many women got jobs whilst their partners / husbands were at war. Many kept their jobs after the war or found other jobs rather than working at home, meaning that two incomes were now coming into the family rather than one. This caused the middle class to grow as many working class people could now afford to live more ~~in~~ affluent lifestyles and referred to themselves as middle class. This increase in income coming into the families meant that more people ~~or~~ could afford to spend money on holidays, cars (which allowed them to travel to more places such as the seaside), televisions and other ^{domestic} ~~consumers~~ appliances such as the vacuum cleaner. The television ~~and~~ ^{caused more} ~~and~~ people to stay at home rather than playing sports and appliances such as the vacuum cleaner meant that people took more pride in their homes due to the increase in time spent at home - showing the change in leisure opportunities. Therefore, the Second

(Section A continued) World War II is also a main reason for the changes in leisure opportunities in 1951-1979.

~~An increase in white collar jobs also was~~

Another reason for the changes in leisure opportunities was the rise in white collar jobs due to the nationalisation of many manual industries. More service jobs which generally paid better than manual jobs were available and so this led to an increasing middle class as many people were working in similar jobs and earning similar wages. This meant that more people could afford to live more affluent lifestyles due to the higher incomes they were earning. However, it could be said that these jobs were only available due to the economic prosperity of this period as more people were opening their own businesses and more jobs were able to run due to the increase in money in the economy. Therefore, although the rise in white collar jobs led to changes in leisure opportunities due to the rise in incomes for many, this could be linked to the economic prosperity at the time.

Overall, I believe that although the Second World War and new opportunities within work such as a rise in white-collar jobs led to changes in leisure opportunities; I think the main reason for these changes is due to the economic prosperity as, without the economic boom, people wouldn't have been able to afford to live a different, more affluent lifestyle.

(Section A continued) Therefore, I believe that the economic prosperity was the main reason for the changes in leisure opportunities from 1951-1979



This demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 4 response. The answer has a strong grasp of the topic, and the conceptual demands of the question. There is clear analysis of the given factor, offering an exploration of the extent to which economic factors led to changing leisure opportunities. Whilst the response would benefit from further consideration of other factors, the strengths of the response meet the level 4 descriptor.

Question 3

This question was the slightly less popular choice within Section B, and many students offered impressive knowledge of welfare provision in the inter-war and post-war periods. The most popular issues considered were pensions, unemployment and sickness insurance, healthcare, with housing, family allowances and education also featuring. More successful responses were those that tied such material carefully to the question, e.g. focused and direct comparison of provision in the two periods, and consideration of issues such as education in relation to welfare, rather than education per se. Whilst there was no formula for successful essays, stronger responses tended to make and develop direct comparisons around different themes and areas, exploring the extent of similarities and differences within these points. Some less successful responses tended to be one-sided, generally in terms of an exaggeration of the differences and a denial of any similarities. Better answers offered a more balanced exploration, considering the continuity in the approaches to welfare over the full period as well, while explaining the significance of the shift post-Beveridge, supported by sufficient detail on the welfare provision in each period. Stronger responses gave critical thought to what constituted similarity or difference, e.g. in terms of universality, the level of provision offered, or the extent to which individual measures were underpinned by a rationale for a more holistic offer of provision. Factors limiting responses to some degree or other were (i) a tendency to drift away from the focus of the question, e.g. attempting to analyse why provision changed, (ii) presenting similarities and/or differences, without limited analysis to explain or examine these, (iii) lack of balance and (iv) a lack of sufficient knowledge placing limitations on the ability to develop points fully.

Welfare provision between 1918 and 1939 was completely inadequate in comparison to care between 1945 and 1979. The healthcare, access to benefits and pensions were far better later in the decade.

The NHS was established in 1948 and treated 8.5 million dental patients and provided 3 million pairs of spectacles in the first year alone. There were 3,100 hospitals, 550,000 beds and 360,000 staff, the healthcare was free and paid through taxes. The amount of women who died in childbirth decreased from 3/1000 to 0.8/1000 between 1948 and 1960. The deaths from tuberculosis decreased from 25,000 to 5,000 due to antibiotics - something the 1921 Tuberculosis Act failed to do by only providing sanitation. The life expectancy of a man rose from 60.5 to 72 and the life expectancy of a woman increased from 71.1 to 78 in the period of 1948-1979. Before WW2 welfare provision for healthcare was atrocious; ~~on~~ when the Great Depression hit in the 1930's only 12.5 million

A had been unfit for Combat in 1918 and 10% were unfit for any role, therefore healthcare was not adequate before WW2.

(Section B continued) were had healthcare insurance. The only similarity between the NHS and the ~~the~~ 1918-1939 period was the few healthcare centres such as Finsbury which was established in 1930 and inspired NHS architect as it provided local health care and access to leisure facilities for 4 shillings.

The Fabian Society found that 40% of men

The provision of housing could be argued to be similar as between 1918 and 1940 'one third of the nation's houses had been built' according to historian Helen Mellor. The 1923 and 1924 Labour Housing Acts built 480,000 and 500,000 houses each, the 1930 Labour Housing Act relieved overcrowding in working class areas such as Birmingham and London ^{by removing slums} Liverpool ^{clearing slums}. The 1934 Town and Country Planning Act built 4 towns ^{such as} ~~like~~ Skemessdale to relieve overcrowding even more. By 1940 4 million houses had been built, 1 million had indoor toilets.

After WW2 the government created pre-fabricated housing estates such as Milton Keynes ^{in 1954} and flat blocks in Essex ¹⁹⁵². Housing provision was similar in both periods of time. ~~The~~ Overall provision was similar!*

The provision of unemployment benefits was by far superior in the later decades. The 1948 National Assistance Act created the National Unemployment

(Section B continued) Board ~~with~~ which increased benefits for 250,000 applicants. When restrictions increased, such as in the 1960's, unemployment benefits were limited to £18 for 26 weeks and by 1960 3 million claims had been rejected by the Unemployment Assistance Board. After ~~WW2~~ WW1 ~~the~~ unemployment benefits were meagre. ~~As~~ were pensions, the 1923 pensions were only 60p for men and 40p for women, later in 1932 pensions were much improved and covered every man over 65 and woman over 60. The Insurance Act of 1934 was extended to cover 37,000 more workers in 1937, proving that the pre-WW2 governments did provide ~~with~~ welfare with ~~a~~ more efficiency as time went on. ~~The 1972 pensions Act increased the pensions~~ ~~provisions~~ The pensions provided by the 1946 Act were greater than the 1923 Act - ^{single citizens} women got £1.20 and married couples received £2.10. The pension provision amount increased throughout the decade, such as with the 1976 increase to cover 14 million ^{more} citizens. ~~It~~ *

In conclusion, the provision of welfare greatly improved between 1945 and 1979 and had few similarities with the 1918-39 period such as housing and ^{unemployment} benefits. Overall, provision was ^{far} better 1945-1979.

↑
However very few lived to this age especially in the North

↑
People lived longer, so more pensions were necessary.

1* However, one difference between housing before and after WW2 was rent control. In 1967 rent was limited based upon property value, making rent more affordable for the working class who ~~couldn't afford~~. The ~~new~~ new houses built in 1923 and 1924 were too expensive for working class citizens, who were surviving on extremely low wages.

2* In 1945 the Family Allowances Act provided women with 10 shillings for each child after their first, this allowed women income ~~so~~ that didn't rely on their husbands. In 1946 maternity, unemployment benefits and funeral expenses were all supplied. In 1947 the Industrial Accidents Act was introduced - this was a large difference to 1918-1939 during which approximately 2,216 mines died per year.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This demonstrates some of the qualities of a level 4 response. The candidate has a clear understanding of the focus of the question, both in terms of the issue of welfare provision, and the need to compare the two periods. There is a clear exploration, with detailed material in a focused response. Whilst some of the evaluation could be developed further, there is evident reasoning.

Question 4

Question 4 was the more popular of the two within Section B. The question produced an interesting range of responses, in terms of material selected, the approach, and the ultimate end quality. At the higher end, there were many who were able to offer a focused and balanced consideration of change and continuity, with one approach being tending to see positive change in terms of integration, anti-discrimination legislation and increasing cultural influences, set against broad continuity (e.g. from the 1950s onwards) in terms of racist popular and political attitudes, and localised difficulties over issues such as housing, jobs and race riots. A range of supporting knowledge was offered, with the most common tending to be events such as the Notting Hill riots, Enoch Powell's political intervention or examples such as the Smethwick by-election, legislation from the 1960s, and examples of the depiction in television and other media. More secure responses were able to securely relate this to the key terms and second-order concepts in the question, e.g. closely focused on attitudes and change/continuity. Some less successful responses did tend to have difficulties with the necessary chronological understanding of when such examples were within the given timeframe, and thus found it difficult to fully consider material in relation to the demands of the question. What was important as far as reaching the higher levels was concerned, was an ability to shape sufficient knowledge to a reasoned analysis and evaluation of the significance of regional differences, and other appropriate issues.

I believe the extent to which attitudes ~~changed~~ towards immigration and race changed in the years 1945-79 was minimal. Although there were cases ~~for~~ increased opportunities and citizenship for minorities, white backlash and even government retaliation to all immigrants and racial minorities proves attitudes were not largely reformed.

Following the British Nationality Act of 1948 and arrival of the SS Empire Windrush in the same year, large scale immigration began to occur in the UK. This provoked an age of white backlash during this period in which interracial relationships, as well as largely interracial

(Section B continued) communities were opposed. A centre for violent opposition to racial minorities was Notting Hill in London. In 1958, a mob of between 500 and 700 white citizens stormed black living quarters there, armed with iron rods, knives and leather belts, chanting things such as 'we will kill all the blacks.' The lack of police intervention led to black citizens acquiring their own means of defence by forming radical groups, such as the British Black Panthers in 1968. The need for such groups demonstrates the ignorance directed towards the black community by the police as well as the increase in violence imposed on upon them by British citizens, thus demonstrating a lack of respect in the attitudes towards immigrants and race.

In addition, there was likewise

(Section B continued) a display of government opposition to race throughout the period of 1948-79. This can be interpreted through the passage of the Commonwealth Immigrants Act of 1962, which was designed to prevent large-scale immigration from occurring, as well as prevent Britain from becoming an even larger multi-cultural society. Another infamous demonstration of government opposition to race and immigration was Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech, in 1968. Politician Enoch Powell publicly condemned race and immigration by stating that it caused social unrest and violence, as well as causing whites to become 'strangers in their own country.' Powell was expelled from Parliament shortly after, however, public opinion showed

(Section B continued) support for ideas presented in his speech, leading to a protest march of hundreds of dockworkers shouting 'don't knock knock'. The passage of acts such as the Commonwealth Immigration Act combined with public disregard for racial minorities shows that, even through previous government reforms such as the British Nationality Act, the ~~government~~ ~~and public~~ attitudes of the government and public alike were still pessimistic, and not largely different from previous decades.

However, in spite of this, there were some changes in society for which show a change in attitudes towards immigration and race. For instance (as previously referenced) the need for new labour in post war Britain ~~led to the~~, combined

(Section B continued) with the British Nationality Act of 1948 led to citizens of the so-called 'new Commonwealth' to immigrate to Britain in seek of work. The British Nationality Act was somewhat liberal in that it allowed members of the Commonwealth to enter Britain, thus leading to the arrival of the 88 Empire Windrush which brought 492 Jamaicans to the United Kingdom. In addition to a rising immigrant population, there was likewise more opportunities for racial minorities, particularly in the entertainment industry. For instance, a Jamaican citizen who went by the stage name of 'Count Duckie' became a renowned DJ in London's West End who attracted many due to his mixture of Ska and Reggae music. More 'liberal' reforms combined with growing opportunities as well as greater respect for

(Section B continued) foreign culture (in the case of "count suckle"), does ~~remind~~ suggest there was a change in attitudes towards race and immigration in the period of 1945-1979.

However, despite a minor growth of acceptance, I believe there was largely little reform in attitudes towards race and immigration for a multitude of reasons. Firstly, the ever-growing age of white backlash and violence as well as lack of protection from police led to the creation of more militant, defensive racial groups, which may not have emerged if it weren't for these factors. This combined with ~~opposition~~ the ~~general~~ evident opposition of the government leads me to the conclusion that attitudes towards race and immigration ~~would~~ did not ~~change~~ in the

(Section B continued)

period of 1945-1979
explicitly change in the period
of 1945-79.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response has the qualities of a level 4 essay. The response has a clear understanding of the issues contained within the question, and offers a detailed and thorough analysis of the extent to which attitudes to immigration and race changed. A range of specific material is deployed as part of the analysis. A range of issues and pertinent developments across the time period are considered. The essay is clearly and confidently communicated, with logical argument.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to access the higher two levels, generally by recognising and explaining the arguments in the two extracts, and building on this with own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge, precisely focused on the specific question of reducing the role of the state. Most candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, recognising and drawing on the various measures outlined by Seldon and Collings, and set these against the limitations of the success of the 'roll back' that Murphy and Walsh-Atkins point to. At the highest levels, responses were found which explored the nuances, often where the extracts touched upon the same issues but portrayed these differently, e.g. exploring the extent to which education policy or the approach to local government did amount to a reduction in the state role, exploring the meaning of this in relation to provision, funding, and oversight. Some responses gave weight to the different issues in relation to the overall perspective, e.g. the significance of the 'assisted places scheme' or 'tax relief on private health insurance' (both extract 1) in relation to the bigger picture. Where candidates brought in contextual knowledge, the more successful were able to integrate this carefully, deploying it to discuss the merits of the given views, and stayed firmly focused on precise demands of the question, e.g. material on the sale of council houses being used to discuss how this amounted to a reduction in state role, rather than a drift to off-focus discussion of the economic or social merits of such a policy. The most common factors limiting the success of some responses again tend to be the following, in particular the latter two: (i) relatively limited use of the extracts, (ii) use of these in a manner not fully suited to Section C, e.g. through attempts to analyse provenance in a manner more suited to AO2, or assert an extract is 'more reliable' as it includes statistics, and (iii) limited own knowledge, or a lack of integration of this in order to examine and evaluate the arguments. With regard to these, candidates should be minded that Section C is focused around AO3. Candidates who made consideration of the argument and evidence within the extracts central to their responses, applying their contextual knowledge to consider the validity of the arguments offered, were more successful. Fewer candidates appeared to offer pre-prepared material 'for' or 'against' Thatcher than previously, although for some, pre-conceived (and at times seemingly partisan) judgements hampered a thorough exploration of argument and evidence. Whilst it is perfectly valid to reach a judgement which is essentially 'positive' or 'negative' with regard to the impact Thatcher had, candidates should seek to ensure they consider the merits of different views in the light of evidence. Examiners are looking for reasoned argument. Overall conclusions may be forceful and come down one way or the other, but discussion and analysis requires some degree of balance. In short, partiality at the expense of reasoned argument is unlikely to produce successful responses.

- 5 Historians have different views about the impact on Britain of Thatcher's governments in the years 1979–97. Analyse and evaluate the extracts and use your knowledge of the issues to explain your answer to the following question.

How far do you agree with the view that the Thatcher government significantly reduced the role of the state? Rollback

(20)

To say Margaret Thatcher significantly reduced the ~~state~~ role of the state may be incorrect as her rollback policies led to a greater interference ~~role of~~ from the central government. Extract 1 by Anthony Seldon and Daniel Collins believe that Thatcher was able to rollback the state while Extract 2 by Derrick Murphy and Patrick Walsh Atkins argue that Thatcher created more interference in peoples lives with rollback. This essay will argue that Thatcher's government did not reduce the role of the state.

In Extract 1, it talks about how ~~the~~ ~~so~~ Thatcher made home ownership a reality for many people. This was done with the right to buy scheme. "home tenants were given the right to buy their own council house." With Thatchers scheme,

(Section C continued)

if someone was living in their home for three years, they would get a 33 per cent discount off the price of the house and a 50 per cent discount if one lived there for twenty years.

While this policy made getting on the housing ladder a reality, councils were not able to build more council houses, and because interest rates were ranging from 5 per cent to 20 per cent, if those who couldn't pay their mortgage due to the interest rates, they would have their home repossessed and would struggle to find a council house as many were bought out. This shows that while Thatcher made home ownership a reality because of roll back, she took control of councils because they were unable to build more houses because of the control between ^{central} ~~two~~ government and local government.

Education was a strong point for Thatcher in her political years as she was Education Secretary under Edward Heath and wanted to continue her trend of leading education standards. Extract 2 believes that Thatcher didn't roll back because of what

(Section C continued)

the policies that were created, "the Conservatives introduced a National curriculum". This meant that the state would have to devise a curriculum for every student to learn and have teachers teaching the same topics throughout. To show even more state interference, John Major introduced OFSTED which created under the influence of Thatcher. OFSTED regulates and inspects schools and reports to the government on their findings. However, Extract 2 disagrees that there was state interference in education. "Schools to 'opt out' of local authority control". This was from the "Educational Reform Act" which gave choice to parents and gave school control over budgets. While this is true, the government are still the ones who provide the budgets to the school and many schools had their spending cut due to the economics of Monetarism and the need to cut from £11 billion in 1983 to £9 billion in 1984. This shows how no matter what Thatcher does to education on rolling back, she created a more central role with the national curriculum and OFSTED, which shows how she did not reduce the role of the state.

Where Thatcher was seen as successful was in rolling back the state was with her plans on privatisation and deregulation. Extract 1 says that rollback was to "let individuals stand on their own two feet". For Thatcher, that was to deregulate the Stock Markets ~~in the 1980s~~, in the mid 1980s which created a small boom known as 'Lawsons Boom' and ~~allowed 'yuppies'~~ the term 'yuppies' was created to describe young people living in the South who were making money off the stock markets. Harry Enfield created a sketch to show the attitudes young people had with their money called 'Loadsa Money'. While this boom was short and led to a bust, it is true that deregulation ~~led to~~ ^{was a} part of rollback. However, Extract 2 believes that privatisation led to an increase of civil servants. "privatisation of industry was accompanied by the introduction of a bewildering series of regulatory bodies". Thatcher's Conservatism was to deregulate and ~~privatise~~ ^{privatise} to allow people to work for themselves as she sold off companies like British, Jaguar and British Gas to make profits and let British people put shares in British

(Section C continued)

business. However, privatisation didn't have the desired effect as British Airways reported to HM Treasury of a £500 million loss during the mid 80s which shows privatisation didn't help a great deal. This shows how privatisation and ~~target~~ deregulation led to a roll back as Thatcher's government didn't play a role in how the stock markets were regulated or how ~~hard~~^{much} the nationalised companies had to be paid which shows a lack of state interference.

Overall, looking at the factors in which roll-back was achieved or not and it is clear that Thatcher did not significantly reduce the role of the state which is agreed by Extract 2 as Westminster had more to do with on how education is run to the sale of council houses while Extract 1 finally believes that Thatcher rolled back the state and gave the power back to the people.



This response demonstrates the qualities of a borderline level 4 essay. There is clear recognition of the different views, and the candidate offers some confident discussion of these, examining the arguments offered in the light of their own contextual knowledge. There is some developed comparison of the two views, and although a more direct and comparative analysis could be offered, there is a clear grasp of the arguments and some recognition of the material basis for the different views. The essay maintains a good focus on the precise controversy, with reasoned judgement.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on Paper 1 Option 1H, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Paying close attention to the date ranges in the question.
- Giving sufficient consideration to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors.
- Explaining their judgements fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but rather a demonstration of their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements.
- Careful focusing on the second-order concept targeted in the question.
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable them to complete all three questions with approximately the same time given over to each one.
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance were:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting 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.
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc., with only limited reference to that given in the question).
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues.
- Making an 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.
- Not reaching a judgement, or not explaining
- A lack of detail.

Section C responses

Features commonly found in candidates' responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification.
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question.
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits.
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge.
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors.
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments.

Common issues which hindered performance on Section C were:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other.
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations.
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support.
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered.
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources.
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract.
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground.

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>

