



Pearson

Examiners' Report

June 2017

GCE History 9HI0 1F

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 2017

Publications Code 9HI0_1F_1706_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the first year of the reformed Advanced Level paper Option 1F: In search of the American dream: the USA, c1917–96.

The paper is divided into three sections. Both Sections A and B comprises a choice of essays – from two in each – that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting 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 (s) 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 a broader timespan.

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

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

Question 1

Question 1 was the less 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 impact the New Deal had on minorities and women. The main limiting factor was a lack of depth of knowledge; most candidates had at least a general sense of how the New Deal treated at least one of the groups, but the ability to offer specific factual material to explore these was more variable. In some cases, it seemed candidates who were most able to think laterally were more successful in this, making use of relevant material they had learnt outside of sections of the course dedicated to the position of women and the minorities. Such responses offered a range of material, across the alphabet agencies, as well as exploring issues specific to the groups, such as Camp Tera. A common argument featuring in some responses, usually in the higher levels, was based on identifying the New Deal as being aimed at a general recovery, and thus predominantly white males, and thus considering its limitations in largely not targeting the named groups and their particular disadvantages, whilst recognising the gains that were made within the wider New Deal. It was surprising to only see the 'Indian New Deal' feature in a small number of responses. Two other factors limiting responses were (i) candidates straying significantly beyond the time frame of the given question, considering issues stemming from the impact of the war that were not a result of the New Deal, or into the civil rights movement in the 1950s and 1960s, and (ii) a tendency to reinterpret this as a question asking for a comparative of causation, and thus compare the impact of the New Deal to other factors bringing improvements to the lives of the given groups.

The New Deal by Franklin D. Roosevelt did bring a change and improvement to the lives of racial minorities and women but not as much as they would have liked. In order to discuss the New Deal's significance it is important to consider the benefits minorities and women received such as jobs but also the hardships they suffered such as the continuation of stigma and racial abuse.

Minorities did have their lives significantly improve following the New Deal as this meant there was the creation of Alphabet Agencies which saw benefits in many areas. For example the Agricultural Adjustment Agency (AAA) provided jobs for many minorities working on farms which supplied them with a stable income. This meant their lives were improved and meant that they were able to rent houses, improving their living standards, buy food and clothes and

in general improve their social life. As well as this there was the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) which meant that minorities were able to take jobs, benefitting the country and therefore improve their lives significantly. Women also benefited from the New Deal as it meant that people such as Eleanor Roosevelt could set up camps in order to provide skills training or jobs to women who did not have them, increasing the chance of future employment and significantly improving their lives in the process. Furthermore the New Deal (Section A continued) reduced the effects of the Great Depression and stabilised the economy which meant that jobs were being paid a bit better and everything could become more affordable.^{#1} This had a very positive effect on women as they didn't have to work and could rely on their husbands income, but a second income made them a very wealthy family. As well as this minorities lives changed in that the cost of living decreased and they could therefore maintain a healthy lifestyle - a significant improvement.

^{#1} The National Recovery Act helped do this by cutting taxes and therefore reducing the gap between the rich and the poor.

The New Deal however has not significantly improved the lives of minorities and women as the effects were only temporary and sometimes not felt at all. The jobs that minorities received were low paid jobs in awful working conditions and often 12 hour days. This in some ways decreased the lives of minorities as they were not receiving reward for their work. As well as this employers often went on the motive of last hired, first fired. This meant that the jobs they received were not stable and they were often fired not long after being hired.

Most importantly however lives of minorities still struggled as shown by the campaigning for rights still lasting for another 30 years, well into the sixties. Hispanics were not considered as citizens still until Nixon gave them their land back; Black Americans still struggled with rights until 1975 and the Voting Rights Act. As well as this women faced the same stigma where following the new deal, they still faced sexism from men, they were still paid less until the Equal Pay Act in 1975

(Section A continued) and the tendency of the New Deal to focus on white men. This meant that women still had to rely on their husband and could not fill their aim of becoming independent.

In conclusion, the New Deal in theory had a positive impact for minority groups and women, but in reality did little to affect their lives significantly. Jobs that were created provided an initial positive, but these were poorly paid and stigma and discrimination that minorities and women faced went well on in to the 1970's.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 2 response. Whilst the candidate has an understanding of the focus of the question, attempts at analysis are limited. Supporting material lacks depth, with generalisations, inaccuracies and a lack of specific support. As a result, whilst an overall judgement is given, it has limited substantiation.

Question 2

This was a popular choice of question within Section A, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within levels 3-5. There was a sound grasp of the role played by civil rights leaders, and in the main a convincing analysis in relating this to the question's outcome, the increased success of the campaign. At times, there was something of a neglect of leaders beyond Martin Luther King; stronger responses were more confident in examining the role played by leadership, developing their evaluation of the relative significance of leaders through a consideration of the different contributions made with select exemplification across different leaders, e.g. exploring the relative contribution made by MLK, set against that of Malcolm X and the Black Power movement. A number of responses examined the contribution of the leaders of other minority groups, such as Native Americans and Hispanic rights movements – a valid approach, as the question did not preclude doing so. Other issues which commonly featured were the role of the media, the contribution of grass roots activists, the growth of liberal attitudes and the role of presidents and/or federal government. Again, stronger responses tended to explore the relationship between different factors throughout the essay. Where candidates were less successful, this tended to be down to one of the following two limiting factors: lapsing to a narrative of campaigns such as the Montgomery Bus Boycott, or a failure to convincingly connect the role of leaders and/or other factors with the increased success of the movement. There were a minority where knowledge was insufficient or confused, but these were thankfully rarely found.

"This world is in dire need of creative extremists" wrote Martin Luther King Jr. (MLK) as he surveyed America in the late 20th century. Yet, leadership such as his may be seen as hollow with the popular mobilisation behind it that could be traced back to events like the Silent Protest Parade in 1917 but escalated to new heights between 1955 and 1968. Henceforth if "success" is defined as de facto improvements in the lives of black Americans the delineation between leadership and supporters must be examined along with evaluation of the social climate shaped by conflict during this period and the actions of government in response to such popular mobilisation. Nevertheless, ~~even~~ it

may be contended that above all it was the protesting black Americans, not their leaders alone, that led to relative "success" during his period by demanding attention through an increasingly sympathetic media.

With this said, it may equally be proposed that leadership remains paramount because without this popular protest would not have been organised.

(Section A continued) This may be supported by Martin Luther King's iconic speech at the 1963 March on Washington, Stokely Carmichael's formation of the Black Power movement in 1965 under the slogan "Vote for the partner, men go home" and James Meredith's martyrdom on the second day of the 1966 March Against Fear, as an inspiration to those that marched behind him. However such differing aims between Black Power's radicalism and the NAACP, SCLC and CORE's more multiracial approach perhaps suggests that leadership did more to weaken than strengthen the movement's cohesion as a precursor to success. This though, fails to recognise the overlap as MLK took over from Meredith in the March Against Fear and his 1966 Northern Crusade drew on the less publicised 10 point community action programme of Black Power. Hence, civil rights "leaders" may indeed be seen as of reasonable significance in increasing Black civil

Rights movements success 1955-1968.

Having said this, the formation of the Montgomery Improvement Association in ^{the} 1955 boycott and the role of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) from 1960 as seen in the 1964 Mississippi Freedom Summer of 1964 suggest a more bottom up rationale for "success" since arguably the top down (Section A continued) de jure approach had been exhausted through Murgood Marshall's *Brown v Board* for instance in 1954. The fact that by 1964 only 1 child out of 100 in the South attended a desegregated school encapsulates the need for mass de facto pressure as seen from 1955. Therefore, although MLK may have been instrumental in choosing not to campaign behind Claudette Colvin in Montgomery and ~~later~~ rather wait until the 1st December 1955 to begin their 380 day long boycott behind the married and not pregnant Rosa Parks; his new media savvyness only held weight because of the popular support behind it. Be that the ~~hand~~ of Birmingham residents photographed passively accepting attacks by Al Sharpton led by Bill O'Connor in "Bombingham" that led to 42% of Americans saying race was the greatest problem the country faced in 1963, or the volunteers sent to the deep South by the SNCC. Indeed, Leadership pioneered his doctrine of as MLK said "It must always be clear who is the oppressed and who is

the oppressor" but it was mass protest that communicated it to the world media and hence pressured government. ~~Therefore a shift may be noted~~ Therefore making popular protest of greater significance than leadership 1955-1968.

Furthermore though, if "success" is deemed to be epitomised in Johnson's 1964 Civil Rights Act (Section A continued) and 1965 Voting Rights Act then an analysis that concluded African American protest alone led to this would be too simplistic. Rather, the broader context of declining presidential confidence as a result of ~~the war~~ Vietnam in the cold war context, coupled with a more interrogative media must be seen as deeply influential. Indeed, Johnson's administration to having "signed away the south" in 1964 can be seen as representative of government under pressure to make concessions as ~~from~~ the cry of "LBJ, LBJ, how many kids did you kill today?" would grow louder through Cronkite's damning February 1968 report on the depravity of the Tet offensive. This then, compounded by the fact that in 1950 9% owned TVs while by 1960 85% did suggests that the cold war context combined with technological innovation made the government more vulnerable just as the Civil Rights Movement grew in ~~its~~ visibility.

To what degree these contextual pressures or weigh popular mobilisation depends upon the extent to

which one sees the white majority effected by popular African American protest and hence amplifying the movement's power. A caveat here could be the fear created in the images of armed, knaki meaning black power activists reducing sympathy. However, as (Section A continued) balance it may be seen in the shock Eisenhower expressed at his inauguration that only 7000 African Americans in Mississippi were registered to vote that white opinion grew to become a vehicle for black "success." Therefore making popular protest intrinsically linked to, but also more significant than the cold war context in ~~empowering~~ empowering black Americans to believe in change and through this the federal government to make change.

Therefore it may be concluded that although "civil rights leaders" set the foundations of change in non-violent direct action before 1955, it was the 30 students arriving on the second day of the 1960 Greensboro sit-in and the bravery of Elizabeth Eckford as she walked towards the central high school in Little Rock Arkansas that changed public opinion and led to "success." Indeed ^{then while} "success" in itself can be seen to lie in the black empowerment drive to leadership organisation, "success" defined as legislative change must be seen as caused more by protest than contextual governmental vulnerability. As the people, the media and

ultimately the government realised that African American discontent ~~was~~ had become simply too great to ignore.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 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 leaders, and explores this relative to other factors, and so sustains argument and analysis. 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 3

This question was the more popular choice within Section B, and many students offered impressive knowledge of the impact of both the First and Second World Wars. The most popular issues considered were the impact on women, the economy, international relations, and attitudes to immigration and/or communism, although a range of other issues featured, such as the impact on black and minority citizens, the fortunes of the two major political parties, and the impact on the government role in the economy. 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 differences within these points. Some responses offered a relatively narrow focus, and developed the chosen issues thoroughly; such an approach was not necessarily a barrier to the higher levels, providing both politics and society were addressed, although it did tend to be responses offering a reasonable breadth of issues, often framed within wider 'political' and 'social' sections of the essay, which were most successful. It was fairly common for candidates to make the shift from isolationism to intervention as being the greatest difference, and the impact on the economy, women and the Red Scares as being the main similarities, although higher level responses explored these further, in many cases, with real critical reasoning over how genuine these apparent similarities or differences were. Factors limiting responses to some degree or other were (i) presenting similarities and/or differences, without limited analysis to explain or examine these, (ii) lack of balance and (iii) a tendency at times to drift from the focus of the question, e.g. begin an analysis with some focus, but for this to diverge to an assessment of the success, causes or consequence, of an issue such as intervention in the Cold War in its own right, with limited linkage to the demands of the question. Related to the latter issue, whilst it was valid for candidates to explore issues that could broadly be termed as 'longer-term' impacts, there was a correlation between this and difficulties in convincingly connecting material to the war, and the comparative focus, e.g. responses which offered sizable coverage of Vietnam and LBJ's actions were by and large struggling to apply this to the question.

In order to accurately evaluate the impacts of both wars on the political climate and society in America, it is important to look at factors such as unemployment, minorities and popular culture, to compare and contrast.

After the first world war (WW1), Wilson was quickly disliked for his interventionist policies and the help he was giving to the poor. During the 1920's after Harding's election, America had entered a period of isolation

and Republican conservatism. They didn't want to police the world, they wanted their government to focus on them alone, and this became reality and led to success. The laissez-faire approach meant that the government let businesses expand, they let banks go unregulated and people felt free. During this period up to 1933, the people viewed politics as something ~~not~~^{not}-personal. There was no connection to the president as he was simply viewed as 'the one in charge.'

(Section B continued) In contrast, after the second world war (WW2) the attitude towards politics became much more open to judgement and criticism. This was a result from the laissez-faire approach during the 1920's which eventually led to the Depression in 1933. The relaxed political nature resulted in banks gambling with money, businesses expanding alarmingly and the Wall Street Crash in 1929.

The main change that this brought was Roosevelt's interventionalist policies and change. He was the one who created ~~the~~ change in politics: he created^a big government, he increased his staff and he involved

the people with his fireside chats. This changed the course of politics because after WW2, the public expected the same level of involvement. When Truman didn't provide this as he was guarded with the media (to not 'stir up communist feeling'), the public felt free to scrutinize their government - a stark change to the attitudes after WW1. This is why it is accurate to state that the ~~pot~~ attitude to politics was immensely different after WW1 compared

(Section B continued) to after WW2, as the people now felt involved and they felt that they had a real voice in politics, a result from the damaging rugged individualist policies of the 1920s. The 1920s voting act which allowed women the vote, also ensured that they were involved.

In terms of society changes, both periods had successes but also failures. After WW1, the brief depression led to changes in machine and motor production which subsequently led to the boom period. The assembly line created affordable Ford cars; the growth of new industries created jobs and more

disposable income and the new-found freedom of the flappers and the speakeasies all ensured a prosperous roaring twenties period. Similarly, after WW2, there were also society changes but at even more of an advanced level.

The new cinema culture, broadcasted news and gossip culture created a sense of unity and immediacy. People could afford to watch their favourite stars in movies, they could go to shopping malls with friends and this just like the period after WW1, was

(Section B continued) carefree and created success and jobs.

In terms of consumer culture, both periods were prosperous and brought about technological innovation, with America producing 46% of the world's technological goods in ~~the~~ the 1940's - 50's.

However, not everyone in society prospered and there are stark differences between the two periods. After WW1, minorities and women did not prosper as much as after WW2. Not every female was a flapper, most were unemployed and ~~many~~ married and had lost their jobs that they had during the war. Furthermore, African Americans (AA) did not fully prosper either, especially women.

Roosevelt's New Deal legislation did not include domestic and agricultural work which is where most AA females were in. In contrast to after WW2, a lot of AA females started working as nannies and in other sectors, ensuring that they were included in the prosperity. The period after WW1 was only prosperous if you were white, young and middle or upper class, so in this sense, society & success was varied.

(Section B continued) After WW2 however, success and prosperity was much more inclusive. Truman's 'To Secure These Rights' created legislation for all. He built 800,000 new social homes and he provided jobs. Furthermore, more women kept their jobs after the war effort and worked in factories making peace-time goods. There were still inequalities like the poor creation of black suburbs but when compared to the post-WW1 period, change was much more inclusive.

In conclusion, both post-war periods saw vast political and societal changes. The impact of WW2 was highly different than WW1. Politics were heavily centred around the

actions of the president and people felt more included. Changes in popular culture and work were also more non-discriminatory after WW2 than WW1. The post-WW1 period set the base for change and influenced the course of change.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates some of the qualities of a level 4 essay. There is a clear grasp of the demands of the question, and there is analytical development exploring the extent to which WWI and WWII had a different impact on the USA. There is sufficient selected knowledge of both wars, deployed to support arguments, and reasoned judgements regarding the extent to which these are similar.

Question 4

Question 4 was the less popular of the two within Section B, although it produced a wide range of responses, the majority of which achieved levels 3-5. At the higher end, there was an impressive knowledge of living standards in the years 1941-80, with candidates drawing upon relevant knowledge from across the course studied to explore the extent of change. Common themes considered were the economic gains resulting from the war, consumerism, the 'baby boom', car and television ownership, the growth of suburbia, changes in leisure and travel as indicators of living standards, and contrasts with urban poverty, variations in prosperity across different social or racial groups, and the economic problems of the 1970s. Where candidates were able to link the wealth of material offered to a convincing examination of living standards, they were successful. Factors limiting the success of responses were largely (i) generalisations, e.g. material relating to car ownership, or other consumer goods, with little to distinguish this from the earlier periods, (ii) potentially relevant material, not convincingly connected to the issue of living standards, and/or the second-order concept of change, and (iii) limited connection to the chronological demands of the question, e.g. failure to go beyond the 1950s or 1960s. At the higher level, many responses were distinguished by a sharp focus on examining how material deployed indicated living were/were not changing and an exploration of the variation of living standards across the USA. Whilst some candidates were successful in framing an analysis of change and continuity within what was an essentially chronological structure, there was a clear correlation between those who took a more thematic approach, exploring the extent of change and continuity within these themes across the period. With regards to the second-order concept of change, some candidates seem less familiar or confident with addressing questions on this. Whilst there is no ideal formula for such essays, stronger responses tended to ensure the essay is driven by argument over the extent of change, with detail selected to support and explore, rather than the other way round, risking lapsing into description. Candidates should also be minded to address the full question, in terms of both the given date range, and the extent of change – in some otherwise well-argued responses, areas of continuity were at times given limited treatment, making it difficult to address the extent of change.

SECTION B

*Depression removed
Cars
Consumer Society*

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen question number: **Question 3** **Question 4**

The USA entered the Second World War on 7th December 1941 when the night before Japanese troops bombed Pearl Harbour. The USA already was supplying Britain and France with munition and arm by the 'Lend-Lease' Scheme

agreed by Roosevelt and Congress in 1940. ~~As~~
With the United States entering the Second
World War, war production of goods heavily
increased and ^{car} factories were transformed to
produce tanks and airplanes for example. However
this did change dramatically as the War ended.
~~Due to the war production that occurred in~~
~~the years 1941 - 1945~~

~~Due to~~ // Due to the war production of
good in the years 1941 - 1945 the USA
finally escaped the Great Depression that
came about in 1929. Unemployment had
nearly disappeared due to the amount of
work force that was required. For this
reason after the War ended in 1945 the
American people enjoyed prosperity in their economy
which led to an increase in the standard of

(Section B continued) Living as a whole. This can be
seen in the statistics of that time where
America owned ~~70%~~ 90% of the cars
of the world and use 70% of the
world's ~~oil~~ petrol. This was a clear sign that
Americans were much better off than for
instance Europeans that were undergoing hardships
of the war that just ended. The average
American had a diet that consisted of

3500 calories which was double that of ~~the~~ Western European Countries. This ~~is~~ highlights the fact that the USA profited a lot of WWII and so did the average person. The very strong economy that President Harry S. Truman was able to ~~put~~ establish gave to the American people a ~~sen~~ great sense of confidence, where they believed nothing could stop them from realising their dreams and ambitions. Therefore living standards sky-rocketed after the Second World War.

Consequently the high levels of confidence resulted in the formation of a Consumer Society in the 1950s and 1960s. This demonstrated that Americans had very high standards of living due to the amount of

(Section B continued) products ~~that~~ they were able to purchase. By 1960 more than 80 million cars had been sold in America ~~she~~ which resulted in the expansion of leisure time and activities available to Americans. ~~The~~ However a large factor that contributed to the formation of the Consumer Society was the baby boom. The baby boom was a result of soldiers returning from WWII

and creating families. In 1950 there were 27.7 million children under the age of 15 and by 1960 the figure rose to 30.9 million. Therefore with the higher population increase people purchased more domestic appliances, cars and houses which illustrates the high standard of living in America. People also increased their leisure time as President Truman regulated the working week to only 40 hours and increased wage as well as decreasing taxes. All of this contributed to a consumer society as Americans were able to spend their wages and therefore increase their standard of living.

However in the 1970s came a period of economic stagnation. ~~The~~ Inflation was

(Section B continued) rising and the wages stayed the same which effectively bought less for people's ~~the~~ money. The economic stagnation was largely due to the Fuel Crises that occurred in 1973 and 1979. In ~~1973~~ the fuel crises OPEC placed an oil embargo on the United States following the decision for the USA to intervene with affairs of countries in the Middle East. The oil

embargo heavily damaged the US economy as the USA was one of the largest consumers of petrol due to the car society that was formed. The price of petrol increased more than four times between 1973 and 1979 and it never returned to its price before the crises. This therefore showed a complete deterioration in the standards of living for Americans. A survey carried out in 1979 showed that for the first time in American history parents believed that their children's future would be worse than theirs. The Iran Hostages in 1979 further declined the trust of the Americans in their presidency and in their government and showed a decline in the standard of living for Americans.

(Section B continued) News reports reminded daily how long the US hostages were kept for and worsened the political situation and social situation for Americans and by that their standards of living.

In conclusion ~~the~~ considering the events from 1941 up to 1980 the overall standard of living for Americans improved greatly. In

1941 the USA was still suffering problems that occurred in the Great Depression in ~~1913~~ 1929 and it was only after the war that the USA left the depression. In the 1950s and 1960s, people's lives did improve even the lives of minority groups when the 1963 Equal Pay Act was ratified, the 1964 Civil Rights Act as well as the 1965 Voting Rights Act that made sure people had an equal say and no one was segregated, thus ~~the~~ improving their standard of living as they were presented with better opportunities. The Consumer Society too helped to create a sense of confidence ~~to~~ amongst the US population, and the landing on the Moon in 1969 further displayed to the world the wealth and high standard of living that America had to

(Section B continued) be able to afford. Without a doubt Americans were better off and that concerned all Americans, including racial minorities. Americans as a whole enjoyed an economic growth like no other and for this reason their standards of living improved.



This demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 3 response. The answer has an understanding of what the question is asking, and there is some analysis of the issue at hand. There is also an offering of knowledge, which spans the chronology of the question. However, whilst the material has some relevance to a consideration of changes to living standards across the period, passages are descriptive, whilst other aspects are of limited relevance, or are not securely linked to the question. Attempts are made to pull this together toward a reasoned conclusion. This is not fully convincing.

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 their own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, and whilst on the whole candidates handled the extract from Stockman (Extract 1) better, most candidates were able to recognise and offer some degree of development in relation to Busch's arguments. There was a tendency for some to expect to see the views as being polarised, examining only the major differences, or even exaggerating these. More successful responses tended to identify the actual arguments made within these extracts early in their responses, often with the introduction acting as a map for the rest of the essay, following this with a developed analysis and evaluation. Many candidates also showed significant own knowledge; the integration of this was more of a discriminating factor in the success of responses. The best answer directly engaged with the interpretations and evaluated them well with use of contextual knowledge. They were able to summarise the key elements of the interpretations before assessing their validity. The most common factors limiting the success of some responses were (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 regards to these, candidates should be minded that Section C is focused around A03. Responses which 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. Responses tended to be more successful when they addressed the issues drawn from the specific question and extracts. Candidates' knowledge and understanding of issues was in the main good, with commonly featuring issues being the deficit and National Debt, tax cuts, military spending, deregulation, and difficulties in reforming welfare. As a whole, responses were less secure in exploring the relevant aspects of the Bush and Clinton administrations considered in Extract 2, although there were some well-reasoned exploration of issues, such as considering the extent to which there were contradictions inherent within Reagan's stated promises and political reality which ultimately led to the trap Bush set himself over taxation. Beyond points already mentioned elsewhere, one issue candidates should consider is how they approach such questions with regard to their own opinion. Whilst it is perfectly valid to reach a judgement which is essentially 'positive' or 'negative' with regards to Reagan and his administration, 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. An interesting argument pursued by a small number of candidates at the higher level, was that the extent to which 'big government' was eradicated depended upon whether one was referring to the aspects of government popular with voters, namely that which they personally benefitted from, or the kind which was disliked, namely that which they felt they paid for and which others gained from.

Study Extracts 1 and 2 in the Extracts Booklet before you answer this question.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Reagan presidency failed to live up to its own claims to reduce 'big government'?

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

(20)

In order to assess the success of Reagan's administration, it is important to look at both the measures that decreased 'big government' but also measures that decreased it. Stockman believes that not a single Reagan measure had reduced the size of government and he makes it clear that he believes that Reagan was disillusioned; he would rather promote his 'slogan' of 'smaller government' than actually create one. Busch holds the contrasting view that Reagan had left a legacy and that Reagan was successful in blocking 'most major expansions of government'.

Stockman addresses the 'battle of the budget' which ended in dismal failure! Despite the omnibus reconciliation act which created a budget bill, Reagan still managed to create a shocking financial deficit of \$208bn - the most in the history of American politics. This begs the question as to why

Reagan was managing to actually increase the size of the government and spending. Busch states that Reagan was successful in the 'balance and block' of previous governments and their 'appetite for bigger governments.' This is to an extent true; he cut 23,000 pages from the federal regulations book, he cut down his staff members ~~by a third~~ by ~~looking at~~ choosing loyalty first and ability second (something Nixon opposed), ~~and~~ and even since his first few days as president he was incredibly active. So it is true that he did literally 'cut government.'

However, when depicting his theory of Reaganomics and the supply-side economics, there was no way he would be consistently successful - even his economics leader agreed.

Stockman mentions the cuts to ~~insure~~ welfare programs like Medicaid and food stamps but also mentions that other 'social insurance programs' like 'Medicare and Social Security' ^{which} had barely been scratched.

This reveals one of Reagan's strengths: his ability to negotiate. He did listen to advice and to commissions, a trait sometimes not

evident in previous presidencies. Despite cuts however, the budget still increased. Why? Defence spending. Stockman ironically states that Reagan was a 'supporter of big government' when it came to 'military and national security.' He spent a total of \$1.2 trillion of defence programmes such as the Star Wars project which was pointless and did not even manifest. Stockman supports the popular 'luncheon theory' of Reagan and states that he did not realise that 'defence imposed the same burden' on the people. Whilst the poorest in society had to deal with 'welfare', Reagan relished in showing off to the world. Stockman suggests that Reagan's priorities were unbalanced, he favoured gain for the rich than help for the poor, increasing government size inadvertently.

Bush brings up an important point of legacy. He states that Reagan's leadership style 'proved itself quite alive' in the 1994 elections.' Contextually, this is true as Bush and even Clinton had continued with Reagan's policies with the same aim of reducing government size. Linking to Stockman-

ans reference to the 'Dunce Theory' however, you could argue that a legacy only remained ~~to~~ due to the actions of Congress. Congress had intervened more than was acceptable during Reagan's presidency, blocking controversial bills surrounding abortion and attempted cuts to programs like Medicare. So this urges us to question if Reagan would still have had the same legacy ~~&~~ without Congress or would he have driven the political system in to the ground, increasing both the size and spending of it.

Furthermore, Stockman interestingly mentions the fact that certain areas of society had not been cut, areas affecting his 'Republican voters.' ~~Again, Re~~ It reveals his ~~discriminatory nature~~, selective nature as he tended to advance the rights of conservatives like him, the ones against abortion, the 'New Right' and all the evangelical groups. This stands in stark contrast to Busch's claim that there was a 'combination of voters,' as there simply was not. Reagan did not help minorities or women, but instead increased welfare for his supporters, increasing the size

of government at the same time.

To conclude, I agree with the view that Reagan had failed to reduce big government and believe that Stockman's view is correct. Reagan almost lacked the common sense to realise that the federal deficit was not going to go away by increasing defence spending. He spent 28% on defence compared to 20% on human resources. Busch does emphasise Reagan's legacy and there sure was one but I question how much of this was actually from his doings and not Congress. Stockman makes it clear that Reagan had a disillusioned thinking and used excuses to justify his inhumane actions. Busch fails to mention the other stuff to Reagan, his emphasis on legacy is too reductionist. This is why despite bringing about change, instilling hope, being flexible, Reagan had too many high hopes, he was selective and relied too much on words rather than action.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 essay. There is clear recognition of the different views, and the candidate offers a confident analysis of these, examining the arguments offered in the light of their own contextual knowledge. There are developed comparisons of the two views, and although perhaps more of these could be found, they are well reasoned. The candidate is able to integrate their own contextual knowledge into a discussion of the arguments and issues raised. A convincing judgment is reached overall, which is related back to the views of the two authors, and follows from the preceding analysis.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

Section A/B responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept(s) targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves 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
- With regards to the level and quality of knowledge, candidates and centres should be minded of the expectation of Advanced Level. In short, it is a combination of the knowledge candidates are able to bring to the essay, married with their ability to effectively marshal this towards the analytical demands of the question, that determines much of a candidate's success
- It is fair to say that on Paper 1, where candidates are expected to study a range of themes across a broad chronological period, the expectations over the depth of knowledge will not necessarily be as great as in more in-depth periods studied. However, the depth and quality of knowledge still makes a considerable difference
- As well as being able to offer more depth of knowledge, candidates who have engaged with wider reading tend to be more successful as they are able to select and deploy the most appropriate examples to support analysis and evaluation.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Failure to consider the date range as specified in the question. Greater examples of this can be when a candidate discusses the correct issue, but for a timespan which

differs from that in the question. Related to this, such candidates also use caution when referring to developments beyond the given timespan 'x ultimately paved the way for y, but in this period its impact was relatively limited...'

- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change/cause, of the issue within the question Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail
- Across the units, there was some evidence to suggest that, as might be expected, candidates were somewhat less confident when dealing with topics that were new to the reformed Advanced Level.

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>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

Ofqual
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

