



# Examiners' Report

## June 2018

### 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2018

Publications Code 9HI0\_1F\_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, the second year of the GCE Advanced Level paper, Option 1F: In search of the American Dream: the USA, c1917–96.

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, 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 the least popular choice with candidates in Section A. Most responses were able to put forward some analysis of the reasons for change in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans, and were thus able to access the higher levels. In some cases the focus and depth on the given reason of affluence was less convincing than on other issues, most candidates could point to relevant examples of higher personal spending in the period after 1945. Higher level responses tended to explore the issue further, e.g. making convincing connections between the changes to leisure activities, growing affluence and increased leisure time, and/or were able to identify clear links between rising wages and consumption patterns, exemplified with specific references to points across the period. A significant number argued that the economic issues of the 1970s countered the impact of affluence, although in some cases this was overstated, and in general, there was less confidence in dealing with the later parts of the time frame for this question. Some very good responses were able to see a turning point in the 1970s as growth began to slow, but that rather than ending leisure per se, examined how other factors and aspects of leisure less dependent upon wealth. Other factors such as technology and media, the development of new suburban patterns, spectator sports and the growth of car-owning and air travel were discussed effectively by many. Stronger responses made a more direct comparison and contrast between the impact of affluence and the role of other factors, and/or discussed the extent to which these were functions of affluence or distinct factors. Discriminating factors in performance tended to be: (i) the degree to which material was focused on the conceptual demands of the question, (ii) the ability and willingness to explore a sufficient range of reasons to offer some overall balance, (iii) and the range and depth of knowledge. With regards to (iii), limitations tended to be in terms of the quality of factual and often statistical information to substantiate points, in order to locate them at specific points within the timeframe, e.g. arguments that clearly related to the post-war boom or specific figures on ownership of cars, technological goods or sporting attendances, rather than general claims which could equally have been applied to the 1920s. Stronger responses offered sufficient coverage of issues (typically the given issue and two or three other substantial points), the necessary detail to substantiate claims, and a clear and critical focus.

In the years 1945-80 the main reason for changes in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans was their growing affluence. Affluence was as a result of the Second World War and it can be related to changes in life as a result of something, in this case the World War 2. During the war, people were unable to consume certain goods and leisure time was sacrificed for war effort. Activities changed due to lifestyles, due to affluence people visited more areas in the country and experienced more leisure. However ~~another~~ <sup>a</sup> reason as to why some <sup>leisure</sup> activities changed is due to <sup>changes in</sup> technology such as ~~the~~ improvements in aviation, <sup>and rising</sup> <sup>income</sup>. To be considered a main reason, it would have to affect many people on a large scale.

The main reason for changes in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans was their growing affluence. This is because after the war, people desired goods that they have been deprived of during the war. During the war, war effort was prioritised over sports and leisure activities. Prior to

(Section A continued) the war, many people attended spectator sports such as baseball. The Yankees star, Babe Ruth made \$80,000 in 1930 but due to the war, this has been forgotten about because leisure was a luxury and the public wanted to focus on winning the war. Activities such as going out to eat, and cinemas increased after the war because the war had been won and the public deserved a reward. As a result of the war, TVs became popular and by 1965, 68.8% had ~~them~~ them. This showed that people could enjoy more leisure time. Also due to the stop in leisure over the war, TVs and more drive in restaurants were created due to the need for changing activities and the situation that they were in. This was of higher importance than changes of incomes and mobility or technological advances because it affected everyone as everyone participated in the war in one way or another. However due to changes in affluence, income, people were more able to change their leisure activities. But affluence after the second ~~war~~ world war affected all, even the poor.

The second most important reason as to why

(Section A continued) for changes in the leisure activities of ordinary Americans is because of changes in income. Those who earned more were able to experience a variety of different activities. Those with higher incomes ~~were mobile due to cars~~ had increased mobility due to cars. As ~~the~~ highways were expanding, the 1961 Highway Act provided 41,000 miles of highways, more cars were ~~were~~ desired due to more traveling. Due to improved roads, people could drive to National Parks for holidays. Moreover they could also drive to out of town malls which became increasingly popular in the 1960s as between 1960s and 1980s, 30,000 were built. This meant that there was an increase in hotels and restaurants. Therefore this created ~~other~~ changes to leisure activities as people moved away from going to cinemas and instead started to enjoy activities outside their areas. Moreover those without cars had to use buses which were slow and were only ~~in~~ within cities. Therefore those of lower incomes didn't enjoy the same quality ~~because~~ of leisure activities. This is not the most significant reason to the changes in leisure activities as it did not have a

(Section A continued) large impact as many lacked cars. whilst most, if not all participated in the war. However cars existed before 1945 therefore this change in leisure activities could be as a result of the government as the government funded highways construction and retreat from city of town shopping malls wouldn't have been as ~~the~~ accessible.

The least important reason for changes in the leisure activities of ~~the~~ ordinary Americans was technological advancement. As a result of planes, people were able to fly to new places and visit more parts of the country. After the Second World War, the first passenger plane, Boeing 707, carrying 181 passengers was invented. This meant people were more accessible as they could work further away from home and instead commute. Also due to the deregulation of airlines by Carter in 1979, this meant that airlines were now in competition so this led to the reduction in prices benefitting consumers. Also due to planes, ordinary Americans could travel within the country but also abroad. Before planes the only way to go abroad was by ships,

(Section A continued) which isn't ideal to all therefore this created opportunities. However due to deregulation, prices may have become <sup>fixed</sup> and so ~~not~~ excluding some members of society especially the poorest. Also this could decrease amount of people using them. Changes in technology isn't as important as affluence and changes in income as ~~some~~ airplanes had problems such as collision hence why the Federal Aviation Administration was set up in 1956 due to a collision over Grand Canyon. Technological advances only affected ~~higher~~ those in higher incomes so unlike the affluence.

~~The~~ To conclude, the most important reason for changes in the leisure activities of ~~and~~ ordinary Americans was their growing affluence because ~~world~~ post world affluence affected all, many were deprived from goods during war. Changes in income was not as ~~important~~ important due to differing levels of income. However technological advancements included other factors such as TVs and computers and but it highly depended on income and there were still faults.



This response demonstrates some of the qualities of a level 5 essay. The answer is clearly organised and focused, with a sound 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 affluence, largely sustaining an analysis which considers this, alongside a range of other factors. The argument is logical and reasoned, and the candidate produces a reasoned judgement. Development is coherent and shows a grasp of the demands of this particular question.

## **Question 2**

This was the most popular question of the two on Section A. Most responses were able to engage with the demands of the question sufficiently to achieve the middle to higher levels, and there were many excellent answers. It was evident that a significant number of candidates were confident writing about black American civil rights, but were less so with regards to minority rights. Within these, the candidature seemed somewhat stronger on Native American and Hispanic Americans than the gay rights movement. Many candidates were able to make good comparison and contrast between the campaigns for black and minority civil rights. Different approaches were taken; most answers focused on key issues such as the methods used, leadership, and aims, and were able to identify and analyse similarities and differences between the black civil rights movement and other minority movements with varying degrees of focus and supporting knowledge. Some also included other features of the campaigns, such as use of legal redress, exploitation of the media or presidential support. An alternative approach seen was to structure responses around comparisons between each individual minority group and black civil rights groups in turn. In terms of the quality of responses, better answers were able to explore points more fully, e.g. use greater depth of knowledge to examine the extent of apparent points of similarity or difference, and/or demonstrate how civil rights movements were not always united, and thus explore the complexity whilst remaining focused. Less successful responses tended to be more descriptive, with at times detailed accounts of examples of the black civil rights campaign, such as Montgomery or Birmingham, and only have limited material on minority campaigns and/or focus on the extent to which there was 'considerable similarity'. The strongest responses had a well-structured analysis of extent of similarity, often based on clearly established issues such as the nature of campaigns, leadership, impact and success, and were able to weigh these in arriving at overall judgements.

Undoubtedly black civil rights set a good example for other movements seeking equality and openness in order for those groups to push for change. Tactics used by the black civil right movement were replicated throughout minority civil rights: the natives marched just as the black movement had; however their aims were entirely different, the gay movement took a spin on sit-ins and renaming these signs and the Hispanics used the idea of boycotts. However each movement had individual circumstances and individual aims, they were all under the same umbrella of equality sometimes pushing for change in similar ways and facing similar problems and other times they were vastly different.

~~Although legally blacks were no longer slaves to white Americans~~  
The 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment abolished slavery, the 14<sup>th</sup> naturalised all slaves and the 15<sup>th</sup> gave black Americans the vote. Despite this binding legislation Americans still refused to accept blacks as equal citizens. Jim Crow laws ensured that they were still racially discriminated against. Things got so bad in the 30s nearly half of the blacks from the South moved North and Idris Muhammad signed a petition to move back to Africa, supported by Booker T. Washington. This was seen as voting with their feet. Hence it was assumed that those that remained in the South had accepted Jim Crow laws. Before Martin Luther King took on <sup>the</sup> role of leadership in Montgomery there had been very little success for the movement particularly due to their link with communists, all other minority groups faced this with particularly the gay

(Launder Score)  
(Section A continued) movement and the Hispanic movement. <sup>event</sup> The movement that ~~sparked a number of years of key protests and was~~ the Montgomery bus boycott sparked a consecutive ~~number of~~ ~~years~~ years of key protest, and ~~which~~ would later be replicated by the Hispanic with the Delano Grape Boycott. Presumably the NAACP had rejected the ~~g~~ ~~cases~~ case of 9 black women accused of the rape of Zephie girls in the Scottsboro case as they didn't want the focus of this campaign to be on angry aggressive black men; ironically communist lawyers took their case and they were acquitted. The idea of a bus boycott was already in circulation from 1954 however in 1955 the ideal candidate came along, Rosa Parks. The embodied MLK's rules perfectly: make it clear who is the oppressed and who is the oppressor, dress well, make sure to be connected as publically and peacefully as possible. ~~From~~ These rules were important because this is how the rest of the world would view blacks. The other movements did not manipulate the media as tactically. 8

Blacks made up 75% of bus users and 90% boycotted. Leaders homes were bombed and taxi drivers were punished for helping however the movement remained peaceful, in 1956 bus segregation was ruled by the supreme court as unconstitutional. ~~So~~ The movement repeated this idea when the Housewives League, Detroit, encouraged the boycott of shops who discriminate by using the phrase 'Don't buy where you can't work'. As I referenced earlier this tactic was used by the Hispanic Civil Right movement the Delano Grape Boycott, <sup>in the 60s</sup> which also included Filipino. In order to ~~settle~~ the boycott in 1970 UFWOC made <sup>3 year</sup> contracts with workers for better conditions. The boycott tactic proved painful in both campaigns however three years later in 1973 none of these contracts were renewed.

(Section A continued) There were problems with schooling in the black movement. In 1956 "Little Rock Arkansas the NAACP tried to desegregate schools. The movement was always keen to pick the areas with the most racist people in power. In order to figure who was the oppressor and who was the oppressed, Little Rock was no exception. Orval Faubus, mayor was racist therefore when a young <sup>black</sup> girl arrived at the gates of an all white school and was met with chants of 'Lynch her' this sent shock waves around the world. After this event Orval Faubus closed the school, was regarded it was conspiracy being <sup>this had taken sometime even after Brown vs the Board of Education</sup> desegregated. <sup>being issued so many years before this had been a paper victory</sup> The NAACP's movement dealt with schooling trouble early on in their campaign at the hands of the BIA. This meant that the Natives had no trust in the government & also in the context of 'termination', BIA was criticised in the assembling of Indian Boarding schools which required them to only speak English, cut their hair and wear 'normal' clothes they were completely stripped of their identity and culture. Differently to the black movement the Indians valued self determination, later in 1980, along with an Indian Financing Act and in 1999 an Indian Child Welfare Act, an act of self determination was produced.

The issue of regaining land was prominent throughout the native campaign, they carried a great deal of resentment from the 1830s Indian Removal Act. Therefore a tactic called on a number of times by Natives was the occupation of either government buildings or land that had once belonged to them. Also the occupation of Alcatraz 1968-71 is an example and another is Wounded Knee in 1973. The government began to listen to their demands even giving back land such as Blue Lake however states such as Hawaii were still excluding Natives.

(Section A continued) Although we can pull many parallels between the black movement and hispanic movement, such as the Brown Berets could be argued to be modelled on the NAACP and the Young Lords founded in Chicago was undoubtedly modelled on the Black Panther and Black Power, the hispanics used the term 'Brown Power' and similarly the Nahuas used the term 'Red Power'. There were many differences one being the hunger strike by Cesar Chavez, the face of the Hispanic campaign, to which later joined by Robert Kennedy which brought on not to the strike evidently the hispanics had more federal support. Both the Nahuas and Americans were <sup>a</sup> smaller percentage of the population and therefore <sup>it was</sup> easier to bring about change for them.

There are undoubtedly considerable similarities between the black civil rights campaign and the minority rights campaign. The black civil rights led the way therefore groups to follow could reflect on this tactics analysis what had worked and effectively replicate it but of course with ~~still~~ differences in and the messages shifted away from the blue print the blacks had to see in order to push for more specific aims of their individual campaigns.



This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 essay. The response has a clear understanding of the issues contained within the question, and offers a detailed and thorough comparative analysis of the different campaigns. A range of specific material is deployed as part of the analysis. The essay is clearly communicated, with logical argument, and whilst some aspects could be developed further, overall the essay offers clearly substantiated judgement.

### **Question 3**

This question was the slightly more popular choice within Section B, and produced a range of responses. This question seemed to present more difficulties for candidates than question 4. Most responses were able to offer some analysis of various changes relating to immigration across the time frame, and thus some consideration of impact. However, a significant number did not focus material towards the conceptual demands of the question, particularly with regards to the impact of immigration. This took varying forms, such as attempts to analyse changes to attitudes towards immigrants, or changing government policies on immigration, or the reasons why such changes took place. In such cases, there was at times sufficient material to potentially reach the higher levels, but this was limited by a failure to shape this consistently towards the demands of the question, and the responses were at times implicit, or in and out of focus. A significant minority also offered very limited material relating to immigration. In general, knowledge was stronger on the earlier part of the period, such as the government policies of the 1920s, but other commonly referenced issues include the relationship between immigrants/immigration and both red scares, the issue of Mexican labour across the period, Kennedy's attitude to immigration, the relaxation of earlier policies in the 1960s, and the relationship between immigration and the slump of the 1970s. Where such issues were framed appropriately in terms of the question, they were duly rewarded. Stronger responses were more clearly focused on both impact and change, with one common (and successful) approach being to develop an analysis based on themes such as the political, social and economic impact of immigration, with a discussion of these across the time frame leading to an overall judgement on the extent to which the impact changed.

Immigration had a large impact on the USA 1917-80. Some of these impacts can be measured through the impact immigrants had on Communist Fears, the impact Refugees created and how employment was affected by immigration. Overall, from 1917-80 the impact of immigration varied in between significance <sup>but</sup> and ultimately changed.

The impact that immigration had on employment clearly changes over time. In the 1920s there was competition for jobs amongst immigrants and Americans. However, during the depression 400,000 Mexicans were deported and the Johnson-Reid Act of 1924 set a limit to 2% of people from that country in the US in the 1890 census. This shows that immigration had a <sup>significant</sup> impact on the employment opportunities, so much so that immigrants were deported to create jobs for Americans. However, immigrants had a positive impact on employment during the recovery as the Bracero Program brought Mexicans over to work as farm labourers and around 4 million contracts were signed. This was a positive impact for the US, not

(Section B continued)

as much the immigrants themselves, as it meant the employers could exploit the immigrants and threatened whites they'd be fired if they didn't leave trade Unions. <sup>In place of immigrants</sup> However, the economy impacts the impact immigration has as during the challenges of the 1970s, 600,000 jobs were created in UK and 1/3 taken by Mexicans and in the 1970s there were around 7m immigrant illegal immigrants in the US, 60,000 more each year and 600,000 departed each year. This also had an impact on the US as it meant many people changed their attitudes towards immigrants to a negative one again. So, overall 1917-80 on the impact that immigration had on the US employment which did change as it fluctuated between positive and negative.

Refugee immigrants also had an impact on the US 1917-80. For example the Displaced Persons Act of 1958 allowed refugees into the US and 200,000 fled Cubans fled Castro 1959-63. This had an impact on the US as the US was now seen as welcoming those that needed help which shows immigration had a different impact to in the 1920s when immigration sparked resentment from US citizens. The Cuban refugees were

(Section B continued)

The ones that caused the immigration laws to change so had a huge impact on the US. Also, the USA's part in Vietnam war caused immigration to have another impact on the US as the fall of Saigon in 1975 meant <sup>around</sup> ~~the~~ 130,000 Vietnamese fled to US and by 1980 there was 700,000. This had an impact on the US as it was the first time in years that Asian immigrants were allowed into the US so it led to the creation of more Asian-Americans and shared cultures. So overall, refugee immigrants had a large impact on the US as it caused key changes in policy and a changing in attitudes towards immigrants as US moved even further away from isolationism. However, there was less change than <sup>with immigrants</sup> Immigration also impacted the US through the spread of communist fears. For example in 1941 the Hillingham Commission distinguished between 'old' immigrants - English, German - and 'new' immigrants - Eastern Europeans - saying the immigration of new immigrants was dangerous as they weren't adapted to US life. 956 were deported during the first Red Scare including Emma Goldman due to the context of the Russian Revolution creating communist fears. However, after the

(Section B continued)

Second world war immigration had less of a fearful impact as acts like the 1952 Refugee Escape Act allowed those escaping communism to live in the US. This shows a change in the impact of immigrants as in the 1920s they are the cause of Communist fears but in the 1950s they caused the US to be represented as the saviour of anti-communists.

To conclude, although some people maintained the idea that immigration had a negative impact, mainly due to that immigrants were the first to lose their jobs and need welfare so people complained their taxes were spent on immigrants, the impact of immigration did change 1947-80. This is evidenced by the fact that immigrants created less fear factor as the years went on and depending on the economy immigrants had more or less of an impact on employment depending on the context.



This demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 4 response. The answer has a good grasp of the topic, and the conceptual demands of the question. There is clear analysis of the given issue, offering an exploration of the changing impact of immigration. The response is largely well reasoned, and offers sound support, although it could go further in terms of depth of analysis and evaluation.

## Question 4

Question 4 was the marginally less popular of the two within Section B. In general, candidates responded with focused responses, with a variety of issues covered and indeed approaches taken. With the former, popular issues included isolationism and the 'return to normalcy' after the First World War, anti-communism, the relative success of Democratic and Republican presidents in the immediate years after the second World War, and Cold War examples spanning the period up to and including Reagan's election, with Vietnam featuring heavily within this, in particular the counter-culture and reaction against this. Whilst in some cases candidates strayed too far into foreign policy, most were able to relate relevant issues back to domestic impact. With regards to the issue of conservatism, the vast majority showed a secure grasp, and were able to justify to varying degrees how examples such as anti-communism and restrictive immigration policies did or didn't amount to a growth in such influences. In terms of approaches, most took a relatively straightforward for and against approach, offering arguments that war did or didn't lead to an increase in conservative influences, whilst others considered other factors contributing to a growth in conservative influences, which was a valid approach where carefully framed in relation to the question. Features of stronger responses tended to be a more critical and nuanced consideration, making distinctions between different wars, exploring exactly how different issues amounted to 'conservative influences' overall, examining the longevity of particular influences (such as anti-communism), or exploring the ebb and flow of such influences over the whole period, and weighing the extent to which, when conservatism was evident, it could be directly related to conservatism or other factors. Less successful responses tended to be less secure in their understanding of conservative influences, offer limited chronological coverage, or drift to seemingly pre-rehearsed arguments about the role played by the media and other factors in shaping the political landscape of the USA.

Plan

| <u>War &amp; Cold War</u> | <u>Economy</u>            | <u>Wider International Context</u> |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Vietnam ↓ (20s-60s)       | Roaring 20s ↑             |                                    |
| World War One ↑           | Great Depression (20s) ↓  | First Red Scare ↑                  |
| World War Two ↓           | Post War Boom (40s-50s) ↓ | Second Red Scare ↑                 |
|                           |                           | Oil Crises ↑                       |

Essay:

Without a doubt war and the impact of the cold war were important in leading to an increase in conservative influences on domestic policy in the USA within the years 1917-80. However I only agree a little for that it led to an increase, and was the ~~main~~ because whilst the cold war ~~did lead~~ and other wars ~~did lead~~ to (e.g. World War One) did lead to the ~~deeds~~ rise of republicanism in the 1920s, the success of the Second World War also led to an over-reliance on Keynesian economic theory that led to the economic stagnation of the 1960s and 70s.

~~One~~ The main war which ~~led~~ ~~led~~ to an rising conservative

(Section B continued) influence was the impact of the First World War on America. World War One was seen largely as a mistake by the American people and after the post-war years saw an economic depression the political zeitgeist shifted away from Wilson. He was seen as having dominated congress and consequently the post-war world war one years are instrumental in ushering in the rise of Republicanism, ~~which~~ with Harding winning in 1921. Moreover Harding believed in Laissez Faire economics and the imposition of tariffs on foreign goods. Support for such policies came about after people lost faith in Wilson's ability to deal with post-war America and therefore show the war years important in <sup>increasing</sup> conservative influence on domestic policy.

However one could argue the developed conservative influence of domestic policy as well. America's success in World War Two led to high faith in the Democrat president Truman and so Keynesian economic theories that high spending would keep the economy stable and unemployment low. For example spending interest due to Truman's Fair Deal policies such as GI Bills that gave 12 million veterans job training, free health care and unemployment pay for a year. This thus shows that the impact of war would lessen conservative influence on domestic policy. However Truman's stance on Trade Unions post-war was quite conservative. When the Railway workers went on strike Truman asked Congress to direct the strikers into the army. The fact that he caused the trade unions to ~~stop~~ slow

(Section B continued) Conservative influence of the same impact under Reagan when he saved 14000 air traffic control unionised air traffic controllers for striking.

However largely the Cold War caused an increase in conservative influence on US politics to increase. The rise of Communism in the east led to many opposing left wing views. Moreover the Second Red Scare took place within the context of the Cold War and during this time groups of Red baiters came out in support of McCarthy's witch hunt, supported by the fact that even after the Tydings Committee reported that his claims were half-truths and lies, many conservatives supported him regardless. However the Cold War also led to the rise of liberalist attitudes in the 1950s and 60s. As the impact of the Vietnam War (a proxy war of the wider Cold War) led to many radical student groups like SDS protesting against the government and facilitating the passing of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1965 Voting Rights Act.

Moreover, the wider international context led to a larger increase in conservative influence on US politics. For example during the first Red Scare membership of the KKK numbered 3-8 million people. Further the Red Scare comprised with the 1917 Russian Revolution and the influence of the Dillingham Commission led to much of the anti-immigration measures of the 1920s, like the 1921 Emergency Quota Act, the 1924 Johnson-Read Act, or

(Section B continued) the 1924 National Origins Formulas which cut right based Asian Immigration.

Conservative influence on domestic politics later increased as a result of the Second Red Scare in the 1950s. During this time the ~~B~~ many suspected of having leftist views were sacked, whilst ~~and a third of~~ a third of librarians didn't stock the works of Karl Marx. Moreover the anti-gay Lavender Scare ran along side the Red Scare because they were both seen as invisible illnesses to the point where homosexuality was a spiritual mental illness. The fact that people felt unable to express themselves or their political views during this time shows that the conservative influence on US domestic politics.

Lastly the Oil Crisis of the 1970s led to conservative influence also, possibly the most significant of all. The 1973 crisis (triggered by the Arab Israeli War) and the 1979 crisis (caused by the Iranian revolution) led to a sharp decline in confidence in the Carter Presidency. He was seen as weak and unable to cope with the economic problems. This influenced him to pass cost cutting measures in 1980 cutting Social welfare, a conservative policy, which led to Ronald Reagan in 1980. The fact that the Oil Crisis caused such a decline in confidence that the presidency switched to a republican is clear evidence of conservative influence on US domestic politics.

(Section B continued) Overall economics caused the ~~last~~ increase in conservatism in US politics within the years 1917 to 80. Initially, however, conservative influence did increase. During the Roaring 20s, conservative influence remained high. This is evident by the fact that from 1921-32 all presidents (Harding, Coolidge & Hoover) were isolationist Republicans who believed in Laissez Faire Economics. This is further evident by the imposition of the Fordney McCumber Tariff in 1923. This is balance tariffs of foreign goods and a belief in "less government in business" and more business in government are all quintessentially conservative beliefs. Therefore the slow increase increased conservative influence on US politics.

However following the Roaring 20s the economy tended to support Keynesian economic thinking and facilitated liberal attitudes going forward. For example during the Great Depression a belief in ~~Republican~~ conservative ideas of "Rugged Individualism" disappeared. It was replaced by high government spending, which increased from 1.9 billion dollars in 1932 to around 9 billion dollars by 1940, and a New Deal for the American people.

One aspect of which was the NRA which regulated businesses, setting a code of practice like a minimum wage and working hours. The fact that Keynesian economics and interventionism were ~~not~~ prevalent during the depression shows the ~~lack~~ of conservative influence. However some ~~conservative~~ influence remained, as in 1930 Congress forced Hoover to pass the Smoot Holey tariff act.

(Section B continued) Lastly conservative influence declined further during the ~~first~~ war boom and during most the economic recovery years during the Second World War. For example in response to the threat of a 100,000 strong march on Washington by Philip A. Randolph Roosevelt passed Executive Order 9802 which desegregated the defence industry. However the fact that Roosevelt passed anti-lynching legislation shows that conservative influence remained; as he needed the support of Southern Democrats to get New Deal laws through Congress.

In conclusion I only agree a fair bit that war and the Cold War led to an increase in Conservative influence in US politics. Post-war was one issue led to the decline in Republicanism of the late 1920s and early 1930s. It is only after then that war led to Conservative influence. Moreover, the main reason is the wider International Context; with Economic boom the left influence.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates the qualities of a level 5 essay. The response has a clear understanding of the issues contained within the question, and offers a detailed and thorough analysis of the role played by war and the Cold War. The essay is clearly communicated, with logical argument, and whilst some aspects could be developed further, such as the ultimate conclusion, overall the essay offers clearly substantiated judgement.

## Question 5

Most candidates appeared to understand the demands of the Section C question, and thus were able to engage with an analysis of the given views in relation to the proposition in the question. Most candidates analysed the arguments in the extracts, with consideration of issues such as welfare provision and welfare recipients, housing, racial and gender issues, the legacy of the Great Society and electoral demographics. Most candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of the extracts and select key points of interpretation in relation to these issues, and in the main there was a good breath of contextual knowledge on display across all levels, with only a minority relying upon the extracts as a source material without further development. At the higher levels, candidates were more likely to offer a developed comparison or synthesis of the two perspectives, although many more did identify the element of common ground over welfare cuts. Many of these more successful responses appeared better able to recognise individual points within the wider view and the emphasis placed, such as the greater focus within extract 1 on the social impact these measures had, or the rationale given for such cuts and the distinctions made on the deserving and underserving poor in extract 2, focusing on the clear difference between the two extracts. Stronger responses were also more likely to focus on both aspects of 'attack on the disadvantaged' and 'created social division', and the different views taken towards both of these that were offered in the two extracts. The most common factors limiting the success of some responses were (i) use of the extracts 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', (ii) limited own knowledge, or a lack of integration of this in order to examine and evaluate the arguments, and (iii) an inability to contain what is essentially political bias, with personal views on Reagan's government leading to imbalanced analysis and clouding judgement in a number of responses. A minority of less successful responses tended to use the extracts for illustrative support, with limited engagement with the views, or offered little by the way of wider contextual knowledge to examine the given views. With regards to (i), candidates should be minded that Section C is focused around AO3. 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. Thankfully, timing seemed less of an issue than last year. One issue that did hold back some otherwise higher level responses was the lack of a strong conclusion at the end; those that did offer strong conclusions were not necessarily exhaustive in length, but offered clear and reasoned judgement, which linked back to the preceding analysis of the view, including the extracts.

- 5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Reagan administration's policies were an attack on the disadvantaged which increased social division?

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

(20)

plan: 1st disagreement:

economic.

2nd disagreement: social policy.

Different interpretations of Reagan's presidency have disagreed over the extent to which his policies attacked the disadvantaged and created social division. While extract 1, a typically liberal viewpoint, argues that Reagan's administration did create social division and worsened the lives of ~~the~~ the most vulnerable in society, extract 2, a more conservative approach, ~~highlights~~ <sup>suggests</sup> that Reagan's policies ~~only~~ were beneficial in that they ended the era of welfare dependency, while still retaining a basic welfare state. While both interpretations hold some weight, Anthony Campagna's extract 1 is more convincing, as ~~a~~ evidence suggests Reagan's policies created ~~both~~ and remedied both social and economic divisions.

The first point over which the extracts disagree is on the extent to which Reagan's policies were harmful for poor people. George Rising, in extract 2, suggests that Reagan not only maintained a 'safety net' of a welfare state ~~designed~~ for the 'deserving poor' but also 'capitalised on anti-welfare sentiment' to inspire people to find work. Both of these ~~are~~ are true to some respect. Reagan - although he may have intended otherwise - did not entirely destroy the welfare state. ~~As~~ <sup>In</sup> his first term, spending on education actually increased by 19%. And, spending on Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security actually increased by more than \$140 billion over the course of his two terms. Taxes were also cut for the majority of people, including those of the lowest income bracket. However, Reagan's very philosophy was founded upon the idea that welfare promoted 'laziness' and a dependence on government, when individuals should in fact look after themselves. Pro-Reagan interpretations stress that his philosophy helped poor people by inspiring them to take up work. And, this does hold some truth. Between 1982 and 1989, the Reagan administration oversaw the creation of 18.7 million jobs. And, the average ~~growth~~ <sup>income</sup> per capita increased 2.6% annually. Thus, Rising ~~is~~ and

Other pro-Reagan interpretations would suggest that Reagan's policies did not attack the disadvantage, but ~~instead~~ helped them.

However, Campagna's critical interpretation deeply refutes the idea that Reagan's policies were helpful to the poor. As Campagna notes of Reagan's policies 'favoured those who needed no help'. ~~And~~ There is substantial evidence to back this up. In his 1981 OBERA economic reform bill, Reagan cut the highest tax band of 70% down to 28%. As a result, many areas of public spending saw huge ~~losses~~ losses. In his first term, Reagan cut welfare spending by \$20 billion annually. ~~He~~ He cut child nutrition programmes by 28% and Medicaid by 5%. And these policies had detrimental effects on the poorest in society. While after his first term the number of millionaires doubled, after 3 years, the number of families living under the poverty line had increased by 3.3%. His cuts to social housing were so ~~detrimental~~ extensive that they triggered a homelessness crisis so bad, FEMA ~~Federal Emergency~~ (a federal emergency relief fund) had to be called in. Thus, it is hard to see how Reagan maintained a

'safety net', as is ~~often~~ stated in extract 2. For these reasons, it is clear that extract 1 is more convincing and Reagan's ~~policies did~~ economic policies did attack the disadvantaged.

Secondly, the ~~two~~ extracts disagree over the extent to which Reagan's administration created social division. Extract 2 emphasises that Reagan's policies were an attempt to bring people out of poverty, which would inadvertently diminish social division. ~~A typical pro-Reagan interpretation focuses less on trying to~~ ~~It is true that many people~~ while it is true that many ~~were brought~~ people found jobs in ~~the~~ Reagan's two terms (unemployment was reduced from 7.1% when Reagan took office to 5.5% when he left), there is not much evidence to suggest this helped with social divisions. What is more convincing, is extract 1's stress on the increase of social divisions there were under Reagan. Campaigner notes of how 'urban dwellers' were pitted against suburban people. This can be seen in the huge divides Reagan created between whites and blacks. ~~the~~ Reagan made no attempt to advance civil rights, in a time when it was arguably still very much needed, and even tried to appoint a judge

who had openly questioned the constitutionality of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. His 'War on Drugs' essentially saw the targetting of young black males despite the fact that whites were ~~totally~~ using drugs at almost equal rates. Reagan created a stigma of fear around black people, blaming them for the problems in the inner cities, despite the fact that inner city programmes were severely underfunded compared to suburban ones. In 1985, black <sup>youth</sup> unemployment rates were four times higher than men they had been in 1954. Thus, Reagan strengthened the division between white and black communities with his attack on inner cities that made white people fear blacks. For this reason, extract 1 is more convincing.

Finally, ~~although not mentioned in extract 2, a~~ ~~typical~~ extract 1 makes it clear that Reagan's policies disadvantaged women. He made it more difficult to claim child benefits, and he publicly questioned the morality of abortion. His cuts to childcare services such as Child Nutrition programmes also put a greater strain on mothers. While this is not explicitly stated in extract 2, a typically conservative

interpretation that Reagan's emphasis on family values was for the better, and was not an attack on women. However, the first interpretation is more convincing as it is clear Reagan did not have a progressive attitude towards the role of women.

Overall, the view that Reagan's policies did attack the disadvantaged and create social division is more convincing than the view that they did not. While extract 2 stresses that Reagan did maintain a safety net welfare state, and his policies encouraged rather than attacked the poorest, extract 1 is still more convincing. His policies created a huge gap between the rich and the poor, as his ~~pro-business~~ individualist stance supported the wealthiest and looked down upon those who ~~weren't~~ were not so wealthy. And, his policies marginalised African Americans and women. ~~Therefore~~ Thus, the liberal interpretation in extract 2 is more convincing.



This response demonstrates 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 is an overall developed comparison of the two views, and there is clearly confident handling of the extracts, considering the arguments and the material basis for the different views. The candidate is able to integrate their own contextual knowledge into a discussion of the arguments and issues raised. The essay overall offers evaluative argument, with precise focus on the specific demands of the question.

## 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:

- 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
- Candidates 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 focussing 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:

- Paying 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
- 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)
- Giving only 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
- Answering with a lack of detail

## Section C responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, 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:

- 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>



