

# ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report  
June 2011

GCE History 6HI03 C

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

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

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com).

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

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

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

Alternatively, you can contact our [Subject] Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on [HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk](mailto:HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk).

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



## Get more from your exam results

### ...and now your mock results too!

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

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

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus).

To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

June 2011

Publications Code UA028157

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

## Introduction

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

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

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

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on Option C of students having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was wide but the paper appears to have worked in the sense that the most able were stretched and the less talented were still able to attempt answers to both parts of the examination. There were also very few rubric errors. As expected, there were far more entrants for C2 (The United States, 1917-54: Boom, Bust and Recovery) than for C1 (The United States, 1820-77: A Disunited Nation?). The candidates' performance on individual questions is considered in the next section.

## Question 1

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss to what extent the Missouri Compromise minimised North-South divisions between 1820 and 1850. The weakest candidates tended to produce (1) a descriptive account of the Missouri Compromise and the key events leading up to 1850 which did not address the question (2) a response which was heavily reliant on unsupported assertions. A few very low scoring answers confused the Missouri and 1850 Compromises. Conversely, the best responses offered a sustained evaluation of the impact of the Missouri Compromise during this period using an agree/disagree essay structure.

Indeed, the Missouri Compromise of 1820 resolved and did to a considerable extent, succeed in minimising divisions between the North and South. The Compromise excluded slavery from any territory North of the  $36^{\circ}30'$  parallel, which ultimately kept the limited expansion of slavery into the Louisiana Purchase area, and limited slavery expansion to the South. It offered concessions to the Northern Whigs, who

(Section A continued) argued that ~~the~~ expansion of slavery, in an unlimited nature, would bring apart the Union and the Sectional sentiment. The compromise did, initially, resolve this issue. Moreover, there were Democrats in the North who were moderates and saw the Missouri Compromise as a means of legal containment of the Northern and Southern divisions. Therefore, due to the tight containment of slavery expansion, it meant, in political terms, Congress was a far more workable legislative body, and thus decreased divisions between the North and South.

Although the Missouri Compromise of 1820 did indeed succeed in minimizing divisions between north and South, it is far greater to argue that it caused divisions, which were already deep seated, between the North and South in the years 1820-1850. Indeed, the Southern Democrats believed it a Constitutional ~~right~~ right for ~~them~~ for the states to decide their own destiny on the 'peculiar institution'. For <sup>Southern</sup> many, the Missouri Compromise illustrated

(Section A continued) federal Government control which was resisted by the South. This ultimately meant that there was fierce opposition to the North and exemplified the North and South divide. Additionally, the stance taken by President Andrew Jackson in the 1832 Nullification crisis, that of federal Government Sovereignty, again highlighted how the terms of the Compromise were wholly unsatisfactory to the South; ultimately this meant the Compromise was unsuccessful in decreasing divisions in the North and South from 1820-1850.

Moreover, far more importantly than the Missouri Compromise is the resolution of minimizing the divisions between the North and South from 1820-1850 was the the problems posed by the acquisition of the Lands from Mexico in 1846. This essentially undermined the success of the Compromise of 1820 as it raised tensions between the North and South once more. In 1846, the Wilmot Proviso was put forward to the by Northern Congressman David Wilmot stating how Slavery should not

(Section A continued) exist in new lands from Mexico. This outraged the South, again on the basis of state rights, and meant the South divided with John C. Calhoun and his doctrine<sup>in 1847</sup>, emphasizing state rights and the right for no limited basis on Slavery. Ultimately, these events polarized political opinion between the North and South; all success gained from 1820 Missouri Compromise was wholly undermined. In the 1840s, the new divisions were again explicit in political terms; therefore it can be argued, with credibility, that the Missouri Compromise only had limited success in minimizing South + North divisions in 1820-1850.

Indeed, the Missouri Compromise highlighted Southern political subordination to the North, and <sup>political</sup> ~~economic~~ <sup>economic</sup> divisions in 1846 and 1847<sup>^</sup> exemplified this reality, the most important reason why the Compromise ~~did~~ <sup>did not</sup> experience any minimal extent in minimizing north and south divide was due to the already, and increasingly, fundamental split between the two economies. The South, for

(Section A continued) 1820-1850, employed an agrarian style of economy, with only 10% of America's manufacturing output. This contrasted with the Northern egalitarian economy, with Massachusetts producing more industrial output than the state of the South combined in 1850. Moreover, there were more industrial plants in the state of New York in 1840, than there were industrial workers in the whole of the South. Here, his explicitly illustrates the long lasting and definite split between the two economies; his next next utterance the Missouri Compromise only had that had political success in minimizing the divisions, the economic divisions grew in the period 1820-1850; again his highlights failure of the Compromise success in uniting the North and South.

In conclusion, although the Missouri Compromise did, to an extent, succeed in minimizing the divisions between the North and the South from 1820-1850, this was only of a primitive nature. Far greater were the political



(Section A continued) tensions in the 1840's, was without a doubt which went to the Missouri Compromise <sup>1820</sup> was <sup>successful</sup> reduced. Moreover, problems arose which led to the Mexican War which again made Missouri Compromise <sup>politically</sup> less likely economic divisions, with cultural and social implications; ~~the~~ period, and at best, the Compromise of 1820 had short lived political success in minimizing divisions between North and South. Therefore it is necessary to conclude due to the primitive success of a political nature, the Missouri Compromise was reduced by economic factors, as well as the L2 for Mexico which did not have <sup>any</sup> ~~any~~ success in minimizing divisions between the North and South.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This low L4 response puts forward the view that the Missouri Compromise had some success in minimising divisions between North and South in the years 1820 to 1850. Here, the argument is focused and based on reasonable range and depth.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

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

## Question 2

This also proved to be an accessible question. Most candidates were aware of the the major developments relating to African-Americans during Reconstruction (1865-77). Consequently, the majority of responses offered some assessment of the 'promise' and failure' of Reconstruction, with particular emphasis placed on the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, the Freedman's Bureau Act (1866) and the level of white discrimination (eg the 'black codes' and the KKK). Indeed, the strongest candidates demonstrated impressive range and depth in precisely focused answers. Weaker candidates tended to (1) write a chronological narrative account of the main developments without relating them explicitly to the question (2) stray outside the time frame of the question (3) neglect the 'promise' aspect of the question.

In 1965, there was the problem of freed slaves wandering the South. The problem here was that the government had no idea what to do with all these people. Crop-sharing was a clever idea of allowing the slaves to have shares in setting crops that they did the labour for. However, they were being exploited by the ex-slaveowners who did little work & made a sizable profit. So, these methods failed in promising equal rights for the African-Americans. Integration into society was also a failure. Black communities were segregated from whites in cities & towns & did not attend the same churches or schools (many were racially selective) so as an attempt to improve Civil rights it was a failure & in some ways made a more racial gap.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This low Level 3 response attempts to address the question but with limited detail and development. It tends to offer general points rather than specific examples.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

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

### Question 3

Quite a few candidates who attempted this question were let down by a lack of detailed knowledge about the size and influence of the KKK. Numerous low-scoring responses offered sketchy or inaccurate accounts of both. Many of the weakest candidates relied on (1) a simple description of the KKK in the 1920s, together with a few basic references to its membership and impacts (2) a general account of the 'intolerance' of the decade (including immigration and Prohibition) which lacked focus on the question. The best responses were able to provide a focused assessment of the KKK's size and influence by deploying detailed knowledge about the nature/extent of its membership, its political connections and the rapid collapse of its 'moral crusade' image from the mid-1920s.

Possibly the greatest influence the KKK could have had <sup>was</sup> in terms of social achievements, though it could be argued that even these were limited. At its peak the KKK claimed to have support from 15% of the eligible population, while it is also suggested that in 1924-1925 membership reached 4 million. However this support is ~~considerable~~ <sup>considering the</sup> size of the US is not too impressive. It could be argued that the 'Great migration' in the 1920's,

(Section A continued) generally of African-Americans from the rural south to the Urban north was a sign of the influence of the KKK in the key farming areas; although it could simply signify the wish of African-Americans to move north in search of more industrious jobs. In considering the size and influence of the KKK it is important to recognise they in terms of territorial support they experienced success as they became increasingly popular in the mid-west. Additionally they enhanced their support in the south, play a huge role in the 'keep California white' rally in the early 1920's. Clearly in terms of public support <sup>and influence</sup> the KKK was experiencing some degree of progress, therefore the view that they possessed neither substantial support or influence cannot be considered entirely correct. However bearing in mind this was the peak of their popularity, in terms of social influence they were largely unsuccessful, highlighted by lack of support in the northern liberal states and also reinforced by the fleeting nature of their <sup>slight</sup> popularity as they began to lose the little support they had nationwide by 1926. This was to such an extreme extent that by 1930 it had only 30,000 members, despite racial tensions in the north still existing over housing and jobs <sup>since</sup> due to the end of the 'great war' and the 'Great Migration'. Overall in terms of social influence it is accurate to conclude the KKK's support was both fleeting and limited while

(Section A continued) their influence, despite territorial expansion, was also largely limited. However it would possibly be too far to claim they had neither such significant support or influence, bearing in mind the escalation in intimidation with mobs and lynchings, particularly in the Deep South.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

Here, this Level 5 response offers a sustained analysis of the influence of the KKK. The candidate's answer shows impressive range and good depth. It also reaches a nuanced judgement at the end of the extract.

## Question 4

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss the US war economy and to what extent it was responsible for post-war prosperity in America. A significant number of responses also considered the role played by the New Deal in promoting economic growth after 1945 but fewer answers examined the part played by post-war developments up to 1954. Weaker responses tended to (1) offer a general survey of the New Deal which was not linked to the question (2) ignore post-war economic developments which promoted US prosperity. Conversely, the best responses put forward a sustained analysis which critically assessed the role of the war economy, the New Deal and developments after 1945 in bringing about post-war economic growth.

one of these  
~~These~~ factors in which led to prosperity is the New Deal which was set up by Roosevelt ~~after~~ in recovery of the Great Depression in the years of 1929-1930's. The New Deal enabled people to gain more job opportunities. For example The Civilian Conservation Corpse (CCC) <sup>set up in 1933</sup> allowed people to gain literacy skills and job opportunities; they planted a large



(Section A continued) number of trees over the US States and they also installed 65,100 miles ~~of~~ of telephone lines. This was successful as it dealt with Unemployment however it was only ~~not~~ open to white middle-class males which is therefore seen as discrimination to other ethnic minorities. ~~Another Another~~ Although it did lead to prosperity as people were getting a wage. Another Act is the Emergency Banking Act (1933); this gave banks the confidence ~~to open~~ in the banking system. ~~It~~ ~~It~~ It allowed the government to close down ~~the~~ banks and to look at how well they were doing and if they were in a 'fit state' there were to be re-opened. This means that it enabled people to take out loans to help standards of ~~the~~ living. This shows that the New Deal was a significant factor which lead to prosperity.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response illustrates two common weaknesses (1) it puts forward a sketchy description (of some New Deal measures) instead of a detailed analysis (2) it is poorly linked to the question (there is little attempt to explain how the New Deal might have contributed to prosperity in the USA after 1945).

## Question 5

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss the role of slavery as a motive for war between the North and South and then weigh this stated factor against others (such as North-South economic differences and the consequences of Southern secession). Better responses integrated source material and candidates' own knowledge to develop an argument about the reason(s) for the Civil War based on the issues raised by the extracts. These responses cross-referenced the sources extensively to support or challenge particular viewpoints in the process of reaching a judgement. Weaker candidates often relied almost exclusively on the source material and introduced very little own knowledge to develop a line of argument. In addition, some low-scoring answers merely offered 'potted' summaries of each source (often with a little own knowledge included) which prevented cross-referencing and the development of a support/challenge approach.

Source 2 argues that slavery is not the only reason why the north and south went to war. It describes how there were many differences between them, economically speaking, "North favoured high tariffs, the south low ones." It says that secession may have been inevitable "even if the slavery issue had been resolved." Source 1 says that there was more to the slavery issue than visible. For example the south had built everything around slavery "its religion, culture, trade and politics," that the "new southern nationalism was merely looking for an excuse to break the Union."



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Comments

This extract, from a Level 2 response, uses the sources in a superficial way. The candidate comprehends Source 2 and Source 1 and notes that they have different views on the importance of slavery. However, the arguments and evidence from the two sources are not fully developed or cross-referenced, and the candidate fails to integrate own knowledge.



### ResultsPlus

#### Examiner Tip

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



## Question 6

On this question, the majority of responses were able to offer a reasoned explanation for the Confederacy's defeat in the Civil War based on the competing views set out in the three sources (Southern disunity, superior Northern resources and Grant's military leadership). Most candidates could also draw on a sound knowledge of the key events and developments between 1861 and 1865 which helped to determine the outcome. Once again, stronger candidates integrated cross-referenced source material with their own knowledge to put forward a substantiated judgement. Lower scoring responses typically adopted the 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else included little or no own knowledge. A few of the weaker candidates uncritically accepted the Southern disunity viewpoint and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the extracts.

Although this is true it should be pointed out that another key factor which contributed to confederacy defeat was the fact that the North had strong military leadership in contrast to Davis which is pointed out in source 4. Source 6 argues that the Northern commander Grant was 'made for war'. Grant had qualities which allowed him to lead the North into success ~~not~~ in defeating the Confederacy. Source 6 points out that Grant never made the same mistake twice and avoided-

(Section B continued) politics like one plague. Grant was respected and idolized by other military leaders such as Lee and in contrast to other leaders 'he had a common sense, a directness of mind, and a ~~tenacity~~ tenacity that set him apart as a great military commander.' If the ideas portrayed in source 6 are compared to that shown in source 4, it becomes clear that the North had a great advantage in terms of leadership, unlike the South. Grant brought the ~~South~~ North together, whereas Davis caused divisions within the Confederacy resulting in a loss.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response uses the sources well throughout. In this extract, the candidate effectively cross-references Source 4 and Source 6 to stress that the North possessed better leadership with Grant acting as an important military rallying point. After this section, the candidate then uses Source 5 intelligently to discuss how the Union's greater resources reinforced its military advantages.

## Question 7

Most candidates found this question accessible. Overall, the sources were used effectively and appropriate own knowledge was included to develop the argument about Hoover's policies and attitudes. Stronger responses offered a sustained analysis based on the cross-referencing of the extracts and the integration of source material and own knowledge. Low-scoring candidates tended to exhibit two main weaknesses - (1) relying on a descriptive essay which was inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) poor or non-existent integration of source material and own knowledge. Many candidates did not pick up on 'supportive' Source 9's point that Hoover used government power 'too modestly' which would have provided a good cross-referencing opportunity.

(Section B continued) On the other hand, it can be argued that Hoover did not prolong the depression. He took used "government power to check the depression in an unprecedented manner". He used such power to increase "Federal construction" and set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Both measures helped to reinstate the economy and can challenge his "belief in self reliance, minimal government", and Both policies were carried on in the New Deal by Roosevelt which explains why Hoover received little credit for. Also Hoover acted in "an unprecedented manner" as therefore he not in "a Sausage world", did actually to an extent abandon some beliefs such as ~~pro~~ ~~pre~~ those which prevented direct aid relief in 1932 to allow for the first time help for the unemployed from the federal government.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response integrates source material and the candidate's own knowledge to good effect. In this extract, the candidate begins to develop an argument which challenges the stated claim that Hoover prolonged the Depression. Short quotations from the sources and the candidate's own knowledge are deployed effectively to make the case.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

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

## Question 8

This proved to be a popular question. Many candidates made good use of the sources and their own knowledge to develop a confident line of argument about the impact of the New Deal on social and economic conditions in the USA between 1933 and 1940. The strongest candidates offered a sustained source-led analysis with impressive range and depth. Many in this category provided extensive cross-referencing of the sources to emphasise, for example, how the New Deal brought about a partial economic upturn which was given further momentum by the approach of war. Weaker candidates tended to produce (1) a narrative of the main New Deal measures which was inadequately linked to the question (2) a 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach.

In Source ten, the source tells us that the New Deal only brought about partial recovery, which left eight million people unemployed, incomes did not go back to the way they were back in 1929, the New Deal also ~~sent~~ devaled its money to the middle-class men, rather than sharing it equally, and by the late 1930's, support for the New Deal had decreased.

Ho In Source eleven, it states that with the state the country had been in, in 1933, President Roosevelt did a good job with raising the morale of the Americans and also the financial system of

(Section B continued) America. However, the author Peter Fearon does not forget to mention that though there were some positive aspects to the New Deal it had its fair share of problems, but in the long-run, the New Deal seemed to work.

In Source twelve, we are told that though the New Deal did not end the Great Depression, the New Deal was not failing, the economy was improving and unemployment fell steadily. Though it did not return to the level during 1929.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This borderline Level 1/Level 2 response adopts a 'potted' summary approach which merely describes the basic surface features of each source in turn. No attempt has been made to cross-reference the sources or integrate own knowledge. Later in the essay, the candidate produces three brief paragraphs of sketchy own knowledge.

## Summary

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

### Depth Study question

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

### Associated Historical Controversy question

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

## Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code UA028157 June 2011

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

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

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning