

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE History 6HI03 C

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.

ResultsPlus

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 2015

Publications Code UA041787

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the penultimate session of the 6HI03C examination. Many candidates wrote insightful comments which placed them in the higher grade categories. The paper was divided into two sections: Section (A) was an In-Depth Study question, and Section (B) an Associated Historical Controversy question.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than enough for full marks.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions. The ability range of those entering was diverse but the design of the paper allowed all abilities to be catered for. There were also very few rubric errors. By a large majority, more candidates were entered for C2 - The United States, 1917-54: Boom, Bust and Recovery than for C1 - The United States, 1820-77: A Disunited Nation?

One positive was the impression that, in general, candidates were able to offer more specific knowledge, particularly in relation to the controversy questions. The discriminating factor in their relative success in applying the knowledge was how well this was integrated with the arguments in the given sources and the precise demands of the question.

One pleasing trend is that very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. The two main weaknesses in responses which scored less well tended to be: (1) a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis, or (2), informed writing which, whilst analytical in some senses, tended more towards answer a generic version of the given question, e.g. responses that offered seemingly pre-prepared assessments of the successes/failures of Reconstruction (1865-77), rather than the specific question asked in Section A, Question 2. The latter issue was also found across the controversies in Section B, with some answers tending more towards the broader controversy than the question as specifically asked. As a result in such cases, engagement with the sources was also often less successful. Overall though, the paper provided candidates with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source material as and when necessary.

At the higher levels, and related to the issue above, a discriminating factor was often the ability to really explore the key words and phrases in the question, such as 'a complete failure', 'heightened political and social tensions' and 'benefited most groups in American society', as well as the common stems such as 'How far do you agree'. Candidates who convincingly applied their knowledge to exploring these issues were very successful. However, candidates should be wary of forcing the use of these, as there were cases where arguments over the 'extent' or the application of key phrases was simply asserted or misapplied.

The previously noted tendency for candidates to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions was to some extent reduced. Candidates should still be minded that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a solid framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they lacked the detailed knowledge base required to tackle these questions and produced a catch-all commentary on the stipulated topic, with obvious repercussions. The best answers to Section A questions showed some impressive study of 19th and 20th century American history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

Question 1

Strong responses had a clear focus on the economic drawbacks and benefits of slavery for the Southern states in the years 1820-60. At this level, candidates considered both sides of the debate with range and depth before reaching an explicit judgement. High-scoring answers typically deployed a variety of supported arguments (such as Southern wages were depressed due to slave competition, slavery hindered industrial development, slavery was a good investment and permitted increased cotton acreages and profits, and slave labour was used successfully in some Southern industries). Weaker responses tended to offer (1) narratives about slavery or the Southern economy in the years 1820-60 with few or no links to the issue of slavery offering the Southern states 'few economic benefits', or (2) sketchy development of one side of the argument.

SECTION A

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

During the years 1820-60, ~~there~~ the southern states were mainly slave societies, meaning that slaves were the foundation of economic and social structure. There were many benefits with ~~this~~ this system as it ^{enabled} brought ~~the~~ 'King Cotton' - the boom in cotton sales in the South - and also had such high value. However, there were also ^{economic} costs to ~~the~~ slavery.

'King Cotton' was the boom in sales of cotton around the southern states in which they were said to "eat, drink and dream cotton" as it was such a major product in the South, cotton defined the south. This included the South supplying the whole world with cotton. ~~the~~ The cotton was produced on plantations in which slaves were made to work. The slaves on plantations meant more and more cotton was being produced as owners would make men work harder

(Section A continued) for more profits. This meant that slaves were effectively the primary source in enabling such a huge profit-making product to become as significant as it did. This suggests that slaves were in fact an economic benefit to southern states.

On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that ~~the~~ slaves actually brought economic disadvantages such as ~~stopping~~ ^{preventing} the progression of southern economy. Southerners were happy with slaves as they provided work and they did not have to pay them, therefore increasing their profits. This meant that the South were not keen on industrialising and modernising their ~~industry~~ economy as the North did as they felt it was unnecessary and would

rather continue as a slave society. This suggests that the fact that the south had slaves meant they did not progress their economy to fit with the rest of the world and because of this had to use the north to export their cotton which meant a proportion of ~~£~~ their profits ended up in the north. Therefore ~~the~~ slaves brought few economic

(Section A continued) benefits to the south in the years 1820-60 and ~~they~~ in fact brought ~~some~~ disadvantages.

~~However, they also~~

the slaves did bring benefits to the economy as they had a net worth a lot. The slaves were seen as property ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~therefore~~ ^{therefore} had value^s. In 1860, slaves were estimated to have a value of \$3 million. This meant that the average slaveowner was five times wealthier than the average Northerner and ten times wealthier than the average non-slaveholding Southerner. This suggests that slaves benefited the southern economy in ^{the years} 1820-60 as ~~they made~~ ~~southerners~~ ~~wealthy~~ ~~and~~ brought wealth to the southern economy.

However, it can be argued that there were only few benefits. This is because ~~the~~ ^{the} slaves...

(Section A continued) In conclusion, it is clear that in the years 1820-60 slaves only brought few benefits to the south. This is because although they brought wealth to the economy through their value, it was a minor benefit when looking at the impact it had in slowing the southern economy.

This is because southerners lacked motivation to progress in to modern times and to industrialise as the North did. This meant that even though the South were exporting tons of bales of cotton, and that cotton was a major profit-making industry, they had to export through ~~the~~ the North as their industry enabled worldwide exports. This meant that a proportion of profits went to the North.

Overall, it is clear that slaves and the idea of a slaves society, provided more costs than it did weaknesses with the biggest cost being their underdeveloped society which made a heavy impact on their economy.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This low Level 3 response is broadly analytical, and attempts to address the question, but offers limited range and depth. As a result, the arguments put forward concerning the economic benefits/drawbacks of slavery for the Southern states tend to lack detail and development.



ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

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

Question 2

Higher-scoring responses had a sharp focus on the extent to which failure outweighed success during Grant's Presidency (1869-77) and addressed both sides of the argument. At this level, candidates considered a range of relevant developments or issues (such as Grant's malleability and lack of political experience, his inconsistent attitude towards the Southern states, his Presidency was tarnished by corruption and scandals, he approved Southern state re-entries into the Union, and, during his Presidency, the 15th Amendment, Civil Rights Act (1875), Enforcement Acts (1870-71) and Klan Act (1872) were introduced). Lower-scoring candidates tended to produce (1) narratives about the major measures and developments under Grant's Presidency with few or no links to the issue of success or failure (2) weak development of one side of the argument, and (3) pre-prepared 'success/failure of Reconstruction' responses which did not engage properly with the question set.

SECTION A

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Politically, Grant was able to ~~re~~ reintegrate the South back into the union, by refraining from military force in reconstruction, implying his presidency was a success. Nevertheless, whilst Grant's presidency did reunite the USA, it allowed reconstruction to completely stall, ~~and~~ suggesting it failed. However, Grant's presidency gave birth to the 'Gilded Age', as weak economic policy and corruption. Thus, though not completely, Grant's presidency was a failure.

From a political standpoint, Grant's presidency was successful in that it improved North-South relations once and for all. The Bargain of 1877, which allowed the Republicans to win in Florida, in return for a railway to the Pacific being built across Texas and an end to Union military occupation in the South, allowed the two regions of the USA to reconcile. Thus, Grant's presidency was not a complete failure because it, arguably, united the USA once and for all.

(Section A continued)

by helping to improve Southern infrastructure, a failure of his predecessor Johnson, whose presidency saw a mere 422 miles of railway being built in the South. Moreover, Grant's refusal to intervene in Mississippi's electoral violence in 1875 meant that the South no longer felt oppressed by Union armies, though it clearly was a corrupt election as Mississippi had a 55% black majority, and a Democratic government was elected there. Thus, from a purely political view, Grant's presidency was very successful, as it reunited the USA again.

Nevertheless, Grant's presidency did result in the failure of Reconstruction. By allowing Democratic governments to, once again, spring up across the South, freedmen were essentially slaves again. For example, slave codes were re-written into 'black codes', which set out segregation.

blows for Southern blacks. In turn, reconstruction failed and blacks were, once again, second class citizens in the South. Moreover, the Freedmen's Bureau, which had proved a vital part of giving blacks a place in society, was closed down, after its popularity dropped, in 1870. Thus, Grant's presidency was a failure because he allowed the

(Section A continued) Freedmen's Bureau, a vital organ of post-civil war America, to be shut down before its job of educating and finding employment for freedmen (Fiske Universities, for example) was complete.

Finally, Grant's presidency was indeed a failure, albeit not entirely, because it was plagued by economic scandals. Famously, for example, was Tammany Hall in NY, which, led by William Tweed, bribed immigrants into voting for it. Another scandal was the Credit Mobilier controversy, where railway executives hired themselves out to make their own profit, which should have gone to the government. Thus, as a result of these scandals, Grant was constantly preoccupied, allowing the primary goal, reconstruction, to completely fail. Moreover, the presidency of Grant was stricken by his economic policy. This resulted in further blows to his credibility as a leader, especially after the Panic of 1873, which is seen by many to be the nail in the coffin for reconstruction. Thus, Grant's presidency was indeed more of a failure than it was

a success, because it resulted in the failure of post-war reconstruction, which, in turn, doomed black civil rights for the next 80 odd years.

(Section A continued)

In conclusion, Grant's presidency was indeed a failure, albeit not a complete one. Whilst he did stimulate reconciliation between the North and South, by improving infrastructure and ~~and~~ ruling out further military occupation, Grant's failure failed to complete Reconstruction. Had Grant been more willing to enforce Reconstruction and salvage the Freedmen's Bureau, both the civil rights of African-Americans and a stable economic future, where blacks could contribute to economic growth more, would have been achieved. Moreover, Grant's presidency failed due to high level corruption and weak economic policy leading to financial crises like the panic of 1873. Put simply, Grant was weak as a president, and too unwilling to cause tensions to rise between the North and South again by ~~and~~ completing Reconstruction.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate has produced a mid-Level 4 answer by offering reasonable depth and range of knowledge within a focused analytical structure. The argument has been developed in terms of a success/failure format which is rounded off in the conclusion with an overall judgement about Grant's presidency. Given the question set, this is a very sensible approach. Greater range and depth (for e.g. on the successes of Grant's presidency) would have pushed this response further into Level 4.

Question 3

High-scoring responses demonstrated good range and depth in assessing how far the USA suffered from heightened political and social tensions in the years 1919-29. At this level, candidates focused on the extent to which (1) issues/developments such as immigration, Prohibition, the rise of the KKK etc. heightened tensions, and (2) tensions were lowered by developments such as immigration legislation, the decline of the KKK from the mid-1920s, and growing affluence and rising living standards. Low-scoring answers were typically either (1) weak narratives with no real analysis of the extent to which the USA suffered from heightened political and social tensions in the years 1919-29, or (2) focused but largely unsupported responses. A few weak answers offered a thinly developed commentary on one side of the argument.

SECTION A

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 Question 2
 Question 3 Question 4

~~Plan - intro YES ^{quite far significantly} greatly heightened ~~the~~ social + political intolerance
 political - immigration acts ↑ mins dec - 1919 (rank cry)
 Social - KKK, % communism Palmer raids
 ↳ race riots - Harlem rise nativism + racism
 immigration ↳ sacco + vanzetti
 prohibition weren urban rural
short intro 1919-29
~~race riots, KKK ↳ lynching Harlem counter hitler. 65% take = decline KKK
 social + political
 social intolerance backed up by political ~~en~~ legislation
 acts, KKK sacco vanzetti - communism
 Palmer raids
 Par 3 ~~urban~~ communism palmer crime
 Par 4 urban vs rural
 prohibition KKK reduced sacco + vanzetti
 weren scene mid~~~~

In the USA during the years 1919 the USA significantly suffered from heightened political and social tensions. Due to a general decrease in social and political tolerance in this period, as a result of WWI

(Section A continued)

In this period there was a general rise in racism in both urban and rural areas.

~~In urban areas~~ From 1914 to 1920

500,000 African Americans migrated North to the cities to find jobs. This caused a rise in racism in the cities

Shown through the 1919 race riots where 25 occurred across the country. The main one in Chicago where during

1916-1918 there had been a 46% increase in the African American population. ~~Racism in Chicago~~ In the race riot

in Chicago 23 African Americans were killed and 1000 ~~from~~ African American families homes were burnt by

protesters. This was due to increased labour competition

from the rise in black people in the cities and this competition was exacerbated by the 1920-21 Great Recession where

they were blamed for the lack of jobs as they were cheap labour.

~~There was~~ ~~therefore~~ ~~there~~ ~~was~~ ~~heightened~~ ~~social~~ ~~intolerance~~ ~~towards~~ ~~African~~ ~~Americans~~ ~~in~~ ~~this~~ ~~period~~. ^{and} ^{knives}

However in urban areas there was a move towards African Americans gaining equality. Known as the 'Harlem Renaissance'

in New York City. Where the NAACP promoted African American culture to show equality through their values and skills such as Langston Hughes and his poetry. However

on the whole throughout this period African Americans faced employment and housing discrimination ^{as they lived in slums} due to social tensions between the races.

African Americans throughout this period rising

(Section A continued) lived in ~~the~~ the rural south where around 85% of them lived. They faced extreme violence and racism from the KKK who were a racist group who opposed African Americans and many others. They were hunted in the rural south in small towns and carried out around ~~more~~⁹⁰ lynchings of black people between 1919 and 1929. This shows extreme racism and violence towards black people in the south as they were killed for their skin colour. ~~It~~ It supports that there was significant social tensions in the period especially between white and black people in the ~~the~~ rural south ^{however it could be argued that this occurred as the popularity of the KKK decreased in the 1920's} generally African Americans faced racism in both urban and rural areas after WWI where there became a heightened social intolerance of ~~black~~ black people and therefore led to social tensions.

Also between 1919 there was a rise in nativism, a fear of foreigners. Due to the WWI where ~~after~~ ^{after} there was an increased immigration to the USA due to its stability post war. ~~the USA took on a large number of immigrants~~ ~~which led to a rise in~~ ~~nationalism~~ ~~and~~ ~~socially~~ ~~and~~ ~~politically~~ ~~tensions~~. In this period between 1919 and 1921 there was a 141,000 to 805,000 influx of immigrants. This led to a rise in nativism as ~~immigrants~~ it led to labor competition similarly with African Americans and ~~and~~ and fear of communism especially from southern and eastern European immigrants. This fear led to social and political tensions as between 1919 - ~~to~~ 1920 the Palmer raids were carried out in the USA where the US general attorney carried out attacks on left wing organisations

(Section A continued) due to America's fear of communism wanting to overthrow their capitalist system. In total 5000 people were arrested without trial and 6500 people were deported. This act shows ^{heightened} political and social tensions in response to the 1917 Bolshevik revolution and birth of international ^{communism} ~~movements~~.

Social and political tensions in the USA against immigrants were backed up by political legislation in the 1920s.

As in 1921 the Emergency Immigration Act was passed which replaced quotas on immigration, limiting it to 3% of the nationals living in the USA in the 1911 census.

This was a result of increased labor competition in the 1920-21 recession creating heightened social tensions due to lack of jobs.

And as this act especially limited Southern and Eastern Europeans. It can be argued ~~that~~ this act was also a result of heightened social and political tensions towards ^{shown through the poster results} ~~communism~~ ↑

which led to intolerance and therefore restriction of immigration from Southern and Eastern Europe. Also in 1924 the government passed another immigration act, the 1924 Johnson Reed Act

which put a ceiling of 150,000 immigrants per year and banned any Japanese people. This showed a general social

intolerance towards all immigrants especially Japanese. This immigration act was during the boom period where there were

lots of jobs and immigrants couldn't be blamed for this showing ~~social~~ a social intolerance towards them just

for the sole reason of being immigrants. Overall this political legislation of restricting immigration shows ^{significantly} ↑ heightened social

(Section A continued) and political tensions in this period due to immigration and a general national attitude of nativism.

Between 1914 and 1929 there were social and political tensions between urban and rural areas. Prohibition was a main source of tensions where it was mainly supported in rural areas especially through rural groups such as the KKK and the Women's Christian Temperance Union. However in the cities it wasn't followed as there was a high supply of alcohol due to organised crime and the popularity of speakeasies.

Also ~~many~~ ~~protest~~ Christian fundamentalism was very popular in rural areas whereas the cities were more liberal. Seen as seen through the Scott trial in Tennessee where a man was put on trial for teaching evolution. The trial became a media event and showed the differing beliefs in rural and urban areas such as when the prosecutor said he believed Eve was made from Adam's rib the urbanites laughed at the ridiculousness. Showing social tensions and an urban to rural divide between ideals. Rural areas in general were less tolerant towards immigrants and African Americans.

Shown through the KKK and the Sacco and Vanzetti trial where in 1926 two Italian immigrants were prosecuted for armed robbery and murder although they had an alibi only two birds of witness said they weren't there, they were charged and executed in 1927. This verdict was supported by small rural towns in the south but it shocked liberals in the cities.

This supports ^{heightened} social tensions between urban and rural areas.

(Section A continued)

To conclude due to a general rise in racism and nativism as a result of WW1 there were increased social and political tensions. ~~This~~ This was a significant rise in tensions as it was felt nationwide and resulted in increased discrimination and some cases even death through the KKK.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This candidate has produced a high Level 4 answer by offering detailed knowledge within a focused analytical structure. Care has been taken to (1) focus on heightened political and social tensions and (2) develop the argument across several issues (e.g. racism against black Americans, the rise of nativism and concerns about immigration, and rural-urban divisions). Consequently the response has good range and depth.

Question 4

The best responses offered good range and depth, and had a confident grasp of the factors promoting US prosperity in the years 1945-54. High-scoring candidates considered the impact of the booming wartime US economy and other factors (such as post-war domestic and international developments which strengthened the USA's economic position, and the impact of the New Deal in the 1930s) before reaching a judgement. Lower-scoring candidates tended to produce (1) a largely descriptive account of the wartime and post-war US economy (or even the New Deal) with few links to the question set (2) relatively focused but mainly unsupported responses, and (3) answers which partially developed one side of the argument.

SECTION A

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1

Question 2

Question 3

Question 4

Prosperity in the US from 1945-54 was due to a variety of reasons, consumerism, new industry and wars, Trade union control, post-war federal intervention and the war itself. The most significant of these factors is the post war federal intervention which ~~set~~ consolidated the growth experienced during the war.

During the war Americas favourable position on the world stage enabled it unprecedented growth which would lead on to prosperity. The lend lease scheme set up by the US had it supplying 175% of USSR soldiers diets as well as 1 million rifles and 50,000 tanks. This scheme meant that the US could employ more people and create a war economy as well as becoming a creditor nation.

Unemployment, as a result, fell to less than 1% which meant people could save

(Section A continued) up for what was later called the consumer boom. Not only were the workforce mobilised but organisations such as the office of Price Administration were set up which helped regulate the economy, the fact industries such as car manufacture were so quickly converted to arms manufacture meant the US could supply arms and supplies quickly. The effect of the war and increased military spending was so great that as a result when spending dropped in 1946 by \$20bn 1 million defence jobs were lost which negatively impacted the economy. The most important effect of the war was the creation of the Bretton Woods system which created the IMF, World Bank and WTO. As a result of the system all currency was tied to the USD and gold reserves of which the US owned 2/3 of the world's supply. This was so significant because it opened up global markets to the US and allowed it to have massive influence over foreign markets, as a result the US supplied over half of the world's goods post war. The prosperity of the US

(Section A continued) was certainly linked to the effects of the war because internationally it put the US almost as a hegemon economically which allowed growth to flourish under economic liberalism.

The post war Federal intervention was ~~was the~~ most significant factor as it enabled the economy domestically to grow unencumbered. The 30% tax cut allowed industries and businesses to reinvest in more factories and which helped bump up employment and thereby consumption. This was further consolidated by after the 1948 election minimum wage increases as well as the construction of million low income housing units. Furthermore the effects of the Servicemen's readjustment Act or GI bill of rights enabled 2.3 million servicemen to enroll in colleges as well as allocating \$15bn to them ^{in 1950s} for investment in new homes and businesses. The Employment Act also further committed the government to increased employment and working standards. All of this federal action helped to secure the prosperity and

(Section A continued) was vital to the continuation of such a strong economy, leaving it the most significant factor. $\$$

Consumerism further increased the GDP and prosperity of the economy by supplying demand. A whole new market was opened up by teens having overall an extra $\$$ 1bn to spend, this enabled more products to be introduced. The creation of suburbs and new fashionable goods like refrigerators and air conditioning further increased demand. The baby boom and savings accumulated during the war of $\$$ 37bn enabled people to spend more on new goods as well as growing markets in children's toys. This was all propped up by the average price rise of 20% compared to the wage rise of 70%. Hire purchase even increased 800% from 1945-57, though slightly after the given period it illustrated a period of sustained growth and consumerism. This consumerism was important as it drove and sustained the economy creating a demand for supply and allowing

(Section A continued)

for more profit and employment, again left to grow unkindered due to good federal ^{policy.} intervention.

New industries also helped sustain growth as it created more employment opportunities. The creation of the H-bomb in turn formed a new nuclear energy industry which led to more research and development. Though the cold war ~~socially~~ created tension it drove increased military spending which helped develop new products such as (orange) chewing gum which became an important industry of its own. New developments such as rigid plastics of acetate were able to be used in consumer goods and as transistor revolutionised electronics enabling the prices of ~~FR~~ TV's and radios to go down, further catalysing consumerism. These new developments were significant in creating new markets and catering to consumerism but came as a result of military spending which was federal intervention. New industries also linked to the export market which was opened up as a result of the war and the Bretton Woods system

(Section A continued) this could also make an argument for war being the second most significant factor causing prosperity from 1945-54.

Finally, the curbing of trade union action also allowed for GNP growth and for the economy to grow unfettered.

Curbing of trade union action came after 1946 because Truman vetoed the extension of the Office of Price Administration food prices ~~double~~ rose 16% within a week, the price of beef doubled. As wages were cut as a result of ~~the~~ this, combined with job losses from the defence sector, many people went on strike. In 1946 the United Miners Association walked out, 4.5 million others did also causing the economy to be crippled for 40 days.

Truman passed the Taft-Hartley Act as a response in 1947 not allowing 'closed shop' strikes and being able to order a 60 day cooling off period. This power over trade unions was deeply significant as though it was a terrible check against workers rights it also allowed the economy to grow and further the trend of governmental regulation to continue. It could be argued

(Section A continued) here, however, that this was simply another example of post-war federal intervention and attributes rather ~~to~~ that factors significance rather than being a stand alone factor.

Overall one would argue that it was the post war federal intervention that caused the prosperity of 1945-54 because it allowed the other factors to take effect. Had there been weak or ineffectual intervention post-war consumerism may not have continued, unemployment may have risen and wages may have fallen ^{as well as trade unions eroding the economy.}. The government had the initiative to capitalise upon the profits reaped by war and this was the single most important cause of prosperity. The events during the war laid the foundations for prosperity with the increased government intervention of the CPA and the creation of the Bretton Woods system but without post war intervention the prosperity would not have been as sustained. Consumerism drove the economy and allowed for new industries to be created and thrive but would have been inhibited had the minimum wage not have steadily increased. Finally, new industries and the curb on trade unions

(Section A continued) were largely effects of increased military spending combined with tax cuts allowing R+D, trade unions was simply more federal intervention so cannot be a stand alone factor leading post war intervention and governmental policy the most significant factor in causing prosperity 1945-54.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response offers a precisely focused and sustained analysis of the reasons for US prosperity in the years 1945-54. Strong range and depth is evident with informed coverage of the impact of the Second World War and important post-war developments. The arguments deployed are reinforced with detailed support throughout and the essay is rounded off with a reasoned judgement in the conclusion.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

When answering a 'stated factor' question, make sure you consider the role of other factors as well to give your response range.

Question 5

High-scoring responses were firmly focused on the issue of an economic clash between the Northern and Southern elites in accounting for the outbreak of the Civil War. At this level, candidates were able to link the stated factor to others in the sources and their own knowledge. Most also recognised the interaction of factors, particularly the links between slavery, economic outlook and secession. Lower-scoring answers tended to generalise about the reasons for the outbreak of the Civil war in 1861 without offering specific development on the 'economic clash between the Northern and Southern elites'. Other weak responses simply described the evidence for the outbreak of the war presented in the three sources with little cross-referencing or integration of own knowledge for support.

SECTION B

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 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

The Civil War was fought between the years 1861-1865 and claimed the lives of over 600,000 Americans. There are many factors which explain the outbreak of the Civil War. One being the economic clash between the Northern and Southern elite. There was the conflicting theory about the future of national policy and lastly another factor to consider is Lincoln's election.

Firstly, Zinn in Source 1 puts the view forward that the Civil War was caused by an economic clash between the Northern and Southern elites. This is shown through the phrase "policy clashes between the South and North... it was a clash of elites" which suggests it was not just an economic clash between the North and South, but sub-categorised into elitist groups. Zinn's argument can be backed up by the fact

That in the era of Andrew Jackson the 1828 tariff was put forward to protect ^{the interests of} Northern industry. The tariff conflicted with the interests of the South, in

(Section B continued) particularly South Carolina, who threatened to secede. This highlights the Civil War was caused

by an elitist economic clash because their interests were extremely different and events such as the 1828 tariff show their economic interests were too different to remain in the Union together much longer. David B Light leads credit to this by suggesting "The South were raising capitalists like the North" which implies the South and North's economic elites were too similar to remain in the Union together

therefore leading to Civil War. ~~However~~ ^{the} ~~the~~ credibility of ^{such a} ~~the~~ ^{theory} ~~is~~ ^{is} ~~to~~ ^{to} be questioned. Zinn argues it was a clash between the Northern and Southern elite, ~~however~~ in the North and South the richest 10% owned 68% of the wealth.

The elites were very similar in terms of how much they earned therefore suggesting their was a ^{and} ~~clash~~ ^{clash} ~~and~~ ^{therefore} ~~is~~ a reason to why the war broke out. [continued later down]

* This can be ^{linked up} ~~also~~ ^{as they both retained economic dominions} ~~referenced~~ with source 2 which also claims there was an economic clash. It states that "conflict over banking reserves, tariffs, internal improvements" which further implies economic clash was a key factor in why tensions were so heated and therefore why war broke out.

Furthermore the source also states "slave interests opposed all that". This is a credible line of argument because

(Section B continued)

The North and South upto 1861 when war broke out were very divided over the issue of slavery. Events such as Uncle Tom's Cabin shamed Northerners making money off of the South's society, therefore further lending credit to the argument it was an economic clash between elites which caused the war. Overall after weighing up the credibility of evidence it can be seen the economic clash between the political elite was a key factor in the outbreak of the Civil War. It ~~is~~ highlighted that the Northern and Southern elite clashed economically and that they could no longer stay united.

Secondly Nye and Morpago put the view forward in source 2 that "the war was truly a civil war" to decide which theory of government should become the basis of future national policy" which suggests the North and South were politically different. This can be backed up by the fact that over the issue of slavery, they had completely different beliefs. The Kansas Nebraska Act of 1854 was voted along sectional lines with 90% of Southerners voting for it and 64% of Northerners against it, highlighting how politically different their views were. This can be backed by Douglas's statement during the period by stating "This is going to

(Section B continued)

create one hell of a storm" implying even during the time period it was evident to see how different they actually were. This can be backed up by source 3 which states "Southern extremists as a triumph of abolitionist intent, like John Brown" which further implies they were politically divided on views such as slavery. This can be backed up by the fact events such as John Brown's raid caused a real uproar in the North and South, further suggesting how politically different they were. Moreover the credibility of the line of argument put forward by Nye and Morphy needs to be questioned. It can be argued that the South within themselves were politically divided and not just a North vs South ~~the~~ split. Although 7 states initially seceded, these were only lower Southern states and a lot of upper Southern states did not at first. Maryland, Kentucky, Missouri and Delaware even stayed loyal to the Union. The South itself were not politically united therefore the view that the North had one clear view and the South another can be discredited. This can be further backed up by the fact a lot of Southern states had 'cooperationists' who did not agree either with seceding or felt the time was not right, highlighting the political divide was not just between the North and

(Section B continued)

South themselves suggesting the reason for Civil War was not due to a political divide. Overall it can be suggested ~~the~~ ^{which} theory of government should become the basis of future national policy was not a key factor in the outbreak of the Civil War as the South themselves had very different political views therefore suggesting there was no coherent North South divide.

Lastly Reynolds puts the view forward in Source 3 that Lincoln's election was the main cause of the American Civil War. This can be shown through the phrase "As Lincoln prophesied... liberty and slavery could not exist". This suggests Lincoln's election ~~marks~~ was the turning point and the North and South could no longer remain united.

This can be backed up by former who state "Lincoln's election was the green light secessionists had been waiting for". The fact Lincoln won 40% of the votes ~~no Southern states~~ and but carried no Southern states highlights the South were completely against Lincoln and what they thought to be was a conspiracy against slavery. This can be backed up by the fact in 1861 at the Virginia Peace Convention the South sent no delegates because

(Section B continued)

They felt they could not continue in the Union with Lincoln in power. This can be backed up by Zinn's ^{insource} study "I have always seen Lincoln and the Republicans as making continuation of their present and prosperous way of life impossible" further suggesting the South ~~could not stay~~ ^{with the abolition} attached to the Union with Lincoln ^{with his abolitionist views} as president hence being a cause for the outbreak of Civil War.

However the credibility of the line of argument put forward by Reynolds needs to be questioned.

Lincoln never actually said he wanted to destroy slavery, just prevent its expansion. Even if Lincoln wanted to destroy slavery, his powers were limited by Congress which he did not control. His powers were also limited by the Constitution which states he could do no such thing. Furthermore

it can be argued Lincoln's election did not lead to the outbreak of the Civil War, but rather secession. Therefore proving Lincoln's election was not a defining factor in the outbreak of the war. Overall after weighing up the credibility of evidence it can be seen

Lincoln's election was not enough to cause ~~the~~ Civil War, as he never explicitly said he wanted to destroy slavery. Furthermore his election if anything led to secession, not

(Section B continued) immediate Civil War.

To conclude it can be argued the Civil War was caused by the economic clash between the Northern and Southern elite. Their overall economic differences and conflicting ideologies highlighted they could no longer remain part of a united nation. This is also backed up by the credibility of what Jim in Source 1 states. There are however other factors to consider such as political differences and Lincoln's election. However the credibility of the lines of argument put forward in source 2 and 3 discredit these viewpoints. Therefore ultimately suggesting it was the economic clash between the Northern and Southern elite which caused the Civil War.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 3 response on the cause(s) of the American Civil War illustrates two common limitations in answers to the Controversy question. Although the candidate cross references the sources, the links are often superficial and only modest own knowledge is added to develop the argument. Consequently, the analysis has limited range and depth. The extracts need to be more rigorously cross-referenced and more detailed own knowledge included.



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 essay.

Question 6

Stronger responses identified and developed arguments for and against the proposition from the sources, and considered to what extent the North's victory was due to the military skills of Grant and Sherman. At this level, candidates weighed the stated factor against superior Northern/inferior Southern resources and morale, integrating relevant own knowledge and then reaching an explicit, supported judgement. Lower-scoring responses often adopted a weak 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else included little or no own knowledge in support of their argument. Some weak answers uncritically accepted a familiar viewpoint (e.g. the North's superior economic strength) and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the sources. Largely narrative accounts of the Civil War figured at this level too.

SECTION B

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 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

Plan

- Intro: External debate - but I'm in it for Rowley (resources) - leadership important (Grant etc) - but impossible without resources.
- Para 1: focus is on military L. ~~Grant~~ ^{Sherman =} slash & burn → Georgia (example) → deflate CSA morale (cross-ref) - due to lack of indus. centre (S5).
Grant = motivated forces - linked up Sherman → superior over Lee - concentrated in VA. BATA
- Para 2: industry: railways enable North to get to battle (fig. cross-ref), manpower advantage (fig) - e.g. Antietam (like to S6). Firearms also - easier to gain upper hand (e.g. Gettys). Refs!
- Para 3: ~~Morale~~ ^{Adaptability (transform)} - 1 in 7 confeds, 1 in 10 Union.
Lincoln - Emanc. Procl vs. Cornerston (ref S6 - compare to other sources). Cabinets of both etc.
- Conc: Resources - as whilst others are impo. underlines them - needed to fight & motivate.

Answer

All the historians in this question outline an external argument (an argument that uses Union superiority as the central cause for their victory over the Confederacy), but Ranley's emphasis on superior Union resources seems to hold the most weight and validity.

Whilst "risk-taking" and "talented" military leadership (as outlined by Keegan) ^{was} ~~is~~ crucial to Union victory, turning point battles and campaigns (such as Sherman's ~~the~~ March through Georgia) could not have been won without Union manpower, "financial and industrial strength". Similarly, the transformational leadership qualities of Lincoln (as shown by his usage of the Emancipation Proclamation to motivate troops) and consequent rises in Union morale, would have had little effect ~~to~~ on military performance had the Union ~~been~~ ~~if~~ foreseen outnumbered.

However, the military skills of Grant and Sherman were crucial in winning the war for the Union. This was demonstrated most clearly in late 1864, when (by taking

(Section B continued)

an advantage of a gap in Confederacy (CSA) defenses in Tennessee) Sherman marched Union troops through Georgia, turning Atlanta (the state capital) and Savannah (a major port) to the ground. Sherman understood the moral effect of his campaign on "the enemy's will to resist" - as both he and Grant knew that, as the ^{CSA had} ~~only~~ ^{ma} few industrial centres outside of New Orleans, the most effective to "crush Southern military resistance" was to destroy CSA civilian settlements, hurting their morale and causing them to ^{therefore} falter on the battle - giving the Union a victory. This strategy proved to be successful, as after Sherman's March through Georgia, the CSA forces were demoralised sufficiently to concede defeat at Appomattox in 1865 (the final battle of the War). This supports Keegan's argument as to the cruciality of the "unceasing aggressiveness" and high quality military leadership, whilst Farmer ^{implicitly} explores the importance of such strategies in destroying "soldier morale" in the CSA, as such strategies shattered the CSA will to resist and allowed Union victory. This is something that is ignored by Ranley - who fails to make the connection between

(Section B continued) the demoralising of the CSA and superior Union resources - the most important correction.

"The predominance of the North in manpower and resources allowed the Union to win victories over the CSA and demoralise their forces - securing Union victory. Ranley mentions the Union "population of 22 million" (over the CSA's "9 million"), ~~but fails to expand~~ ^{as a reason for} Union victory. However, he fails to expand on this - the Union, in 1860, had 3.5 million men of military age, whereas the CSA only had 1 million such men, meaning "the South as [was]... woefully unprepared to wage a modern war" against the Union, whose ~~own~~ manpower advantage allowed them to win at crucial battles (such as Antietam and ~~Appomattox~~ ^{Gettysburg}), causing victory. Also, whilst ~~great~~ ^{of the Union} battles were "costly in casualties", the fact that "three-quarters [71%, in 1860] of the USA's railway mileage" was located in the Union meant it was easier to transport large numbers of Union troops ~~to~~ from across the North to key battles (such as Vicksburg, which, whilst taking place in the CSA, is an example of how Union railway links to the Mississippi River proved

(Section B continued)

vital in transporting many troops to battle). This allowed the "aggressiveness and relentlessness" of Grant and Sherman's tactics to be effective, as without "advantage in... men," such bold tactics would have led to defeat due to outnumbering by the CSA (such as at First Manassas in July 1861). Ranley's argument could be further enhanced if he had mentioned that the ^{United} Union ^{States} produced 97% of US firearms in 1860, and as "defeat caused defeatism," the victories such as ~~a~~ Superiority in arms caused (such as at Gettysburg, where Meade's forces used fire power to overwhelm the CSA assault on Cemetery Hill - causing Union victory at this battle in July 1863) meant that the South was sufficiently demoralised to be eventually defeated - meaning (in contrast to Keegan's emphasis on military leadership) morale was not only affected by Union military leadership, but by their manpower advantage ~~and~~ and industrial advantage in battle (adding an extra dimension to former's emphasis on morale).

It is also worth bearing in mind the potential of Lincoln's transformational leadership to ^{help} cause Union victory. By using

(Section B continued) The Emancipation Proclamation to turn the Civil War from "a battle of armies to a conflict of societies" (Foner), by making the Union cause ^{spec} ~~spec~~ ^{unambiguously} anti-slavery from January 1863 onwards, Lincoln ensured that "the morale of Union soldiers was high (as they were motivated by a moral cause), ensuring that only 1 in 10 Union soldiers deserted, compared to 1 in 7 CSA soldiers. This allowed the Union to have an "advantage in... men on the battlefield, leading to a greater chance of Union victory, meaning Lincoln's ability to increase "morale" was nearly as crucial to Union success as industrial and manpower resources (in contrast to Ranley's industry and manpower focused argument).

In conclusion, Union "advantage in... men, iron, food, railroads and ships (and firearms) was the most important cause of Union victory. This is because, whilst Keegan argued convincingly for the importance "increasing aggressiveness" in Grant and Sherman's military leadership - ~~the~~ Such ability ^{would} have been undermined had Union commanders not had sufficient manpower, infrastructure, arms and

(Section B continued) food (in 1860, 80% of US wheat came from Northern States, along with 94% pig iron) to commandeer. Whilst Rowley fails to link his argument to the devastating morale of the South CSA, it is clear to see that Union superiority of resources allowed massive Union assaults (such as that through Georgia in 1864) on the CSA that ensured their ^{in the end} victory. The march through Georgia could not have occurred without Union superiority in manpower). Factors such as political and military leadership were crucial to Union victory, but they were either ~~not~~ ^{themselves} enabled by, or overshadowed by (as is the cause of superior political leadership) Union "advantage" in manpower, as argued by Rowley and not Keegan and Farmer.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 5 response possesses several strengths. The candidate uses the sources provided, together with detailed own knowledge, to make an informed assessment of the relative importance of a range of factors, including the military skills of Grant and Sherman, the North's superior resources and Lincoln's leadership. This integrated approach is then rounded off with a clear judgement in the conclusion.

Question 7

The strongest responses demonstrated a firm grasp of the controversy over the reasons for the 1929-33 Depression in the USA and assessed the source arguments confidently before reaching an explicit, supported judgement. At this level, own knowledge of the controversy (e.g. the problems of the international economy or the structural weaknesses of the US economy) was convincing and firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources. Weaker answers often relied on a descriptive account of 1929-33 which was inadequately linked to both the question and the sources provided. Lower-scoring candidates were also likely to adopt a weak 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else include little or no own knowledge in support of their argument. A few responses uncritically accepted a familiar viewpoint (e.g. the role of international economic problems or US government policies) to explain the Depression and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the sources.

SECTION B

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

There were many reasons for the Great Depression in 1929, namely the poor international economy, the US banking and business system, federal intervention, overproduction and unequal distribution of wealth. Harrison argues that the international economic problems were the main cause of depression as does Boyer to an extent. Boyer also argues the unstable foundations for boom as a reason for depression, Shlaes argues that federal intervention was the main cause for depression. It was the ~~foundations of boom~~ ^{federal intervention}, one would argue, that was more significant as a factor attributing to depression.

The international economic climate was fragile in the 1920's as a result when the US banking system collapsed so did the world economy. Harrison argues that as 'the world economy was largely stagnant in the 1920's [it] seriously limited export markets

(Section B continued) for American goods' this was largely true especially as post war Britain and Germany had gone into economic slumps. This resulted in US overinvestment into Germany with the Dawes and Young plan which led to massive losses after the Wall St. Crash. Boyer also agrees by saying 'European economies struggling with war debt payments and a severe trade imbalance with the US, collapsed in 1931' it refers to here the calling in of debts by the US, with the US practically paying itself back with more loans. When EU countries namely Germany couldn't pay Hoover issued a moratorium of 6 months on debts, enough time for the US economy to spiral even further into depression. Though the international economy did cause the depression it only exacerbated it rather than becoming a primary driving factor, therefore one would be less inclined to agree with Harrison.

✓ Federal intervention was the primary cause of the depression because Hoover and Coolidge's inaction allowed little to slow down or alleviate the depression. Shlaes (Section B continued) argues this point strongly 'the deepest problem was federal intervention and lack of faith in the market place'. Government management of the late 1920s and 1930s hurt the economy. She refers to the Fordney-McCumber Act of Coolidge's government and the Hawley-Smoot Tariff of Hoover's, which ^{on average} raised the duty on goods 42% making it almost impossible for the EU or other countries to trade with the US, making worse the international economy. Boyer and Harrison both agree, Boyer saying 'The Federal Reserve fight money powers' which refers to the bankers + ^{businessmen} running the Federal Reserve board only spending \$10 million on relief when Hoover set up the National Credit Corporation. Harrison agrees with Shlaes on the isolationism. 'The tariffs imposed in 1922 + 30 made it nearly impossible for foreigners to earn US dollars that would enable them to buy US goods' though Hoover set aside ^(C. 1925 - 1932) \$750 million to kick-start the economy and business his powers of countervailing self help and protectionism left him unwilling to implement effective federal intervention. Furthermore the ^{unanimous} consensus of source support

(Section B continued) of federal interventions relevance leaves it the strongest factor.

Unequal distribution was also a major cause of the depression. Shlaes acknowledges this by saying 'He ~~raised~~ ^{ordered} wages up when they wanted to go down' Hoover believed this would spur on consumerism but it didn't. The fact ^{of} ~~fact~~ ^{60% average families} ~~families~~ were earning ^{under} \$2000 compared to the top 5% of Americans earning 1/3 of national wealth left consumerism in a slump, people simply could not afford it and this was exacerbated by debt.

This is Bayers strongest argument 'Economists probing the depression's underlying causes focus on structural problems that made the 1920's prosperity highly unstable' the unequal distribution was one of these cracked foundations, leading to the geographical extent of depression being so wide and lack of alternative employment leaving 24.9% of workers unemployed 1931 compared to 3.4% 1929. The effect of unequal distribution was notable as it caused the ~~broader~~ ^{geographical} vast sense of it however federal intervention and Shlaes

(Section B continued) overproduction remains the most important as federal intervention could have stopped unequal distribution.

Overproduction was also a fundamental cause of depression, the assumption of a demand economy artificially inflated shares and led to the Wall St crash.

Boyer mentions it briefly stating 'Agriculture remained depressed throughout the period' as mechanisation came about farmers ran up \$20 million worth of debt they could not repay leading to widespread repossession and unemployment. Harrison also briefly mentions how the economy being stagnant affected export markets for US goods 'particularly American farm goods' though Hoover set up ~~the~~ grain stabilisation corporations and set ^{aside} \$500 million to buy, store and dispose of farm goods at artificially high prices this did little to alleviate the issue. The fact it is only briefly mentioned by two interpreters goes some way toward indicating its significance, the overproduction was largely a result of federal intervention or lack of it, the Agricultural Marketing

(Section B continued) Act came too late, as a result of the Tariffs and government policies overproduction was further increased.

The banking system and nature of US business were significant factors in causing the depression. Boyer suggests this by stating 'Monetarist economists also blame the Federal Reserve Board's tight money policies in the 1920's' the fundamental issue with FRB was they were all self interested businessmen and bankers not a surprise after Hoover elected Andrew Mellon as the head of the Treasury. The lack of money in circulation certainly depressed consumerism banks and monopolies ran hot and pumped up shares further which led to Wall St crash and the disappearance of \$50bn from the US economy between Oct 29¹⁹²⁹ - Nov 13¹⁹²⁹. Harrison also mentions it fleetingly saying 'the international system was highly vulnerable to a reduction of capital flows after October 1929' Harris proved the structural weakness of the banks as a result of lack of intervention. 659 banks closed with losses of \$200 million in 1929 after a run on the banks, largely as

(Section B continued) a result of a decentralised banking system lacking a network of support. This was made worse by the liberal lending powers the government let the banks pursue as well as the overextension of credit leading to initial active speculators in 1929 80% of whom had no savings and were buying 'on the margin' so had no chance of paying back debt. Again, this factor is only briefly mentioned so lacks significance and validation from interpretations. It was another factor simply caused by lack of intervention.

Overall one would agree strongly with Shioes interpretation, 'Federal intervention and the fact there was a lack of it ~~in~~^{or} effective action led to the worsening of all other listed factors, the significance extended beyond itself and had far reaching consequences leading to a collapse in the banking system, overproduction, unequal distribution of wealth and a weak international economy. Boyer has the second most significant interpretation as it is a more nuanced approach bringing in

(Section B continued) a variety of factors of which we would agree, the foundations of boom were so fragile the depression was bound to happen. Finally, Harrison's approach was the least credible as though the ^{international} economy exacerbated the depression it was largely a resultant factor of the governmental policies and federal intervention.



ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

In this high Level 4 response the candidate integrates source material and own knowledge confidently to develop the analysis regarding the reasons for the American Depression (1929-33). Most of the main arguments in the sources are examined, cross-referenced and extended with relevant own knowledge. The answer is then rounded off with a clear conclusion. Greater range and depth would have pushed this response into Level 5.



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

Stronger candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the 'benefits' debate surrounding the New Deal in the 1930s and assessed the source arguments with confidence. At this level, relevant own knowledge was firmly tied to addressing the debate within the sources. Higher-scoring responses also revealed good understanding of the relationship between the sources (e.g. Source 11 can be used to support the competing claims of Source 10 and Source 12). Weaker candidates tended to produce (1) a largely unsupported commentary on the New Deal's benefits/lack of benefits which was inadequately linked to the sources provided (2) a basic 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach (3) a generalised narrative account of the measures introduced under the New Deal which barely addressed the question.

SECTION B

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

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5

Question 6

Question 7

Question 8

It is believed in some people that 'the New Deal' in the years 1933-39, benefited most groups in American society. My view being not fully convinced. I believe that yes the new deal did bring relief and some efforts were made to pump money into the economy, however other important factors such as massive government spending and the second world war, also brought change and benefited most groups in American society.

Source 10 and 11 both share similar views about the new deal, ^{this} benefiting America and 'saving' millions of Americans. However Source 11 does include an alternate view point which is explained a lot further showing this alternate view to be the

main point. This view ~~being~~ specifically targeting ~~the~~ unemployment. Source 11

opinion/view gives the reasoning of massive government spending during the second world war being the reason behind full economic recovery.

This a view which I very much agree with. Due to the second world war, high demands for weaponry, vehicles, transportation, materials, latest advancement in technology needed for warfare, brought about high demands for jobs to make and create jobs to help for the war meaning thousands of jobs were created for many Americans, labour force for both men and women were vital for America during this period.

This meant wages were being brought in and economic condition steadily improved. However due to this being 1940's shows a negative view that the 'New Deal' did not do very much at all. In Source 11 it explains that federal reprisals were introduced and federal laws required employers to negotiate with worker's unions to set wages, hours, and working conditions. So it shows some stability for economic welfare was being introduced

(Section B continued) but times were still pretty bad.

~~Both~~ Source There was a welfare system, however this did offer some sort of economic protection this was not ~~the~~ because of 'The New Deal'.

Referring to both Source 11 and 12, both have key similarities in sharing the view that the new deal did not benefit. Source 12 did agree partially but the outstanding clear opinion was negative which matches similar attitudes to Source 12. Source 12 (concentrates) heavily on black Americans at this time. During this time black American lives were dreadful. Discrimination, abuse, segregation were daily occurrences during this time and if white Americans were having a hard time, black Americans were having it worse, this was just how it went during this period, wages were lower than the legal minimum, times were very hard. Source 12 disagrees with the view.

(Section B continued)

To conclude Source 10 supports view heavily and totally contradicts Source 12, with explaining that basic American's benefited greatly. 'Steadily improved through most - of the 1930s' was the main attitude and view point which totally agrees with the view of 'The New Deal, in the years 1932-39, benefited most groups in American Society. Source 11 and 12 on the other hand disagreed mainly however partially agreeing with some part of the view both using the word 'relief' however relief does not always grant action and change.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response on the New Deal 'benefits' debate has two major weaknesses. First, the candidate simply extracts a basic few points from the sources provided but does not really develop or cross-reference them effectively. Second, there is only limited supporting evidence drawn from the candidate's own knowledge. The answer is also relatively short.

Paper Summary

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

In Depth Study Question

- Candidates must provide more factual details. Candidates need to ensure their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth of analysis.
- Stay within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.
- More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.
- In order to address the question more effectively, candidates need to offer an analysis not provide a descriptive or chronological account. Many candidates produced answers, which were focused and developed appropriately.
- Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.
- Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.
- Regarding conclusions, they were sometimes basic summaries rather than offering an explicit judgment linked to the analytical demands of the question. The importance of conclusions that are explicit rather than implicit is emphasised. Indeed, it was fairly rare to find an answer for Section A especially that was not of Level 4 quality overall where there were effective, considered introductions and conclusions.
- It is suggested that the students who perform best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question. Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off potential areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question, without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.
- 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.
- Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Some candidates could have explored links and interaction more effectively between own knowledge and the sources. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little or no own knowledge was included.
- Some needed to develop their points with more specific factual details.
- More candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.
- Some candidates could have explored links / interaction more effectively between own knowledge and the sources. Some needed to develop their points with more specific factual details.
- 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. Whilst there was some excellent analysis which incorporated historiographical knowledge, reference to, say, 'revisionist' historians often added little, or was even to the detriment of genuine analysis.
- That said, there were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the

substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.

- There was also a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, the process of carefully studying the sources to ascertain how they relate to the statement in the question, prior to writing the main analysis, allows candidates to clarify and structure their arguments.

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



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