



Examiners' Report

June 2019

GCE History 9HI0 2E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2019

Publications Code 9HI0_2E_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with the A Level paper 2E which deals with Mao's China, 1949-76 (2E.1) and The German Democratic Republic, 1949-90 (2E.2).

The paper is divided into two sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two linked sources. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt both answers within the time allocated. Examiners continue to note this year that a number of scripts posed some problems with the legibility of handwriting. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers were able to develop reasoned and supported inferences based on the sources and to evaluate the sources thoroughly in relation to the demands of the enquiry on the basis of both the contextual knowledge displayed and an awareness of the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It is important, as was stated last summer, that candidates should be clear that weight is not likely to be established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the sources. However, comments on all the things that the sources might have contained, but failed to do so, is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight. This approach was still evident this summer, although less so than last summer. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches.

In section B it was clear that most candidates had a secure knowledge base, but this was not always effectively used to address the specific focus of the questions posed. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question, although weaker candidates continued this summer to often engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Last summer candidates were advised to ensure that there was both an argument and a counter argument in their responses; it is pleasing to note that there was less evidence this summer of a lack of counter arguments. Candidates need to be aware of the chronological parameters of questions and to ensure that they write across the chronology, not merely using the start and end dates as bookends with little consideration of the events between. Not all candidates have a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

Question 1

On Question 1, stronger responses clearly considered the sources together (e.g. both sources agree on the circumstances of Lin Biao's death), although treatment of the sources may have been uneven. Such responses also analysed the source material in relation to the enquiry with a sense of interrogation which went beyond selecting key points and made reasoned inferences (e.g. the reluctance to destroy Lin Biao's legacy completely suggests Mao was still aware of Lin Biao's latent popularity). Knowledge of the historical context was used to discuss limitations/what can be gained from the content of the source material (e.g. Lin's connection to the PLA led some to view him as a threat to Mao, Lin Biao's daughter revealed the assassination attempt in September 1971, Mao named Lin Biao as his successor at the Ninth Party Congress, many regarded Lin's fate as evidence of Mao's growing paranoia) and revealed an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which it was drawn (e.g. the Chinese Communist Party's determination to manage the incident and minimise damage to its authority and image). Furthermore, high-scoring candidates evaluated the source material relevantly in line with the specified enquiry and considered matters of provenance confidently (e.g. the release of an official statement through a smaller embassy indicates that the Chinese authorities hoped that acknowledgement of the Lin Biao incident would attract little international attention). The weight of the evidence was taken into consideration when coming to a judgement (e.g. the top secret nature of Source 1 might indicate that it was intended to give communist leaders a candid account of the incident).

Weaker responses began to consider the sources together (e.g. both refer to the events of the assassination plot). In addition, such responses showed some limited understanding and analysis of the source material through the selection of key points relevant to the question (e.g. Lin Biao was viewed as manipulative) and valid inferences (e.g. Lin Biao was little threat to Mao's power). However, these valid inferences had only limited support or remained undeveloped. Knowledge of the historical context was mainly used to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail with some attempt to support inferences (e.g. Lin Biao became reluctantly involved in an internal plot led by his son to assassinate Mao). Lower-scoring candidates tended to evaluate the source material with some relevance regarding the specified enquiry and noted some aspects of source provenance to draw conclusions about reliability or utility. At this level, judgments often lacked support and could be based on questionable assumptions (e.g. since the Central Committee communiqué (Source 1) was the official version it would be unbiased).

Both sources are useful in the investigation of how significant a threat Lin Biao posed to Mao's position in 1971, as they detail to some extent the same events and corroborate each other. ~~Both documents of the Communist Party, they have some limitations.~~ However, their utility is undermined by some limitations, such as the fact that they are both official documents of the CCP, and that they neglect to mention certain aspects of the situation key to the inquiry, such as Lin Biao's lack of ambition.

Both sources agree that Lin Biao ~~was~~ attempted a "coup d'état", what the 'Top Secret' communiqué (Source 1) calls a "monstrous conspiracy." The press release specifies that he aimed to "surp" the "leadership of the party, government and army." The ~~fact~~ fact that both sources agree on the nature of this supposed plot ~~for~~ adds validity to the idea that Lin Biao was indeed attempting an overthrow, confirming Mao's fears that he would be

a "Bonaparte of the Revolution", hijacking it ~~to~~ to
his impole his own authoritarian rule.
However, this ~~agreement~~ point of convergence
between the sources must not be overestimated;
both documents are issued by the CCP, under
different circumstances, granted, but
by the ruling, monolithic party of China nonetheless.
It is cogent then, that their take on the issue
should be the same. Both claim that
he tried to kill the Chairman, Source 1
indicating that he did this by organising a
"plot to blow up" Mao's train. However,
neither mentions that while evidence of a
plot was found, it was most likely
Lin's son who was behind it. Both
sources, then, can be used together ~~for~~ usefully,
as they agree on the nature of the ~~plan~~ coup
that Lin was attempting: he aimed to
kill Mao and the "pled towards the Soviet Union",
his plane crashing in Mongolia. The specificity
of detail adds utility to the sources when
used in conjunction, but one must remember
that in actual fact, both documents are
issued by the party itself. It is only
logical then, that they should have the same line
on this "anti-CCP" activity.

The sources are also useful in that there is a discrepancy in what they say. Source 1 claims that it was Lin Biao's daughter who "reported the situation in time", allowing her father's ~~monstrous~~ monstrous conspiracy to be failed. We know that this is the true version of events - she, like many of her counterparts, was still suffering from the indoctrination of the Red Guard period of the Cultural Revolution which encouraged young Chinese people to denounce or report their 'feudal', 'bourgeois' or 'Confucian' parents. However, Source 2 seems to be saying that it was Mao himself who ~~unmasked~~ "unmasked his plot." This difference could be attributed to provenance: while Source 1 is an internal party document, meant for "Leadership Cadres" only, Source 2 is an official press release, released not a week after the incident as the communiqué was issued but almost a year afterwards. Its enhancement of the rôle of Mao in the affair could be interpreted, then, as a move to prove to the international community, especially the West (Algeria had deeply embroiled historical links with France) that Mao, though his health was in decline, was as politically

astute as ever. Source 1 may award credit to Lin Biao's daughter and not Mao himself because Mao's dominant position in the Party and domestically, had already been absolutely consolidated by his purging of Lin and Deng in the previous phase of the Cultural Revolution. Source 2, then, makes it seem like Mao was never really under threat and in control of everything, while Source 1 alludes to the fact that even the Great Helmsman needed insider information to uncover the plot. There is a detail in Source 2 that again puts Mao in the dominant position, saying that he even "made efforts to rehabilitate him," almost suggesting that Mao knew about the plot before it was executed, implying that he was under no serious threat. The international audience of the press release could account for this disparity.

Both sources also seem to agree on the fact that it was a premeditated affair. Source 1 says that Lin stole "secret documents" and foreign currencies", while Source 2 talks of a "premeditated" cause of

action with a well-determined programme.
However, Source 2 attributes this to his "double-crossing" name, saying that although he "made propaganda in favor" of Mao Thought, he was in reality "opposed" to it. There is no mention of this 'double-crossing' name in Source 1 - he is said to "betray" China but this is because his destination was the Soviet Union, hostile after the 1961 Sino-Soviet Split. Ma Lin Biao had indeed "made propaganda": in fact, the 'Little Red Books' had been his brainchild, and he was the architect of its distribution and the reverence it evoked in soldiers, initially, and the whole population subsequently. Perhaps Source 1 does not mention his duplicitous nature because party members, especially leaders, would have found this strange, as they knew Lin Biao and his devotion to Mao Thought. A general international audience, however, might not have. ~~This difference in~~
~~pro~~ In fact, even the Chinese people began to lose faith in the system when Lin Biao, previously revered, was posthumously referred to as being part of a collective called 'Confucius and Co.'

In Summers, both sources are useful because they agree on the plot and conspiracy and that Lin Biao had betrayed the country. However, they disagreed on certain elements such as who actually uncovered the plot, showing Mao's power in two different lights. However, there are limitations to their utility for this inquiry: both are ~~government~~ Party documents, which explains their authoritative insistence that it was indeed a conspiracy organised by Lin Biao (this has not yet been confirmed). Moreover, the fact that they are both targeted at a very specific ~~group~~ readership does not help, as Mao would have wanted the Party leaders and international community to believe different things and this may have manipulated the content to do so. They neglect also to mention Lin's health problems and lack of real ambition - he had only reluctantly accepted the post of Interior Minister in 1959 after Peng's sacking. They are both assiduous about him organising a plot whose actual nature and content are unknown to this day. Moreover,

They are both written during Mao's time in power and therefore subject to his control. Had the press release been executed under Deng, 4 years later, the tone may have been different.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Question 1 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) it interrogates the evidence of both sources making reasoned inferences (e.g. the assassination was premeditated, Mao knew about the plot in advance), (2) it deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source (e.g. Mao's continued political dominance) and (3) it evaluates the source material taking into account its weight as part of coming to a judgement (e.g. Source 2's attempt to portray Mao as politically astute).



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

The two main ways to establish the weight of a source are (1) to use contextual knowledge to confirm or challenge claims or statements made in the source and (2) to consider the nature and purpose of the source (for e.g. the status and motivation of the author). Simply stating that a source fails to cover a particular event or development does NOT establish weight.

Question 2

On Question 2, stronger responses clearly considered the sources together (e.g. both sources suggest that protest potentially had the power to force change and that the SED government was unwilling to use force against non-violent protest), although treatment of the sources may have been uneven. Such responses also analysed the source material in relation to the enquiry with a sense of interrogation which went beyond selecting key points and made reasoned inferences (e.g. the East German police state had lost legitimacy/authority). Knowledge of the historical context was used to discuss limitations/what can be gained from the content of the source material (e.g. in autumn 1989 the Leipzig rallies attracted wider support from those hoping the SED would discuss reform, mass protest spread to other cities including Dresden and Berlin, Gorbachev stated that Soviet troops would not be used to support the SED government, after Honecker's dismissal, the SED government began to contemplate reforms in a bid to retain authority in the GDR) and revealed an awareness of the values and concerns of the society from which it was drawn (e.g. the growing moral bankruptcy of the communist system in the GDR). Furthermore, high-scoring candidates evaluated the source material relevantly in line with the specified enquiry and considered matters of provenance confidently (e.g. Bramke's role as a historian meant he was probably inclined to provide accurate information). The weight of the evidence was taken into consideration when coming to a judgement (e.g. Bramke's interview took place two years later so he may have amended his opinions after the fall of the SED).

Weaker responses began to consider the sources together (e.g. both indicate that the SED was being openly challenged). In addition, such responses showed some limited understanding and analysis of the source material through the selection of key points relevant to the question (e.g. loyal SED members did not think the government had legitimacy) and valid inferences (e.g. church group involvement in the protests suggested that the SED was losing its moral authority). However, these valid inferences had only limited support or remained undeveloped. Knowledge of the historical context was mainly used to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail with some attempt to support inferences (e.g. in 1989 new political groups, such as Democratic Awakening, were founded that openly challenged the authority of the SED). Lower-scoring candidates tended to evaluate the source material with some relevance regarding the specified enquiry and noted some aspects of source provenance to draw conclusions about reliability or utility. At this level, judgements often lacked support and could be based on questionable assumptions (e.g. Werner Bramke (Source 4), as a long-time member of the SED, would automatically provide a pro-government account).

Plan:

- both sources are relatively useful - they suggest that the SED was losing power prior to the protests and that they forced the hand of government

P1 1

- reliable - written [✓] after [✓] death
- peaceful protest - true -
- paved the way for a dialogue w/ the government
↳ in a sense true -

P2 - less reliable - hindsight
'breaking apart' of system →

P3 - together

- limited power of state

Both source 3 and 4 are relatively useful to discern the way in which mass protests affected the authority of the SED, since they both address the ~~expected~~ government response to the protests in the short term, as well as projecting forward, to an extent, the expected outcomes of the Leipzig protests. Although source 4 has the benefit of hindsight, it and can therefore be assumed to be somewhat more optimistic, alongside ~~the~~ source 3 it gives a relatively balanced account of the impact of the two protests.

Source 3 begins with the assertion that the protest remained peaceful due to the 'calm response of the police force and militia', as well as the actions of the protesters themselves - and in part this is true. However, the fact that the authorities did not respond violently to the protests suggests that the hold of the SED was beginning to slip even prior to the Leipzig protests. There was, beforehand, such anticipation of ~~an~~ a violent confrontation - Honecker had openly praised the Chinese government's suppression of the ~~sa~~ Tiananmen Square protests - that more

doctors had been put on call in Leipzig in anticipation of casualties. However, this never materialised. The source also mentions 'justice, human rights, and environmental protection' groups - a nod to the fact that calls for reform did not come from a single source, and were essentially the work of many single-interest groups of the type described. Additionally, the superintendent of Leipzig - East's comment that the protests would 'pave the way for a deal dialogue with the government' ~~was~~ including 'offers of reform' shows clearly that the SED's authority was considerably weakened. As a member of the police is one of those upholding the state, to openly advocate for the protesters is something of an unusual turn. Additionally, the fact that this was published at all shows a weakening of the SED's ability to control information, and its contemporaneity with the events it describes make it an accurate account of initial reactions to the protests.

Source 14, on the other hand, is subtly different in its message, which is undoubtedly

coloured somewhat by hindsight. Unlike the claim of source 3, that the protests were largely for 'reform', Brambe suggests that a change of any kind, rather than 'maintaining things as they were' was desired. The claim that 'it was not important ... whether socialism could be saved'; has some validity but is perhaps somewhat exaggerated due to the author knowing the course taken by later events, but it is true that the second Leipzig protest was one of the first in which demands for reunification drifted in over the usual calls for reform. The two sources have a similar attitude to the use of violence in the protests, source 4 once again shaming the failing authority of the SED, who were no longer feared by a people who believed that 'the most severe repercussions imaginable' would be enacted on them. This attitude was to come to a head in a raid on the Stasi office later in the year, the ultimate symbol of a state whose power is over its people was waning. Although this source speaks of a 'breaking apart' of the system, this is likely to be influenced by the author's knowledge

of subsequent events, and is therefore not representative of sentiments in the GDR at the time.

To conclude, both sources ^{together} give a reasonably accurate portrait of the effects of SED authority - particularly police & military, that was effected by mass protest. Although they cannot shed light on SED policies, the fact that material in support of the protesters was published, and protesters themselves no longer feared authority shows clearly that the impact of mass protest on SED authority was very significant.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Question 2 response achieves Level 4 because it (1) interrogates most of the evidence of both sources making some reasoned inferences (e.g. calls for reform had not come from a single section of society or group), (2) it deploys knowledge of the historical context to illuminate and/or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source (e.g. Honecker's hardline domestic stance) and (3) it evaluates the source material taking into account its weight as part of coming to a judgement (e.g. since he was talking some time after the event, Bramke (Source 4) may have revised his views).



Simply stating that a source fails to cover a particular event or development does NOT establish weight. See Examiner Tip for Question 1 for advice about how to establish the weight of a source.

Question 3

On Question 3, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of the extent to which the launch of the Great Leap Forward was motivated by a genuine desire to build upon the industrial and agricultural achievements of 1949-57. These also included an analysis of relationships between key issues and a focus on the concept (causation) in the question. Such responses had a solid grasp of relevant issues regarding motivation (e.g. desire to build on increased agricultural productivity, the growth of heavy industry under the First Five-Year and the success of water infrastructure projects, Mao's personal desire to develop a uniquely Chinese economic programme as Sino-Soviet relations soured, a desire to promote Chinese revolutionary socialist thinking, Mao's determination to extend his personal power over China). The treatment of key issues may have been uneven with greater focus given to certain features (e.g. greater emphasis on the desire to build on the economic achievements of 1949-57). Judgements made about the relative importance of the desire to build on previous economic achievements were reasoned and based on clear criteria (e.g. economic, political and ideological motivation). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of the motives for launching the Great Leap Forward. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on causation or were essentially a description of China's economic policies in the late 1940s and 1950s. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. impact of deteriorating relations with the Soviet Union) and attempts to establish criteria (e.g. Mao's political or personal motives) were limited. Furthermore, such responses were often brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

The Great Leap Forward (GLF) was launched in 1958 following the huge industrial successes of the first five year plan. Mao had many reasons for launching the GLF however it is debatable whether a genuine desire for building upon ^{the} achievements of agriculture and industry in the years 1949 and 1957 is one of them. Rather, the GLF was launched for ideological, political, ~~and~~ agricultural and industrial reasons.

The GLF itself was in many ways a failure. It did little to improve industry compared to first 5 year plan ~~heavy industry~~ and worsened agriculture despite being intended to improve it. Ideologically however, the GLF was a huge success. China resembled communism more closely than ever before and Mao's position was stronger. Following the success of the 1st 5 year plan - which saw the Chinese economy grow at a rate of 9% a year - Mao was optimistic and felt encouraged that rapid improvements were possible. He also realised that his need to enforce ideological indoctrination in far flung rural areas among the peasants was growing. For these reasons collectivisation

had begun in 1951 with mutual aid teams of 10 households before growing in size to Higher Agricultural Producers Co-operatives of 200 or 300 households. While these did little to improve the efficiency of agriculture, ~~they were~~ ^{communal living was an} effective tools for encouraging collective thought and ideological conformity. With this, Mao believed that by setting China the goal of "walking on two legs" - growing industry and agriculture simultaneously - when launching the GLF, it would promote ideological commitment and national unity.

Launching the GLF had significant political factors, as ~~the~~ divisions within the party had emerged between ideologues and pragmatists. Mao thought that the success of industry was a result of ~~the~~ mass mobilisation and revolutionary drive, fuelling his calls for full collectivisation at an increased pace in 1955. Pragmatists, like Liu Shaogqi and Deng Xiaoping, warned against this as they feared the ~~great~~ impact of growing dis-incentivisation and inefficiency within the communes. This fear can be seen in reality as agricultural production grew by just 3.8% in 1955 compared to the growth of 15% between 1950 and 1952. Scornful

of their pragmatic suggestions, Mao launched the GLF in hopes of its success reverting China to his ideologically driven policies and undermine people like Liu and Deng. In addition to this, the GLF was launched with the intent of cementing China as an economic power independent of the USSR. This was because ~~the~~ China had relied heavily on the USSR for financial support during both the Korean War (1950-53) and the first 5 year plan (1952-56), having received a loan of \$300 million with very high interest rates. Mao resented having been forced into the Korean War by Stalin as his proxy puppet and as Sino-Soviet relations began to deteriorate in the late 1950's. Undoubtedly, Mao had several strong political ~~reasons~~ reasons both within ~~and~~ the ~~is~~ party and on an international scale for launching the GLF in 1958.

In some ways, it could be argued that Mao did launch the GLF due to a genuine desire to build upon previous achievements. His aim of rapid industrialisation under the first 5 years plan had been achieved, with coal fulfilling 115% of its 1957 target. Agriculture too had seen some success - although it was much more muted.

The imbalance between the growth of agriculture and industry was a strong motivation for Mao to launch the GLF ~~to~~ as ~~industry~~ agriculture had not grown enough to be able to sufficiently supply industrial towns and cities with food, whose populations had doubled to over 100 million. Knowing that further industrialisation was heavily reliant on improving agriculture, Mao was likely strongly motivated in this sense as the GLF focused much more on agriculture. Furthermore, significant failures of earlier industrial and agricultural reforms likely fuelled the launch of the GLF, as Lysenkoism in the mid-1950's proved disastrous. Resulting in a cultural genocide killing 1 million people in Tibet alone (25% of its population), Lysenkoism greatly contributed to the Great Famine, which is estimated to have resulted in the deaths of upwards of 300 million people.* ~~While the~~ ~~GLF~~ when Mao launched the GLF in 1958, it ~~was~~ did have some genuine motivation in hopes of continuing the success of the 1st 5 year plan and ~~was~~ neutralising agricultural failure.

~~Overall~~, Mao had many reasons for launching the GLF. The most convincing of these, however is to a large extent

not a genuine desire to build upon the achievements made in agriculture and industry between 1949 and 1957. It seems instead that Mao's prominent reasons for launching the GLEWes to ~~increase~~^{spread} ideological indoctrination, increase his political control, and reform agriculture in a way that enabled it to support rapid industrialisation. ~~Because of this~~, while Mao did hope to build upon and improve industrial achievements, a genuine desire to do so was not the main motivation for launching the GLEW in 1958.

* Likewise, the Backyard furnace campaign clearly did not intend to ~~improve~~ build upon previous achievements as it was so poorly administered that it damaged both industry and agriculture. The use of steel in the furnaces led to a shortage of raw materials for factories and the iron that was produced was too poor quality to be of any use. Furthermore it led to agricultural decline as fields were abandoned due to the constant need for peasants to tend the furnaces.



This Question 3 response achieved Level 4 because (1) it targets the reasons for the launching of the Great Leap Forward (2) sufficient own knowledge is brought in to support the arguments made (e.g. building on the success of the First Five Year Plan, Mao's determination to outflank the pragmatists in the leadership) and (3) a reasoned judgement is reached in the conclusion based on the criteria developed in the analysis.



Higher level responses are often based on brief plans that offer a logical structure for the analysis. They identify three or four themes and points for and against the proposition. Take a minute or two at the beginning to plan before you start writing your response. That way, you are more likely to produce a relevant, logical and well-structured response.

Question 4

On Question 4, stronger responses were targeted on the extent to which social reforms transformed the lives of the Chinese people during the years 1949-76. Such responses explored key issues and developments relevant to the question (e.g. married women's legal status transformed by the Marriage Law of 1950, mass campaigns improved literacy rates, increased health provision improved public health, the social welfare policies underpinning the communes proved disastrous, traditional and patriarchal attitudes remained stubbornly entrenched in Chinese society, the Cultural Revolution wiped out the early gains in educational provision creating a 'lost generation') although the treatment of key issues was sometimes uneven (e.g. greater emphasis on the extent to which the lives of Chinese women were transformed). High-scoring candidates also demonstrated an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question (change-continuity), deployed sufficient knowledge and established criteria to make a judgement (e.g. change-continuity in levels of literacy and gender inequality). Such responses were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of the extent to which social reforms transformed the lives of the Chinese people during the years 1949-76. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change-continuity or were essentially a description of some of the main social reforms of the period. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. the social reforms affecting women). The conceptual demand (change-continuity) of the question was generally understood but not developed and attempts to establish criteria (e.g. the extent to which the social status of women altered) were limited. Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Social reforms transformed the lives of the Chinese people during the years 1949-76 through a few ways such as through education allowing more of the country to become educated better, health care allowing the peasants to have access to health care and reforms such as the marriage law to help improve the lives of women in particular.

One way that social reforms transformed the lives of the Chinese people was through education.

Towards the beginning of the time period Mao realised that the country had to become better educated.

In this through the introduction of schools to all people in China it boosted literacy and also by the later 1950's 40% of primary school children were girls which was a large improvement from years prior. Education affected people's lives in a negative way also as during the cultural revolution in 1966, schools and universities had been closed leaving 130 million young people uneducated and unable to help

further the countries development to become one of the worlds superpowers. Which therefore should that there was transformation in the lives of the Chinese people both positively and negatively.

Healthcare helped to transform the lives of Chinese people in the years 1949-76. Barefoot doctors were sent to the countryside to treat the peasants and help free them of illnesses, these doctors were given 6 months training before ~~begin~~ being sent out to make sure they had the right skills, this was effective as the barefoot doctors helped to rid of illnesses and helped to increase life expectancy as well as lower the infant mortality rate giving a better standard of living. This was also affected during the Cultural Revolution as doctors were attacked due to being in a position of authority. This shows a transformation in the Chinese peoples lives as they benefitted from this and due to healthcare they were able to live longer with less chance of getting diseases.

Social reforms helped to transform the lives of the Chinese people especially in women. For example before 1950, at the age of 6 girls feet were foot bound to slow their growth as it was seen as appealing to men. The introduction of the marriage law changed that as it made foot binding and arranged marriage illegal allowing for women to have a better life. Women during this time period were also given more jobs and opportunities in the PLA and the communes instead of doing house chores. This shows a transformation as it is vastly improving the lives of women especially from what it once was making sure that everyone is treated equally.

To conclude social reforms did transform the lives of the Chinese people during the years 1949-76 because ^{completely} their lives were never the same as they had been even though some aspects still remained.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Question 4 Level 3 response offers (1) some limited analysis of the extent to which social reforms transformed the lives of the Chinese people during the years 1949-76 (e.g. the impact of education and healthcare, and social reforms affecting women) but there is scope to develop the analysis in terms of range and depth (2) some criteria for judgement are established but are not developed very far and the conclusion does not provide a convincing overall judgement.



You will be expected to offer detailed knowledge to support your arguments. Check the specification so you know what is required.

Question 5

On Question 5, stronger responses were targeted on an analysis of how different/similar the GDR's economic policies were in the two periods 1949-61 and 1963-71, with some commentary on relationships between the key features and the issues clearly relevant to the question (e.g. the different economic priorities of the pre-1961 Five-Year Plans and the New Economic Policy (1963-68), greater diversification of industrial development from 1963, the years 1963-71 saw a desire to create a GDR economic policy less dependent on the Soviet Union, central planning/state control remained a key feature of economic policy, collectivisation of agriculture and nationalisation remained the core basis for economic production, the Soviet Union, Comecon and other socialist countries remained the focus of trade relationships). Treatment of key issues may have been uneven with greater focus given to certain similarities/differences (e.g. the ongoing role of state control/central planning or diversification of industrial development from 1963). Sufficient knowledge was deployed to demonstrate an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question (similarity/difference) and to meet most of the demands of the question. Judgements made about similarity and difference were reasoned and based on clear criteria (e.g. the nature/extent of state control/central planning, the emphasis placed on quantity or quality). Higher scoring answers were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of the extent of similarity/difference in economic policy across the two periods, often with fairly extensive descriptive passages (e.g. narrative accounts of the GDR's industrial policies in the years 1949-61 and 1963-71). Supporting knowledge was mostly accurate and relevant but some knowledge was insecure and its relevance less clear (e.g. trade links with the Soviet Union, COMECON and other socialist countries). Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited comments on the New Economic Policy). The conceptual demand (similarity/difference) of the question was generally understood but often lacked development and attempts to establish criteria (e.g. the extent of economic centralisation across the two periods) were limited.

I ~~mainly~~ ^{mainly} agree that the economic policies of the GDR were very different in the years 1949-61 and 1963-71.

The economic policies in the German Democratic Republic were focused on rebuilding industry and primary industry in order to cope with the devastating repercussions taken by the USSR. The USSR took ~~10~~ ~~10~~ 1020 billion in reparations from the Soviet Bloc after World War Two. When Khrushchev came to power in the years 1956-61, he had to rapidly rebuild to keep up with the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG); the western side led by Adenauer. These economic policies included 2 5 year plans that spanned from 1951-55 and 1956-59. The first 5 year plan was a focus on heavy industry. This increased industrial output by 60% but consumer goods only improved by 2%. Iron production went from 36'000 tonnes to 7.5 million tonnes. The second 5 year plan had the motto of 'modernisation, mechanisation, Automation'.

This was a focus again on the idea of catching up to the west in terms of military, industry and technology. However, consumer goods did not improve much. The policies industry wise in the years 1949-61 were very heavy industry focussed.

On the other hand, economic policies in the years 1963-71 had a focus on consumerism in order to keep satisfaction in living standards high in the GDR. Therefore, these policies were quite different in terms of aims.

Collectivisation started in the 50s and continued through the 60s and as such was a factor that was similar within both of these time frames.

In conclusion, I half agree with the question as their aims in terms of industry and advancements were very different however they had similar policies such as collectivisation running throughout.



This Question 5 Level 2 response exhibits many of the shortcomings of lower scoring answers. (1) It offers little analysis of the similarities and differences between the GDR's economic policies across the two periods 1949-61 and 1963-71. (2) The candidate's own knowledge lacks range and depth (e.g. little of substance is offered on agricultural policy). (3) Given the limitations noted above, the overall judgement lacks proper substantiation.



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

Question 6

On Question 6, stronger responses were targeted on the extent to which the quality of life for people in the GDR improved under Honecker's leadership. Such responses explored key issues and developments relevant to the question (e.g. increased social security through social welfare policies, rising East German living standards, women benefited from greater employment and educational opportunities, repression of social freedoms remained a constant feature, declining living standards by the mid-1980s, poor quality and limited availability of consumer goods, growing social inequalities apparent by the mid-1980s) although the treatment of key issues was sometimes uneven (e.g. repression of social freedoms by the Stasi or improvements through social welfare policies). High-scoring candidates also demonstrated an understanding of the conceptual focus of the question (change-continuity), deployed sufficient knowledge and established criteria to make a judgement (e.g. the extent to which living standards or social/gender inequality improved). Such responses were also clearly organised and effectively communicated.

Weaker responses tended to be generalised and, at best, offered a fairly limited analysis of the extent to which the quality of life for people in the GDR improved under Honecker's leadership. Low scoring answers also often lacked focus on change-continuity or were essentially a narrative account of life in the GDR under Honecker's leadership. Where some analysis using relevant knowledge was evident, it tended to lack range/depth (e.g. limited availability of consumer goods). The conceptual demand (change-continuity) of the question was generally understood but not developed and attempts to establish criteria (e.g. the extent to which gender inequalities were removed) were limited. Furthermore, such responses were often fairly brief, lacked coherence and structure, and made unsubstantiated or weakly supported judgements.

Although Honecker placed far more emphasis on social developments and improvements to welfare than his predecessor, Ulbricht, the reforms, policies and improvements that he implemented were undermined by overwhelming economic and political instability. Whilst Ulbricht remained focused on improving industry and repairing the immense damage brought about by WWII, Honecker recognised that in order to successfully compete with the FRG and the West, significant social welfare reforms would have to be installed to satisfy the needs of the people.

Housing was left in a dire situation after the second World War, and although Ulbricht attempted to tackle the housing crisis, homelessness was still a large issue. Plattenbau housing was introduced in the 1960's, which consisted of unattractive and poorly constructed apartment blocks. Due to their cheap prices and extremely close communities, Plattenbau estates caused crime rates to rise. Under Honecker, housing remained an issue, but an issue that was partially tackled. With the funding that the GDR received from the FRG under its 'Ostpolitik' policy, investments into housing

and social welfare greatly increased. However, as was the trend with many of Honecker's policies, the four ~~remained~~ remained in quantity over quality. Housing targets were met, but conditions remained undesirable, especially compared to the FRG, and homelessness was still a pressing issue. It could be argued that Honecker was faced with an impossible task in regards to housing, as Ulbricht had established a status quo of poor quality, cheap housing with the introduction of Plattenbau housing and 'Socialist New Towns', and to undo Ulbricht's work would not only have been costly, but also counter-productive, as Honecker's focus remained on having as many GDR citizens as possible.

Under Honecker, health care improved, but at a deplorably slow rate. Although statistics would suggest that the GDR rivaled if not out-competed the FRG in medical provisions, the quality of medical supplies was dire. By 1975, the GDR had more available hospital beds than the FRG, but lacked other vital equipment such as forceps, gloves and syringes. Polyclinics had been set up to provide accessible and free health care to all citizens, but medical supplies and pharmaceuticals were poor quality. This perfectly demonstrates how although Honecker did attempt to improve the quality of life of GDR citizens, albeit out of necessity,

necessity rather than compassion, his improvements were not sufficient enough to fully fulfill the needs of the people, and therefore remained a ~~failure~~ failure.

Following on from Ulbricht's Family Code of 1966, Honecker recognized the need to support and promote the rights of women within the GDR. In Marxist-Leninist ideology, women are encouraged to seek equality with men by working the same jobs and sharing the same responsibilities and duties. Although Honecker ~~did not~~ recognized that the aging population needed to be tackled, and therefore a high birth rate encouraged, he also recognized that the GDR population was predominantly female, and therefore needed to encourage women to be actively involved in the development of the state. ^{women needed to fill} ~~filling~~ the ~~vac~~ void that had been left by young male workers emigrating, the loss of male life in WWII, and the aging population. Abortion were legalised in 1972, access to contraceptives were far more readily available under Honecker, ~~and~~ although they were poor quality, and by 1985, the birth rate actually surpassed that of the FRG. This tackled two birds with one stone and was a success for the state and SED, but women did not receive the total equality they had been promised. Rather than promoting the status of women, the SED focused on the promotion of the status of mothers, offering financial rewards for mothers. Women were

still paid less than men, although it was marginal, and although they had a significant presence in the teaching and medical professions, were generally assigned simpler, less challenging jobs. Women remained to be totally neglected in the political scene throughout Honecker's reign, and the only female member of the Politburo was ^{Honecker's} ~~his~~ wife, who obtained a non-influential role as the head of education.

In conclusion, although improvements were made by Honecker to social welfare problems, the issues within the state remained ingrained and incredibly challenging to ~~root~~ ~~out~~ remove. Although funding was increased with the help of loans from the GDR and the West, the overriding economic problems within the GDR meant that consumer goods and standards of living could only be increased marginally. Furthermore, ideologically, the GDR presented ideas of equality and equal representation, but these ideas proved to be unobtainable, as the economic requirements and social issues within the nation meant that Honecker could not totally reverse the damage that was brought about by WWII and his predecessor. Therefore, lives in the GDR ~~were~~ were not significantly improved under his leadership.



This Question 6 response secured Level 5 because it (1) attempts to analyse the quality of life for people in the GDR under Honecker's leadership with a strong focus on change-continuity - 'improved greatly' (e.g. Ulbricht's legacy, healthcare, measures affecting women), (2) reaches a judgement in the conclusion related to the criteria developed in the analysis.



When planning your answer to a support / challenge question make sure you have a good balance of key points on either side of the argument, or be prepared to argue support and challenge within each key point.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should go beyond paraphrasing the content of the sources to draw out reasoned and developed inferences
- Candidates should move beyond stereotypical approaches to the nature/purpose and authorship of the source by, e.g. looking at and explaining the specific stance and/or purpose of the writer
- Contextual knowledge should not be used to list all the information that is missing from the sources, unless omission was the aim of the author
- Contextual knowledge should be linked to the material provided in the source
- Candidates should make use of the sources together at some point in the answer.

Section B

- Spending a few minutes planning helps to ensure the second order concept is correctly identified; candidates need to be aware that not all questions demand a factor/other factors approach
- Candidates must provide more precise contextual knowledge as evidence. Weaker responses lacked depth and sometimes range
- Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive approach; this undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels
- Candidates need to be aware of key dates as identified in the specification so that they can address the questions with chronological precision
- Candidates should try to explore the links between issues rather than merely present a list of factors.

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>

