

Examiners' Report

June 2022

GCE History 9HI0 1F

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

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



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2022

Publications Code 9HI0_1F_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, Advanced Level paper 1F.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. This was most evident on Section C, as would be expected. Whilst the impact of this cannot be fully mitigated against, and the best advice is thus to plan time accordingly in the first place, the responses that appeared to experience such timing issues yet overcame them to some degree were those who offered more direct responses. Those who wrote abbreviated question 5 responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given views, rather offering extensive explanations and quotes, were more likely to still produce a reasonably effective response, than those failing to reach any comparative analysis and evaluation. Finally, examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

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

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

Question 1

Question 1 was the more popular choice with candidates in Section A of the paper, and produced a range of responses. The main discriminating factor in the quality of responses was candidates' knowledge of minority rights campaigns, and an ability to focus carefully on the issue of success. At the higher levels, responses demonstrated a good knowledge of a range of minority groups, and a sharp focus on the extent to which they were successful. The strongest demonstrated careful and sustained reasoning over success, eg exploring success in relation to the aims of the individual groups, their position at the start of the period and as result of their campaigns, and the relative success of the different groups. Such focus often fed into well substantiated judgements.

The majority of responses were able to cover a range of different minority campaigns, typically offering three of the following campaigns: black American, Hispanic, Native American and gay rights. A small minority wrote about women's rights, assuming women to be a minority. Most candidates organised their essays around individual groups, although some followed alternative approaches, eg sections for and against the proposition, or themes relating to political, social and economic issues. All of these approaches proved capable of producing high quality responses. In general, candidates proved equally secure in their knowledge and understanding of all groups; if there was a particular group some were less secure on, it tended to be Hispanic campaigns.

When examining Native American campaigns, commonly covered issues and events included AIM, the Alcatraz and Wounded Knee occupations, the limited success in reclaiming land, the support given by politicians such as Nixon, and continued problems such as suicide rates and alcoholism. A smaller number recognised the unique nature of some of the Native American aims, and significance of these aims with regards the chances of success, eg how, despite some sympathy and movement towards their position over cultural issues and autonomy, land was realistically not going to be returned. A small number did become confused over events and outcomes. When candidates examined black American civil rights campaigns, most tended to focus on King's campaigns and saw achievements in terms of the legislation of the mid-1960s, with stronger responses exploring the extent to which this brought the change that was hoped for. A smaller number explored subsequent campaigns. Analysis of Hispanic campaigns tended to centre on Chavez, FLOC and the Grape Boycott, with other examples including Rodolfo 'Corky' Gonzales, the Brown Berets, and, to a lesser extent, the LA school walkouts, MAYO and MALDEF. Most managed to focus on what they brought onto the issue of success to some degree, although analysis tended to be stronger on workers' rights than issues relating to education or land and property rights. Responses tended to be relatively strong on gay rights, typically citing Harvey Milk, the Stonewall Inn, Proposition 6, varying state laws and attitudes in different parts of America, the removal of homosexuality as a registered mental illness, reactionary campaigns such as Save Our Children, and polling or other data on social attitudes. A number did lapse into issues beyond the period, eg Reagan's response to the AIDS epidemic. The most successful responses were able to explore the differing aims, experiences and relative success of the campaigns discussed. Whilst some candidates did tend to make judgements predominantly through the values and expectations of our time, most were also able to recognise to some degree the campaigns in context of the period.

In the years 1960-80, it could be argued that whilst minority groups had some ~~political and~~ ^{de jure} ~~legal~~ success in achieving their aims, ~~they~~ their success was somewhat limited in terms of realistic de facto success. Limited success suggests that minority civil rights groups, Native Americans, Hispanics and gay rights, were not efficient in achieving their goals. ~~in terms of~~ in order to measure this success one would need to breakdown their legislative or federal govt. responses, how much support ~~the minority groups aims, methods and outcomes to~~ they had and the responses provoked by their campaigns ~~that~~ evaluate the extent to which their successes ^{for Hispanic Americans} were limited. Whilst native Americans arguably had ~~some~~ many successes and their campaigns were not limited, gay rights ~~and Hispanics~~ still faced many issues indicating that their successes were incredibly limited.

There were many successes that arose from the aims, methods and outcomes of the Native Americans civil rights campaigns. In terms of legislative success, they were able to achieve some de jure successes. For example, president Johnson increased tribal funding to Native American ~~groups~~ lands

(Section A continued) whilst Nixon signed many important laws to protect their rights, including the 1972 Indian Education Act which increased funding to tribal schools, the 1974 Indian Financing Act which increased funding to many tribal reservations and the 1975 self-determination Act, giving more voting rights to Native Americans. This suggests that the campaigns for Native American rights ~~were~~ did not have limited success as many legal changes were made to promote Native American self-determination and the restoration of ancestral land. Native American tactics also arguably had great success, for example, the Alcatraz Occupation of 1969-71 which included ~~4~~ 400 Native American activists and 50 different tribes or the sit-in at the BIA office in 1972 which gathered national media coverage. This indicates now their success was not limited as such campaigns and use of non-violent tactics helped put pressure on the fed. govt. to achieve their aims. For example, after the sit in at BIA in the SC case ^{Antoine v. Washington} ~~Nicholas v. Law~~ (1974) the court ruled that state laws must take Native American cultural rights into consideration and exempt them from hunting laws, proving their success was not limited. However, despite the ^{legislative} success of their tactics, unemployment for NAs (Native Americans) was still 40% in 1970 and

(Section A continued) only 33% of tribal land had been returned whilst NAs were still elected from Hawaii. This suggests that despite these legal successes, NAs still faced many problems in regards to economic and land rights, suggesting de facto success was indeed somewhat limited. However, NAs had become an increasingly vocal political voice and many of their campaign efforts experienced success that was not limited such as the ^{village of the} Wounded Knee 1971 siege that lasted 71 days, ending in govt. recognition of their tribal rights. So, whilst NAs achieved legislative and political success, their success was indeed somewhat limited but not to the extent which some suggest.

Campaigns for hispanic rights did achieve some successes in terms of their aims methods and outcomes. For example, Cesar Chavez and the UFW were fighting for better workers rights and against deportation and took part in the Delano Grape Strike 1965-69, ~~beginning~~ walking off their ~~farmers~~ union many Mexicans and Filipinos worked at and told the country to boycott table grapes. This indicates how their ^{successes} ~~campaigns~~ weren't limited as in 1972 California

(Section A continued) Signed the Fair Labour readjustment Act giving workers the right to organise and to hear disputes over unfair practices, suggesting they had some legislative success in achieving workers rights and were not limited in their campaigns. After Rodolfo Gonzales encouraged a school walkout in LA including 10,000 students who were punished for speaking Spanish the 1974 education Act and 1975 voting rights Act provided more bilingual materials in public schools and elections suggesting they were not limited in their de jure successes. However, in terms of de facto success Hispanic groups still faced discrimination and economic equality. For example by 1970 half of Hispanic families in the Bronx, NY were ~~not~~ on welfare benefits whilst 1966 Cuban adjustment Act granted citizenship to Cuban-Americans, millions of Mexican and Filipinos still faced deportation, with 3.8 mil deported in operation wetback. This indicated that ~~at least~~ in terms of deportation and ~~economic~~ economic equality, their campaigns did have limited success however they still achieved many legislative, and widespread successes that suggest this statement is not completely accurate in regards to hispanic minority rights.

(Section A continued) Gay rights groups had much more limited successes in their aims, methods and outcomes compared to Native Americans and Hispanic campaigns. There were some successes, for example, the aims of gay rights groups were to decriminalise homosexuality, obtain unbiased information under the law and equal protection. In 1973, the American psychiatric Association removed homosexuality from the list of mental illnesses whilst the first openly gay mayor Harvey Milk was elected in 1977, suggesting their campaigns were not completely limited in terms of achieving decriminalisation and unbiased information. However, in terms of legislative ^{successes} ~~federal responses~~ and equal protection under the law gay rights campaigns were incredibly limited, for example Anita Bryan and the Citrus Commission for Florida ~~tried to pass~~ started a bill to "save our children", banning homosexual education in schools whilst by 1980, there were over 7,200 attacks on people provoked by homophobia with 982 in North Carolina. California also proposed ^{the} Briggs initiative to ban gay and lesbian learners in schools, emphasising how campaigns for minority rights did have limited success as despite their campaigns drawing on the tactics of other civil rights groups, e.g. the NYC pride march in 1970

(Section A continued) which amassed 100,000 people, they were extremely limited in achieving both de facto and de jure change, suggesting this statement is accurate in regards to the success of gay rights campaigns.

To conclude, it should be argued that some minority ~~fight~~ rights campaigns, including Native Americans and Hispanics, did not have limited success in achieving their aims particularly in regards to de jure successes. However, due to the entirely unique aims of gay rights groups their campaigns were incredibly limited and therefore this is partially accurate. Whilst ~~that~~ all groups had some success in theory, their successes of their campaigns were ~~not~~ somewhat limited in practice suggesting that this statement is to a limited extent accurate but accurate to a large extent in considering gay rights campaigns.



This response demonstrates some of the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with good knowledge to explore these. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, with confident and substantiated judgement being offered as to the extent of the success of the minority campaigns. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 2

Question 2 was the less popular of the two within Section A. In general, candidates responded with focused responses, with a variety of issues covered. There was a generally good offering on the given issue of anti-communism. Stronger responses tended to be able to give a range of examples from across the time period, and were able to clearly relate these to the political landscape, exploring the extent and nature of the influence they had. The period after the Second World War featured most frequently, with most candidates able to offer examples such as HUAC or McCarthy's activities. A number also examined the response of the Truman and Eisenhower regimes, exploring the significance of anti-communism in terms of its electoral influence and reach at different levels of politics. Most also examined the anti-communism seen after the First World War, detailing events such as the Red Scare, often in terms of how this shaped political attitudes over issues such as isolationism and immigration policy. A commonly found argument was that both red scares were significant, but that much of the impact was temporary. A smaller number considered further aspects of anti-communism in the Cold War through to the late 1970s, eg exploring the rise of a counter culture and reaction against this with reference to anti-communism. Stronger responses were often typified by taking opportunities such as this to explore the interrelationship between factors such as anti-communism, war, the media and the performance of the domestic economy. The majority though tended to treat factors in isolation. In referencing US involvement in foreign events, a small number of candidates did offer detailed material on a range of issues, but with limited reference to the issue of influence on the political landscape.

War featured in many as an alternative influence, with the Second World War being commonly cited, with arguments exploring the influence the war had in extending executive power and ending isolationism. Candidates referencing the First World War tended to examine the significance of this in relation to the era of Republican dominance, the desire for a 'return to normalcy' and isolationism, and in some cases the extent to which this contributed to the anti-communism that was seen after the war. In general candidates were more likely to place greater emphasis on the significance of war in relation to the consequences of increased military spending, with reference to the Second World War, Korea and Vietnam. Analysis of the Cold War also featured in many, including examinations of growing mistrust of the government and the growth of counter culture attitudes. Other issues explored included particular political ideas, economic factors, the role of the media, and the role played by individual presidents.

In order to assess if anti-communism was the most significant influence on the political landscape one must consider its influence on public attitudes ^{and perception of} towards politics and the president and the actions of the ^{government and} president. ~~as a result of the creation of the~~ To be the most significant factor it would have the most impact and create the most change to these factors overall although anti-communism had a big impact on the political landscape by changing the role of the president and changing public attitudes towards politics other factors such as the economy had a more consistent impact throughout the time period and was also hugely changed the political landscape.

It is largely accurate to say that anti-communism had a large impact on the political landscape due to the events that occurred as a result. The first red scare occurred in 1919-1920

(Section A continued) and it changed the political landscape because it made people fearful of communists. In 1919 2 million people joined the American Legion which was created to hunt communists, this changed public attitudes as it made people suspicious of their friends and accuse ^{of being communist} people. ~~the~~ ^{second} red scare that occurred ~~changed presidential action~~ ^{because they} between 1947 and 1954 ~~occurred~~ once again made people fearful and especially ^{communist} as spies were found to be working in government. So in 1947 loyalty boards were created to test the loyalty of those in government. This would've made the public fear that their own government was communist ~~therefore~~ making them trust government less. This also demonstrates government involvement as they got involved to try and ~~deffo~~ overcome the red scare issue. Another way ~~the~~ government got involved with anti-communism was by initiating the cold war in 1947 ^{which continued until after 1990} with the Truman ~~administration~~ ^{doctrine} to try and stop communism spreading. This changed the political landscape because it changed the role of the president as they ^{could not go} ~~went~~ to war without congress agreement. It would

(Section A continued) also have changed the public's perception of the government as this was a clear stance against communism. Overall this demonstrates that anti-communism did have a huge influence on the political landscape however it was only really significant at periods of big fear which was not consistent across the time period. ^{so therefore not the most significant factor} ~~therefore~~ ~~it didn't~~

this statement could be said to be largely inaccurate due to another factor of war being a more significant influence on the political landscape. Firstly World War I changed the political landscape as it reduced the public's trust in the government as they had not wanted to go to war and therefore it changed the government's actions and ~~that~~ America became an isolationist country, therefore they did not join the League of Nations and created Neutrality Acts between 1935 and 1939. this therefore demonstrates the influence of war on public attitude and the action and legislation made by government.

(Section A continued) the Korean war from 1950-1953 also had a big influence on perception of government as there were many reports of Congress and the president's disagreements which went against the public's hope of the American Dream and made the government seem incompetent, therefore changing attitudes towards government. The Vietnam war ~~also had changed~~ ^{also had changed} the presidential role as now the public felt the government were more concerned with international policies and in 1968 shouted at Johnson "hey hey LBJ how many kids have you killed today?" This placed the responsibility of war on Johnson's shoulders and therefore changed public perception and government action as they were more involved with international affairs. Therefore war appears to have ^{had} more of an impact on government and public attitudes, and due to how much the war would have affected everyone ^{daily} this is arguably more significant than the influence of anti-communism.

(Section A continued) Another factor that could be considered more significant than anti-communism is the influence of the economy as that changed the political landscape ~~massively~~ ^{by} hugely. Post world war 2 there was an economic boom which meant the public wanted less government control and therefore the government adopted a ~~laissez~~ ^{laissez} faire approach and didn't get involved. For example Cordell was so uninformed that he asked congress how he should vote. Therefore this shows a change in public attitude and government action ~~for example~~. However after the 1929 wall street crash government had to change their approach and public wanted them to so they became much more involved and in 1933 Roosevelt created the Alphabet Agencies ~~which~~ ^{such as} for example the NRA created ~~rules~~ ^{codes} of practice for businesses when before they'd been allowed to do ~~as much~~ as what they liked. Therefore this also changed the political landscape and suggests that when the economy is good

(Section A continued) government became less involved and when it's bad they get more involved. ~~Again~~ This is shown again in the 70s economic decline, after the 50s and 60s Baby boom in which the economy benefitted and government went back to a more laissez-faire approach. The economy then crashed again so government got more involved for example in 1979 they put restriction on the money supply in an attempt to fix the economy. Overall ^{this means that} the economy consistently changes the political landscape depending on whether things are going well or struggling. Also since the economy greatly impacts everyone's lives it would have the biggest impact on opinions and force of action.

In conclusion anti-communist influences did impact the political landscape through changing government action and the public's perception of politics and the president similarly to how war did. However anti-communist major impact was during the red scare.

(Section A continued) Not continued throughout the time period like the economy did. Furthermore the economy was a more significant influence on everyday life and was majorly impacted the economy too day to day lives, therefore ~~showing~~ suggesting that anti-communism was perhaps a more significant factor.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates many of the qualities of a level 5 response. There is a clear and effectively sustained focus on the question. One of the strengths of this response is the quality of specific exemplification, and the deployment of this – the response offers a range of detailed examples which are used to demonstrate the extent to which anti-communism was the most significant influence on the political landscape. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is well reasoned judgement, weighing the relative importance of the various causes.

Question 3

Question 3 was the less popular of the two within Section B, although it produced a wide range of responses. Less successful responses were largely those which were offered limited material on the given issue of government policies, and/or limited focus on affluence. There were also responses which offered limited chronological range. At the higher levels, responses were tended to be distinguished by a sharp focus on the examining exactly how government policies – and other factors – brought about affluence, often with consideration of what constitutes affluence, and an exploration of the interaction between the chosen factors under consideration. There was also impressive consideration of the relative importance of different factors at different points within the time period.

Commonly found points relating to government policies included: Republican policies during the 1920s, although seemingly with a greater focus on tariffs than other aspects of the laissez faire approach; the New Deal, which featured heavily; wartime policies such as Lend-Lease and the GI Bill; Truman's Fair Deal; specific measures such as the Highways Acts; LBJ's Great Society programmes. Stronger responses were those that securely related these to 'growing affluence', eg those which argued that the New Deal played an important role in bringing the USA out of the Great Depression, and thus laid a basis, but which distinguished this from the mass affluence seen in the 1950s. When considering policies which sought to broaden affluence to sections of society to which it hadn't fully reached, some candidates lost focus, although others did offer reasoned analysis of this.

Commonly offered alternative reasons were typically the effect of the Second World War and Cold War, the role of business innovation and developing technologies, growing consumerism and consumption, favourable trading conditions, and available resources. The majority of candidates were able to offer sufficient coverage of other factors alongside government policies, and also cover the chronological range sufficiently.

One further observation was that many candidates appear to interpret government policies largely in terms of government funded programmes. Whilst there was sufficient valid material within such an approach, it was generally found that candidates who also recognised government policies in terms of issues such as taxation, monetary policy, regulation and general approach towards the business environment were able to offer a fuller exploration, and tended to be more able to appreciate and explore the relationship between government policies and other factors.

Government powers introduced between 1917-80 were ~~important when growing~~ an important factor behind the growing affluence however was not the main force behind growing affluence as there were issues with confidence in government which may have hindered the success of powers. Economic growth and post war affluence in America played a very key role behind the growing affluence in America.

During the early 1930s there were issues with the stability and effectiveness of government as Herbert Hoover did not govern effectively and ~~in times of economic decline~~ he ~~he~~ a time of economic decline he intervened too late. As a result this paved the way for Franklin D. Roosevelt's recovery and his implementation of the New Deal. FDR created the New Deal in order to restimulate the economy by attempting to

(Section B continued) initially improve businesses and increase employment. The introduction of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) was very beneficial and helped to stimulate confidence as it ~~helped to~~ created voluntary ~~work~~ work for people and allowed further development in the American economy. ~~Inflation rates were high and~~ The introduction of fireside chats also helped to increase affluence and confidence in America as people in America felt that they ~~became~~ were beginning to grow a connection with the president in which they had not experienced before. However, it could be argued that the influence of government policies ~~were~~ were not as successful as the New Deal did have differing effects for different groups of people, for example, the New Deal was not a success when supporting women or minorities which suggests that it was flawed and may have resulted in a decline in affluence among different groups of people.

Another factor could be the economic benefit

(Section B continued) of war. America joined WW2 in December 1941 and as a result ended up benefiting from the war as they did not ~~lose~~ withstand large amounts of damages and their industries boomed after and during the war. Production increased by 50% during the war and they reached full employment which is measured to be around 3% or under being unemployed. As the war ended America shifted to ~~as~~ a consumption based economy as people began to consume goods such as cars as a result of great improvements in productivity due to large scale innovations in manufacturing during the war which allowed ~~the~~ firms to produce goods at cheaper costs and sell goods at cheaper costs. Inflation remained below 1% which allowed consumption to continue increasing. There was an increase in suburban living ~~as~~ which resulted in large ~~increases~~ increases in ~~the~~ the consumption of white goods (fridges, microwaves) as house ownership increased. There was a post-war baby boom which allowed infant product sales

(Section B continued) to also ~~increased~~ increase as the sale of apples tripled from 1944 to 1948. The economic boom led to a large increase in confidence and affluence in America as it led to large developments in industries and increased quality of life as the cost of goods fell. However, a clear downside to this would be the inevitable decline in economic success and the impact of a recession and incidents such as the oil crisis where the price of oil increased by 40% which led to higher costs for firms to produce goods impacting the rate of inflation.

Further policies introduced such as Truman's Fair Deal helped to try and replicate the success of previous policies such as the New Deal. ~~However~~ Truman also created the Truman doctrine which helped to support other countries and this did generate an increase in confidence as it benefited America with the reduction of communism. However, people lost confidence due to issues such as the Korean War.

(Section B continued) and troops being sent to Korea as media coverage led to ~~the~~ people believing that it was not the correct approach which in turn reduced the confidence in the presidency which led to further government policies to have a diminished effect. It could also be argued that further issues such as the 1972 watergate scandal also contributed to a lack of affluence in America as people were shocked with Nixon's involvement. This led to people not trusting the government and may have even made it harder to carry out government policies.

Government policies did play a large role when attempting to stimulate affluence and confidence however due to scandals and decisions made by government such as sending troops to Korea and Vietnam it reduced how effective policies ~~were~~ were and as a result economic growth and prosperity in the economy had the largest impact on growing affluence in America.



This response achieved a level 3. There is some awareness of the demands of the question, although at times, material is not focused towards this, or analysis is implicit. Valid points are made regarding the role played by both government and other factors, and accurate and relevant knowledge is included. The inconsistent direction is demonstrated across the response, thus demonstrating some organisation, but with parts that lack clear coherence in respect of the demands of the question.

WW2 - Lanham Act Eleanor Roosevelt ^{camp} Tara
Now - '90 voice of women's liberation'
60% said they didn't mind ^{married} women working
Roe vs Wade 1973 Equal Pay 1963 Betty Friedan

I agree to a partial extent that the position of women changed considerably during the years 1917-80 due to the fact that while it can be said that ~~women~~ more women, married or unmarried, were now able to work and have control / freedom over their bodies, it could also be argued that the rights that they had gained did not happen in practice. for example by 1980 women were still facing discrimination at work and were still paid less than men. Therefore while their position may have changed it was only slightly due to the fact that they still faced ^{similar problems} ~~the same problems~~ as they did in 1917 in 1980.

It could be argued that ^{the position} ~~women~~ of women had changed due to the fact that they had more freedom and control over their bodies. In the 'Roaring 20's' flapper girls were women who cut their hair short

(Section B continued) and raised their hemlines and went to sports clubs without an escort. They represented a new freedom that went against the traditional values of women and only being a housewife. However only a small amount of women were a part of this and they were usually younger girls. Therefore this did not apply to a majority of women. ~~Women had~~ ^{A feature that} was similar in many of the women's rights campaigns ~~fought for the right for abortions and contraception~~ was the right to contraception and abortions. This was granted in the Roe vs Wade case 1973 and contraception was passed a few years prior. Therefore it can be said that the position of women had changed considerably by 1980 as they had more freedom over their bodies and sexuality. However while this legislation was passed it was still considered immoral in many people's eyes and women who did want an abortion were practically shunned by society which stopped some women from getting one. So in turn women still felt as if they had no choice but to have the baby whether they wanted to or not, so it could be argued that they were in the same position by 1980 as they were 1917.

The position of women in work ~~changed~~ ^{could be} seen to have changed considerably due to the fact that more women, married or unmarried, were able to work, especially during the Second World War. Since

(Section B continued) a lot of men had gone to war, that left job opportunities for women to take over. The government passed the Canham Act in 1941 to allow ~~daycare~~ for more women to drop their children at day care so that they could work. Women were also working in more professional positions not just in domestic jobs such as dress making. The percentage of people who thought that married women should be able to work had risen from around 30% before the war to around 60% after it. In spite of this, when the men came back from war they wanted their jobs back so therefore ~~many women were back to being~~ ^{while some women were able to keep their job, many} ~~were unemployed~~ ^{became unemployed again.} While it could be argued that there was an increase ~~there was an increase in women getting jobs after the~~ in job opportunities for women after this, many men still thought women should stay at home and look after the kids or become a housewife. The government stopped funding the Canham act so for some mothers they had no choice but to stay at home and look after the kids as they could not afford day care. Therefore for some women their position had not changed at all by the end of the 1940's.

It could be said that the opinion of women had not changed considerably ~~in some~~ ^{in the} due to the fact that many still considered the position of women to stay at home and look after the children. In schools girls

(Section B continued) were not taught to think about the future apart from marrying a man and looking after him and then eventually having children. Therefore ~~women~~ girls are taught from an early age that their position in life was a housewife. It was found in the 60's that careers / guidance counsellors were not pushing girls to think about high profession careers for their future. By 1980 women were still being discriminated against at work, as while there were acts that said this was illegal, businesses found loopholes to this and treated women less than men. The Equal pay act was passed in 1963 however by 1980 women were still being paid less than men ~~or~~ even when they were working in the same position. America did not sign the discrimination against women legislation, they had a long time period where they needed at least 3/4 of the country to sign it however 15 states refused to sign it and it still had not been signed today. Therefore it can be seen that the view of women in many of the public's eye did not change, so in turn the position of women did not change considerably in terms of how they were viewed in society. ~~to conclude~~

agree
In conclusion ~~I believe~~ to a partial extent that women position in society changed considerably from 1917-80 as while they did gain more rights and progressed in the working world, their ~~to~~ successes only happened

(Section B continued) in theory and not much in practice. For example the women's liberation movement was not taken seriously even by other civil rights groups as they viewed women as weak and only painted them in a radical light in the media. Because of examples like this it can be viewed that the position of women did not change considerably since they were still being treated the same in 1917 as they were in 1980.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates most of the qualities of level 4. There is a clear awareness of the demands of the question. Sufficient material is used to examine a range of relevant issues, and in doing so, the response explores key issues, and there is some attempt to consider the extent to which there was considerable change, although this could be developed further. The response is effectively organised, with logical argument.

Question 4

This was overwhelmingly the more popular question in Section B and, in the main, candidates seemed well prepared, both in terms of their knowledge, and their ability to organise a response to the question. Such responses typically demonstrated good knowledge of issues related to the position of women in the USA, a broad coverage of the period, and an ability to focus these on the issue of change. The majority of candidates attempted to organise their responses around themes, typically the social, economic and political position of women. Such responses tended to be effective in allowing candidates to develop and explore, balancing impressive knowledge with a clear focus on exploring change across the full period. A number structured their responses around the impact particular issues had on, for example, legislation, war work, and the women's movement. Such responses could also prove effective, although some responses did lose focus from the precise demands of the question, eg into an analysis of the reasons why women made gains, or descriptions of events, and thus less clear focus on change across the period. Within all of these approaches, a wide range of topics featured, notably gaining the vote, flapper girls, the experience of wartime work (in both wars), suburban living, the baby boom, the women's movement, Betty Friedan and NOW, and legal landmarks such as *Roe v Wade*.

This question also tended to produce considered and focused conclusions examining the extent of change. In stronger responses, these were often a product of reasoned evaluation within the individual themes examined, with candidates exploring issues according to criteria such as the starting point of women's position, the demands of campaigners, variation across different sub-groups, the extent to which equality was achieved, and in some cases consideration of whether the extent to which progress on patriarchal terms was indeed equality. A number of candidates also sought to weigh the extent of change in the different themes they examined.

Where some candidates were less successful, it tended to be due to either, or both, of the following two factors. Firstly, responses which offered a considerable amount of knowledge, but with less focus, analysis and evaluation of change, with some responses offering detailed narrative with limited reasoning and judgement. Secondly, a minority of responses did not sufficiently cover the chronology, such as responses which largely focused on the impact of the Second World War and developments during the 1960s.

To a large extent, I agree that the position of ~~women~~ women had changed significantly in the extent of improvement across 1917 to 1980. The role of women had largely improved through the bounds of legislation, both wartime and domestic, as well as the increasing social position of women through the feminist movement and creation of icons such as Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem. Whilst there were limitations such as Phyllis Schlafly and STOP ERA preventing the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment, ultimately there was a significant change and improvement in the role of women.

The bounds of legislation passed throughout 1917-80 highlights the explicit improvements in the position

(Section B continued) of women as being written into the constitution. The 19th Amendment acts as the initial monumental piece of legislation in granting women the vote due to their wartime contributions to industry in World War One. The passing of the 19th Amendment in 1920 highlights a stark shift in societal attitude to both the role and the position of women. The legislation of World War Two built upon this improvement in the 1941 Lanham Act providing childcare for women ~~in the~~ to encourage the influx of women workers in the war industry, it enabled the influx of an extra 6 million ~~to~~ female workers from ~~1941~~¹⁹⁴¹ to 1945. Whilst this legislation is significant, arguably it was a pragmatic decision of the government to help the war industry as opposed to a genuine attempt to bolster and improve the position of women; thus it ended post-war and women had to return to their role as domestic mothers and wives. The formation of the feminist movement in the 1960s catalysed the legislation

(Section B continued) passed for women and thus the 1964 Civil Rights Act, whilst not being passed solely for women, did include gender discrimination. The Supreme Court ruling of *Roe v Wade* in 1973 legalised abortion and the *Eisenstadt v Baird* ~~1972~~ ruling in 1972 legalised contraception. The 1970s rulings of the Supreme Court are fundamental to the improved position of women as it wholly enabled female sexual empowerment and sexual liberation as demanded by Gloria Steinem and the National Organisation for Women. The proposition of the Equal Rights Amendment is crucial to the changing position of women in that it was the first equal rights legislation concerning gender and would secure female equality, it was given 10 years to be ratified. The legislative gains experienced by women epitomise the extent of the improvement of the position of women.

Furthermore, the role of women improved socially both in the New Deal through Frances Perkins and ~~Mary Bethune~~ as well as the 1960s through Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem. Frances Perkins was the first female secretary of labour and was appointed by Roosevelt, she headed multiple New Deal Agencies and fundamentally improved the position of women. In 1933, the Civilian Conservation Corps banned women from outside, environmental work, female volunteers received 50¢ a week whereas male workers received \$1 per day. Perkins helped to develop New Deal alphabet agencies to cater to women in which the CCC employed 8500 women between 1934-37. The emergence of Betty Friedan through her 1963 novel 'The Feminine Mystique' inspired the second wave of feminism of the 1960s in which she exposed the dissatisfaction of women in being shrouded by the cult of domesticity in the suburbs of the 1950s. Friedan

was a founding member of NOW in 1966 and NOW campaigned for equal ^{female} pay, autonomy over female bodies and the ERA. NOW fought over 1000 discrimination cases and won \$13 million in compensation for women. The 1970 march for women's rights was co-ordinated by NOW and The Young Radicals and resulted in NOW membership increasing to 40,000.

Gloria Steinem transformed the image of feminism in her social antics and behaviour and created a community in allowing women to crave more than the American Dream of suburbia. The roles of individuals greatly improved the position of women through the transformation of feminism into a mass movement. In 1930, 80% of society were against married women working, this decreased to 38% in 1972, showing the changing nature of societal sympathies and expectations of women. Through the influence of Perkin's, Friedan and Steinem and the popularisation of feminism, the

(Section B continued)

extent of female improvement is evident.

However, whilst the extent of the changing position of women is vast and explicit, there are limitations to this improvement, namely the failure of the ratification of the ERA. The Conservative backlash to the 1960s feminist movement manifested itself in Phyllis Schlafly's creation of STOP ERA in 1972. The organisation reached 40,000 members highlighting the disunity of the female movement in that not all women wanted change and improvement. Schlafly conducted tv and radio interviews and multiple campaigns over years that Equal Rights would produce female socialism and dismantle the traditional aspects of American society. The ERA needed 38 states to be ratified, however was only supported by 35, this alongside the lack of sympathy of 1970s presidents to

women's rights highlights the limitations to the improvement of women. By 1980, women still earned 73% of a man's salary as employees found ways around being bound by equal pay legislation. Furthermore, federal funding for abortions was removed in ^{the} 1970s and thus whilst it was legalised, the bridging of the gap to accessing abortion had not been achieved. Women had improved to a large extent, however by 1980 they had not achieved equality and so the difference in position of women in 1917 and 1980, whilst was monumental for the time, it had not been transformative. Women were not in as many executive and managerial positions as men and the US refused to sign UN legislation regarding the banning of gender discrimination, thus there were limitations to the extent of change that women experienced.

(Section B continued)

Overall, the position of women did change considerably from 1917 to 1980 through ~~legislative~~ ~~acts~~ the passing of significant and crucial legislation as well as the changing position of women in a social context.

By 1980, women were not burdened with rigid expectations of being a perfect wife and mother such as in 1917. Whilst there were ~~legisla~~ limitations to such improvements such as the failure of the ERA to be ratified, in 1980 women had the social, political and economic freedom that they had not accessed in 1917, thus experienced considerable change in their position.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates the qualities of level 5. There is a sustained focus on the demands of the question, with sufficient knowledge to explore these. Judgements are reasoned and substantiated, evaluating the extent of change. Arguments are well organised and coherent.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to access the middle and higher levels, generally by recognising and explaining the arguments in the two extracts, and building on this with own knowledge. The strongest responses tended to offer a comparative analysis of the views, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most candidates were able to identify some of the main differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, such as how Extract 1 highlights the growth in prosperity that generally occurred, along with the impact of lower taxes and falling inflation, in contrast to the negative aspects Extract 2 emphasises, highlighting the plight of those who did not share, along with scandals and deteriorating social conditions for many.

Candidates took various approaches to their analysis of the extracts, eg some assessed Extract 1, then Extract 2; others assessed both extracts together within the same paragraphs, some within political, economic and social categories; a further approach was to assess the positives and negatives of Reagan's presidency, relating these to the extracts. All of these could prove valid and successful, although those who sought to use the extracts together tended to be more successful, allowing for more direct comparison.

Most candidates were able to identify and consider several of the following issues arising from the extracts: Reaganomics, inflation and unemployment; deregulation and the Savings and Loan crisis; the varied experience across the American demographic; homelessness; the AIDS crisis; the Iran-Contra scandal; the Reagan legacy (eg on the Bush & Clinton administrations); the black American middle class; inner cities and the struggles of minority groups; the growth of high tech industry.

The following issues tended to be important in determining the quality of responses. The vast majority of responses demonstrated understanding of the views, although a minority did treat them as sources of information, and thus offer limited engagement with the views. Some responses demonstrated secure understanding, but tended to describe and explain them, with limited attempts at discussion and evaluation of their arguments. Stronger responses engaged more in the discussion of the arguments, with comparison and evaluation of these. Some otherwise strong responses focused excessively on narrow aspects of certain extracts to the detriment of other aspects. As far as the use of contextual knowledge was concerned, most managed to offer some valid evidence with which to examine the given views. Most were also able to securely link this to the arguments within Extract 1 and 2, and thus reach at least the middle levels. However, some tended to use this to explain and expand on the material from the extracts, and thus were less well positioned to reach the higher levels. Stronger responses were more able to carefully select evidence to examine the merits of the given arguments. The very strongest tended to thoroughly discuss the arguments and reach reasoned and substantiated judgements.

Certain issues were more likely to present problems for some candidates. 'Trickle down' was sometimes cited as an explicitly named policy of the Reagan government. Whilst candidates were often able to cite the impact the Reagan administration had on inflation, few recognised why this was an achievement, i.e. the impact that high inflation had on people (and those that did tended to be the small minority who set Reagan's policies in the context of the experience of the 1970s). A number also gave figures for taxation rates which were incorrect, or misleading in their use. Deregulation also presented an issue for some candidates, with some misconceptions, and in some cases, ascribing nefarious motives to the Reagan administration, without recognition of the benefits to consumers from increased competition and efficiency it aimed to produce – which can of course be debated.

One further issue that should be noted, and may indeed explain some of the issues noted above, is that of candidates' pre-conceived views on the controversy. It is perfectly valid for candidates to take a view, and reach a conclusion which is firmly for or against the given proposition. However, stronger responses which tend to arrive at such conclusions are careful to ensure these are substantiated. In the case of this particular question, the vast majority disagreed with the proposition, and thus sided with the views put forward by Rossinow in Extract 2. Doing so did not stop candidates achieving high marks, as long as they ensured this was the result of genuine discussion. Sadly, there appeared to be candidates who did not do as well as they perhaps could have done, as a result of an imbalanced analysis of the two extracts. For example, some gave the impression of analysis, but tended to select only evidence to support their favoured view/extract, and select only evidence which countered the view they did not agree with. Some other responses were outright dismissive, calling arguments unfounded, untrue or inaccurate, with little evidence to back such claims up. Others tended to be more likely to misconstrue points within the extract they disagreed with, or offer their own evidence which did not relate to the point from the extract they were attempting to challenge, than they tended to be when supporting arguments for the extract they favoured. For example, several candidates simply dismissed Extract 1's point that 'People of all races were moving up the income ladder' as untrue, and cited Extract 2's highlighting of the injustices within the 'criminal justice system' towards 'poor and black communities' to be the correct explanation. More measured responses were able to recognise both these related points could hold merit, and explore these in the light of their own knowledge, to reach a reasoned evaluation of the extent to which the notion that Reagan 'shaped America for the better' can be seen to be valid when considering the impact it had on racial minorities. Such issues were seen in various forms, in essays which attained across the range of levels, and thus did not necessarily stop these from achieving higher levels, depending on the particular manifestation of the issues described. That said, there is little doubt that more successful responses tended to be more measured in their language, analysis and judgement, and were able to subject both extracts to the same level of scrutiny. Such responses also tended to be more likely to explore the America that existed in between the extremes of rich and poor.

5 In the light of differing interpretations, how convincing do you find the view that the Reagan presidency shaped America for the better?

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

(20)

Ronald Reagan's presidency was one of the most controversial, and debated leaderships in American history. Extract 1 mostly praises Reagan, arguing that his economic policies, known as Reaganomics, were an "economic miracle". Extract 2 ~~dis~~ predominantly disagrees and heavily criticizes Reagan's neo-liberal approach, claiming that there was "widespread suffering during his presidency". However, although Extract 2 considers some valid points, particularly social factors and disparities, Extract 1 uses more accurate claims and also looks at Reagan's legacy, better understanding his impact on America. Therefore, it is clear that Extract 1's point that Reagan shaped America for the better is more accurate.

Extract 1 agrees with the question, stating that under Reagan, "prosperity was almost uninterrupted". Indeed, economically, Reagan's

brought significant improvements, increasing the GDP rate from -0.3% in 1980 to 7.6% by 1984. In addition, Extract 1 covers the benefits of the Reagan presidency over other economic indicators - "inflation fell by over half". Between 1980-88, Reagan managed to reduce the rate of inflation from 12.5% to 1.1% , showing major improvements in terms of lowering prices, such as those of fuel, through his "deregulation policies". Extract 2, however, claims that Reagan tried "unburdening the rich from taxes" whilst Extract 1 argues that he generally kept "taxes low".* Although also decreasing the ^{top} tax rate from 70% - 50% via the 1981 Economic Recovery Tax Act, and then down to 28% with the 1986 Tax Reform Act, Reagan's ERTA in 1984 also lowered the lowest tax rate from 14% to 11% , proving Extract 1 right once again. * something that his "successors embraced, as seen by Bill Clinton's presidency.

Conversely, Extract 2 focuses on the "shameless approach" taken by Reagan. Economically, this extract claims that Reagan increased wealth disparities and led to larger economic inequalities, helping the ~~people~~ men who are already wealthy". Indeed, the wealthy

did gain a lot during the 1980s; in fact, the top 1% went from owning 8% of the country's wealth in 1980, to owning 15% by 1990. Likewise, Rossinow argues that Reagan's presidency was negative for "black communities" as they were treated harshly by the "criminal justice system". During Reagan's presidency, representation of African Americans had arguably declined in the justice system, with only 7 out of 368 federal judges being black. Nevertheless, Extract 1 does claim that "all races were generally moving up the income ladder" under Reagan. This does indeed limit the scope of the argument of Extract 2 as the black middle class did see an increase during the 1980s, showing that even African Americans saw some victories under Reagan.

Furthermore, Extract 1 suggests that "employment fell" under Reagan. This is completely accurate as unemployment rates went from 10.8% in 1982 to 5.3% by 1988. Nevertheless, Extract 2 also says there was a "problem of homelessness". Throughout the 1980s, homelessness did in fact double, from 200,000 in 1980, to 400,000 by 1990. This does

suggest that Reagan's economic agenda, despite ~~being~~ "growing opportunities in living standards, as claimed by Extract 1, did have some limitations. Finally, while Extract 1 is almost solely focused on his economic policies, Extract 2 mentions Reagan's "indifferent bystander" approach to the AIDS epidemic. This is indeed true to an extent; Reagan only increased spending on solving this "crisis" after his friend, Rock Hudson, died of it in 1985². After this, Reagan spent \$2.3 billion until 1989 on helping solve the AIDS epidemic.

In conclusion, Reagan's presidency clearly had tremendous impacts on many different groups of people in the United States. Extract 2 does ~~3~~ convey several weaknesses of his presidency, ranging from the "victims" in society, which Rossinow considers to have been minorities and the lower class, to the "range of corrupt practices", referring to the 1985 Iran Contra Affair. However, Extract 1 manages to highlight the "remarkable recovery" achieved by Reagan following the recessions in the early 1980s. Extract 1 also manages to cover all economic policies and their legacy on Bush

and Clinton. Ultimately, despite Extract 2 offering valid points, Extract 1 is more accurate.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This Question 5 Level 5 response possesses several obvious strengths, namely (1) It offers a clear understanding of the extracts and uses this to develop an analysis based on the two competing views. (2) It uses own knowledge effectively to examine the merits of these views. (3) It is focused on the precise issue (whether Reagan shaped America for the better) rather than the general controversy and (4) It offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue.

Paper Summary

Paper Summary

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

Section A/B responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (eg main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- Focus carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – eg a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, eg write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (eg looking at other causes, consequences, with only limited reference to that given in the question)
- Answers which only gave a partial response, eg a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

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

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, eg consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, eg clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors
- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, eg consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, eg extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, eg through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

