



Pearson

# Examiners' Report

## June 2017

GCE History 8HI0 1F

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

### See students' scores for every exam question.

Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.

Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

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

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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

June 2017

Publications Code 8HI0\_1F\_1706\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the second year of the reformed AS Level Paper 1F, In search of the American Dream: the USA, c1917–96.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections 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 time span.

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 the 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 the 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

This was a popular question amongst candidates, and produced responses at all levels. Most candidates grasped the conceptual focus of the question, and were able to consider Roosevelt's influence set against other factors, in particular the experience of the Great Depression and the Second World War. Most responses demonstrated understanding of the move from a laissez faire to interventionist presidency, and many were able to frame this in terms of there having developed a perceived need for a more interventionist approach. A few went further and questioned the extent of the change, citing how aspects of the legislation introduced by Roosevelt were later challenged and declared unconstitutional, although the need to focus firmly on the second-order conceptual demands of the question – causation – should be remembered with this. Some responses – typically higher-scoring – in qualifying and evaluating the extent of his impact, reflected on the impact FDR's influence had on the scope of subsequent holders of the office, such as Truman. For a minority though, this was a question which presented some difficulty, at times seemingly borne out of misunderstanding of the notion of the presidency.

Such responses tended to offer a description, explanation or even analysis of the New Deal, but with limited focus on the precise demands of the question. In contrast, high-performing candidates were able to focus carefully on the presidency (drawn from theme 1 of the option), yet firmly tie relevant knowledge from other aspects of the course to explore issues.

Plan:

Thesis:

- ⇒ Roosevelt's new Deal, 1933 election
- ⇒ His approach with media eg 'Fireside Chats'
- ⇒ Government intervention - Welfare. Alphabet agencies
- ⇒ More hands on approach to government/presidency, executive orders. Domestic policy.

Anti-thesis:

- ⇒ Failure of Laissez-faire policies (Republican)
- ⇒ 1929 Wall Street Crash, (Unemployment)
- ⇒ Hoover, 'rugged individualism' Hoarevilles.
- ⇒ Radio/media attention
- ⇒ WWII, the government had to become more involved in international affairs.

Roosevelt had significant influence in moving the presidency from a Republican, isolationist perspective in the years 1933-45. He also impacted how the White ~~hou~~ House was run, creating a more interventionist government with the president becoming ~~more~~ increasing involved with legislation and domestic policy. Roosevelt (Section A continued) ~~br~~ brought the ~~people to the~~ American people to the front of the ~~prese~~ presidential job. However other factors did also cause changes to the presidency in contrast to previous years.

Roosevelt's ideas about welfare and government intervention through his New Deal Policies changed to presidency to become more interventionist. Unlike the previous Republican government Roosevelt was active in putting the welfare of the American people the responsibility of the President and the government. He did this by abandoning the previous ~~lasser~~ 'Laissez-faire' policies of Presidents like Coolidge and Harding and introduced aid through Alphabet Agencies. Roosevelt ran his election Campaign on his New Deal ideas that would help the American people tackle the problems of unemployment and a failing economy due to the 1929 Wall Street Crash. Which was a direct result of limited government intervention and regulation of banks. Roosevelt offered welfare for the ~~these~~ poorest Americans and offered training for those

who were unemployed along with schemes to get them back into work, for example ~~prge~~ projects building roads or bridges. This caused the presidency to become more responsible in helping the poorest and most needing Americans.

**(Section A continued)** Nevertheless, the need for Roosevelt's New Deal stemmed from the ~~collapse~~ economic ~~gap~~ collapse in 1929 and the decreasing confidence in a Republican government under Hoover. Republican policies which had ~~pre~~ previously caused an economic boom was failing. The American people were suffering due to the mistakes of deregulation within banking. The limited hold Hoover had on the situation and the presentation of Hoover just leaving the poor to fend for themselves through the named 'hoovervilles' caused the change in the presidency. Before Roosevelt comes to office ~~Her~~ President Hoover identified the mistakes of the Republican governments and lack of government intervention. He starts creating government provision such as the Hoover dams but the American people had lost confidence in him so elected Roosevelt. The change of the Presidency to a more interventionist one was started before Roosevelt ~~at~~ due to the economic collapse.

However, Roosevelt not only changed the presidency to be more interventionist but he also influenced a

Change in how the President ~~interacted~~ interacted with the public and the media. Roosevelt was confident and used the media to his advantage unlike Presidents before him. He understood people and the power of gaining and keeping support. He started (Section A continued) 'Fireside chats' which he used to present policies and simply explain White House affairs. This brought politics into the homes of ordinary Americans, they felt part of the decision making and more informed. Similarly, Roosevelt had weekly press meetings answering questions and giving off the record and on the record responses. Through this more prominent public image of the presidency and the now expectation for the President to be open and honest. Roosevelt influenced a ~~more~~ ~~best~~ Presidency more ~~to~~ concerned with how it ~~came~~ came across in the media and with public perception. Truman inherited a presidency that needed to have good public relations.

Change in the Presidency also came due to a 'boom' in the population having access to news via Radios. ~~also~~ News became a lot more ~~re-~~available and quicker in comparison to newspapers. Due to this Roosevelt had to be a President that controlled the public perception of the Presidency because Radio shows opened up an area for more opinions from

Other sources. Radio shows listened to by many Americans meant new ideas and more instant reporting on current affairs. To keep up with this new media expansion Roosevelt had to turn his attention to media. ~~It~~ Thus changing the role of the Presidency to being more media friendly.

Roosevelt also made the Presidency more involved in domestic policy making, which did in turn cause worry regarding the separation of powers. During WWII especially Roosevelt had executive powers to bypass Congress. ~~For~~ For example his executive order 8805 to desegregate War Work. This gave the president more power and the president became significantly more important in leading the country through legislation.

Roosevelt's influence on a more interventionist and hands on presidency did cause the role of the president to change in the years 1933-45. His tackling of the economic crisis, homelessness and unemployment through his 'New Deal' policies created a more interventionist presidency that future presidents couldn't ignore. Both Truman and Kennedy after Roosevelt understood the importance of government support. Similarly the presidential change in working



With the media and the image of the president also was a direct result of Roosevelt's influence. This also can be seen later on by Kennedy and the importance it had in his election campaign. Roosevelt started off the importance of public image and (Section A continued) caused the public president's job to change due to this. Nevertheless, Roosevelt's influence during the 1933-45 changed the presidency but other factors were also influential. Both the lack of confidence in a Republican government due to the Wall Street Crash and the new significance of media due to wide spread radio use forced change for the Presidency. High levels of unemployment and homelessness called for government intervention. And new media coverage demanded a more open President prepared to interact with the American people.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates the qualities of a Level 4. There is a clear focus on the question, and the response is well organised to address this throughout. Sufficient knowledge is deployed throughout to explore the issue of Roosevelt's influence, as well as a range of other factors, such as previous failings and developments in the media. Issues are developed to offer reasoned judgements.

## Question 2

This was a slightly less popular question within Section A, yet it produced a good range of responses, including many which were excellent in both knowledge and analysis. Most of the candidates seemed confident in offering knowledge of factors stemming from wartime, such as increased production and the impact of full employment, and many were able to successfully tie factors such as government support for returning GIs or the 'baby boom' to the Second World War. A range of other factors were also offered, most popular being the growth of suburbia, the development of consumerism, technological innovation and the Cold War. The determining factors in success tended to be (i) an ability to convincingly link material to the question's demands, e.g. explore the precise causal relationship between war, favourable trading conditions afterwards and the implications of this for affluence, (ii) an ability to explore the relationship between factors which could be seen as both 'wartime' and 'post-war', and, related to this, (iii) make critical distinctions over the way in which different factors worked to create affluence, e.g. some followed a line of argument that war created the conditions for a post-war boom, but other factors, such as government action and the emergence of consumerist culture sustained the boom. Less successful responses tended to drift to descriptions of issues such as the baby boom, teenage culture and consumerism, without varying degrees of success in linking these to the question. A minority did seem to misunderstand the term affluence, a word drawn directly from theme 4 of the specification.

It is arguable that the second world war was the main reason for post war affluence, however there were other contributing factors other than the war itself; such as, government spending, the 'Baby Boom', and the change in industry. I believe that the war was the main reason and was the foundation for all the other factors. In this essay I will discuss what way the main reason for the post war affluence.

The Second World War brought about turmoil for European countries, but revenue for the US. Scarce resources in Europe allowed the US to give a helping hand, in terms of munitions and subsidies to struggling European governments, such as the UK. The demand for weaponry in Europe allowed the war

(Section A continued) manufacturing industry to flourish in terms of employees, therefore jobs were available to people. Also loans and subsidies were paid back to the US with interest. This allowed more revenue for the US government, this allowed government spending, as well as manufacturing heading an impact on the changing industry.

The change in industry helped the post war affluence, in terms of the demand for consumer goods as the war ended. As the war ended manufacturing industries found the switch from war time goods to consumer goods much easier. This was due to

the high demand at consumer goods people had done without during the war; especially returning soldiers. Furthermore profits at industries increased from \$2.2 million to \$2.8 million. This shows that the demand for consumer goods from industries ~~was~~ <sup>led</sup> to a prosperous economic environment.

(Section A continued) Following a change in the industry, was the 'Baby Boom'. This was the increase in the number of ~~B~~ births after the ~~B~~ Second World War. Men who returned from the war to their wives tended to expand their families. This resulted to an increase of sales at baby products and ~~also~~ fuelled the demand for consumer goods; nappy sales increased markedly after the war. This was due to the change in industry, as well as the government spending which allowed men to attend the expansion of their families.

Government spending was mainly due to revenue from the war and

was seen as an investment in returning soldiers. The GI government guaranteed loans, free healthcare and work for returning soldiers, this way they had to integrate into society and to return to being productive members of society. A further GI Bill was granted through presidential

(Section A continued) From Truman's 'fair deal', this gives the means for men expanding families or starting businesses, this shows that government spending was introduced in the 'Baby Boom', however it was its foundation was the war itself.

In conclusion; I believe that the war itself was the main reason for post-war affluence due to the foundation it began, such as providing revenue for later government spending as well as it resulting to a change in industry with high demand, (which contributed to the baby boom). This shows overall the second world war

was the reason for post war  
affluence.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This response demonstrates the qualities of a secure Level 3. There is a sound focus on the issue, examining the link between the impact of the war and post-war affluence, alongside consideration of other factors such as government spending. Supporting knowledge is sound. The response is generally clear and organised, and offers reasoning to reach judgements.

### Question 3

This was a very popular question, and the vast majority of candidates offered knowledge across a range of factors. The main discriminating factors in performance tended to be (i) relevant knowledge on the given issue, and in particular the given factor of federal intervention, (ii) focusing of said knowledge towards a logical argument relating to the question, and (iii) careful attention to the given time period as demanded by the question. On the former two of these points, many candidates argued that federal intervention was relatively limited – a valid proposition. However, where this was based on assertion or limited evidence, responses were less successful; stronger responses were able to examine the contribution made by federal government before reaching judgement on the contribution it made. Within this, consideration was given to the failure to intervene on lynching and the continuation of de facto segregation, the impact of Roosevelt's New Deal, the use of Executive Orders and the relationship between different levels of government. Strong responses often made use of material from across the different themes studied, such as an analysis of the impact the Great Migration and/or New Deal measures had on improving lives. With regard to point (iii), it was evident that some candidates were determined to write about civil rights in the later period, and offered material that could not be credited. Those candidates who were able to exemplify argument across the period 1917 to 1955 were best placed to attain the higher levels.

Federal government intervention had some significance in improving the lives of black Americans. This is because the new deal had some positives such as the Wagner-Steagall housing Act but many policies like the NRA that were meant to be 'colour blind' were not enforced. Also all of Truman's civil rights policies were rejected. ~~How far these~~ ~~caused~~ However legal challenges ~~also~~ improved the lives of black Americans. <sup>more.</sup> How far all these factors effect segregation, employment, education and <sup>housing</sup> voting rights will show how far the lives of black Americans improved.

The New Deal tried to improve the lives of black Americans when the 8802 executive was introduced, this banned discrimination in defence jobs this being change did not bring facts change. By 1942 only 3% of defence workers were black and the military was still segregated. This shows that the change in law has not increased employment opportunities and there is still segregation. However the

(Section B continued) <sup>Wagner-</sup> Steagall Housing Act introduced by Roosevelt to clear slums and build more low income homes was good for black Americans as they moved into a third of the new homes. This shows an improvement in the lives of Americans as they have better ~~over~~ quality housing and this leads to an increase in living standards. Overall the New Deal brought some improvements but ~~an~~ inequality in employment ~~and~~ means that black American lives have not improved significantly.

Legal challenges ~~to~~ improved the lives of Americans to an extent. Brown vs Board of Education was a black girl could not attend the local white school. The NAACP took this to court to challenge the Plessy vs Ferguson 'separate



but equal ruling' this is because the white school was going to be a better standard <sup>than</sup> of the black school. So the court ruled that 'separate but equal' is wrong. This was significant long term in improving the lives of black Americans as it was a great stride towards ending segregation. However short term the ruling ~~was~~ did not improve the lives of black Americans because only

(Section B continued) 3% of black pupils went to a mixed school this shows that there was no ~~be~~ fact change. The case has ~~quite~~ a fair amount of significance in improving the lives of black Americans because it ended separate but equal which long term will make fights against segregation easier but short term there was little change so the significance is limited.

Truman wanted to introduce legislation to improve the lives of black Americans. However his proposed anti-lunching, anti segregation and fair employment laws were all rejected by Congress. This highlights a major weakness in federal legislation because the proposed changes need to be agreed by a large amount of people. This means it is difficult to improve the lives

of black Americans through Federal legislation thus limiting its significance.

The <sup>1950</sup> Smith v Allwright case was a fight to vote in the primaries. The NAACP used the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment to get black Americans the right to vote in Alabama. After this first ruling all the other southern states followed, there was a domino effect. ~~By 1950~~

(Section B continued) By 1952 around a million black Americans voted in the south. This shows an improvement in the lives of black Americans because they can now have a say on who decides laws that will directly affect them, they have more control. However this gain is limited by the fact they would be heavily outnumbered by southern white Americans. This limits the significance of the case because the candidate black Americans vote for will not get in most likely. However there still is a significant gain as their rights have increased so still an improvement in their lives.

In conclusion Federal Legislation has limited significance because firstly its hard to

get through federal legislation. Also the New Deal did not increase employment significantly in defence and segregation continued in defence jobs too. However it did move a large number of black Americans into housing instead of slums. Legal challenges were more significant because the Brown v Board of Education case ended 'separate but equal' and made gains into segregation within education.

(Section B continued) However short term this had limited success as only 3% of black students went to a segregated school. Smith v Allwright had a lot of significance as it allowed <sup>a million</sup> black Americans to vote in primaries in the south.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This response achieved a Level 4. The candidate has a clear grasp of the given issue, and is able to explore the relationship between the material offered on federal action and improvements in the lives of black Americans. The response confidently deals with other issues, with well-reasoned points framed around the impact legal challenges had. The arguments are clear and logical, the coverage across issues and the chronology is at least sufficient, and the judgements are explained and substantiated.

## Question 4

This was a less popular choice of question within Section B, although most of those who did attempt this question demonstrated a real range and breadth of knowledge, and produced a wide range of responses. Less successful responses tended to offer a narrative of leisure activities, a lack of specific detail, or include material on issues such as culture and the standard of living, lacking a convincing focus on the issue of leisure. Common issues included the development of new technologies, cinema, radio, television, sports, aspects of consumerism, and the impact of the mass production of affordable cars, with relevant contextual consideration given to issues such as the impact of the economic situation, socio-economic groupings, rural/urban divisions and the development of electricity. With regards to the second-order concept of change, some candidates seem less familiar or confident with addressing questions on this. Whilst there is no ideal formula for such essays, stronger responses tended to ensure the essay was driven by argument over the extent of change, with detail selected to support and provide exploration, rather than the other way round, risking lapsing into description. Candidates should also be reminded to address the full question, in terms of both the given date range, and the extent of change – in some otherwise well-argued responses, areas of continuity were at times given limited treatment, making it difficult to address the extent of change.

From 1917-1980, it can be argued that leisure activities changed to a <sup>large</sup> ~~large~~ extent of the American people. Despite the <sup>significant fluctuation</sup> ~~fluctuation~~ of progress within America via the economy, throughout the time period of 1917-80, other contributors such as the 1920s economic boom, 1950s baby boom as well as ~~political~~ <sup>through</sup> social progress ~~but~~ as technological advancements such as pop culture, cinema/retail park openings were major changes to leisure activities. At the same time, these were advocated mainly to a privileged few from 1940s due to political/economic issues such as women/black civil rights campaigns however by 1980s, ~~majority~~ <sup>significant</sup> only those who were wealthy were able to see change in leisure activities therefore with reasonable confidence, it can be argued that throughout 1917-1980, leisure activities were ~~only~~ changed to a small extent.

The 1920s economic boom was seen as a time of prosperity which heavily impacted leisure activities ~~through~~ via cars.  
Throughout the 1917-1980, there were many

The time period of 1920's to 50's fluctuated in terms of leisure activities in America. The 1920's economic boom had a major impact on the provision of leisure activities such as Henry Ford's mass production of cars where cars were quicker to produce at a cheaper price alongside hire purchase - the use of deferred installments were to be made on

(Section B continued) Consumption. The car symbolised wealth and road provision acts such as the federal funding of \$400m of infrastructure and road funding meant cars were to be driven for leisure - on average

40% of households owned cars by 1923. <sup>Furthermore, the boom created thousands of jobs which made income <sup>and confidence</sup> <sup>disproportionally high</sup></sup> Furthermore, the boom also arranged the flappers regime - the 'new woman' where women were able to make

the most of their freedom - both social and sexual by going to speakeasies and to male-dominated sporting venues such as boxing and public houses <sup>without a male escort</sup>.

This had a major consequence <sup>however</sup> where flappers were shot by men as they threatened their roles alongside got in the way - by 1928 were shot. ~~At the time~~

By the 1950's, the suburban life and baby boom too created leisure activities; from 1945-1960, there was 109M babies born - arguably because of the lack

of sexual activity deprived from war, however, mainly due to the confidence in funding the baby boom from greater living standards. - As baby's grew, demand for baby facilities and products were ~~totally~~ increasing giving firms the chance to produce more goods - many profited from this. ~~however~~ To build on this,

Dr Green's book ~~about~~ created a guide on motherhood and parenting whereby it was encouraged to ~~the~~ spend as much time with babies thus resulting in LBJ providing federal funding of \$250M to create new parks and landscapes for family picnics which was utilised greatly.

However, this was mainly for the rich white people where the 3/4 of wealth of

The whole country was monopolised by them - Segregating the minorities / ~~Korner~~ ~~Family~~

~~Technological advancements~~ Although lives of American people was increased by the mid leisure activities, these were all volatile as time shifted;

After the 1920's boom came the 1930's bust where ~~the~~ as the banks crashed,

(Section B continued) Consumer / producer confidence too spiralled out of

control. Henry Ford's car industry also became irrelevant and

suddenly there was no time for leisure as many were

deeply ~~impacted~~ <sup>impacted</sup> by the Great Depression ∴ cultivating lower

living standards as many were to save money rather than

spend - ~~30000~~ <sup>340</sup> businesses went bust by 1932 as a result of this.

To build on the the baby boom of the 1940's - 60's also came to an

end; the 1970's depression due to ~~political~~ <sup>political</sup> affairs such as the

Vietnam war and Cold war made poor domestic / government provision.

Although, in the 1960's, the cinema industry made \$550,000 through

that cinema tickets where seats had increased to 3.2M by 1972, ~~the~~ as

well as regulating movies to portray the American Dream, all this was ~~totally~~

irrelevant because of the oil crisis in 1979 - ~~the~~ where families were

unable to drive to theatres due to high prices of petrol furthermore, energy

problem <sup>as a result of</sup> ~~due to~~ Kennedy's embargo on ~~Iran~~ <sup>Iran</sup> after supporting Israel as well

as USSR invading them - Furthermore, energy problems meant theatres were

to go bust - more than 45 in ~~Hollywood~~ <sup>LA</sup> alone went bust. This meant

that not only did cinema close due to the depression, but leisure activities

were shut down (insignificant) ∴ by the end <sup>of 1980's</sup> this did not change as

much.

Therefore, in conclusion, although, at some time periods leisure activity had changed ~~the~~ significantly through greater living standards, the fluctuation of economic activity made leisure activity insignificant ~~and~~ as many were too concerned (during bust years) ~~to~~ to either save what they had remaining or to ~~protest as a result of~~ ~~forget~~ about leisure either ∴

(Section B continued) Some were too ~~poor~~ poor to afford it or because it became irrelevant.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates the qualities of a secure Level 3. There is specific and relevant knowledge, and a good understanding of issues. Use of interesting and relevant material from the wider context is also made. However, whilst there is some analysis of change, the focus is at times limited or implicit.

## Question 5

Most candidates were able to identify differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, seeing the former as 'pro-Reagan' and supporting the notion of his government having created a transformation which was positive, set against Extract 2's questioning the extent to which any kind of transformation was achieved. More nuanced responses also tended to pick up points of agreement. One issue that limited some responses was a relatively limited use of the extracts. Section C is focused around A03. Responses which made consideration of the argument and evidence within the extracts central to their responses, applying their contextual knowledge to consider the validity of the arguments offered were more successful. One line of argument which was successfully pursued included the view that Reagan was transformational, but not in a positive way, developed with issues such as the extent of tax cuts and the consequences for both federal income and presidents such as Bush. Other candidates argued effectively that Reagan was transformational when set against the failure of previous Presidents, considering his effective use of the media and his ability to present a new national optimism. Responses tended to be more successful when they addressed the issues drawn from the specific question and extracts. Some candidates appeared to offer pre-prepared material on 'big government' or solely on economic policies, and whilst this could be productive, at times it tended to narrow or even divert from the debate.

Beyond points already mentioned elsewhere, one issue candidates should consider is how they treat such questions with regard to their own opinion. Whilst it is perfectly valid to reach a judgement which is essentially 'positive' or 'negative' towards the impact of Reagan, candidates should seek to ensure they consider the merits of different views in the light of evidence. Overall, conclusions may be forceful and come down one way or the other, but discussion and analysis requires some degree of balance.

Extract 1 by David M. Abshire and Richard E. Neustadt suggests that Reagan was a "transformational leader" with "transformational objectives". This therefore supports the view that the Reagan presidency transformed the USA in the years 1981-96. However, extract 2 by Cheryl Hudson and Gareth Davies does suggest that the policies Reagan made and actions he took were not revolutionary and they had deep roots in the 1970s, and not developed by Reagan. This therefore does not support the view. It can be said that the Reagan presidency transformed the USA in the years 1981-96 to a certain extent. This is because he was able to produce a lot of legislation relatively quickly, although the consequences of some of his <sup>policies</sup> politics were drastic.



Extract 1 says that Reagan's predecessor "recognized this need in his deregulation policies". One of Reagan's objectives was to deregulate businesses because he thought there should be minimal government intervention in business. The extract also describes his objectives as "transformational" despite the fact the deregulation policies were anything

**(Section C continued)** but "transformational". For example, when the banks were deregulated this created competition between the banks and Savings and Loans Institutions (S&Ls). S&Ls wanted the best for their customers and they also wanted to attract more people than the banks, so they made risky investments and set high interest rates on savings and low interest rates on loans. This benefitted people with savings, as they were earning more money, and it also benefitted those with loans, who would not have to pay back as much as they would in banks. Moreover, the incompetence of the S&Ls caused their failure and acts had to be passed in order to bail them out. This happened because people with long-term loans began to struggle and could not pay the institutions back. This was worsened because of the high interest payments the institutions were making to those with savings; S&Ls were not making profit. Thus, this shows that Reagan's ~~policy~~ presidency did not transform the USA in the years 1981-96 because his policy of deregulation caused a huge scandal that resulted in a huge loss of money - both personal

and federal. Reagan wanted to reduce federal spending, but this was inhibited due to the large amount of money spent trying to save the savings and loans institutions.

Extract 2 says that Reagan's policies were "not of (Section C continued) sufficient stature to justify the contemporary notion of a Reagan Revolution". This means that Reagan's policies did not make as much of a difference to the USA as he was expecting to make. For instance, Reagan ~~recognised~~ stated that there was a difference between the "deserving" poor and "welfare scroungers" who supposedly just wanted money from the government without working for it. This is why he developed his idea of workfare. He passed an act that said states had ~~to~~ to make working on state projects a requirement for welfare claimants. As well as this, at least one working parent was required to claim welfare payments. This was difficult for single parents, who found it impossible to find childcare, so they could not work. Reagan's presidency experienced a large number of homeless people, as a result of the workfare policies as well as the social housing policies; there were 3.7 million families eligible for social housing but there were no houses because Reagan cut federal funding for the building of these houses. The amount of despair that was caused to peo-

ple who ~~to~~ were not middle class is a reason why the Reagan presidency did not transform the USA in the years 1981-96. However, it can be argued that Reagan transformed some sections of the USA. For example, the Economic Recovery Tax Act, 1981 (ERTA) cut personal and business tax. For those in the higher tax bracket, tax was (Section C continued) cut from 70% to 50%, but for those in the lower tax brackets, tax was only cut from 14% to 11%. This meant that the wealthier people in America got richer as a result of ERTA, but the poorer people did not really benefit. Hence, some sections of America were transformed by the Reagan presidency, but most weren't.

Extract 2 also says that the "seeds of the post-1983 boom were sown during the 1970s". This means that the roots of the economic boom that was experienced ~~in~~<sup>Post</sup> 1983 was in the 1970s and not as a result of Reagan's presidency. The 1970s saw the introduction of many technological advances, such as the personal computer and cordless phones. This, combined with cheap mass production techniques, was a significant factor that contributed to the boom post 1983. This was because many people bought these new items, contributing to the nation's overall economy. Thus, Reagan's policies had a minimal effect on the boom. This is why it can be argued that Reagan's ~~policies~~ presidency did not transform the USA.

Both extracts recognise that Reagan made a ~~lot~~ lot of legislative reform throughout his presidency. However, extract 2 suggests that this legislation was not "sufficient" to leave that much of an imprint on the USA. This is because of the negative consequences Reagan's legislation had

(Section C continued) on some people and the economy. ~~therefore~~ whereas, extract 1 suggests that Reagan was so "transformational" that "George H. W. Bush and Bill Clinton" followed". In fact, Reagan's successors were forced to introduce acts in order to save the economy and the government that Reagan ruined. It is safe to say that Reagan's presidency did not transform the USA in the years 1981-96.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This response demonstrates understanding of the extracts, and the different interpretations offered. Knowledge is applied to discuss issues, and there is a grasp of a range of aspects of the debate. Discussion does lead to supported overall judgement. However, the extracts themselves are at times underused. Thus, whilst the response does demonstrate sufficient qualities of Level 4 to achieve that level (bullet points 2 and 3 of the generic mark scheme), it is less secure in bullet point 1.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A/B responses

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

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

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Paying little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. writing about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempting to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions.
- Answering a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes, consequences, etc., with only limited reference to that given in the question).
- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues.
- 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.
- A judgement was not reached, or not explained.
- A lack of detail.

## Section C responses

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

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

Common issues which hindered performance on Section C were:

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

## Grade Boundaries

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

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

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

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government

