

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_1F_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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). Section B offers a further choice of essays, typically covering a longer time span. Both Sections A and B target 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 a few cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. This was most evident in Section C, although there seemed to be fewer instances of this than has been seen in some previous years. The responses that managed time most effectively planned time accordingly in the first place and offered more direct responses. Where responses indulged in lengthier contextual description, rather than an analysis and evaluation of precise demands of the question, they were both less likely to produce responses at the highest level, but also experience time pressure issues. Those who produced responses that focused sharply on arguing and analysing the given issue in the question, and on Question 5 the given views, were more likely to produce an effective response.

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 offered substantial knowledge, but did not effectively direct this towards the conceptual demands of the question. In the main though, candidates 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. One of the central features of responses attaining the highest marks was an ability to consider and evaluate in relation to the specific demands of a particular question. For example, some candidates offered detailed explanation of changes, but the strongest responses tended to offer more consideration of the extent of change.

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 also need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that responses sufficiently cover the given period, and do not spend time detailing issues that are outside the timeframe of that particular question.

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 the 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. A small minority did approach the question in a manner which would be more suited to an AO1 (i.e. Section A/B) response, engaging with the issue in the question and showing understanding, but tending to neglect the extracts, or treat them more as sources of information rather than interpretations.

Question 1

Question 1 was the less popular choice with candidates in Section A of the paper. The vast majority of candidates were able to engage with the conceptual demands of the question to enable some analysis, and apply appropriate knowledge in order to allow them to access levels three and above. There was a wide range of material offered, covering the changing fortunes of the economy as a whole through periods such as the 1920s boom, the Depression and the New Deal, and to a lesser extent the recession of 1920-21 or the impact of European war from 1939. Candidates considered issues such as GDP, employment, home ownership, consumer goods, electrification and access to leisure. Candidates in the main had a good sense of these issues, although those with a secure and detailed grasp of issues such as GDP and the purchasing power of the American people tended to be best placed to evaluate the extent to which there was a decline. Some candidates effectively considered living standards in relation to sub-groups within the US population, typically women, and those in rural areas, or African Americans, although in some cases this saw a loss of focus.

What also distinguished within these responses tended to be down to how closely they focused material on an exploration of the extent to which there was a decline. Some responses tended to chronological description, with intermittent focus, e.g. describing life in the 1920s, during the Depression, and then during the New Deal. Some tended towards explaining reasons why living standards declined. Stronger responses offered a good coverage of the period, with a clear focus on the concept of change, and sufficient consideration of the extent to which there was a decline.

To some extent it is accurate to say that from 1917-41 there was a significant decline in the living standards of American people because of the 1929 economic crash. This lowered standards as $\frac{1}{3}$ of Americans lost savings or housing due to the crash. However, to some extent it can also be argued that in the years 1917-41 can also be argued that it's not accurate to say that from 1917-41 there was a significant decline in the living standards of the American people due to the 1920s post war economic boom, as well as Roosevelt's new deal reform policies from 1933-40. These factors can be judged and quantified by the extent to which they caused a decrease in unemployment, and therefore the extent to which affluence was increased as a result of this.

To some extent it's inaccurate to say that in the years 1917-41 there was a significant decline in the living standards of American people due to the post war economic boom in the 1920s. President Harding was elected in 1921, when unemployment

(Section A continued) unemployment was at a post war high of 5,010,000. Due to this, the Republican party implemented laissez-faire policies that promoted the needs of the economy - paired with the infrastructure such as factories and planes after the First World War - this created an economic boom. The boom was catalysed by ~~the increase~~ increasing the electricity grid, with only 8 million homes being on the grid in ~~1917~~ 1917; compared to 24.5 million in 1930. During this period of economic affluence, jobs were created due to the creation of new international product markets. In the 1920s, supermarkets sold ~~20%~~ 22% of all goods and people spent 20% of their own personal income on food. This included eating out, which aided both local businesses and larger chains. The boom was a positive for all American citizens, as by 1929 29% of women were in employment. The increase in affluence led to an increase in leisure time for Americans, with 50% of houses owning a gramophone and in 1929 - and ~~\$75~~ \$75 million being spent on records that year. Overall, it is clear the economic boom - that was catalysed by ~~the~~ increasing electrical infrastructure and ~~increase in employment and~~ Harding's laissez-faire policies - evidences

(Section A continued) that it's not accurate to say that there was a significant decline in the ~~stand~~ living standards of Americans from 1917-41 as there was a significant positive improvement from 1917-29. In this period there was not a decrease in affluence, there was an increase caused by ~~decreased~~ increased employment in new industries. Americans with jobs could loan money from banks, with loans increasing \$5 billion from 1921-29. This once again evidences growing affluence, facilitated by the increase in employment after the 1921 election. Therefore it could be argued that the living standards of Americans increased in the period 1917-41.

~~To some extent it is accurate to~~

On the other hand, to some extent it is accurate to argue that ~~if~~ in the years 1917-41 there was a significant decline in the standards of living for American people because of the 1929 Wall Street Crash. Although Republican laissez-faire policies facilitated a post war economic boom after 1921, after unemployment rose and wages fell in 1927 it also ~~facto~~ led to the economic crash of 1929. After this gradual decline in unemployment after 1927, in 1929 shareholders

(Section A continued) began to quickly sell shares, creating the crash. Although only 10% of Americans actually owned shares on Wall Street, the ~~catastrophic~~ worldwide nature and implications of the boom meant $\frac{1}{3}$ of Americans lost jobs, savings or housing. This resulted in a mass decline in unemployment, it being 20% in 1932 and 25% in 1933. In 4 Americans were out of work, resulting in the decline in affluence for Americans. Many of the poorest who could no longer afford housing moved to shanty towns called 'Hoovervilles', as it was ~~Hoover's~~ Hoover and the ~~19~~ Republican's laissez-faire policies and ideologies that caused the decline in the standard of living - evidencing a short term positive but long term negative impact of this ideology. ~~The economic crash hit immigrants the hardest.~~ The economic crash universally affected all Americans, with black Americans being 'last hired and first ~~to be~~ fired' after the 1929 crash, evidencing the increase in NAACP members from 9,000 in 1919 to 600,000 in 1946 - as they believed change was needed due to their position in society. Overall, it's ~~inaccurate to argue~~ ~~that~~ mostly accurate to argue that in the

(Section A continued) years 1917-41 there was a significant decline in the standard of living of American people due to the economic crash. The 1929 crash increased unemployment to 20% in 1932, and therefore catalysed the drastic decline in affluence after this - with many living in Hoovervilles.

~~To some extent it's~~

However, to some extent it's also inaccurate to say that in the years 1917-41 there was a significant decline in the standard of living of the American people due to Roosevelt's new deal socio-economic reforms from 1933-40. After the 1929 economic crash, Roosevelt was voted in on the promise of his new deal reforms in 1933 which were aimed at restoring the positive standards of living from the 1920s. Roosevelt introduced the ~~agricultural~~ Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, which ~~subsidised~~ subsidised farmers to grow less crops to increase prices and combat inflation. The Agricultural Adjustment Agency (AAA) and other 'alphabet agencies' created government jobs whilst restoring faith in the Presidency - therefore increasing living standards. The Wagner-Steagall Housing Act of 1937

(Section A continued) created a government body ~~in charge~~ responsible for clearing slums and (Hooverilles) and attempting to cultivate an atmosphere that could ~~too~~ lead to growing affluence for all Americans. ~~Then~~ Roosevelt's new deal created jobs and restored pride in the American people, with unemployment ~~halving~~ halving from 20% in 1932 to 10% in 1941 - evidencing a clear shift due to these reforms. In terms of housing, by 1940 70% of houses had running water, ~~and~~ 69% had electricity and 60% had an indoor toilet. A monumental improvement compared to the ~~shanty~~ shanty towns and ~~the~~ Hooverilles being lived in under a decade before - evidencing the success of the 1937 Wagner-Steagall Housing Act in under 3 years. Overall, it's clear that it's inaccurate to say that the living standards of Americans significantly declined from 1917-41, as Roosevelt's new deal reforms created jobs and therefore increased public spending and affluence. In the 1930s, there were over 80 million movie tickets sold a week, evidencing the increase in disposable income caused by affluence. This once again catalysed by reduced unemployment, influenced by the 1933-40 new deal.

(Section A continued)

In conclusion, despite the argument that the economic crash led to a mass decline in the living standards of Americans - with 20% unemployment in 1932, it is clear that when examining the whole time period from 1917-41 there is a clear improvement in the standards of living due to two surges in employment and affluence in the post-war boom and Roosevelt's 1933-40 New Deal policies. Therefore the statement is inaccurate as the New Deal reduced ~~un~~ unemployment to 10% in 1941, increasing living standards and affluence to levels not seen in 1917 - evidencing an overall positive trend in this entire period.



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 deployment of specific material—whilst responses are found that offer even more, this has a sufficient range of detailed examples, but crucially uses them to effectively argue throughout, examining the extent to which living standards declined. Argument is logical and well organised around key issues, and there is a substantiated and reasoned judgement.

Question 2

This was a popular choice of question within Section A, and produced a range of answers, the bulk of which were within levels three to five. There was a wealth of material relevant to the given factor (new approaches to campaigning), and in the main convincing analysis in relating this to the question's outcome, the success of the campaign. In relation to the given factor, some candidates placed more emphasis on how non-violent direct action marked a change from previous legal challenges, whereas others focused more on the changing approaches borne out of frustration of the 1960s, such as the black power movement, with others exploring a mix of these. Any of these approaches was valid, and could produce sufficient analytical development of material for the higher levels. Stronger responses were more confident in exploring and assessing these, e.g. examining the pros and cons of a particular approach, or the relative success of different methods. Other issues which commonly featured were the role of the media, the contribution of grass roots activists, the growth of liberal attitudes and the role of presidents and/or federal government. Again, stronger responses tended to explore the relationship between different factors throughout the essay. In general, candidates were stronger on the earlier part of the given years.

The most obvious distinction between less and more successful responses was their focus on the second-order concept. Some responses tended to describe the different campaigns. Others were at times implicit in their analysis, e.g. offering some analysis of relevant examples, but not fully relating these to the specific demands of the question, e.g. tending to examine relevant examples, such as boycotts or sit-ins, but not explicitly developing this in terms of new approaches. The strongest responses were able to explore the similarities and differences and evaluate the extent of these. There were a minority where knowledge was insufficient or confused, or drew on examples from outside the period, but these were thankfully rarely found. Whilst stronger responses were more likely to offer fuller detail on these, a key feature of success was often a candidate's ability to select and deploy appropriate examples to explore particular issues, offering overall breadth and balance within a focused response.

In consideration of what caused the success of the black American civil rights campaigns, new campaigning approaches, the continued use of the Supreme Court and federal intervention can be evaluated. The factor which brought about the success would be the one bringing attitude changes (social), economic improvements, and increased political rights most significantly in this period. Under these criteria, it is evident that the new approaches to campaigning were the main reason for the successes in the years 55-65 as the factor which underpinned all others.

Firstly, with regards to new approaches to campaigning the growth of emphasis on individuals was key to changing attitudes and realising political ~~gains~~ and economic gains. The growth in popularity ~~of~~ of Martin Luther King was immensely significant in reshaping societal attitudes, evidenced by the March on Washington in 1963 which attracted over 250,000 ~~to~~ to listen to his 'I have a dream' speech, 20% of whom were white showing a huge shift in the nature of campaigning and increased ~~lenie~~ acceptance of the need ~~to~~ to improve black civil rights demonstrating its significance under the criteria. More than just his powerful oratory skills, the ^{frequent} mass-mobilisation he created represented a huge shift

(Section A continued) in the dynamics within Congress who passed the Civil Rights Act less than 1 year later. This act offered huge economic benefits with it banning discrimination in all walks of life, particularly employment, and by the end of this period, 27% of blacks were middle-class demonstrating how these new approaches to mass-mobilisation provoked increasing government reactions which helped to bring huge success to civil rights campaigns ~~in this~~ under the criteria, underlining its importance. Finally, with the growth of TV ownership in America (90% of households by 1960), the civil rights movement adopted a new approach that emphasised making gains via ~~real~~ positive media representation. For example, ^{during} the Greensboro sit-ins, black participants were portrayed as civilised and peaceful whereas white youths were perceived as yobbish and hooligan-like, shifting traditional stereotypes towards black Americans, demonstrating the significance of these new approaches to be at the heart of successes regarding shifting attitudes. Further, this had a practical application with JFK's executive order on civil rights following in 1961 to further challenge segregation, leading to concrete economic improvements. Therefore, it is evident that under these criteria, these new approaches were the main reason for the success of civil rights campaigns in the years 55-66.

(Section A continued)

However, it could be argued that the continued use of the Supreme Court was far more significant in leading to ~~with~~ successes of the campaign. Following the landmark *Brown v Board of Education* ruling, *Brown v Board II* in 1955 described segregation as 'inherently unequal' setting the precedent to challenge the entire system of segregation 'with great speed'. ~~the~~ Whilst this would in theory provide ~~an~~ increased economic opportunity through improved education for black children, the Supreme Court's inability to enforce these rulings ~~severely~~ ~~the~~ severely tempers its impact on the successes. For example, by 1963, only 9% of Southern schools had desegregated and without enforcement from federal action such as was the case with the Little Rock 9, little ~~was~~ was achieved through the Supreme Court. This ruling also struggled to change attitudes with 102 Congressmen signing the Southern Manifesto in 1956 to try and overturn the ruling, highlighting the obstinance of the Southern States and showing how Supreme court rulings were not responsible for realising concrete (economic and attitude) changes and thus under the criteria cannot be seen as the main reason. Further, rulings such as *Brauler v Gayle* which built upon these rulings were brought a response to the new approach of mass-mobilisation and disruptions caused by ~~the~~ This is because *Brauler v Gayle* ruled

(Section A continued) Segregation on buses as unconstitutional, an issue brought to light by the Montgomery Bus Boycott where 75% of blacks stopped using buses and made up 90% of total bus users, inspired by the heroic act of Rosa Parks and her leadership. Thus, it is clear that new ^{approaches} ~~methods~~ of campaigning including mass mobilisation and roles of individuals underpinned most new Supreme Court action and so can be seen as more important, especially considering the minimal practical impact brought about by these judgements.

Finally, it could be argued that the increasing ~~use~~ federal action was the main reason behind the successes of civil rights campaigns between 55-68. The primary and higher education acts introduced by LBJ as extensions of the landmark civil rights act helped enforce educational improvements leading to improved economic rights. For example, the Black wage on average in 1960 was half that of the whites, and due to the combined effects of affirmative action policies in 1967 and 68 and these educational ~~gaps~~ changes, the ~~gap~~ wage discrepancy had halved showing how federal action was directly behind concrete economic improvements. Perhaps the strongest argument for increasing federal action to be the main reason for successes in the civil rights

(Section A continued) Campaign was the Voting Rights Act in 1965 which made huge gains both politically and economically. In Southern States blacks had been ~~stoppe~~ prevented from voting due to literacy tests and the grandfather clause for years but as a direct impact of this act political ~~repre~~ power / voter numbers surged, ~~esp~~ above all in the South. For example, in Mississippi, the number of black voters rose from 54 ~~to~~ ~5% ~~to~~ to 60 ~~>~~ 60% between 60-68 showing the huge political success made happen by the voting rights act. ~~Further More~~ Equally as significant was the fact that increased political power guaranteed an improved economic and social position with LBT passing the Housing Act in 1968 to legally end housing discrimination. However, these gains were brought about by the ~~mass~~ ^{frequent} ~~mass~~ ^{approach} mass-mobilisation and media representation (two new ~~methods~~ ^{approaches} to campaigning) of the Selma March and the ~~resp~~ brutal violence of Bloody Sunday. The Voting rights bill was introduced merely a few days later showing the direct impact of these new campaigning methods on federal action. This is because federal action was reactive to external pressures, media influence and moral condemnation which ^{were} all brought about by ~~camp~~ the new campaigning methods showing this to be the ~~priner~~ main reason for success.

(Section A continued) In conclusion, it is evident that ~~as~~ the new approaches to campaigning were pivotal and the main reason ^{behind} ~~beyond~~ attitude changes, economic improvement and political gains which were the three key areas of success in the years 55-68. The Supreme Court was limited in its power of enforcement and federal action was a response ^{to the new approaches} rather than an underlying cause of the successes explaining why ~~the~~ new approaches to campaigning was the main reason for successes.



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 deployment of specific material. Whilst responses are found that offer even more, this has a sufficient range of detailed examples, but crucially uses them to effectively argue throughout, examining the relative importance of new approaches, weighed against other factors. Argument is logical and well organised, and there is a substantiated and reasoned judgement.

Question 3

Question 3 was the more popular of the two within Section B. In general, candidates offered focused responses, with a variety of issues covered. There was a generally good offering on the given issue of war. 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 question's demands, deploying material to explore the extent and nature of the influence they had on domestic politics. The impact of the First World War featured most frequently, with candidates typically discussing issues such as isolationism and the 'return to normalcy', and in some cases the extent to which this contributed to the anti-communism that was seen after the war. Anti-communism was dealt with as a separate influence by some, and as an aspect of war by others, typically linked to the Cold War and Vietnam. The Second World War was commonly cited, with arguments exploring the influence the war had in extending executive power and ending isolationism. Candidates examined 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. The most commonly found alternative influences were economic factors and the role of the media, followed by the role played by individual presidents.

Most candidates were able to offer a reasonable range, in terms of exemplification on the given issue of war, balance across war and other influences, and the chronological demands of the question. The depth and relevance of the material did vary though. A significant factor determining the success of responses was the ability to focus material towards the demands of the question. Some responses offered sufficient valid material, but tended to describe features of various wars, or struggle to relate this clearly to domestic politics, e.g. extensive sections detailing multiple examples across the period, but with relatively limited or asserted links at the end. More successful responses tended to consistently relate material to the question's demands, and thus explored the influence of war (and other issues), with some offerings considering analysis of what constituted 'significant influence'. Some stronger responses were often typified by taking opportunities to explore the interrelationship between war, anti-communism, and the performance of the domestic economy. The majority, though, tended to treat issues in isolation.

I agree to a great extent that, in the years 1917-80, the most significant influence on domestic politics in the USA was the impact of war. This is because the impacts and results of war were extremely effective in deciding domestic policies, and arguably even more important in swaying election through military success. Although, other factors such as the Economy and media did also play a key role, they were both influenced partially by war.

~~For~~ I believe war to be the most significant

(Section B continued)

influence on domestic policies. For example, during the Second World War, ~~in 1942~~ in 1944, Franklin D. Roosevelt (FDR) signed the G.I. Bill. This programme aimed at supporting returning WW2 veterans, eventually handing out education and training to 12 million individuals, helping them integrate back to civilian life. The Second World War also affected domestic politics by boosting support for FDR and gaining votes. This was seen after Pearl Harbor (December 1941) where FDR gave his "Infamy Speech", leading to only one senator not voting to declare war on Japan, boosting his political image. Furthermore, this opposing effect was seen during the Vietnam War, where LBJ was blamed for the "unnecessary deaths", as Commander-in-Chief of the USA American military. On top of Vietnam War protests and famous phrases such as, "Hey, hey LBJ. How many kids did you kill today". This significantly lowered his image and affected the political scene by drop in support. Therefore, ~~this is the main impact~~ this is the main impact

(Section B continued) d war was the main influence on US politics between 1917-80, as the success of conflict played an incredibly important factor in the popularity of the president and whether it affected his image and national political career.

Although not as influential as war, the economy played a key role in domestic politics between 1917-80. For example, the Wall Street Crash in 1929 ~~lost~~ lost the US economy \$30 billion, closed 659 banks in the same year and led to the Great Depression which resulted in 25% of the US population becoming unemployed. This effected domestic politics, as it was Hoover's actions that were blamed for the Great Depression, as his deregulation of banks ~~led to~~ and farms led to over-production and underpaid mortgages. Therefore this huge economic blame was one of the factors which led to Hoover's loss in the 1932 election, hugely effecting US domestic politics. ~~Hoover~~, Furthermore, Economic crisis was caused under Lyndon B. Johnson, as he ~~used~~ claimed to be

(Section B continued) Funding "Guns and Butter" during the Vietnam War, referring to spending on military and domestic projects. This ~~shows that although~~ juggling of funds led to an economic crisis and further effected LBJ's political legacy. This shows that although the economy was an important factor, the influence of war is the most important, due to the great financial impact it ~~can~~ ~~bears~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ the US, causing ~~political~~ domestic politics to alter in accordance.

Finally, although not as important as war, ~~as the economy~~ the media held a significant influence on US domestic policies, acting even more importantly than the economy. For example, the media were key in reporting and uncovering the 1972 Watergate Scandal, an event which led to massive loss in the presidency of Richard Nixon. This scandal was uncovered by the media and according to a Gallup poll, over 70% of Americans believed Nixon had obstructed justice, this was not helped by Nixon's claims of

(Section B continued) "If the president does it then it's not illegal". This led to the early resignation of Nixon, due to extreme domestic political change caused by media coverage.

Furthermore, showing the influence of war in media, Walter Cronkite's media expedition into the first televised war, Vietnam, uncovered many ~~the~~ concerning affairs which affected domestic politics. For example, the 1968 Mai Lai massacre reported the murder of 500 innocent civilians. As commander-in-chief, this led to uproar against LBJ's presidency and demanded change. This shows that although the media was crucial in the uncovering of events leading to domestic, political change, it was ~~an~~ ~~again~~ war's impacts which played a crucial factor in what was being reported by the media.

In conclusion, I ~~definitely~~ agree with the statement to a great extent, as it was war's influence on media coverage, economic imbalance and overall political support for presidency which had an effect on domestic politics.



This displays many of the features of a level 4 response. The candidate deals with the stated issue of the impact of war, as well as establishing other influences, in order to compare the relative significance of their impact. The response goes on to offer sufficient material to explore these issues, and valid judgements are reached, although these could be developed further.

Question 4

This was the slightly less popular choice of question in Section B, and produced a range of answers. The key factor in determining the quality of response was the degree to which responses were focused on the conceptual demands of the question. These candidates shaped the material they had to offer towards an analysis of change and continuity were most successful.

Most responses were able to offer some analysis of various changes relating to immigration across the timeframe. However, there was significant variation in the degree of focus material towards the conceptual demands of the question, particularly with regards to the impact of immigration. This took varying forms, such as attempts to analyse changes in attitudes towards immigrants, or changing government policies on immigration. In such cases, there was at times sufficient material to potentially reach the higher levels, but this was limited to some extent by a failure to shape this consistently towards the demands of the question, and the responses were at times implicit, or in and out of focus. More secure responses were able to successfully focus the material they deployed, identify themes, such as the changes to the origins and nature of immigration, the impact in terms of public attitudes towards immigrants, the social, economic and political impact, or how changes in immigration policy resulted from the impact of immigration.

A minority offered relatively limited material relating to immigration, although the majority were able to offer some range and depth of valid material. In general, knowledge was stronger on the earlier part of the period, such as the government policies of the 1920s, but other commonly referenced issues included the relationship between immigrants/immigration and both red scares, Ford's use of immigrant labour, the issue of Mexican labour across the period, in particular the Bracero Programme, Kennedy's attitude to immigration, the relaxation of earlier policies in the 1960s, and the relationship between immigration and war, the Cold War, and other global events, e.g. Jewish refugees fleeing the Nazis, Cuban exiles and Vietnamese immigration. Where such issues were framed appropriately in terms of the question, they were duly rewarded. Stronger responses were more clearly focused, with a discussion of these across the timeframe leading to an overall judgement on the extent and impact of these changes .

I agree that ~~the~~ immigration and its impact on the USA changed significantly in the years 1917-80. ~~The~~ Then type of immigration and its impact fluctuated throughout the time period. In the beginning after WWI, Americans were less accepting of immigrants who they ~~could~~ believed could pose a threat. This was reflected in legislation. Later on, ~~as~~ after WWII and the expansion of communism, the US became more ~~accp~~ welcoming to refugees trying to flee communism, this led to a change in immigration and its impact. Finally, ~~the American immigration~~ was ~~much~~ broader towards the end of the time period, immigration and its impact took a liberal shift.

I agree that immigration and its impact on the US changed significantly. In years 1917-²⁵~~30~~, immigration ~~was mainly~~ most immigrants were from southern and eastern ~~europ~~ europe. Many of them were catholic, Jewish or poor, this challenged American society and politics as suggested by the Dillingham report. To combat this the 1917 Immigration Act is introduced. It enforced literacy exams ~~and~~ for those over 16 and made a list

This encouraged a certain type of immigrant by filtering
(Section B continued) of undesirables. This filtered through
~~uneducated~~ uneducated immigrants until the
1921 and 1924 Acts which introduced quotas.
This heavily limited immigration. It was a result of the
the 1917 Immigration Act was a result of the Dillingham
Commission but also the first red scare which caused
hysteria within American society following WWI. The
impact of immigration was a rise in the fear of
communism, as new immigrants were suspected of being
secret communists. ~~This impacted American society~~
~~Significantly~~ ~~within~~ Therefore, early on, the impact
of immigration fueled anti-communism. This resulted
in the 1921 and 1924 Acts which introduced quotas, to
further limit immigration. However, this still was not
enough. Rising Mac immigrants led to an increase
in unemployment and made competition for jobs, since poorer
immigrants would work for much lower wages than
American born citizens. This led to the 1929 National
Origins Formula which banned Asian immigration
altogether and implemented a 150,000 year limit on
the number of immigrants. It was extremely harsh
and reflected a growing resentment towards immigrants
within American culture. Therefore, at the beginning
of the time period, immigration ultimately caused fear
~~within society and~~ resentment within society. It also
decreased heavily over time due to restricting legislation.

(Section B continued) ~~That~~ In 1929-1940, this anti-communist attitude remained. During WW2, certain immigrants were classified as the enemy, such as Italians, Germans and Japanese. Due to separate conflict such as the Pearl Harbor attack, Japanese immigrants were harshly treated. For example, Japanese internment camps in which 120,000 Japanese immigrants were taken. Their property confiscated and they could only take what they could carry. Ironically, 75% of them were American-born citizens but this only reiterates the ~~unfair and~~ impact that immigration had on American society. WW2 ~~cause~~ ~~there~~ caused such anxieties that these extreme measures were put in place. The 1940 Alien Registration Act further emphasises American anti-communist attitude. It further restricted immigration within this time period, forcing citizens to register within the USA, what if they could not live and work, therefore, illegal immigrants were in great at deportation. However, ~~As~~ during WW2, there was the Bracero programme. This was a government-sponsored programme which encouraged and attracted Mexican immigrants, ~~to~~ in order to fulfil agricultural vacancies. The workers were exploited for their cheap labour. The Bracero programme ~~was~~ would have led to an increase in Mexican immigrants as well as the prosperity of the agricultural sector, which was necessary during war. Therefore, in 1929, the overall attitude is still anti-communist, immigration

(Section B continued) is not restricted and the USA seems to benefit from this immigration at this time.

Finally, in the end of the time period, ^{immigrants} ~~the~~ impact and its impact changed significantly. The 1952 immigration and nationality Act would have removed the asian ban, it also permitted 100,000 asian immigrants into the US. Therefore, immediately, asian immigration would have increased. This is followed by the 1959 cuban revolution in which 200,000 cubans fled to the US to escape communist leader Castro. Due to America's anti-communist stance and ~~open~~ open rejection of communism after by the Cold War, it welcomed in cuban refugees under the 1959 cuban refugee programme. Led to an increase in immigration but also the ~~american~~ impact ~~was not~~ was different to the earlier anti-immigration sentiments, instead, they accepted ^{refugees} ~~immigrants~~ due to their flee from communism. This is similar to vietnamese refugees who fled to the USA after the fall of saigon. In 1970, there were ^{130,000} ~~300,000~~ vietnamese refugees. By 1980 there were ~~over~~ around 700,000 ^{asian} immigrants let in. ~~Although they welcomed them~~ ~~it~~ Ultimately, the US welcomed in these immigrants, however, there was still some resistance. This immigration led to competition for housing, jobs and other opportunities, therefore American society were still

(Section B continued) apprehensive. However, regardless of this, a 1965 Immigration Act which abolished all quotas was passed. This reflects an acceptance of immigration, suggesting that immigrants were having a positive impact. President Kennedy, who introduced the bill, ~~he~~ ^{he} ~~was~~ ^{was} himself from an immigrant family and believed that immigrants contributed to the culture and prosperity of America. This suggests that later in the time period, immigration was prosperous for America. The 1965 Act, increased immigration significantly. The number of nonwhite immigrants quadrupled ~~at~~ over a year alone. Regardless of this progress and liberal thinking, later in the 1970s, deportation of illegal immigrants continued. In 1975 there were 7 million immigrants, over 600,000 of them were found to be deported but many more entered. Americans believed this was a great problem. Since patrolling the border was expensive. In 1985 over one million illegal immigrants were deported. This suggests a lenience and acceptance of immigrants but a rejection of illegal ones, which were most likely Mexican. Seen by opinion hit back in 1954, in which deportations began, and mainly effected Mexicans. ~~la carta~~ Therefore, by the end of the time period, overall, immigration increases and is considered prosperous for the US, reflecting a change in societal attitudes.

In conclusion, immigration and its impact flourished

(Section B continued) Throughout the years 1917-80 whilst in the beginning of the time period, it was strict, which reflected anti-communist attitudes and resentment towards communism, this simmered down after WW2. Not immediately though, since WW2 was shrouded by a second red scare ~~and~~ but during the 1950's ~~we see~~ there is more lenient attitudes towards immigration. It had a positive impact during the war but heightened communists fears afterwards. During Americas involvement of cold war, they encouraged citizens feeling communism as a way to reject the soviet sphere of influence and advocate themselves as a capitalist nation. Finally, the end of the time period reflects a more lenient attitude, with the abolishment of quotas by liberal president Johnson. It does however shift between this liberal mindset, to a more restrictive one with the heavy acceptance of immigrants in the 1970's. Therefore, immigration and its impact heavily fluctuate, changing significantly in years 1917-80.



This response demonstrates 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. The response offers a range of detailed examples which are used to explore immigration and its impact across the period. The argument is logical and well organised around key themes, and there is a substantiated overall judgement.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to access the higher two 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, often thematically structured, discussing and evaluating these in the light of contextual knowledge. Most candidates were able to identify the differences between Extract 1 and Extract 2, e.g. how Extract 1 offers argument to support the contention that Reagan's policies benefited a broad range of Americans, with economic expansion and lower taxation, whereas Extract 2 emphasises that the policies of Reagan's government did much to damage its capacity to deal with the issues it faced, and did little for ordinary Americans.

The more successful responses tended to be those whose careful reading of the extracts meant they identified the clear differences between the two views, and then discussed these with a clear focus on the question's demands, and in the light of evidence from contextual knowledge and from within the extracts. Many responses in the higher levels used a thematic approach, recognising areas where the extracts offered arguments relating to particular issues such as the impact of taxation policies or levels of federal involvement, but then explored the differing arguments offered by the two interpretations in relation to these. Where candidates were less successful, they tended to explain the views, and elaborate to varying degrees with their own contextual knowledge, but offered less discussion. In some cases candidates made use of evidence, such as statistics they had learned, but with limited linkage to the arguments in the extracts, or offered evidence but seemed uncertain in their understanding of what they had written. In such cases, candidates should be minded that more is not always better, and that the quality of use of learnt material will tend to produce more successful responses. Inflation and interest rates were perhaps two of the issues referenced by the extracts which candidates in general seemed less secure on. In terms of the question's focus on 'the American people', most were able to at least attempt to examine the different groups within this. Many focused on the references to rich and poor. In some cases this produced work which suggested America as a rather simplified dichotomy. More successful responses seemed to have a better grasp of the social makeup of American society in the 1980s, and recognised that in between these two extremes, there were a great range of Americans who felt the impact of Reagan's policies in varying ways, e.g. how tax cuts would benefit the better off the most, but not solely, or how reduced inflation was a general benefit. In some cases there was a nuanced grasp of the dynamic nature of these classifications. Whilst there was still evidence of candidates who were determined to argue one way or the other – typically against Reagan – many recognised that a genuine discussion of the merits of differing arguments produces more successful responses.

Candidates' knowledge and understanding of issues was varied, but in the main this was successful, particularly on the economic aspects of Reagan's impact. A discriminating factor in success was the deployment of knowledge offered, i.e. the difference between referencing an issue with contextual knowledge linked to the extract, and, at the higher levels, exploring this in relation to the precise focus of the question, and assessing the validity of argument. With regards to judgement, it was pleasing to see a substantial number of candidates who offered reasoned and considered assessments of the merits of both arguments, regardless of their ultimate decision. Overall, Question 5 produced a strong response from a good number of candidates.

Extract 1 (E1) supports the view, that ~~that~~ Reagan's economic policies greatly benefitted the American people, basing ~~it's~~ its argument on the strong progress America made in a variety of economic measures, making the view convincing. ~~E1 highlights that 'the unemployment rate' and 'the inflation rate' fell dramatically due to Reagan.~~ E1 highlights that 'Reagan's economic policies ... provided] the formula for ... economic growth'. It's 1981 Economic Recovery Act cut the top band of income tax from 70% to 50%, and the bottom rate from 14% to 11%. This allowed people to ~~have~~ have more disposable income, allowing them to spend ~~to~~ in the economy and thus creating economic growth. So E1 makes the view convincing that Reagan's economic policies greatly benefitted the people as it highlights how standards of living rose and ~~and~~ consumption in the economy grew. E1 also illuminates a variety of

economic measures that ~~also~~ demonstrate the fundamental success of Reaganomics, making the view further convincing. E1 highlights for example that 'the unemployment rate' fell dramatically. Under his administration, the finance, technology and manufacturing industries expanded, creating 20 million new jobs and pushing the overall rate of unemployment to 5.5%. Thus, E1 makes the view convincing by demonstrating how standards of living dramatically improved for ordinary people given that many more were employed and could earn a wage, and how industries expanded, creating long-term economic growth, thus benefitting future generations.

~~However~~ However, E1 may make the view less convincing by its underemphasis on the income inequality that occurred due to Reagan's economic policies. Whilst it does point to the fact that the rich paid a larger share of tax revenue, ultimately 'the poor' did not get 'richer' and their standards of living may have fallen during Reagan's administration. ^(as extract 2 notes) ~~Reagan~~ Reagan opposed the national minimum wage. Furthermore, when 12,000 air traffic

controllers ~~strikes~~ ~~when~~ went on ~~strike~~, strike, Reagan fired them all and ~~called~~ called in the army to do their jobs. This demonstrates how ^{standard of living} ~~the~~ for the lowest-paid workers declined under Reagan, as he allowed them to be exploited ~~at~~ without a minimum wage, and was incredibly harsh when they fought for better working rights, thus making the view that Reagan's economic policies greatly benefitted the American people less convincing. Moreover, E1 fails to recognize ~~how~~ why 'the inflation rate' fell dramatically. In August 1981, interest rates soared to 20.5%, reducing spending power, therefore reducing the rate of inflation. ~~These~~ This interest rate triggered a recession where unemployment fell 10% and GDP fell 1.8%. This makes the view less convincing by demonstrating how Reagan's efforts to solve the 'misery index' actually worsened the state of the economy and standards of ~~living~~ living for the ordinary people.

Extract 2 (E2) does not support the view, ~~arguing that~~ that Reagan's economic policies greatly benefitted the American people, basing

its argument on the both short and long term devastating consequences of Reaganomics, thus making the view less convincing. §2 highlights the 'stock market crash in October 1987' as a ~~result of~~ long-term result of Reagan's deregulatory economic measures, causing a crisis for Americans. Reagan's 1982 Garn St Germaine Depository Institutions Act heavily deregulated the finance industry, leading to increasingly risky loans being offered and ultimately a savings and loans catastrophe that had to be bailed out by the tax payer. Therefore §2 highlights how Reagan's economic policies ultimately caused ~~crises~~ crises in the economy, and ~~adding~~ the ~~standards~~ burden fell on ordinary tax payers, reducing standards of living. Furthermore, §2 ~~points to the~~ illuminates that 'the budget deficit soared'. Reagan's increased defence expenditure meant the budget deficit averaged \$200 bn a yr, and the national debt ~~tripled~~ tripled to \$2.6 trillion, the highest in American history. This demonstrates how Reagan's efforts to reduce taxation and big government not only failed to balance the budget, but made it exponentially

worse, thus making the view less convincing.

However, ~~Q2 may make the view less more~~
~~convincing~~ ~~the~~ fundamentally
underemphasises and downplays the
economic benefits of Reagan's increase in
'defence expenditure'. The West Coast,
which had a large number of aerospace and
~~militar~~ defence factories, saw a windfall of
prosperity, as Reagan's increased spending
~~also~~ allowed them to ~~invest~~ upscale
production. Furthermore, federal employment
actually grew ~~despite~~ ~~down~~ in the defence
department by 11.5-1., creating new jobs for
ordinary people and allowing them to earn
a higher income. ~~So Q2 may~~ This demonstrates
the ~~high~~ benefit of Reagan's increased
defence expenditure; it boosted the economy
and ~~was~~ reduced unemployment. This makes
the view that Reagan's economic policies
greatly benefitted the American people more
convincing.

Overall, in light of differing interpretations,
it is largely convincing to say that
Reagan's economic policies greatly benefitted

the American people. Many ~~key~~ key areas of the economy improved, such as unemployment and inflation. Furthermore, ~~there was~~ ~~a~~ Reagan did create a period of strong economic growth. Whilst it ~~was~~ could be argued that his efforts to reduce inflation led to a recession, this was only temporary. ~~More~~ Moreover, Reagan's increased defence expenditure fundamentally spurred the economy, outweighing the increase in the budget deficit. ~~Overall, it's largely convincing. However, it still is a~~ Overall, it is largely convincing to say Reagan's economic policies greatly benefited the people.



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's policies greatly benefited the American people) rather than the general controversy and (4) it offers a reasoned judgement on the given issue.

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 (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explaining 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
- Focusing carefully on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Giving consideration to timing, to enable themselves 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:

- Answers which pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. 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
- Where a response does not give sufficient consideration to the given issue/proposition 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 or 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, 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:

- 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 .

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>

