

GCE

Edexcel GCE

History (6526)

This Examiners' Report relates to Mark
Scheme Publication Code: UA018000

Summer 2006

Examiners' Report

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information please call our Customer Services on 0870 240 9800, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2006

Publications Code UA 018000

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2006

Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	Introduction	1
1A	The Crisis of the Tudor State, 1547-58.....	4
2A	The Quest for Settlement: Cromwell and the Protectorate 1653-58.....	5
3A	Radicalism and the British State: The Chartist Experience 1838-50.....	7
4A	Decline of the Liberal Party, c.1900-29.....	9
5B	Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control, 1933-39.....	10
6B	The Soviet Union after Lenin, 1924-41.....	12
7B	Cold War to Détente, 1945-90.....	14
	Statistics	15

Introduction

This was the fifth Advanced Level examination of GCE History on this Specification. This particular Unit attracted an entry of almost 19,000 candidates. Within this, there were wide variations in the number of candidates entering for different papers, with Paper 5B, '*Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control 1933-9*' attracting 8,299 candidates and, at the other end of the scale, Paper 4A, '*The Decline of the Liberal Party c.1900-29*' attracting 784 candidates.

All papers differentiated effectively and this produced a full range of marks. Whilst broad comparability across all papers was achieved by the range of questions asked, some adjustment to the grade boundaries was made where questions appeared to have created particular difficulties. The grade boundary marks published with this Report should be read with this in mind. A high grade boundary does not indicate that the paper was difficult, nor does a low one suggest that it was easy to attain high levels - indeed, the opposite may be the case. With these mechanisms available for fine-tuning, comparability of standards and demands across the different papers can be assured.

Examiners were required to take account of the quality of written communication displayed in candidates' responses. Whilst in most cases, the quality of written English was commensurate with candidates' quality of historical knowledge and understanding, there were far fewer candidates than last year experiencing problems in communicating effectively and within the normally accepted rules of English grammar.

Comments specific to each of the papers will be made later in this Report. There are, however, some comments that relate to the Unit as a whole and to all seven papers.

- The quality of knowledge displayed by the majority of candidates was, as last year, commented on favourably by all examiners. Examiners were impressed by the depth, detail and range of knowledge shown by most candidates on their chosen topics. The best scripts were absolutely excellent.
- Unit 6 is the synoptic Unit. It is synoptic principally in that it seeks to assess the full range of skills, ideas and concepts developed through the study of other AS and A2 units. Thus responses should be led by a careful analysis of the sources. Whilst it is not expected that candidates should rehearse, at this level, the sort of evaluation regarding bias, cross-referencing, utility and reliability seen in Unit 1, it is expected that candidates should internalise the skills developed from GCSE and AS source work and integrate these into their arguments. Relatively few candidates were able to do this. Far too many candidates simply used the content of the sources as part of an extended, or explained, narrative.
- The sources provided for the (b) question are intended to give candidates pointers to the different sorts of interpretations that are possible on a particular topic, and the primary sources can be used to back or challenge these interpretations. Few candidates appreciated that the sources are selected with this intention and so few responses began with the arguments presented by the sources and developed their own argument/interpretation from them.

- Both the questions on each of the papers involved both the use of sources and the candidates' own knowledge; both targeted AO1 and AO2. However, the focus of the two questions was different. There were still candidates who seemed unaware of this.
 - The (a) question involves making and supporting a **judgement** on the **key features** of an historical movement, episode or issue. Candidates are expected to focus on three sources and their own knowledge.
 - The (b) question focused on the making and supporting a **judgement** about an historical **interpretation**, with candidates being presented with an interpretation and invited to make and support a judgement about its truth or validity. A substantial minority of candidates did not seem aware of the fact that they were addressing an interpretation. Candidates are expected to focus on all the given sources and their own knowledge.

In answering both questions, candidates were expected to draw on their understanding of a range of historical perspectives and to make linked use of their own knowledge and source material of different types.

- The key to the (b) question is to explain how two or more different arguments, drawn from two or more of the sources, can be sustained and developed using the other sources and own knowledge. The aim is to show how different interpretations, identified from the sources, can be argued from both the content of the set sources and wider knowledge, contrasting the emphases and evidence used in each point of view. Candidates should then reach their own considered, supported and appropriately evidenced view.
- Examiners reported that far fewer candidates than in previous years were dealing first with the sources and then going on to develop an answer using their own knowledge. However, there was a disturbing growth of formulaic answers, particularly in responses to the (b) question. Candidates adopting this approach dealt first with the interpretation given in the question and then moved on to discuss, in turn, 'other factors'. Whilst this approach might provide a 'safe' structure for less able candidates, it served to inhibit the more able, who struggled to fit what they wanted to say into a structure they had been taught to use.
- Relatively few candidates weighed the evidence they were presenting when reaching a conclusion. Presenting a supported case for two or more interpretations, candidates plumped for one, seemingly at whim, without giving any sort of logical judgement as to why they made this particular choice.
- The mark allocation is (a) 20 marks and (b) 40 marks, and this should work as a guide for candidates in their time allocation. As last year, too many candidates seemed not to appreciate this. Very full answers were seen to the (a) part question, leaving scant time to respond to the (b) part, which always requires more thought and developed argument.

- Careful planning is a key to success on this paper. It is pleasing to report that the majority of candidates are now having the confidence to spend time working out carefully constructed answers. This invariably paid dividends as these candidates were able to focus on the question asked and maintained that focus in their answers.

The future: 2007 and 2008

Centres are reminded that the revised Specification will come into force for examinations in 2007 and 2008.

Insofar as content is concerned:

- Paper 6526E 'Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control' will extend from 1933 to 1945 instead of, as at present, 1933-1939.
- Paper 6526G is no longer 'Cold War to Détente, 1945-90', but has been renamed 'The Origins and Early Development of the Cold War, 1945-62' and the revised content reflects this shortening of the time-span.

One change that will affect all papers is the shift in balance of the assessment objectives, with more weight being placed on AO2.

For full details, please consult the revised Specification (Issue 5 September 2005), the revised Coursework and Teachers' Guide and the Edexcel web-site www.edexcel.org.uk/history

1A: The Crisis of the Tudor State, 1547-58

- (a) This question asked candidates to focus on the problems created by Edward's minority. All candidates were aware of the problems that arose during Edward's reign but weaker candidates found difficulty in identifying those that were associated with the minority itself. The majority of candidates, however, were able to link the three given sources with their own knowledge and consequently Level 1 answers were rare. Candidates who were able to focus on the latter part of Source 1, which touches on the general impossibility in following a monarch as terrifying as Henry VIII, who understood the problems of Henry's legacy, and who could relate this to the additional problem of Edward's age were off to a good start. Better candidates linked the ideas in Source 1 and their own knowledge about Henry's legacy, to Source 2. This carried the idea a stage further by focusing as it does on the difficulties experienced by the Council in exercising the powers delegated to them by Henry during Edward's minority and on the failure of both Somerset and Northumberland to command the loyalty of the people. Many candidates portrayed Somerset as being either self-seeking or inept or both, whilst Northumberland was seen as doing his best to rescue the situation. Many candidates saw Source 3 as providing evidence of Edward's increasing involvement in government and of promise cruelly cut short. Better candidates were able to question the provenance of the source and used it as evidence of the ways in which Northumberland was able to manipulate Edward - a further problem of the minority. There were a pleasing number of well-focused responses that were comprehensive in their source use and selective in their deployment of knowledge to answer the question in a thoughtful, analytical way.
- (b) This question enabled candidates to address the central issue of this paper by evaluating the root causes of unrest in the mid-Tudor years. A wide range of responses was seen, with candidates responding at every level. There were some excellent answers, produced by candidates who fully appreciated that they were dealing with an interpretation, and used the given sources as the 'building blocks' of their response, developing a sustained argument from them. A small minority of responses were seen where candidates used only their own knowledge or paraphrased the sources adding little or nothing of their own. It was disappointing to see candidates with excellent knowledge of the period failing to focus properly on the causes of unrest. Far too many responses were merely descriptive of the events in the period whilst the best really focused on the notion of unrest and considered far more than the actual rebellions. Those agreeing with the hypothesis given in the question focused on the political interpretations given in Sources 1 and 2 and supported these by reference to the evidence of the primary sources 3 and 4 and from their own knowledge. Economic justifications for people's grievances can be extracted from Sources 1 and 5. The most common interpretation to be juxtaposed against that of political and economic grievances was that of religious difficulties. These can be extracted from Sources 1 and 5 and, by inference, Source 4 augmented and developed by candidates' own knowledge.

2A: The Quest for Settlement: Cromwell and the Protectorate 1653-58

- (a) This question asked candidates to focus on the problems Cromwell had in establishing the rule of the Major-Generals. Many candidates felt the need to explain, in considerable detail, exactly why the Major-General 'scheme' was set up which could have been linked to relevant comments but, in most cases, was not. Candidates such as these compounded this weakness by using Sources 1 and 2 to support the reasons why. Furthermore, a significant number of candidates had prepared sets of points on the issue and were not able to adapt well to the points suggested in the sources. Source 3 was particularly poorly used, with relatively few candidates able to extract key ideas. However, most candidates were able to focus on Source 2, the only source critical of the Major-Generals. Reference to the 'heavy hand of centralising government' being 'imposed' on the localities, the 'policing' of communal activities and the 'reformation of manners' were all starting points for candidates to use their own knowledge to show how these appropriately reflected difficulties in establishing the rule of the Major-Generals. Similarly, reference to the 'patchy' performance and effectiveness of the system did provide critical reference points for candidates' own knowledge. Many candidates used Source 1 as evidence of the 'divided, discontented and dissatisfied populace', suggesting that the Major-Generals would experience problems in establishing their rule. Source 3, spotted by many as being Royalist propaganda, nevertheless was seen by better candidates as providing evidence of Cromwell's willingness to desert the Major-Generals if they did not deliver - and by inference his lack of faith in their ability to do so and of his commitment to them. A few centres had obviously encouraged candidates to build up a bank of very individual knowledge on the Major-Generals and some interesting detail emerged.
- (b) This question focused on the interpretation that it was Cromwell himself who was the main reason for the failure of the achievement of his aims during his time as Protector. Here, the full range of responses was found. The best candidates were able to present a sustained argument, recognising the existence of different interpretations about the reasons why Cromwell's aims were not achieved, but at the same time marshalling the sources to support their own opinion. Those supporting the stated view usually started with Source 5 and developed the author's viewpoint by describing from their own knowledge some of the ways in which Cromwell behaved inconsistently. This they backed with Source 6, which again emphasises Cromwell's own culpability by focusing on his moral uncertainty and his habit of 'waiting for the Lord.' Many candidates supported these interpretations by reference to Sources 1 and 3 which, taken together, show Cromwell's apparent inconsistency in his attitudes towards the Major-Generals. Those candidates taking a different view usually focused on the interpretation given in Source 4, which presents Cromwell and his regime in a very positive light. Others focused on the first part of Source 5, which suggests that a major reason for Cromwell not achieving his aims was the attitude of the Protectorate parliaments towards the Army, picking up that the author quickly moves on from this to accuse Cromwell himself of apparently dilatory behaviour whilst explaining how this came about. Candidates used Source 1 to suggest underlying discontent amongst the general populace as indicating that achieving a 'godly reformation' peacefully might be somewhat tricky, no

matter who tried to bring this about, whereas Source 2 points to the failure of the Major-Generals themselves. As was expected, weaker candidates tended to consider whether or not Cromwell's aims were achieved, rather than the reasons why they were not achieved.

3A: Radicalism and the British State: The Chartist Experience 1838-50

- (a) This question asked about the reaction shown to the Chartists by those in positions of influence and authority. There were disappointingly few very good responses, with many candidates finding it difficult to identify 'those in positions of influence and authority'. Only a handful were able to comment on the policies of the Melbourne and Peel cabinets, or really explore the different groups in society that were in positions of influence or authority. A surprising number of candidates, for example, failed to mention MPs or the rejection of Chartist petitions by parliament. However, some candidates did have a really secure understanding of the complexity of the response from those in positions of authority and influence and it was pleasing to read their confident responses. Most candidates began with Source 3, which provided an account of what many regarded as a typical response from those in authority. This led, logically, to a consideration of Source 1. Here, the majority of candidates were able to show that Napier, an authority figure, was not unsympathetic to the Chartists. However, only a handful picked up on the nuances of the source and on the differing reactions of central and local government. Relatively few candidates were able to appreciate that *The Times* was an influential newspaper read by those in positions of authority, and even fewer appreciated that it was not completely hostile to the Chartist position. Some were able to point out the essential ambiguity in the newspaper's position - acknowledging the roots causes of distress but at the same time refuting the Chartist claim that full representation would remove these. As expected, weaker candidates focused on the Chartist challenge, and wrote lengthy accounts of physical and moral force incidents with only a slight nod in the direction of the question focus.
- (b) This question focused on the nature of the Chartist movement and posed the hypothesis that it was primarily a political movement. Here, candidates found themselves on familiar ground. Most were able to use the sources productively, and the best responses were outstanding. Indeed, the main problem for many was how to control the vast amount of information they had at their disposal and how to meld it with the sources. Here, careful planning paid dividends and sharply focused responses usually resulted from those candidates who took the time and trouble to work out their response beforehand. The very best responses came from those candidates who addressed 'essentially' as a key word. Those supporting the view that Chartism was essentially a political movement tended to start with Source 5, which stated clearly that 'the Charter remained their sole and constant objective.' Many candidates realised that, whilst acknowledging the frustration felt by many at the 1832 Reform Act and the 1834 Poor Law Amendment Act, Browne does assert that the Chartists were following a well-worn radical tradition of demanding representation. Candidates found some support for this view in Source 3, which does mention working class frustration at the lack of representation in parliament, but links this in with fear and hatred of the new police force and with economic distress, and so could be used to counter the original hypothesis. Many candidates appreciated that *The Times* newspaper clearly believed the Chartist movement to be fundamentally about representation and so was essentially political. Those candidates looking for challenge to the view that Chartism was essentially a political movement found it in Source 4, with its clear focus on economic distress. Support for this view was found in the detail of Source

3, although Jones' three trigger points would seem to imply that Chartism combined the economic and social with the political. Source 1 focuses sharply on opposition to the Poor Law Amendment Act with no suggestion that Chartists were driven by political motives, and most candidates picked this up and developed it fully using their own knowledge. Better candidates were able to use the sources to drive a wide ranging a productive debate about the nature of Chartism.

4A: Decline of the Liberal Party, c.1900-29

- (a) This question asked about the problems faced by the Liberals as they tried to re-unite their party in the years after 1918. A minority of candidates rehearsed the problems faced by the Liberals after 1918, but failed to link these with their efforts to reunite the party. However, most candidates were well rehearsed in the detail of the Asquith/Lloyd George split and could, with some degree of success, continue a description of the antipathy between the two men into the post-1918 period. Here, Source 1 was used as indicative of this antipathy, with a go-between in the shape of Alfred Mond being needed to bring about the possibility of a rapprochement and of Lloyd George's obvious reluctance to participate. Candidates tended to use this source as a springboard for investigating the post-war relationship between the two men. This source led naturally, for many candidates, to a consideration of Source 2 when, four years further on, Lloyd George is being 'cold-shouldered' by the Liberals. Better candidates used their own knowledge to develop this into a consideration of such things as electioneering and election results. Source 3 moves away from personalities as a problem in reunification and looks beyond this to wider political affiliations, implying, as many candidates pointed out, that a major problem for the Liberals was their loss of their power base in the country.
- (b) This question enabled candidates to address the reason for the decline of the Liberal party, and poses the hypothesis that this happened mainly because it failed to meet the challenge from the Labour Party. Most candidates were able to comment critically about the stated factor and, with varying degrees of success, weigh the significance of the rise of Labour against other factors. Candidates supporting the view expressed in the question generally started with Source 4, which, although considering the difficulties the Liberal Party faced before 1914, made it clear that the main beneficiary of these problems was the Labour Party. They developed this by using their own knowledge to explain why Labour, and not the Conservatives, benefited. Candidates used Source 3 to illustrate the growing strength of the Labour Party, affiliated as it was to the Trades Union movement and thus benefiting from that movement's growing strength. Many pointed out that Source 5 supports this to some extent by indicating that the working classes were becoming increasingly attracted to Labour and used their own knowledge to develop this further. Source 1, although acknowledging that Labour was the largest opposition party, nevertheless, as some candidates pointed out, shows Lloyd George as dismissive of MacDonald, indicative of the lack of awareness the Liberals had of the nature of the Labour challenge - and that challenge was clearly present. Some further emphasised this by reference to Source 2. Candidates found challenge to the given hypothesis in all sources. Source 4 finds the Labour Party ineffective and looks to the failure of the Liberals to deal with contemporary social problems as the root cause of their decline; Source 5 considers the 1914-18 war as putting irremediable strains on an already divided Liberal Party that would probably have declined anyway. This view candidates saw as supported by Source 3 with its emphasis on the increasing class awareness of politics. Sources 1 and 2 were possibly the easiest sources for candidates to use here because they were so clearly indicative of the problems caused by the Asquith/Lloyd George split.

5B: Hitler and the Nazi State: Power and Control, 1933-39

- (a) This question asked candidates to focus on the significance of Goering's role in the Nazi state in the years 1933-9. Alarming, there were whole centres where candidates clearly knew nothing (beyond that which was in the sources) about the man. Centres are urged to keep themselves up-to-date with modifications and clarifications to the Specification by regularly accessing Edexcel's web-site. However, even candidates with little or no knowledge of their own were able to trawl the sources and demonstrate skills of source evaluation. Candidates were able to use Source 2 to focus on the special relationship Goering had with Hitler and on the significance this had for the Nazi state. This was exemplified by Source 1 and nearly all candidates picked up on Goering being made responsible for the Four Year plan and, better candidates, on the significance of this for Hitler's policy of autarky. Candidates drew on Source 3, with its criticism of Goering and the way in which he set about directing economic affairs, as a counter-balance to Sources 1 and 2 and, using their own knowledge, reached a supported judgement. However, many candidates' knowledge of Goering was patchy. For example, some were able to explain the significance of the Four Year Plan in preparing Germany for war and providing further employment. However, relatively few were able to expand on this by explaining Goering's role in centralising the economy and prioritising military needs. Many candidates were able to describe Goering's role in the Rohm purge and the Blomberg-Fritsch affair, and some linked this effectively to the comments in the sources about Goering's ruthlessness and loyalty.
- (b) This question enabled candidates to address the central issue of the nature of Hitler's rule in the Nazi state by presenting the hypothesis that he was a 'weak dictator'. For many candidates, this was a well-rehearsed topic and it was pleasing to see that so many were able to engage effectively with the debate. Support for the view was found in Source 5 and this is where many candidates began, because the phrase 'weak dictator' is found here. This source suggests that it was Hitler's dependence on his own popularity that contributed to government inaction in domestic affairs, and better candidates developed this idea, using their own knowledge. Source 4 was used to show that Hitler wasn't aware of what was going on in the German work-place, despite the dictatorial methods of governing exemplified by Source 1. Better candidates treated Source 3 and Source 4 with caution because of their provenance. Many linked Source 2 with Source 5 as it exemplified ways in which Hitler created new organs of state to carry out specific projects. Candidates challenged the 'weak dictator' hypothesis by using the sources to show that Hitler was, in fact, a strong dictator. Source 1 was used to exemplify the way in which he preferred to govern by decree, expecting his decrees to be obeyed. His selection of a political giant like Goering (Source 2) was used together with Source 3 to show that Hitler was not afraid of pushing through his own views with his own men. Source 4 was used to demonstrate that the 'Hitler system' did have successes, and that one wouldn't expect a dictator to know what was going on on every factory floor. Indeed, candidates used the first part of Source 5 to show Hitler's strength in building up a system of rival empires that left him unchallenged and in supreme power. Many candidates were able to develop a discussion from the sources, identifying the key issues and demonstrating familiarity with such concepts as the polycratic state, divide and rule, the Hitler myth and the Fuhrerprinzip. However, there were a considerable number of

candidates who provided a sound summary of the sources rather than using them to create a sustained explanation or argument. There was, too, a tendency to state that the sources could be viewed in different ways without reaching a judgement about which way was more valid. On the issue of delegation, for example, many wrote that this 'divide and rule' policy could enhance Hitler's power, or undermine it, but did not show which interpretation was more convincing.

6B: The Soviet Union after Lenin, 1924-41

- (a) This question asked candidates to explain how Soviet propaganda and the arts reinforced the cult of Stalin's personality in the years 1929-1941. This question revealed that many candidates lacked specific knowledge about the methods used to reinforce the cult of personality, and as a consequence a sizeable minority of responses drifted into explaining why the cult of personality was developed instead of focusing on how it developed. Another approach taken was to describe aspects of Stalin's cultural policies, even though their link to the cult of personality was somewhat tenuous. Indeed, Source 2 seemed to prompt candidates into describing Socialist Realism where detail was often good but a relevant focus not always sustained. However, many candidates were able to show an awareness of the range of methods used: radio, theatre, fine art, statues and cinema. Precise examples to illustrate these methods were usually missing, but better answers were able to make use of Marfa Kriukova's 'Tale of Lenin', the renaming of Tsaritsyn as Stalingrad, and the image of the 'Vozhd'. Komsomol and the Stakhanovite movement were sometimes used as examples of vehicles of propaganda that could be linked to Stalin and his cult. Candidates seemed to find the sources easier to deal with than their own, somewhat limited, knowledge. Weaker answers tended to rely too much on paraphrasing the sources rather than drawing points of evidence from them, but the number of candidates that relied solely on paraphrasing was fewer than in previous years. Most candidates were able to use the sources to develop specific points: Source 1 was used to show how propaganda was spread through education both to promote Stalin and demonise his opponents; Source 2 as evidence of the use of Lenin's image to reinforce Stalin's cult and to highlight the control exerted through government organisations such as the Union of Soviet Artists; and Source 3 as evidence of how government control over the arts and propaganda was implemented through intimidation and censorship. Better answers used the sources as starting points to highlight a relevant aspect and then developed it by using knowledge.
- (b) This question enabled candidates to address the central issue of Lenin's legacy and posed the hypothesis that Stalin destroyed it. This was clearly a debate with which most candidates felt comfortable. Weaker candidates tended to see the issue in terms of differences and similarities between Stalin and Lenin and this approach was often effective at providing a relevant if unsophisticated focus. Better responses discussed the nature and complexity of the Lenin legacy before weighing up Stalin's impact on it. There was a range of different yet well supported arguments. These included the view that Stalin and his policies were a consequence rather than a continuation of the Lenin legacy, or that Stalin, rather than destroying the legacy used it for his own purpose and took it to extremes. The common feature of the better answers, whatever their argument, was the quality of reasoning, the depth of knowledge and its integration with the deployment of the given sources fully to debate the different facets of the question. Candidates found support for the view given in the question in Source 5 and many candidates began here. Better candidates appreciated and developed the tricky concept embedded in the source: whether socialism was the means or the end, and demonstrated their understanding by reference to events drawn from their own knowledge and/or appropriate use of Sources 1 and 2. Candidates found challenge to the view in Source 4, and many were able to pick up on the phrase 'After Lenin's death, the party was compelled to make

corrections to the relationship between the first leader and his successor'. They used their own knowledge to explore the ramifications of this, deciding whether or not Lenin's legacy was thereby destroyed. The focus on the use of terror at the beginning of Source 4 was well supported by Source 3, and many candidates spotted this. Candidates used Source 6 to develop the theme of change from Lenin's regime and continuity with it. The source provided starting points for many candidates. There were many high quality responses where candidates showed real assurance in debating and arguing a complex issue. It was also pleasing to read responses from candidates of more modest ability who were nonetheless able to show real engagement with the historical issue under consideration.

7B: Cold War to Détente, 1945-90

- (a) This question asked candidates to explain the issues involved in the USA's foreign policy from the end of the Second World War until April 1950. The best responses addressed the key issues and supported these effectively from the sources and from the candidates' own knowledge. Many candidates were able to debate the issues from both US and Soviet perspectives by reference to Source 2 in particular, which enabled them to consider the variety of interpretations that could underpin US actions based on the issues. Candidates found that Source 1 set out clearly the central plank in the USA's foreign policy, that of national security, and addressed its suggestion that this became an issue only when other states began to look to their own national security and developed systems of their own. Many candidates appreciated that this theme was continued in Source 2, which explains how the 'spiral of distrust' was formed. Better candidates picked up the hints at ulterior motives. Many candidates found that Source 3 was, in many ways, a development from Source 1 and 2 in that it admitted to going further than simple maintenance of national security, arguing for superior military power and a policy of containment of the USSR.
- (b) This question enabled candidates to address the central issue of responsibility for the continuation of the Cold War to 1990 and presents the hypothesis that this was because of the USSR's expansionist policy. Unfortunately a considerable minority of candidates did not venture beyond 1979 (mentioned in Source 5) which effectively meant that about one-quarter of the time span of the question was not considered. Other candidates failed to consider the stated factor in any depth, relying exclusively on the invasion of Afghanistan to support the statement. However, the best responses were those that were able to come to judgements based on evidence from across the period, using the sources to generate points for the earlier period and own knowledge to support arguments beyond 1979. Candidates supporting the view expressed in the question usually started with Source 1, expressing as it does the need of the USA for national security and showing an understanding that the means of achieving this were in direct conflict with the strategic objectives of the USSR. Candidates appreciated that this theme was picked up in Source 5, which focuses sharply on Jimmy Carter's fear of the USSR's expansion into Afghanistan and concern that this was part of a policy aimed at global domination. Candidates found support for this in Source 3, where perceived USSR expansion resulted in a recommendation that this expansion could be blocked by containment and superior military strength. Candidates challenged the given hypothesis by citing Source 4, where Kissinger sees Brezhnev as being essentially conciliatory towards the USA. Indeed, many candidates used Source 2 to argue that, right from the start, the USSR was simply trying to protect the sovereign rights of all nations, using their own knowledge to explain how this 'protection' could be seen as expansionist by the USA, and how the USSR viewed the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan as similarly expansionist.

Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
1a	60	32.4	10.4
2a	60	30.5	11.9
3a	60	35.4	10.6
4a	60	37.4	8.9
5b	60	35.4	10.6
6b	60	33.5	9.6
7b	60	36.5	9.8

Paper 1a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	39	34	30	26	22
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		29.8	46.2	60.0	73.4	85.5

Paper 2a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	34	29	24	19
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		26.5	43.8	59.0	73.0	83.8

Paper 3a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	39	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		25.7	39.5	53.3	66.9	78.8

Paper 4a

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	40	36	32	29
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		27.1	43.1	58.3	74.7	84.6

Paper 5b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		21.5	35.0	52.5	65.9	78.1

Paper 6b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	37	33	30	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		23.5	38.8	56.7	68.9	79.3

Paper 7b

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	40	36	32	29
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		24.5	40.1	55.4	70.1	79.7

Advanced award

Provisional statistics for the award

	A	B	C	D	E
Cumulative %	23.3	47.8	71.6	88.9	97.3

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced UMS grade boundaries

	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Advanced Subsidiary	300	240	210	180	150	120
Advanced	600	480	420	360	300	240

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code UA 018000 Summer 2006

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at www.edexcel.org.uk/ask or on 0870 240 9800

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

edexcel 
advancing learning, changing lives

A PEARSON COMPANY

