

# Examiners' Report Summer 2007

GCE

## GCE History (6522)

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](http://www.edexcel.org.uk).

Summer 2007

Publications Code UA019219

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Edexcel Ltd 2007

## Contents

Paper	Title	Page
	Introduction	4
2A:	Monarchs and their Servants: Henry VIII and Charles I	6
2B:	Health, Welfare and the Constitution in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Britain	8
2C:	Reformation and the Catholic Challenge in Europe, 1517-63	9
2D:	Challenges to Authority and the Struggle for a New Order in France and America in the Late Eighteenth Century	10
2E:	A New Nation and the Rise of Fascism: Italy 1848-1925	11
2F:	Democracy and Bolshevism in Post-War States: Germany and Russia, 1918-29	13
2G:	Social and Political Change in Post-War Powers: The USA and China, 1945-76	15
	Statistics	17

# Introduction

## General Comments

The examination prepared for June 2007 was the first summer examination under the revised specification, and involved some adjustments for both students and examiners. Changes to Unit 2 were:

- the reduction of the (a) question to 20 marks and the raising of the (b) question to 40 marks
- the removal of L4 from the (a) mark schemes
- the incorporation of 14 options into 7 papers with a choice of sections.

Although the mark scheme levels remained common across both questions, these changes did require some adjustment of expectations because of the time allocation implied in the different mark weightings. Levels one to three applied to both questions and can be broadly defined as:

- Level 1 - simple statements, marked on the basis of relevance to the question
- Level 2 - statements with some development of either supporting reference and examples or explanatory links to the question
- Level 3 - developed statements with both supporting reference and explanatory links to the question.

Within these levels, marks were awarded on the basis of the range of statements, depth of support, and development of explanatory links, requiring in many cases that the examiner had to balance these qualities in an overall judgement. This can often be influenced by the quality of focus within the response - the extent to which the candidate maintains focus on the question and selects material that is relevant as well as accurate. Clarity of focus is defined by relevant selection and the development of links to the question that explain the relevance. In this context candidates can often lose marks because they concentrate on demonstrating what they know, or try to reproduce prepared responses, rather than focusing on an answer to the question that has been asked. Detailed comments on these problems can be found in the option-specific comments below.

In terms of the generic mark levels, therefore, this examination session did not bring changes, but their application to the different questions was inevitably affected by the mark allocations and the advice on how this should influence the allocation of time. Candidates were expected to divide their time according to the marks available, implying that about 15 minutes should be spent on the response to part (a) and about 35-40 minutes on part (b). While this did not affect the quality and levels of thinking required, it inevitably had some impact on expectations of range/depth. Hence a high L2 or L3 mark could be achieved in part (a) with two well-developed points or a greater number of weaker ones, whereas L3 responses in part (b) required three well-developed points or more.

Teachers and students should also be aware that in part (b) marking, L3 now begins at just over half marks. The greater range of marks available in this level now allows more refined judgements about links to the question and the role of explanation. Many candidates write responses that cover a good range of material that is clearly relevant to the question, but fail to develop explicit links to show how it is relevant, or simply assert 'and this helped to cause....' without further elaboration.

The range within L3 now allows such responses, which can be described as having strongly implicit links, to be awarded marks within the range of 21-25 on the basis of range/depth of supporting material.

Similarly, responses that have clear and explicit links, but very limited range/depth, can be marked within this category. Responses that fall securely within L3 merit a mark between 26 and 31, while those that begin to explore the role of different factors by developing causal links more fully, or begin to prioritise, are marked within the range 31-36 marks. Those who develop role, interaction or relative importance fully as part of their response to the question, are likely to access L4 at 37-40 marks.

The experience of examining in June/July 2007 suggests that many candidates are capable of developing these skills and an understanding of the concept of causation as an active process in which factors work together to create a particular outcome. The extra time available to develop causal explanations, in which the role of different factors can be considered and compared in order to explain interaction or assess relative importance, produced a greater number of very good responses than in previous sessions. In addition, where attempts were made to address these issues that fell short of the development necessary for L4, they contributed to a thoughtful response that merited good L3 marks.

In the light of this experience, certain points can be emphasised as advice to centres and students:

- Candidates should limit the time spent on part (a) questions, and focus on developing two or three relevant points in response to the question asked. They should support their claims and show how they relate to the question. They should not attempt to write an 'essay'.
- Candidates should study causation as part of their course, paying attention not only to what factors played a part in causing key outcomes, but also to the part they each played and how they combined. They should develop an understanding of causation as a process taking place over time - for example by considering the role of conditional and contingent factors, the interaction between circumstances and individuals, and/or the ways in which actions and reactions are influenced by attitudes and ideas. These concepts lend themselves to group work, discussion and planning of responses as well as to writing essays, and can be extremely appropriate as part of a revision programme.
- Within the examination candidates should focus on answering questions appropriately rather than parading knowledge for its own sake. This begins with careful analysis of the question - the most common reason for well-prepared candidates failing to achieve high marks is a failure to address the question effectively. Numerous examples of this are described in the option-specific comments below.
- As always, the ability to communicate effectively is of enormous importance in examination performance. Knowledge of appropriate vocabulary (including the avoidance of slang), good sentence and paragraph construction, and fluency of explanation remain valuable qualities in any written responses, and confer great advantages to those who have acquired them. Candidates should be aware that the source of these skills lies in reading, analysing, making notes and deconstructing good historical writing, as an ongoing part of their studies.

## 2A: Monarchs and their Servants: Henry VIII and Charles I

The entry for this option was close to 2500, split evenly between the two sections. In section one there was a marked preference for question 2 over question 1, while responses to section two were more evenly divided between questions 3 and 4. All questions posed some difficulties for candidates, and all produced a full range of responses, including some that were of a very high standard.

In question 1a candidates were familiar with parliaments role as a source of taxation, and were able to show how this caused tension with Wolsey, especially in 1523. Many were also able to discuss issues such as enclosure and anti-clericalism, citing the Hunne case and the difficulties experienced in the 1515 parliament as examples. Hence many candidates were able to define key feature of hostility. Weaker responses often lacked real understanding of the role of parliaments and drifted into issues such as Wolsey's relations with the nobility. Clearer understanding the nature and structure of government in this period would benefit many candidates. 1b was generally handled well, with most candidates able to argue that Wolsey had too many other matters to attend to, and that reform of the Church was not a priority. Weaker candidates tended to drift into describing other matters, while the best were able to link the King's attitude and priorities, limited desire for reform in the population as a whole, and Wolsey's own exploitation of Church offices and revenues to explain why he paid so little attention to reform.

Question 2 was the more popular choice, not always wisely. Many candidates found it difficult to relate Henry's personality to his effectiveness as a monarch, and many tried to offer 'balance' by emphasising his weaknesses alongside his strengths. Good responses showed an understanding of kingship, including the importance of image and the benefits conferred by Henry's physical and military attributes, and the best also addressed his ability to delegate power and choose an effective servant while maintaining control of overall policy. Part (b) was probably the attraction for many candidates, who demonstrated impressive knowledge of foreign policy. Good responses covered the period, relating Henry's problems to the nature of his aims, finance and resources, the need for allies/unreliable allies, and the eventual problem of the divorce. In some cases this was overstated or given prominence too early in the period. A pleasing number of candidates were able to link factors and develop some interaction - often between finance and alliances - but a disturbing number of candidates still rely on a narrative structure and give them selves little scope to explain causation.

Most candidates who attempted question 3 had secure knowledge of the Hampden case, and many were able to explain its significance in a number of areas, referring to the views represented by Hampden, the impact of the judges decision, and division, and the growing resistance to the collection of Ship money thereafter. There was much minor inaccuracy in references to the nature of the trial, showing a lack of understanding of the legal structure. A similar lack of accuracy weakened many responses to part (b), with weak chronology and confusion over the sequence of events undermining the ability to show how the Scottish rebellion brought an end to the Personal rule. Other responses described events in accurate detail but failed to establish causal links, and few were able to link events in England and Scotland effectively. The best were able to show how religious changes and the personality of Charles caused rebellion in Scotland and a lack of enthusiasm for the king's cause in England, and how the resulting rebellion forced Charles to recall parliament, demonstrating the interaction of both individuals and events across the two kingdoms.

Question 4 produced a good range of responses. In 4a candidates were able to describe Laud's actions and policies in some depth, but many failed to focus on his role and impact outside the Church, or to explicitly develop the political impact of his changes within it.

Good responses covered his role as a privy Councillor, the policy of thorough, and the enforcement of changes via Star Chamber and High Commission, as well as the impact of Arminian reforms to show he fuelled fears of both Catholicism and absolutism. Question 4b seemed to confuse some candidates, who wrote about the execution of Strafford, and many were unsure of the after-effects of the Irish rebellion. Most understood its impact in terms of fear of Catholicism and mistrust of the king, but many candidates lacked precise exemplification to develop these points. The best responses were able to show how the rebellion created mistrust and provoked a response in parliament (Grand Remonstrance, Militia Bill) that divided MPs and allowed Charles to rally support.

## 2B: Health, Welfare and the Constitution in Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century Britain

This option had an overall entry of nearly 2500 candidates, with over 2000 choosing to answer questions 3 and 4 on the Liberal governments.

Only small numbers attempted Qs 1 and 2 but the responses were generally sound. Most candidates opted for question 1 and were able to describe Chadwick's 1842 report and its impact, including influence on the 1848 Act. Some evaluated his role in a balanced way and some focused a little too much on his negative influence. In consequence responses tended to cluster in the mid L2 to borderline L3. Responses to part (b) were quite well informed and focused, covering a range of groups and reasons for resistance. Some spent too long discussing why the opposition was eventually overcome. While many responses lacked depth of exemplification - some reference to particular localities may be a useful option to consider in relation to this issue - better candidates were able to offer sufficient range of opposition to secure L3. Question 2a had a very specific focus, but most candidates were aware of the key elements and therefore responses were quite high scoring. The best were able to explain why they were key features, including the significance in terms of origins and impact rather than simply describing the Act. Part (b) was quite well answered as most were aware of the main steps/influences that brought gradual change from very limited and permissive legislation of 1848 to the compulsory and comprehensive 1875 Act. Most responses had a chronological structure and many had enough explanatory links to the question to reach L3

Question 3 was by far the most popular question with over 1700 responses and (a) was well answered with many candidates able to describe 'old' attitudes and why and how these changed to 'new' attitudes towards poverty. Some were not focused enough on attitudes and spent too long describing the origins of reforms and details of the measures but most were able to access mid/upper L2 or borderline L3 Part (b) was also well answered on the whole, in that most could make the explicit links to the budget as provocation but relatively few had the depth or range of focused links to achieve good L3 marks and above. After some focused discussion of the budget, many drifted into narrative of the constitutional crisis, which was not the focus of the question. Good responses maintained the causal focus by exploring underlying tensions and the attitude of the Lords towards Liberal legislation, and/or considering the issues that arose from rejection of the budget. The best were able to explain and evaluate the role of the legislation alongside a range of long-term and short-term causal factors.

Question 4 was less popular, perhaps because many candidates lacked awareness of what the Liberals did in relation to Ireland before 1910. However, the question produced many good responses from those who tackled it. Most candidates were able to explain why Ireland and Home Rule were on 'the back burner' in this period, and good explanations of that could reach borderline L3. Only a very few were able to get secure L3 (18 or more) by describing (in addition to above) specific measures taken e.g. land reform, Councils Bill and Universities. However, good candidates were able to make up their marks with a strong response to part (b). This was very well answered as most candidates were well prepared on a range of factors explaining the defeat of HR in the period and the best were able to always explicitly link these factors/events to the wording of the question to reach secure or good L3. Some attained L4 by demonstrating linkage/interaction/relative importance of causal factors, in particular by relating opposition in Ulster to conservative and imperialist supporters at Westminster.

## 2C: Reformation and the Catholic Challenge in Europe, 1517-63

Of the overall entry for this option of around 1250 candidates, only 17 chose questions 3 and 4. These included some good responses but many candidates lacked breadth and tried to respond to questions from a very limited knowledge base. Most chose question 3 and were able to deal comfortably with the Council of Trent, relating the increased power of the papacy to a perceived need for unity and leadership in the face of the Protestant challenge. Knowledge of early reform movements was much weaker, and some candidates clearly did not understand the terms of the question, referring only to the actions of Pope Paul III. With only 4 responses to question 4 there was no clear pattern, other than a tendency to understand the impact of the failure of the Regensburg Colloquy much better than the later attack on heresy. Overall, it could be suggested that candidates in this option need to place events relating to the Church and its internal development in a much wider and more secure context of understanding the period and the religious conflicts across Europe.

In contrast, questions 1 and 2 were quite well handled by the majority of students. Question 1 was by far the more popular, producing responses with a wide range of quality, from very poor to excellent. Most candidates understood something of the political structure of the Empire, particularly the role of the princes, but many simply described their actions with only implicit links to their political role and powers. Others wandered from the question into a general description of Charles V's problems, without the links to the structure of the Empire that enabled the material to be rewarded at higher levels. A disturbing number of candidates did not understand the term, some believing that the Empire was controlled and governed by the Pope. The best responses were able to link the diffusion of power and the conflicts arising from it to the survival and development of Lutheranism in both specific and general terms. Part (b) was generally handled well, with most candidates understanding the reasons for the appeal of Luther's ideas. Some focused on reasons for popularity other than his ideas, such as the printing press or imperial weakness, but many of these were able to link such factors to Luther's ideas, if only briefly, and secure good L2 or even low L3. Most candidates were able to describe key ideas and relate them to factors such as abuses in the Church or German/ anti-foreign attitudes, and many could understand the impact of the ideas themselves. The best were able to relate different aspects of Luther's ideas to different sections of the community, or to appeal across different sections, and secure high L3/L4 marks.

Question 2 attracted fewer responses, but many of good quality. Most candidates understood the role and actions of Frederick the wise, although some limited the range to pre- or post-Worms, and others offered only a description of his actions, limiting themselves in both cases to L2. L3 responses offered some range and clear explanation of the effect of his actions on Lutheran development. Similarly, most were able to explain the decline in Luther's significance, although some explained this only by reference to the role of the Princes from 1526. Better responses addressed the role of other reformers, Luther's own distractions and limitations, and his inability to compromise at key moments. The best linked these aspects by pointing to his appeal for princely support and the necessary evolution of the movement within the political and military context of the Empire and the period.

## 2D: Challenges to Authority and the Struggle for a New Order in France and America in the Late Eighteenth Century

Only 80 of over 1200 candidates attempted questions 1 and 2, but these were often answered well. Of these, 77 attempted question 1. Most were able to describe British attempts to raise new revenue in considerable depth and detail, although some spent too long on this question and limited their response to part (b). Some candidates merely described legislation or administrative provisions, but the best were able to relate these to the need for 'new' revenue, the failure of some 'attempts' and the efforts at enforcement, thus creating explicit links to the question. Part (b) was also handled well, with candidates generally aware of the political dimensions of the issue, although some were unable to go beyond this. A few simply repeated their response to part (a), but most were aware of the wider implications of the question and the need to focus on causation. Reference to events covered in part (a) was rewarded as part of a wider response if relevant, and at L3 if related to causation. Good responses related taxation to representation, and considered both the nature of American resistance, the role of individuals and groups such as the Sons of Liberty, and British reactions, to explain how the situation deteriorated and opposition grew. Surprisingly few candidates were aware of economic factors, but many did understand colonial resentment of British attempts to restrict westward expansion. Question two was also handled reasonably well by those who attempted it, with some reference to key areas of resistance such as Boston and Virginia, and of other areas that benefited from the British presence, such as New York. Reasons for the Federalist success focused on the benefits of unity in terms of both economic and defence issues. The role of key individuals could have been more fully developed.

Performance on questions 3 and 4, which were similar in terms of popularity, was much more variable. Most candidates understood the impact of the Enlightenment in general terms, and a pleasing number saw the significance of religious belief in relation to divine right, but many lacked accurate reference or failed to make links to acceptance of the monarchy. Some simply offered narrative details on Louis XVI, with little reference to the question. Part (b) was handled reasonably well, with most candidates considering the threat to the revolution, the impact of war, and the need to maintain control. A few were aware of other factors such as political infighting, the role of the sans-culottes and the attitudes of Robespierre. Some candidates showed lack of chronological awareness and related the Terror to the tyrannical rule of Louis XVI. In question 4 many candidates struggled to relate Marie Antoinette to the outbreak of war, although good responses were able to address her family links, her desire for a war of restoration and her influence on her husband. However, many candidates focused on her role in the fall of the monarchy, or her wider influence role in the rise of discontent throughout the period - a focus that would be too wide for a part (a) question. Part (b) caused more problems for candidates than 3b, in part because many candidates had little knowledge of the attempt to create a constitutional monarchy. Again weak chronology misled some candidates, but the main problem appeared to be an over-focus on the role of Louis in creating mistrust. Good candidates were able to address the difficulties of effective reform, political attitudes and party conflicts, the impact of war and economic problems as well as the role of the King and Queen. However there is some cause for concern that a disturbing number of candidates seem to address this option only in terms of the causes of revolution to 1789 and the failure of Louis XVI to adjust thereafter.

## 2E: A New Nation and the Rise of Fascism: Italy 1848-1925

This was, as always, one of the larger options, with nearly 6000 candidates entered for the paper. The majority of these attempted questions 3 and 4, but over 100 focused on questions 1 and 2 with a reasonably even split between the two questions. All questions produced a full range of responses.

Question 1a allowed candidates to describe the early career of Mazzini, and many demonstrated secure knowledge of his actions. A few missed the specified time span and included his role in the Roman republic, but most focused on his efforts to spread revolutionary ideas through the medium of writing and his activities in the Carbonari and Young Italy. Most were able to address his role, and a pleasing number considered both achievements and limitations to offer an evaluation, developing strong explicit links. Part (b) also produced some good responses, based on a range of Italian weaknesses (regionalism, lack of leadership, conflicting aims and ideas, failure to engage the peasantry) and the strength of foreign powers (Austria and France). Weaker responses tended to generalise, but many candidates were able to refer to a range of good examples to support their claims. An impressive number attempted to address interaction and/or prioritisation, establishing links between Austrian recovery and Italian divisions and between the role of the Papacy, the failure of Piedmont, and French intervention. Question was slightly more popular, with many candidates able to explain the impact of Cavour's reforms in depth and detail. Weaker candidates sometimes became sidetracked into a focus on foreign policy and the attempt to drive out Austrian influence. Responses to part (b) were variable. Some very good responses considered the nature of Cavour's alliances, French withdrawal, and the limits of Italian ambition and commitment to unity, along with the ongoing role of the Papacy and foreign presence to extend the span of the response. Weaker candidates sometimes lost focus and explained how unification was completed, or drifted into discussing regional, social and economic divisions after 1861, without establishing links to political or geographical unification of 'the whole of Italy'.

Question 3 posed some problems for those without a good grasp of political systems and ideas. Many candidates ignored the reference to 'the system of government' and described 'features' such as fear of socialism, government weakness or nationalist discontent without reference to the nature of government or the system on which it rested. These responses sometimes showed wide and accurate knowledge of post-war problems, but could not score well. Some candidates appeared unaware of the widening of the franchise in 1919, although many made reference to proportional representation. Good responses covered the franchise and PR, the nature of coalitions and their effects, the failure of the large parties and the continuing system of 'transformismo' (variably spelt but usually recognisable). The best were able to relate these to certain features - particularly instability. Part (b) produced many good responses where candidates were able to pick out key fascist ideas and link them to the problems facing the country in 1919-22 in order to explain their appeal. Some responses focused primarily on one or the other, but a pleasing number were able to develop both ideology and problems sufficiently to demonstrate why 'so may' Italians responded positively, and to develop interaction or prioritise factors. Weaker responses tended to describe ideas, or more frequently, to ignore them in favour of other factors that aided Fascist popularity - personality, Fascist strategies and actions or external events. In some cases these factors had implicit links to ideology, allowing reward at L2.

Question 4 proved the most popular of the questions, with nearly 3000 candidates attempting a response. Knowledge of Mussolini's role in the growth of Fascism was generally secure, although a disappointing number of candidates drifted into general description of the rise of Fascism or concentrated on the role of other elements such as the Ras, without clear links to Mussolini's role.

Good responses covered the foundation of the movement, the switch to the Right, the foundation of the PNF, the dual strategy, propaganda and the exploitation of fear of socialism. The best developed explicit analysis of Mussolini's role and/or links to the growth of the movement. Part (b) produced many good responses, although a large number of candidates limited themselves to L2 /low L3 by adopting a narrative structure with brief causal links or describing the consolidation of power with implicit or brief links to dictatorship. Many candidates focused on why Mussolini was able to establish a dictatorship, citing his popularity, the role of the king and the weaknesses of opposition. Good responses of this kind could reach mid-L3, but marks at 28 and above required some reference to his motives and/or the pressures on him such as the demands of the Ras. The best responses were able to explain and develop both motives and opportunity, and many explained the impact of the Matteotti crisis and the actions of the Ras as a trigger factor, to reach high levels.

## 2F: Democracy and Bolshevism in Post-War States: Germany and Russia, 1918-29

With almost 8500 entries, this is the largest of the options. By far the most popular question was question 2, attempted by almost 4500 candidates. Nearly 5500 candidates had prepared for questions on Russia, with a little over 3000 candidates dividing evenly between questions 3 and 4. There is, however, a tendency for weaker responses to all the questions to be poorly focused. In this option more than any other, weaker candidates tend to offer narrative, descriptive and often stylised responses that pay little attention to the question.

Q1 was chosen by a minority of candidates, but often produced the best responses. Q1a demonstrated good knowledge of Bolshevik social policies, although many students concentrated on changes to women's rights and roles in Russia, sometimes but not always with explicit links to the family. Though these form a central pivot to changes in family life, students could not achieve the higher marks without some reference to children, education and/or the broader spectrum of communist approaches to the family, including issues about communal living and the removal of religion from social life. Responses to question 1b testified to the work done in some centres on society and culture, as well as their political implications. Most responses include some reference to propaganda and the arts. Many students were then able to link this to indoctrination, in terms of education and promulgation of communist ideology amongst a largely illiterate peasantry. Better responses were able to provide useful examples from a range of arts - including most commonly, film, posters and literature. There were also many useful references to the role of arts and artists in support of political events - notably the agitprop trains and positive representations of the Reds in the civil war. While some candidates continue to generalise on such topics, many have an impressive knowledge of art and literature under the Bolsheviks, and of their ideological role.

Question 2 was extremely popular, but many students made the mistake of not considering the questions fully. 2a was a straightforward question, but included a key aspect that many students missed - the phrase 'adoption and working' and the range provided by the dates 1921-27. Most students concentrated on the early years and presented arguments on the 'adoption' of the NEP. These points focused primarily on the changes in regulations from war communism for peasants regarding 'tax in kind', and for urban workers to begin trading for profit. Some noted the reintroduction of money into the economy. Better responses recognised the second aspect of the question on the 'working' of NEP and were able to highlight the consequences of NEP with the advent of Kulaks and Nepmen. In question 2b the majority of students were able to describe in narrative form the struggle for power between Stalin and Trotsky in more or less detail. This led to L2 responses. Better responses were able to include the power vacuum left as a result of Lenin's death and the difficulties posed by the testament. The most effective responses were able to link these narratives to the complex political struggles and debates within the communist party - including the future direction of Russian communism, 'permanent revolution' or 'socialism in one country'; the correct economic programme and the future of NEP; and the kind of leadership for effective government. These points were then related to the characters and actions of the key players in the struggle for power. However, a disturbing number of candidates misinterpreted the question to mean 'why did Stalin win the struggle for power?' and while some were able to achieve L2 with implicitly relevant material, many scored badly as a result.

The most common responses question 3a described the economic crises from 1918-23. These included, in the best examples, post-British blockade events, the war debt, deficit financing, welfare costs and the whole series of events linked with the Ruhr crisis. Better responses addressed the issue of these crises arising as a result of government policy, and made explicit links between government decisions and the economic outcomes. Many candidates understood the role of wartime expenditure by the Imperial regime as well as decisions made after 1919.

The decision to accept the Treaty of Versailles was not treated as valid material, since the government had little choice. The best answers also often showed causal chains of government policies and actions that led to the hyperinflation of 1923. The most common failing in responses to question 3b was to address only one aspect of the question - usually economic factors. Often, even those that did pay attention to political events tended to do so briefly or provide narratives of earlier events such as the Kapp putsch; or they narrated the events of the Munich putsch without explaining why the Weimar government survived. Some candidates offered detailed accounts of Stresemann's foreign policy after 1924, which cannot explain the republic's survival in the crucial period of 1923-24. The best responses included the role and actions of Stresemann in terms of economy, with references to the building world economy to 1923. They also tended to show the weaknesses of political opposition and the support for Weimar, especially as a result of the French invasion of the Ruhr.

Question 4 allowed many students to excel. A sound knowledge of the Constitution led to many good L2 responses with different articles described. The best responses were able to define features and relate them to groups of articles or sets of principles that they then illustrated with examples from the Constitution. 'Democratic' and anti-democratic features were a popular option. The key to success in question 4b was recognition of the need to cover the whole period. Many students wrote effectively about why there were economic difficulties to 1923 but considered little or nothing thereafter. Well-developed responses of this kind could attain low L3, but lacked the range for higher levels. Another group of responses included reference to the Wall St Crash but no information between 1923 and 1929. Material relating to the Crash itself had some relevance and brief reference to early stages of depression could be rewarded, but much of this material quickly went out of the specified period. Good responses explained the problems to 1923 and the partial nature of recovery thereafter, especially in agriculture. The best responses addressed the period as a whole by explaining the long term effects of the reparations and the Ruhr crisis, the consequences of relying on external loans throughout the period and some warning economic difficulties in agriculture and long term unemployment.

## 2G: Social and Political Change in Post-War Powers: The USA and China, 1945-76

Just over 7000 candidates were entered for this option, the vast majority opting for questions 1 or 2. Within the two sections, candidates were fairly evenly split between the two questions. All questions were accessible and students produced a full range of answers. Overall, the main problem seemed to be the lack of focus on the question, and the lack of precise knowledge, such as the dates of main events, the names of US presidents and the dates of their presidency.

In question 1a, many students offered very detailed information, however, too many candidates ignored the dates given and described actions taken after 1957, especially the Meredith case and too many of them concentrated on retelling the story of Brown and his daughter, rather than focusing clearly on the question. Some candidates used up valuable time by describing the situation before 1945 in considerable detail. However, the question was handled well overall, and many candidates achieved L3, covering both nature and significance. The best covered both Brown and Little Rock, and were able to address the legal precedent, the problems of enforcement and the importance of Federal intervention. Some candidates also considered the long-term implications of educational opportunity and the slow pace of change in practice. Question 1b also produced a good range of responses, with some candidates offering only narrow or generalised responses but most demonstrating secure knowledge of events. Some knowledgeable candidates drifted into describing the emergence of Black Power, but many established clear causal links and a range of factors. Impatience with slow progress, the shift of focus to the north, the emergence of Malcolm X, internal divisions and resentment of King, the difficulty of changing attitudes and practical opportunities, and the impact of Vietnam were commonly considered. The best were able to demonstrate interaction, especially between Vietnam, government attitudes, King's influence and the growth of Black Power, to achieve high L3 and L4.

Question 2 was addressed less effectively, although 2a posed few problems. Most candidates were familiar with events, and weaker responses lacked technique rather than knowledge. Many candidates focused exclusively on the story of Rosa Parks and the start of Montgomery protest, not the significance of the events for the development of the campaign, or they placed the responsibility for the protest and its success entirely on Martin L. King. A further problem was the tendency of some to assert long-term significance, usually as a precedent for direct action campaigns and/or the significance of King's emergence, but fail to demonstrate this by reference to the campaigns and events that followed. The best analysed the campaign to draw out significance - increased awareness of economic strength, increased sense of community and commitment, the example of a successful campaign and King's role - and then demonstrated the accuracy of these claims by reference to later developments. The greatest problems occurred in 2b, where many candidates failed to address the question. A significant number of candidates addressed a different question - 'why was legislation passed in 1964-65? - and could not go beyond L1/2 because the material selected was not relevant to the issue of delay. Others tried to explain delay by referring to the factors that created success in 1964-65, and then described their absence in the years before that - a difficult strategy that few could execute successfully. Others ignored the dates and blamed internal divisions and militancy, as well as Vietnam, none of which were of major significance before 1964. Much of this is surprising, since similar questions have been asked previously. Some candidates spent much time on difficulties prior to 1945, and a few managed to link this to the extent of problems that had to be overcome, while a few were successful in applying counter-factual arguments.

The best responses looked at obstacles to progress such as the role of Congress, the power of southern Democrats, states' rights, the depth of white racism, and the reluctance of Presidents to get involved.

Some also dealt accurately with internal divisions among civil rights activists and the effects of white power and intimidation, by both legal and illegal organisations.

The evidence of these responses does suggest that candidates benefit from studying civil rights within an explicit context of American political organisation and practice.

About 350 candidates attempted questions 3 and 4, producing a good range of responses. Question 3a was handled well, students mostly concentrating on the roles of Communes in social development, their impact on the lives of their members and contribution to the economy. Some candidates offered an entirely negative picture, presenting the communes simply as Communist tyranny and/or Mao's means of control. There was a similar fixation on Mao in some responses to 3b, from students who saw the Cultural Revolution entirely in terms of his political ambition. However, there were some good responses that offered a wide range of reasons, including the role of Mao, the nature of political rivalries and the attitudes of the Red Guard. Question 4a brought a range of answers using similar material, students mostly described the damage to social progress, although some considered the impact on the economy as well. Attacks on 'experts', the interruption of education and the attempt to destroy traditional culture were all prominent, and some candidates considered the impact on family life. In question 4 candidates offered many reasons for Mao's domination, often focusing on the political skill and determination of Mao and the impact of the Cultural Revolution, but also considering propaganda (including the preparation of the 'little red book'), censorship, the elimination of rivals and the role of the 'gang of four'. Surprisingly few sought to place Mao's authority in the context of his long-term role and place that he had achieved within the history and development of the Party.

As always, students' performance across the options demonstrates some consistent features. The major requirements are sound knowledge and the ability to focus on the question asked in order to apply it. The revised weighting of the questions has brought some changes, mostly to the benefit of students. Mean marks are up on most papers. The reduced emphasis on 'descriptive' questions and narrower focus of the questions that can be asked in part (a) seems to have helped candidates to select material with greater confidence and use it to develop focused arguments. The increased time allocation for part (b) has enabled more candidates to develop and explain causal links, rather merely assert them. Careful planning, explanatory focus and consideration of the role played by different factors can encourage further development and the raising of standards.

## Statistics

### Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
2A	60	35.7	10.3
2B	60	36.9	10.4
2C	60	37.6	10.7
2D	60	34.7	9.8
2E	60	36.0	10.8
2F	60	32.0	10.0
2G	60	37.2	9.1

#### Paper 2A (2350 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		29.8	49.0	66.6	79.6	88.2

#### Paper 2B (2321 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		21.6	42.3	63.6	77.4	85.2

#### Paper 2C (1270 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	35	30	25
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		28.3	45.8	62.5	76.1	88.2

#### Paper 2D (1193 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	36	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		33.7	49.4	66.1	79.4	87.2

Paper 2E (5784 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	43	28	33	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		27.2	45.5	64.2	79.4	87.5

Paper 2F (8341 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	36	31	26	21
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		19.9	36.7	56.2	75.7	87.7

Paper 2G (7161 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	45	40	36	32	28
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		21.7	42.1	60.7	75.4	85.9

Paper 4B Resit (9 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	35	30	26	22
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		28.6	42.9	85.7	100	100

Paper 6A Resit (5 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	39	35	32	29	26
Uniform boundary mark	90	72	63	54	45	36
% Candidates		40.0	60.0	60.0	60.0	60.0

8264 AS Cashin (25124 candidates)

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Uniform boundary mark	300	240	210	180	150	120
% Candidates		18.2	40.8	64.4	82.9	93.5



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](mailto:publications@linneydirect.com)

Order Code UA019219 Summer 2007

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit [www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications](http://www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications)  
Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at [www.edexcel.org.uk/ask](http://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