

Principal Examiners Feedback Summer 2008

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 GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.org.uk.

Summer 2008

Publications Code UA 020219

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Edexcel Ltd 2008

Contents

Introduction	4
2A: Monarchs and the Servants : Henry VIII and Charles I	6
2B: Health, Welfare and the Constitution	8
2C: Reformation and the Catholic Challenge in Europe, 1517-63	10
2D: France and America in Revolution	12
2E: A New Nation and the Rise of Fascism: Italy 1848-1925	14
2F: Democracy and Bolshevism in Post-War states: Germany & Russia 1918-29	16
2G: Social and Political Change in Post-War powers: The USA and China, 1945-76	19
Statistics	21

Introduction

As ever the 2008 papers produced a wide and varied range of responses. A small minority of students seemed totally unprepared for the examination, offering only the barest of generalisations or occasionally nothing at all. There were a pleasingly large number of very high scoring scripts, perhaps reflecting the impact of the revised specification.

In general terms, the (a) questions seem to have produced a large number of middle-range answers. Few candidates are unable to make one or two relevant points with some supporting development, and thereby achieve L2. Where this occurs it tends to reflect a lack of understanding of the question, or occasionally a serious misunderstanding of the issues involved. In paper 2E, for example, some candidates appeared to believe that the Roman Republic of 1849 was established and led by Pope Pius IX, while some candidates in 2C seemed to equate an Imperial election with the election of a Pope. This reflects a wider misunderstanding of the role and functions of Popes and Emperors, which has been apparent in previous years. More serious, perhaps, was the lack of understanding shown of terms such as 'economic' and 'social', which led some knowledgeable candidates to offer considerable quantities of accurate but irrelevant information, also achieving low marks.

The vast majority of candidates demonstrate sound and relevant knowledge, thereby achieving marks in L2, which can be as high as 16. Relatively few, however, deal confidently with the question focus and relate their information to its requirements. Most candidates who attempted question 1a on paper 2F were able to describe some of the methods used by Trotsky to improve the Red Army, by few linked methods to explicit improvements beyond brief references to 'keeping up morale' or 'discipline'. Most candidates attempting question 1a on paper 2A knew a great deal about Wolsey's vices, but few related these directly to the weaknesses of the Church and the need for reform. Perhaps most marked of all - the vast majority of candidates attempting question 3a on paper 2F were familiar with both reparations and the economic crisis of 1923, but very few could grasp and explain the stages by which the crisis developed, preferring instead a chronological narrative, or in some cases, a causal explanation that drew in much irrelevant material.

The result is that a large number of candidates remain within level 2, where progression depends on range, depth and precision of supporting information. Many well-prepared candidates achieve marks between 12 and 16. Unless they produce outstandingly good responses to the part (b) question, this is likely to prevent them from attaining the highest grades. This problem is compounded because candidates who do not focus and confidently select information to answer the question often write a great deal too much, thereby curtailing the time that they can spend on part (b). Part (a) questions are set with a definable focus in order to make them manageable in 15-20 minutes and require two or three developed statements that directly answer the question. Even where candidates fail to develop explicit links for L3, a clear understanding of the focus of the question enables them to structure a response of this kind. Those who do develop such links score highly.

Answers to the (b) questions were often of a good standard, and perhaps reflect a growing focus on understanding causation. Fewer candidates fell into the trap of offering pure narrative, and most attempted to address causation. Many responses reached at least low L3. Most who fell below this tended to misunderstand the question, to lack accurate knowledge, or to describe reasons /factors without reference to how they caused the outcome. In low/mid L2 they offer valid statements supported by general assertions, lacking precise or accurate exemplification. Candidates do need to be aware that knowledge of specific examples and respect for chronology are essential. Progression

often depends on development of a statement with specific examples, and in the higher levels it may well be essential to relate the examples to particular phases or areas of the period in question (see, for example, paper 2C question 1b). In addition, candidates need to be aware of the period specified - for example question 4b on paper 2F could not accommodate the impact of the Wall Street Crash, which took place in October 1929.

There were, however, many good responses achieving secure L3 or above. A growing number of candidates attempt to explain how a particular factor contributes to the outcome, and therefore develop causal links securely. A smaller, but significant, number achieve this for more than one factor, thereby beginning to explore the role of different factors, while the best begin to develop a sense of interaction. Fully developed L4 responses remain few, but many more candidates seem to be attempting to address role and interaction and develop their explanations more fully. This is reflected in the number gaining marks in Level 3 band 3. Perhaps more importantly for the future, this lays a foundation for making judgements about causation and evaluating relative importance, which will serve them well in A2. Equally, understanding of role and interaction will enable new students to address the judgement-based questions that they will meet in the new specifications operating from 2009.

Option-specific comments

2A: Monarchs and the Servants : Henry VIII and Charles I

There were around 2,500 entries for option A, split fairly evenly between the two sections. Although it remains one of the smaller options, this does reflect secure and perhaps growing interest in the early modern period. Questions 1 and 3 were significantly more popular than questions 2 and 4, although the latter produced some very good responses from students who were confident with the issues.

Question 1

This question was generally handled well. In 1a students had sound knowledge of Wolsey's career, including his vices, although related this explicitly to the need for reform in the Church. A small number simply offered a narrative of his career or listed his offices, but most were able to relate them to abuses such as pluralism, absenteeism and simony. In 1b candidates showed a good understanding of the problems facing the Church, with fewer than in previous years attempting to deny that they existed. Some showed awareness of the historical debates on this issue, without falling into the trap of one-sided assertion, and without being distracted from the main task of explaining why the Church came under attack. Weaker responses tended to focus too much on the King's 'Great Matter' but most addressed a wider range of problems. The best were able to link the two, showing how a weakened institution allowed the King to adopt an aggressive strategy in seeking his divorce, and to exploit and intensify existing anti-clerical feelings.

Question 2

This question was handled less well. Although some candidates showed impressive knowledge of relations with Scotland, many were aware of little other than the battle of Flodden, were confused about which of Henry's female relations became regent thereafter, and made no reference to the Duke of Albany. More understood the links between Scotland and France, and were able to consider issues as intended in the question, but very few had both the knowledge and the understanding of diplomatic and strategic concerns to develop their responses to L3. This was also a feature of responses to 2b. Although many candidates had a sound knowledge of events and of English foreign policy, fewer responses were grounded in a good understanding of the rivalry between France and Spain or the wider European context. Many were able to describe English weakness, and those who added clear causal links could reach secure L3 with this approach. Far too many candidates offered a narrative of foreign affairs from the English viewpoint, some with a lack of secure chronology that restricted them to low/mid L2. Better attempts demonstrated impressively detailed knowledge, but failed to address causes, reaching only low L3 at best. A very few were able to explain the opportunities created by Franco-Spanish rivalry, and offer developed reasons why Henry and Wolsey failed to take advantage of it.

Question 3

In question 3a many candidates demonstrated secure knowledge of financial strategies and some were able to define features such as financial antiquarianism, the exploitation of crown rights, or the impact and extent to which they were effective. The main weaknesses here were a failure to acknowledge the specified dates and dwell on Ship Money after 1635, and a tendency to confuse measures with those of the 1620s - forced loans and even the Five Knights case featured in some responses. Question 3b produced a

wide range of responses. Weaker candidates offered many assertions about Charles's character and showed much chronological confusion. Some drifted off into a discussion of his religious policies or whether he intended to establish absolutism - neither being completely irrelevant, but tending to distract from the main focus. Better responses focused on the build-up of irritation during the 1620s and its impact on Charles's attitude, or considered his ability to sustain government without a parliament in the years after 1629. The best considered both, and the very best also addressed his refusal to call a parliament despite mounting problems in 1637-39, drawing on a range of factors to explain his resistance.

Question 4

Fewer candidates answered question 4, but some did so very well. Most candidates had sound knowledge of Ship Money, fewer developed its impact on relations between Charles and his subjects. Those who did explained the growing resentment, but few showed real understanding of the nature of the tax and its implications for property rights. More were able to explain its potential for enabling Charles to rule without parliaments, and reached L3 on this basis. Question 4b produced a very wide range of responses. Some candidates had little understanding of the issues, and offered descriptions of Strafford's career, Charles's relationship with his 'friend' (confusion with Buckingham?) or claimed that the King could not govern after the loss of such an able adviser. Some attributed the Irish rebellion to Strafford's death. Better responses considered the impact of the execution on either the opposition or the King, and many addressed the method used, the implications of attainder, and the divisions that emerged within parliament as a result. The best considered the impact on both King and opposition, and showed how mistrust increased on both sides. The very best were able to link this to more aggressive strategies such as the Ten Propositions, the Grand Remonstrance and the Militia Bill to explain growing divisions in parliament and the King's ability (and determination) to resist any settlement that the opposition could accept.

2B: Health, Welfare and the Constitution

The total entry for this option was a little over 2000, with the vast majority opting for section 2. Only small numbers attempted questions 1 and 2.

Question 1

In question 1 most were able to describe Snow's discoveries on the nature of Cholera as a water-borne disease during the 1853-54 epidemic but tended to have only implicit reference to the impact this had on public health policy. Others offered a more extensive account of his career, but did not always relate this to improvements in public health provision. In consequence responses tended to cluster in the mid L2 to borderline L3. Better responses had a fuller explanation of the significance of his work for the development of policy and some were aware of other significant aspects of his work/career and their impact. Responses to part (b) were very variable. Some were distracted by the events of the epidemic and others discussed the weaknesses of the 1848 Act, which was outside the period of the question. Reasons for its weaknesses could gain some credit if rooted in the years 1833-47. Most were able to identify and explain opposition to reform and scientific ignorance and make implicit links to the question. Better responses had explicit focus on the question and offered a range of causal factors including the temporary, localised and permissive nature of any measures taken. A few candidates successfully adopted the strategy of explaining why these measures were so limited, but for many this was a route into a descriptive and only partially relevant response.

Question 2

In question 2 most candidates were able to describe some key events in the period such as, Chadwick's surveys, and better responses were able to explicitly link developments to 'progress'. Some tended to focus on lack of progress but the most effective could present an accurate and balanced assessment of the significance and nature of any progress made up to 1848. Question 2b was quite well answered, as most candidates were aware of the main steps/influences that brought gradual change from the very limited and permissive legislation of 1848 to the compulsory and comprehensive 1875 Act. Most responses had a chronological structure and implicit focus, while some developed sufficient causal links for L3. Better responses defined a range of causal factors, including growing experience and scientific knowledge, the example offered by successful local initiatives, the work of the Board of Health and other local bodies, including Medical Officers, improvements in technology, and political changes such as the 1867 Reform Act. Some responses mainly on why the Act came in 1875, while others emphasised gradual progress - the very best explained both.

Question 3

Question 3 was the most popular Q and (a) was quite well answered with many candidates able to describe actions taken by Lloyd George that were linked to some idea of 'achievements of the Liberal governments'. These generally included the 1909 Budget and National Insurance, but some explained his role in the victory over the House of Lords. Some were not focused enough on Lloyd George and spent too long describing all the reforms and events associated with the Liberals but most were able to access L2. Better answers were well informed on how various specific contributions made by Lloyd George resulted in the Liberal achievements of welfare and constitutional reform. Question 3b

was also well answered on the whole, in that most could make some explanatory links to reasons for failure to introduce HR by 1915 but fewer had the depth or range of focused links to enter secure L3. Inevitably answers focused mainly on events after 1910 but the highest scoring responses were also able explain the failure to bring in Home Rule in 1905-1910. Many drifted into narrative of the Home Rule crisis of 1912-14. The best answers were able to explain and evaluate the role of long-term and short-term causal factors, or explain their interaction, allowing access to L4.

Question 4

In question 4 most candidates were able to describe the provisions of the National Insurance Act, with more focus on health than unemployment, and therefore access the range of marks available in L2. Most, but not all, were stronger on provisions than on principles. Better responses (L3) had explicit (or strongly implicit) focus on 'key' elements of the Act and many based this on the principles that inspired it - such as 'New Liberalism' and new attitudes on the cause/nature of poverty. Question 4b was quite well answered, as most candidates were able to explain either, why the terms of the budget were controversial, or, why its rejection led to a controversial 'constitutional crisis'. However, far too many who focused on the latter drifted into a narrative of the crisis, while others offered only implicit links between the crisis and the budget. Better responses were able to cover both aspects and maintain a clear focus on 'controversy' while explaining how events unfolded 1909-11. Those who could place the budget in the context of growing hostility between the parties, explain the role of the Lords before 1909 and/or the role of Lloyd George as the controversy developed accessed good L3 marks, while those who could explain how long-term and short-term factors interacted were able to access L4.

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

Entry for this option was a little over 1300, the vast majority of whom opted for section 1.

Question 1

Question 1 was generally handled well. In 1a some candidates included Hus and Wycliffe among 'humanist' critics, while others strayed well beyond 1517 in explaining Luther's criticisms. Credit was given to some material relating to the 1518 and 1519 debates, when it was used to draw out the implications of the 1517 Theses, but reference to the 1520 pamphlets was clearly out of period. Most candidates were able to describe differences between the ideas of Erasmus and those of Luther, and could argue that Luther went further, in challenging fundamental doctrines rather than highlighting abuses. Progression generally depended on how well these points could be explained and exemplified. Some candidates considered similarities, gaining credit where these were used to highlight differences. In question 1b most candidates were able to offer a range of factors that prevented the authority of the Church from being reasserted. Many candidates argued that by 1529 Lutheranism was too strongly established, and drew on material from earlier years. While this was a dangerously mono-causal strategy, many reached low L3 because they covered different factors and made reference to their continued existence in later years. Prominent among these were the role of the Princes and the distractions of Charles V. However, some candidates weakened their argument by presenting particular factors, such as Charles's military weakness, as if it applied throughout the period. Others focused on the period from 1529 and discussed the Schmalkaldic League, Charles's problems, his relations with the Papacy, the conflict between suppression and reconciliation, and the errors that he made after Muhlberg. The role of Maurice and of the French was also considered. Given the range of relevant material, candidates could reach good L3 with either focus, but the best responses drew on both and balanced the arguments. The very best were able to use a strong awareness of chronology to relate particular factors to particular periods, and build up an integrated response.

Question 2

Within section 1, question 2 was the more popular. Question 2a produced a very wide range of responses. Those who understood the nature of the Imperial election could score well. Most were able to suggest that the election distracted the leaders of the Church from the Lutheran problem, and many were aware of the role and powers that it gave to Frederick the Wise, linking this to his ability to protect Luther. Some were aware of Papal hostility to the Hapsburgs and the resultant desire to keep Frederick's support, fewer were aware of the debts incurred by Charles V. Few demonstrated a clear understanding of Imperial and Papal politics in this period, but many had sufficient awareness to achieve L3 or high L2. Other responses were weakened by some strange perceptions of both Papal and Imperial powers, including the assumption that the election was for the role of Pope, to be chosen by German princes. Candidates' understanding of the political context of the Reformation is variable, but many showed good understanding of the period and were able to apply this to the question successfully. Question 2b was probably the attraction for a number of candidates, but it was not always handled well. There were a large number of excellent responses, covering the appeal of Luther's ideas, his ability to present them, his character and courage, the social and political context of Germany, and the weaknesses of the Church. Some candidates also discussed the difficulties facing the leaders of the Church and the Emperors, as enabling factors. The role of Frederick the Wise in protecting Luther was dealt with effectively, but the wider role of the Princes was

problematic. A number of candidates ignored the specified dates and attributed a central role to Lutheran princes - better candidates specified those who converted before 1525, and developed the role of the cities and the Imperial knights. The Peasants Revolt and the impact on and of the princes frequently took candidates out of period.

Uncertain chronology was a problem for some candidates but the main fault in weaker responses was a tendency to offer only generalised support and rely on assertion. The nature of material dealing with ideas and appeal makes this a trap for the unwary, and candidates do need to equip themselves with some specific examples and precise reference.

Question 3

Of the 22 candidates who answered question 3, most were well able to describe the life and work of Ignatius Loyola, and many could address the idea of his achievements. Some tended to describe the early history of the Jesuits, but many had detailed knowledge of Loyola's contribution to their success. Candidates were often less secure on 3b, with a number describing the work of the Council of Trent rather than explaining the rejection of humanist reforms, while others equated humanism with Protestant thinking. Those who focused more effectively on causes referred to the importance of tradition, the need to impose unity, and the desire to strengthen Papal authority, especially in the face of Protestant attacks. One or two responses adopted an assertive defence of traditional beliefs.

Question 4

Only 3 candidates attempted this, none of them accessing a high level. They also adopted an assertive defence of traditional beliefs.

2D: France and America in Revolution

Questions 1 and 2 were answered by a small number of candidates, with the majority preferring question 1.

Question 1

Most demonstrated sound knowledge, of the Stamp Act and its aftermath, but there was a tendency to drift into narrative without addressing 'impact' in (a) or establishing causal links in (b). Thus there were some excellent responses, while others were grouped in high L2/low L3. The weakest responses tended to rely on generalisation without specific detail.

Question 2

Question 2 proved more demanding. While some candidates were able to consider the nature of foreign intervention in some detail, and to relate this to the outcome of the war, others offered only generalised claims. A few pursued a 'balanced' response, moving from the impact of foreign intervention to other reasons for American victory, thereby losing valuable time without accruing marks. In part (b) there some excellent responses, covering the difficulties faced by the republic - financial problems, foreign pressures and internal unrest - and explaining clearly how the Federalists were able to use these to convince the majority of the need for a new Constitution with a stronger central authority. Others described events, or summarised the debates without explaining why the Federalists were successful.

Question 3

Question 3 attracted by far the largest number of candidates and produced a full range of responses. Most were aware of the impact of the American War on finances, and many also referred to the spread of egalitarian ideas. The weakest responses offered only brief general assertions, the best developed both aspects with accurate and well-chosen detail, with explicit links to how they sparked discontent and led to the crisis of 1789. Between these extremes were large numbers of candidates who sought to explain the outbreak of revolution, with variable links to the American War. Many described the weaknesses of the Ancien Regime in great detail with only minimal reference to the war. As a result they produced relatively short answers to part (b) where they clearly had some understanding. Many sought to answer question (b) by describing the motives of a range of factions and individuals who supported the decision to go to war. This strategy produced some reasonable responses, reaching L3, but it also tended to pose organisational problems and lead candidates away from a fully developed or integrated response. Other candidates addressed a range of causes - fears of invasion, the attitude of foreign powers, especially Austria, internal divisions, the role of the monarchy, the desire to defend/export the ideas of the revolution. The best responses addressed the role of groups and individuals within this context, and were able to explain their interaction to achieve high marks.

Question 4

Question 4 proved more demanding for many, but also produced some excellent responses. A number of candidates demonstrated little understanding of Jacobin rivalries, simply describing the Terror (often with some reference to Danton) and/or the last days of Robespierre. This suggested that they made their choice primarily to access question 4b, but in many they cases offered a mono-causal or near mono-causal response, focused

on the role of Louis XVI. Others offered long explanations of the fall of the Ancien Regime before considering (if at all) the problems of the constitutional monarchy. Some candidates, however, demonstrated an impressive knowledge and understanding of factions and opinion within the Jacobin clubs, relations between the CPS and CGS, the role of individuals such as Danton and Hebert, and the impact of war and Terror, to show how Robespierre's position deteriorated. In part (b) they were able to consider the problems of addressing reform in France, the weaknesses of the Assembly, the role of the King, the impact of war, and the growth of republican sentiment via the clubs, the radicals and the sans-culottes, in order to explain why the Republic was established. The best responses developed the interaction between these elements, sometimes within a chronological framework, to offer an integrated explanation.

In recent examination sessions there has been a steady improvement in the range and quality of candidates' factual knowledge of a difficult and complex period, but many candidates need more appropriate focus and selection in their responses in order to do themselves justice.

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

This is a large option, with nearly 6,000 entries, attracting a wide range of candidates. Questions 1 and 2 were answered by almost 1,000 candidates, about two thirds of whom opted for question 1.

Question 1

Many stumbled on 1a because they did not accurately define 'economic and social'. Some apparently wanted to explain why there was support for political change, but focused on political ideas, Mazzini, dislike of Austria and the impact of a liberal Pope without reference to economic and social conditions. Others were able to describe some economic problems, with little reference to the political and social impact. Good responses covered the back ward state of the economy, burdens on the peasantry, barriers to trade and the frustrations of the middle classes, the impact of early industrialisation and poor harvests in 1846-47. The best related explicitly to the growing desire for constitutional rights, popular unrest and the role of Austria in upholding the status quo. Part (b) was generally handled well. Most candidates had sound knowledge of the revolutions and offered a good range of reasons for the failure to implement political change. Some drifted into narrative, but the main problem with weaker responses was a tendency to describe problems without showing how they contributed to failure. The best responses considered poor leadership, internal divisions, the lack of popular support, the strength of Austria, the role of the Pope and French intervention, and some showed a good awareness of links between factors. At the lower end of responses there was a tendency to generalise about revolutions and not refer to specific events.

Question 2

Question 2a produced a wide range of responses. Many were done well, although most tended to focus on the idea that the main legacy was that Italy needed foreign help or that the Pope was not going to lead a united Italy. Some referred to French interference throughout the period until 1871. Some candidates were also able to explain the importance of the Republic as a heroic myth, and some linked this with the role and career of Garibaldi. The best considered both positive and negative effects. At the lower end there was a tendency to describe the life of the Republic rather than its legacy, while some candidates appeared to confuse it with the Pope's liberal period, the Allocution, and even ancient Rome. Question 2b produced some excellent responses, but was clearly challenging for many. Many candidates focused on either why unification took so long, or the role of foreign powers, without seeing the links between them. Some ignored the specified dates and began their explanation in 1815. Those who could handle this context skilfully did well, but many failed to deal with the period from 1859-71 adequately. Others offered a narrative of this period, and those who included some causal links could reach L3 with this approach. The best responses focused on the role of foreign powers and how this caused delay, covering Villafranca, continued Austrian presence in Venetia, the role of France in Rome, and Italian weaknesses. A few excellent responses were able to develop the international context and relations between the powers to provide an integrated explanation of the process and timing of unification.

Questions 3 and 4 produced some excellent responses and many that were secure, but they also revealed areas of weakness in the approach and understanding of many candidates. Many do not understand the nature of ideology, and seem reluctant to consider it.

Question 3

In question 3a most candidates were able to establish different areas of Fascism, and better candidates were able to draw out that the features identified would gain them support. However, most concentrated on actions and policies, sometimes in accurate detail, without addressing the underlying beliefs and attitudes that they illustrated. Many candidates wrote a great deal about early Fascist left wing ideas without tying them to the question, others used them to demonstrate change. There was reference to nationalism, anti-socialism and occasionally a belief in strong leadership, but very few showed understanding of the anti-democratic that these created. Question 3b was handled rather better, with good explanations of factors such as the mistakes made by opponents of Fascism, their lack of unity, the role of the elites, especially the King and the Pope, the use of violence, Mussolini's opportunism and the role of the Ras. Some candidates were able to support their claims with accurate detail, and the best developed the links and interactions between them. Too many, however, relied on generalised assertion, and some who did have sound knowledge focused on Mussolini's consolidation of power, largely ignoring his opponents, while others described the problem they faced without any linking to the effects and outcomes.

Question 4

Question 4a was focused on an issue that has been addressed many times, yet proved surprisingly difficult. An alarming number wrote nothing about economic difficulties, and those who did often wrote about north/south divide ignoring the effects of the First World War. Some better responses covered economic difficulties in secure depth, but made no links to undermining democracy. Secure responses often used the Red years as a bridge, linking deprivation, unrest and extremism, or explained how the Liberal governments were made to appear weak, but a number of candidates then fell into the trap of describing the 'mutilated victory', Fiume and frustrated nationalism. Question 4b also produced some very weak responses, much narrative and chronological confusion. However, many candidates were able to explain in some detail how Mussolini balanced concessions and opportunism, the role of the elites, especially the King, the mistakes of his opponents and the role of the Fascist party and squads. Some very good responses were able to show that Mussolini had built up a secure power base that remained intact and enabled him to exploit these factors.

2F: Democracy and Bolshevism in Post-War states: Germany & Russia 1918-

This is the most popular option within the unit, attracting over 8,000 entries. Over 5,000 students attempted questions 1 and 2, with the remaining 3,000 much preferring question 3 to question.

Question 1

Over 4,000 students attempted question 1, with varying degrees of success. Many candidates' responses to this question focused on Trotsky's use of his train to go around motivating the troops and his use of ex-tsarist officers. Some candidates coped well and integrated Trotsky's use of terror and discipline with the above factors to fully explain why the Red Army was made effective. Some were able to quote specific examples of the successes that he achieved. However, many others were unable to make these links and listed them as methods used by Trotsky, often with only implicit links to the effectiveness of the Red Army. Generalised comments were often made on Trotsky's overall leadership abilities. Some candidates attempted comparisons with the Whites, which added little to the argument, and others went off on a tangent and treated the question as 'why did the reds win the civil war'. The main weakness in these, as in responses across the option, was a tendency to rely on generalised assertion.

Responses to question 1b also varied a great deal. At all levels candidates were able to state that the death of Lenin led to divisions within the party as to the direction in which they should go, with special reference being made on the NEP. In addition, candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding on the NEP, the ban on factions and the cult of Lenin to explain how Stalin got to power using Lenin's ideals. This though was done to varying degrees of success as some chose it to explain how Stalin ousted Trotsky rather than focus on how it demonstrated why Lenin's policies were still influential. Lenin's key policies of the NEP and War Communism were also explained, with some candidates using the change to demonstrate Lenin's pragmatism and why the NEP continued due to the results it had achieved. Candidates in general were aware of Stalin's influence in connection to why Lenin's policies continued, though some were more explicit than others as to why he chose to do this. Only a few excellent responses were able to link Lenin's career and achievements, his status in Russia, and his value as a supposed mentor for Stalin. In general candidates tended to focus either on Lenin's career and achievements, or the impact of the power struggle. Better responses drew on both, and the best related these developments to ideology and Lenin's influence in shaping it.

Question 2

There was also wide variation among the smaller number of answers to question 2. Responses to 2a tended to focus on what Lenin had done to win over the next generation towards communism rather than measures taken under the collective leadership or under Stalin's influence. There was strong emphasis on the youth groups that Lenin had set up and the changes he had made to the educational system. The descriptions of both were mostly accurate although some were rather generalised. Many responses included only implicit links to the effect on youth, but to some extent these measures speak for themselves. Some candidates did show an awareness of how the arts and propaganda were used with varying degrees of success, or dealt with other measures relating to the family, employment or living conditions, but only a few explicitly related these to the impact on young people. Few candidates achieved level 3 due to their inability to link the points they

raised to the question itself. In addition, their lack of in depth knowledge on this topic was also highlighted as responses were lacking precise examples to support their ideas.

Question 2b produced some excellent answers among who resisted the temptation to explain the rise of Stalin rather than the defeat of Trotsky. Answers tended to focus on the factors that led to Trotsky being expelled from the party rather than exiled. All candidates were aware that a key reason for Trotsky's expulsion was the work of Stalin. The ideological difference between the two men was visible in most answers. Furthermore, most candidates had some awareness of what the ban of factions was and of how it was used by Stalin against Trotsky. However, some candidates were more general in their explanation of this than others. Many candidates also addressed Trotsky's errors and misjudgements, and some factors out of his control such as his Menshevik past and the mistakes made by others, notably Kamenev and Zinoviev. Thus range was offered, but it was not always made really clear as to why that factor led to Trotsky being expelled or exiled. For example, Trotsky's personality traits were often mentioned but it was not always clear why they led to Stalin being able to undermine him. At the higher levels, candidates were able to explain why the power vacuum/struggle that emerged after Lenin's death led to Trotsky's downfall, and Stalin's manipulation of the events that brought it about, especially the use of the ban of factions. A few, including some very good responses, also addressed separate reasons for his exile, arguing that his determination and talent posed a continuing threat to Stalin.

Question 3

In question 3 candidates at all levels showed awareness that the economic crisis of 1922-23 happened because of the effects of World War One on the German economy, and because of reparations in particular. Key terms like budget deficit, passive resistance and hyperinflation were used, either as generalised comment or as a developed explanation to explain how the crisis unfolded. At higher levels, candidates were able to make strong links between the stages clearly explaining how one led to another with good analysis. Some candidates did try to explain how the problems were solved, though this was a minority. Most candidates were able to explain how one stage led to another, like printing more money leading to inflation and the invasion of the Ruhr leading to passive resistance, and in turn, to hyperinflation. However, many knowledgeable candidates offered this as a narrative, without developing stages, while some lost the focus of the question and considered other factors such as the Weimar Constitution in depth and detail. Unless clearly linked to the impact of reparations, these points could not be rewarded. Question 3b also produced a range of responses with a variety of strengths and weaknesses. Many candidates' responses focused on the work of Stresemann and how he led Germany to stability with the key term of bringing on the golden years being frequently mentioned. Clear knowledge and understanding of his economic and foreign policies were visible. Key terms/policies like the Rentenmark, the ending of passive resistance, Dawes and Young Plan being very popular to use. Candidates did vary in their ability to recognise why these factors led to stability with analysis on the whole being more implicit than explicitly linked to the question. For too many candidates this was a sufficient explanation, and other factors encouraging stability were not well explained, or even addressed at all. Those candidates that did reach the higher levels used their knowledge of PR, Hindenburg being elected and the fact that people were more supportive to the Weimar Republic through the election turn out and their lack of support for political extremism.

Question 4

Question 4 was generally handled less well than question 3, although a minority clearly chose for the right reasons and produced excellent responses. In 4a candidates in general did not always seem to appreciate that some actions could both hinder and help the Weimar government and opted instead to explain their ideas on either help or hinder. Better responses addressed both, as separate items: for example the Ebert-Groener Pact was often used to explain how the military helped, and the stab in the back how it hindered. Many candidates referred to the 'revolution from above' as initiating democracy, and the value of this material depended on how fully it was explained. The best responses covered a range of these events, and also the Kapp Putsch, explaining how the decisions taken by the military both helped and hindered, to develop an explanation of its relationship with democratic governments. In general, candidates did not tackle question 4b very well. Some candidates' knowledge of the period was adequate though not always used to its full potential when explaining their views on why Weimar was experiencing political conflict during the time scale given. Reference was made to the limits of, and problems created by, economic recovery, the beginnings of Nazi success, the role of the SPD and the failure of the Grand Coalition. Surprisingly few candidates dealt with the impact of the campaign against the Young plan. The best responses also linked the legacy of earlier difficulties, especially Versailles and inflation, to explain why some remained hostile to policies such as 'fulfilment' and to the Republic itself. A few were able to develop the links between a troublesome legacy and the events of 1928-29 to access L4. However, far too many candidates lacked any sense of chronology and dwelt mainly on events in 1919-23, or went significantly out of period to explain the problems resulting from the Wall Street Crash.

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

The vast majority of candidates in this option attempted questions 1 and 2. Fewer than 400 attempted questions 3 and 4, with varying degrees of success. In general there were fewer answers than in earlier examination sessions that adopted a politically charged approach, although some candidates continue to attribute every thing to the monstrous skills of Mao.

Nearly 6,500 candidates attempted questions 1 and 2, with responses being fairly evenly split. However, question 1 was generally handled better than question 2.

Question1

There is a great deal of sound knowledge of King's career in 1956-63, although weaker responses tended to list events rather than explain development. Most candidates were able to get to the concepts of non-violence and media support, often linking the two purposefully. The concepts of white support and, more noticeably, the concept of political support were less readily identified, but provided a fertile area for those who developed them. There was a tendency among weaker candidates to develop too strongly narrative sections on events such as Montgomery and the marches, to go beyond 1963. Progression to high levels depended mainly on the extent to which candidates addressed development. Some contrasted King's methods of mass protest with the earlier activities of the NAACP, while others demonstrated development within the specified period, including the exploitation of white racism/presence of the media. The best covered both.

Question 2

Question 2 was handled less effectively, although there were a number of very good responses. Part (a) produced a good range of attainment. The basic features of violence/non-violence, integration/separation were got by almost all candidates, with varying degrees of support. Many got further than this by contrasting the religious differences and the differing approaches to the media, although these were not always clearly related to aims and ideas. However, a number of candidates did make such links, seeing religion as the source of King's non-violence (as well as Gandhi) and the exploitation of the media as a means of gaining white integrationist support. Weaker candidates tended at times to divert from 'aims and ideas' and instead to develop accounts of methods or narrative accounts of particular episodes. Many candidates were much more secure on King than on Malcolm X, whose attitude to violence also continues to be oversimplified. In some cases there were indiscriminate end-on accounts of the role of the two men and a tendency sometimes to develop points of similarity rather than the required points of difference. Part (b) was the least well answered question in this section, mainly because many candidates lacked accurate knowledge of events in 1966-68, and failed to focus on this period other than to assert that the legislation of 1964-65 'didn't work'. Many answers provided excessively long narrative introductions, casting back in some cases to the mid-nineteenth century, but in most cases covering the times of IKE, JFK and LBJ to indicate what had been done for civil rights by legislation and how little had been achieved. This was of course a useful approach if then linked with particular circumstances in the late 1960s that led to poverty and discrimination, but too often the link was lost. Another common feature of weaker scripts was to approach the question far too generally, with remarks that might fit almost any weak economy and society. There were, nevertheless, some well focused and supported answers, but they

were not so numerous here as in, for example, Q1(b). The best responses established the depth of the problems (in both north and south) and showed how continuing racism, entrenched poverty, and the impact of problems like Vietnam, the Cold War, and Black Power/white backlash prevented rapid or easy solutions.

Question 3

Many candidates found it difficult to address economic problems in question 3a, although general descriptions of problems facing China often included some reference to the economy. Others wanted to describe Communist economic policies, often overlapping significantly with part (b). In part (b) itself there was a tendency to attribute everything to Communist ideology without considering wider factors such as the practical benefits or the nature of Chinese society and tradition. Many candidates described the process of collectivisation, but fewer offered clear causal links.

Question 3b was generally handled quite well - certainly more so than 2(b) - and the theme of northern frustration was often both well illustrated and well substantiated. Other salient themes, such as the nature of Black Power and the role of individuals (apart from Malcolm X) and of student activists were less thoroughly explored. A feature common to a number of answers was failure to identify the nature of the attraction of Black Power; it was often left as an item in itself without this important area being adequately explored. This led to a number of descriptive responses, demonstrating how its influence increased rather than why. Most weaker responses suffered from generalised assertion - that King was failing, that northern ghetto-dwellers preferred Malcolm X, or that legislation achieved nothing. There is also a greater need for precision about events from 1966, especially in relation to King's attitude to Vietnam and his focus on social and economic problems. Some candidates made no reference to Vietnam, others considered its financial impact, but few were fully aware of the impact of the draft and growing resentment of patriotic/Cold War rhetoric. Nevertheless, given the range of factors to be considered, many candidates were able to produce high-level responses without fully addressing these issues.

Question 4

Question 4 proved the more popular, and most candidates could make some attempt to describe social changes, although the 'structure of society' was less well understood. However, most addressed class and gender at some point, with obvious relevance. Few candidates could offer accurate detail to support their statements, but many did compensate to some extent with range. Question 4b appeared to be the attraction, and there were many moderately good responses covering his political skills, ruthlessness, the impact/exploitation of the Cultural Revolution, and the weaknesses of his rivals. Some very good responses also considered his earlier achievements and status and the relevance of his ideas as something more than propaganda, as well as addressing the extent to which he provided a convenient figurehead for others in the last years of his life.

While many candidates attempting this option have sound and secure knowledge, there is a tendency to over-simplify the North/South divide, for example to ignore economic and social problems in the south, to equate the two entirely with urban/rural environments, and make blanket assertions about the attitudes that were held. There is also a tendency to ignore the progress that was made, for example in education and the growth of a black middle class, and therefore to fail to take into account the impact, positive and negative, of such changes.

6522 Statistics

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Paper	Maximum Mark (Raw)	Mean Mark	Standard Deviation
2A	60	34.4	9.7
2B	60	36.3	10.5
2C	60	35.9	10.2
2D	60	32.9	10.8
2E	60	37.4	10.3
2F	60	33.0	10.1
2G	60	35.9	9.2

Paper 2A

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	41	36	31	27	23
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		28.7	48.8	67.3	80.3	89.2

Paper 2B

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		24.9	44.4	61.0	74.6	84.3

Paper 2C

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	32	28	24
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		29.8	45.2	63.4	78.3	89.8

Paper 2D

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	40	35	30	25	21
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		29.7	49.3	65.1	78.2	85.5

Paper 2E

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	34	30	26
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		28.6	49.5	68.4	80.0	88.1

Paper 2F

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	42	37	32	27	22
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		20.5	38.1	58.4	76.1	87.3

Paper 2G

Grade	Max. Mark	A	B	C	D	E
Raw boundary mark	60	44	39	35	31	27
Uniform boundary mark	120	96	84	72	60	48
% Candidates		19.9	41.2	58.5	73.2	84.6

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 020219 Summer 2008

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.org.uk/qualifications

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