



---

# **GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**HISTORY**  
**AS/Advanced**

**SUMMER 2016**

Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at:  
<https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?!=en>

### **Online Results Analysis**

WJEC provides information to examination centres via the WJEC secure website. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.

### **Annual Statistical Report**

The annual Statistical Report (issued in the second half of the Autumn Term) gives overall outcomes of all examinations administered by WJEC.

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	1
2	19

# HISTORY

## General Certificate of Education

Summer 2016

### Advanced Subsidiary

#### UNIT 1

#### INTRODUCTION TO UNIT 1

In this, the first sitting of the Unit 1 examination, there was considerable evidence that many centres have met the challenge of transition from the long established practices at HY1 to meet the increased demands of the new AS unit. The demands on Unit 1 are now set at the full A Level standard by the Regulators and this is reflected in the use of open ended rather than structured questions. These essay questions assess all the skills involved in Assessment Objective One so that candidates must:

- (a) analyse, evaluate and reach a balanced and substantiated judgement;
- (b) focus on debating the concepts and issues exactly as in the question set;
- (c) use their knowledge to answer the question set;
- (d) cover the developments over the period set;
- (e) organise and communicate their response in a coherent essay style.

It was evident that the better responses in both essays were holistic in nature, debating the key concept set in the question rather than outlining the various factors or events and supported by appropriate factual support. The better candidates engaged with the actual question set and thought about how to respond to the particular demands of that question. They provided a debate on the key concepts and key issues of the period covered in the questions set. They provided appropriate and balanced judgements which emerged from the argument they made in the essay.

Amongst the weaker responses there were strong echoes of listing, ranking and mini judgements scattered throughout many of the scripts. Some failed to focus on the key concept which was provided for them to analyse, evaluate and come to a judgement upon. They needed to focus more closely on the evaluative word provided - the "mainly", "most", "greatest" or similar - to evaluate the degree of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference or significance as the "key concept" as defined by the Assessment Objective 1.

It was noted that some candidates relied heavily on formulaic or even prepared responses which failed to focus on evaluating the particular concept required. For example in a question the evaluation may be on "mainly responsible" which involves a debate, rather than "responsible" which just requires knowledge and, in effect, encourages listing. Candidates could sometimes offer lots of judgements on "responsible" but that is not enough: they need a discussion and judgement on "mainly responsible" to get a higher band mark. Equally it is not enough to simply assert that something was "mainly responsible": they need a justification rather than an assertion in a concluding paragraph.

Across the full ability range some candidates failed to realise the need to ensure that the full period set in the question was covered – partly, it seems, from a lack of appropriate knowledge. It is essential in the Period Study that the period set is covered. In some questions it was evident that candidates found it difficult to bring together elements of the whole specification due to the wide ranging and unpredictable nature of the questions. It is essential that candidates understand that the questions set are meant to test aspects of the whole specification and are not restricted to any sub-theme: it is how well candidates are able to use their historical understanding to respond to the unpredictable and particular question set on the day that differentiates the better from the weaker responses.

**Further comments follow on the specific questions set in each paper.**

## PERIOD STUDY 1

### GOVERNMENT, REBELLION AND SOCIETY IN WALES AND ENGLAND, c. 1485-1603

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*'The main reason for Henry VII's success as a ruler lay in his financial policies.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 581 candidates. A listing approach was very evident in this question as candidates tended to outline the reasons for Henry VII's success as a ruler, often beginning each paragraph with: *'Another reason why Henry was successful was because he ...'* Many of these answers tended to describe Henry VII's policies with no real debate of the key concept in the question. The better rewarded candidates were clearly aware that they had to analyse and evaluate whether Henry's financial policies were the *main reason* for his success or not. The candidates that challenged the premise of the question – often by suggesting that the main reasons why Henry VII was successful were because he secured his throne by defeating the pretenders and / or by controlling the nobility – were most likely to engage in a meaningful debate on the key concept. A number of candidates framed their answers in a particular way by following each paragraph with a mini-judgement ranking the importance of that particular. This approach was rewarded but was not integrated enough to reach the demands of the higher band.

##### Question 2

*To what extent were economic grievances mainly responsible for causing rebellion between 1529 and 1553?*

This question was attempted by 455 candidates. This question proved to be challenging for many candidates. The issues were two-fold: firstly the date range set in the question and secondly the lack of knowledge regarding *economic grievances*. A number of candidates did not note the specific dates in the question which led many to discuss the Wyatt rebellion (1554) and the rebellion of the Northern Earls (1569), neither of which were germane to the question. It seemed that many candidates had arrived with a prepared answer and were unable to adapt this to the question set. It was also evident that a number of candidates were unsure of what constituted economic grievances – this led them to ignore this aspect of the question in favour of a discussion of general religious, political and social grievances. Unfortunately this often resulted in a list-like answer to the question.

In order to achieve a higher band mark candidates were required to discuss and offer a judgement on the concept of *mainly responsible*. Some candidates thought it was sufficient to simply assert that something was *responsible* – political or religious grievances - without any meaningful attempt to offer a justification to turn the assertion into an evaluation. The most effective answers were from those candidates who discussed the relative importance of the causes of rebellion between 1529 and 1553 in a thematic rather than in a chronological way – the rebellion by rebellion approach was often seen but tended to be descriptive in approach.

## Section B

### Question 3

*How far do you agree that Mary's Counter-Reformation was the most significant development in religion in Wales and England between 1529 and 1570?*

This question was attempted by 966 candidates. This proved to be the most successfully answered of the four questions on the paper. The majority of candidates worked within the set date range which enabled them to discuss the religious developments in England beginning with the Henrician Reformation through to the Elizabethan Church Settlement. It was pleasing to note that many candidates focused on the evaluative phrase *most significant*. The relative significance of Mary's Counter-Reformation was discussed alongside the religious developments associated with Henry VIII, Edward VI and Elizabeth. The majority of candidates concluded that the most significant development in religion in this period was either the break with Rome or the dissolution of the monasteries. There was an absence of the usual listing of events or developments with many candidates offering a reasonable justification for their evaluation. In a number of cases it was concluded that without the break with Rome the other religious changes would not have occurred - hence why it was *the most significant development*. It must be noted that a considerable number of candidates tended to follow their discussions with mini-judgements in which each development was ranked in significance against that given in the question. This often resulted in list-like answers to the question.

### Question 4

*How successfully were the problems of poverty and vagrancy dealt with in the period between 1531 and 1601?*

This question was attempted by 69 candidates. This question elicited the weakest responses of the four questions. The candidates were required to identify the problems associated with poverty and vagrancy followed by an evaluation of the success, or otherwise, in the way they were dealt with between 1531 and 1601.

The greatest weakness here was certainly not historical knowledge but the inability to properly evaluate the key concept. Candidates were able to identify and list the problems associated with poverty and vagrancy but many did not focus on the evaluative word provided, namely *successfully*. Some candidates were content to simply identify, list or describe the problems associated with poverty and vagrancy. Others relied on formulaic or prepared answers connected with poverty and vagrancy which failed to focus on evaluating the particular concept required. Most of these candidates tended to ignore the date range and begin their discussion in the reign of Henry VII rather than in 1531.

Those candidates that did focus on the concept of success were able to conclude that the problem of poverty and vagrancy was never successfully solved in this period. Some candidates even pointed out that poverty and vagrancy is still with us and that the Tudor authorities simply managed the problem.

## PERIOD STUDY 2

### GOVERNMENT, REVOLUTION AND SOCIETY IN WALES AND ENGLAND, c. 1603-1715

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*How effectively did James I deal with the problems he faced during his reign 1603-1625?*

This question was attempted by 41 candidates. The majority of candidates identified and discussed the problems facing James - mainly financial, religious and political - but many did not follow this by evaluating how *effectively* he dealt with them. Many candidates used *successfully* rather than *effectively* in their answers which sometimes worked where they argued that the most effective policies were the most successful in resolving the problems. By the same token these candidates equated ineffectiveness with failure. Consequently many answers tended to be a straightforward discussion of James I's successes and failures. A minority of candidates simply described key events in his reign. More pleasing was the attempt by some candidates to highlight the financial problems James inherited from his predecessor Elizabeth I. This was a valid point which contributed to highlighting an often overlooked problem facing James from the very beginning of his reign. Unfortunately some candidates failed to note the dates of the question which led them to also discuss the problems faced by Charles I after 1625.

##### Question 2

*To what extent was the rule of the Major-Generals the most significant development in government and politics in the period between 1625 and 1660?*

This question was attempted by 22 candidates. The answers to this question were generally disappointing. Candidates tended to concentrate on political events during the reign of Charles I particularly the period of the Personal Rule (1629-40). There was a heavy concentration on the mainly financial disagreements that soured relations between the Crown and Parliament. The in-depth discussions relating to Ship Money and the Short and Long Parliaments were in contrast to the telling absence of worthwhile material on the Interregnum (1649-60). Some candidates appeared to know very little about the key developments that took place during the period of the Interregnum and this included the role of the Major-Generals! Even those candidates who preferred to concentrate on the reign of Charles I did so mainly by listing and describing key events. Consequently, many candidates failed to focus on the key concept which was provided for them to analyse, evaluate and come to a judgement upon. They needed to focus on the evaluative phrase provided - *most significant* – but many did not do so.

## Section B

### Question 3

*'The main cause of tension between the monarchy and its parliaments in the period 1603-1649 was religion.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 49 candidates. The majority of candidates tackled this question with some confidence. The better responses engaged with the actual question set and thought about how to respond to the particular demands of that question. Most candidates were aware of the tension that existed between the monarchy and parliament in this period and many focused on the evaluative phrase *main cause* which enabled them to debate the role played by religion in the worsening relationship between the king and members of parliament. It must also be noted that a number of candidates tended to follow their discussions with mini-judgements in which each cause of tension was ranked in importance against that given in the question, namely religion.

It was clear that many of the candidates were more comfortable discussing the relationship between Charles I and his parliaments. Candidates were less sure of James I which led to an imbalance in many answers. It was also evident that many candidates did not go beyond 1642 because, in their opinion, tension had been replaced by outright conflict so the premise of the question no longer applied. However, this was not really the case since a new set of criteria emerged to add to the tension between the combatants in terms of their military objectives, destruction wrought, treatment of the civilian population and means of raising money to fund the war. Most candidates missed the opportunity to discuss the tense nature of peace negotiations towards the end of the Civil War c.1646-48 reaching its climax with the King's trial and execution.

### Question 4

*How far do you agree that the Bill of Rights was the most significant development in government and politics in Wales and England in the period between 1660 and 1715?*

This question was attempted by 13 candidates. This question proved to be something of a challenge for candidates. Their knowledge of the Bill of Rights was sound enough but they rarely offered any discussion of political developments beyond 1689. The political developments of the reign of Charles II and James II dominated the majority of answers – some of which were presented in a listing format. It is clear that many candidates were more comfortable dealing with the period between 1660 and 1689 than the period between 1689 and 1715. This was due in large part to the lack of appropriate knowledge, namely of the reigns of William III and Queen Anne. Candidates need to ensure that the full period set in the question is covered. In this instance it was evident that some candidates found it difficult to bring together elements of the whole period set in this Section B question.

## PERIOD STUDY 3

### POLITICS, PROTEST AND REFORM IN WALES AND ENGLAND, c. 1780-1880

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*Were economic conditions mainly responsible for discontent and radical protest in the period 1812-1848?*

This question was attempted by 848 candidates. The key concept that had to be addressed was whether economic conditions were *mainly responsible* for discontent and radical protest. This would primarily require an assessment of the links between economic circumstances and discontent and protest. Many answers focused on the post-war economic conditions 1815-1820 and the incidence of economic depressions in the 1830s and 1840s. Luddism was seen as a response to industrial change and some of the post-war disturbances were used as evidence of a link with poor economic circumstances. Candidates often described the link between economic conditions and the origins of the Chartist movement.

There was plenty of scope for a discussion on the responsibility of alternative influences on discontent and protest, notably radicalism, the revival of parliamentary reform, the effect of the Reform Bill crisis 1830-1832 and the political background to Chartism. There were also good discussions of the role played by the Queen Caroline trial riots, the Merthyr rising and Rebecca. Unfortunately in many answers this emerged as a list of alternatives without any meaningful debate on their importance in leading to discontent and radical protest. Too often there was a throwaway judgement in the final part of the essay about the importance of economic conditions without any substantial link to the content of the main body of the essay. The better answers quickly identified the key concept, recognising that a debate was required and then providing a meaningful discussion about the reasons for discontent and radical protest, making judgements based on evidence as the essay proceeded. Period coverage was usually satisfactory and a majority of candidates were able to draw upon a suitable range of examples across the period 1812-1848.

##### Question 2

*To what extent was the reform of the Poor Law the most significant social reform in the period 1815-1848?*

This question was attempted by 121 candidates. The key concept that had to be addressed here was whether the reform of the Poor Law was the *most significant* social reform in the period 1815-1848. This primarily required an assessment of the significance of the Poor Law Amendment Act 1834. Knowledge and understanding of the Act itself were generally good and the best answers engaged in a debate about the significance of a range of social reforms in the period. The most popular alternative reforms considered were the Factory Acts and the Public Health Act 1848. Candidates sometimes ran into problems identifying social reforms, confusing them with political reforms such as the Reform Act 1832. The best answers established criteria for a debate on significance, for example the impact of a particular reform, its effectiveness and the extent of change. Less successful answers did not identify appropriate comparisons or asserted a list of alternatives without any meaningful attempt to evaluate them beyond a mechanical judgement in a final paragraph. Most candidates were able to choose a suitable range of examples from the period 1815-1848.

## Section B

### Question 3

*How successfully did governments deal with the demand for parliamentary reform in the period 1780-1848?*

This question was attempted by 636 candidates. The Section B questions also require a debate on a key concept but covering a longer period of history. The key concept in this question was *the extent to which* governments were *successful* in dealing with the demand for parliamentary reform. This was a very popular question with many candidates concluding that Pitt's and Liverpool's governments were successful because they repressed the demand for reform whereas the Whigs were successful as they passed the 1832 Reform Act. Better answers debated the success of Pitt and Liverpool in dealing with the radical threat and the success of the Whigs in defusing the Reform Act crisis 1830-1832. Was the 1832 Act a shrewd concession to split the middle and working classes or was it an abject failure to address working class grievances resulting in the Chartist movement? The role of Sir Robert Peel's government (1841-1846) in providing financial and economic stability came under scrutiny in these answers with judgements regarding its success in undermining popular support for Chartism. Less successful answers described the policies of various governments without any meaningful attempt to address the extent of success. Many added a final paragraph on their success without adequate linkage to the main body of the essay. Sometimes period coverage was compromised by a failure to address the early period of the 1780s or the post-1832 situation. However a majority of candidates were able to draw upon an effective range of examples across the period.

### Question 4

*'Sir Robert Peel was the most significant influence on the development of the Tory party in the period 1815-1880'. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 330 candidates. The key concept in this question was the *significance* of Sir Robert Peel's influence on the development of the Tory party. Sir Robert Peel's achievements were generally well known and understood and there were useful discussions about his role in the 1820s, the influence of the Tamworth Manifesto and the split in the party after 1846. Most candidates then discussed the role of Benjamin Disraeli as an obvious alternative influence with material on Tory democracy, 'One Nation' Toryism and Disraeli's achievements in the 1860s and 1870s. Too often the comparison was asserted rather than debated with better candidates discerning that both had different influences on the party, some positive, some negative. Comparisons were drawn with Liverpool and Wellington in some answers. Again better answers saw that the question also invited comment on influences that were not necessarily about individuals but policy debates on free trade versus protection, the extent of parliamentary reform (particularly 1867), the changes to party organisation and the influence of the opponents of Toryism. Period coverage was sometimes less successful in this question with references sometimes only to Peel and Disraeli.

## PERIOD STUDY 4

### POLITICS, PEOPLE AND PROGRESS IN WALES AND ENGLAND, c. 1880-1980

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*How far do you agree with the view that the experience of war had the most important influence on the role and status of women between 1900 and 1939?*

This was a popular question answered by 380 candidates. In order to fully address the question set candidates needed to evaluate whether the experience of war had the most important influence on the role and status of women between 1900 and 1939. The key concept therefore was *the most important influence*. A successful answer needed to judge and evaluate the relative importance of the influence of the experience of war when set against other influences on the role and status of women in the period. Weaker candidates provided a list of 'important influences', war being mentioned as being important and other 'influences;' were also listed as also being important. This is clearly a weak response as it fails to deal with the key concept of 'most important.' Some candidates supplemented this type of response with a series of mini-judgements at the end of every paragraph, merely stating that 'as you can see, the experience of war was more important than' another named influence. No attempt was made to explain **why** this was so. These did resonate as being prepared answers in that the question was treated as a series of factors to be mentioned and 'gone through'. A similar tactic was to list 'the important factors' and provide a final paragraph in which the question was addressed. This 'bolt-on' approach to the question was rewarded but is still not an evaluative response worthy of the higher bands. The most effective answers were those that weighed up the experience of war against other experiences and explained why one could be considered more important than the other. These evaluative responses were addressing the key historical concept of importance and coming to a judgement on the actual question set.

##### Question 2

*To what extent was the decline of the Liberal Party the most important development in party politics between 1914 and 1939?*

This question was attempted by 66 candidates. This question proved challenging for many candidates, mainly because of a lack of knowledge about the decline of the Liberal Party in this period. Some candidates discussed the Liberal Party in the pre-1914 period and others only discussed the fall of the 1922 Coalition rather than the decline of the Liberal Party itself. For the most part candidates brushed over the Liberal Party and then discussed other developments such as the rise of the Labour Party and Conservative dominance. Much of this was done in a prepared fashion and there was little evidence of a meaningful discussion of the key concept namely whether the decline of the Liberal party was *the most important development* in party politics between 1914 and 1939. The listing approach does not lend itself well to evaluation of the key concept of relative importance. Paragraphs that began with the words 'Another important development' seemed more intent on providing a list of such developments rather than evaluating the relative importance of these developments when weighed up against the decline of the Liberal Party. A similar tactic was to list 'the important developments' and provide a final paragraph in which the question was addressed. This bolt-on approach to the question was rewarded but was still not an evaluative response worthy of the higher bands. The most effective answers were those that weighed up the decline of the Liberal party against other developments and explained why one could be considered more important than the other. These evaluative responses were addressing the key historical concept of importance and coming to a judgement on the actual question set.

## Section B

### Question 3

*'Governments were largely effective in dealing with the social and economic problems facing Wales and England in the period 1906-1951.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 412 candidates and as such was by far the most popular question in Section B. Generally candidates would have benefitted from spending more time reflecting on the actual question set. The key concept in the question, namely *largely effective*, needed some reflection and could have been approached as a thematic evaluation of the social and economic problems over the period including poverty, depression, economic decline or welfare. Judging relative effectiveness would also need to be done based on some type of measurement, for example, whether the problems were fully, partly addressed, or whether governments were effective in achieving what they had set out to achieve. An approach of this nature would have provided a more evaluative response and it would be useful to advise candidates to spend more time thinking about the actual question set, focussing on the key concept and how best to evaluate this.

Most candidates provided a response that covered the period in the question 1906-1951, meeting the broader period coverage demands of the question in Section B. The approach taken by many however was very formulaic, beginning with the Liberals 1906-14 and moving on to the First World War, 1930s depression, Second World War and Labour Government 1945-51. Good knowledge was shown by some about what the social and economic problems were but many lacked knowledge about what successive governments did to try to tackle these issues. Given this lack of knowledge, it was challenging to provide an evaluative response as to whether governments were 'largely effective' or not in dealing with these problems. Some candidates provided unqualified statements at the end of every paragraph such as 'as you can see the Liberals were largely effective', but there was little substance to back up these assertions. These types of answers did not discuss the period as a whole but rather providing a series of assertions about governments in different periods. The most developed answers had clearly thought about the question set and looked at how different problems were combatted between 1906-1951 often judging how effective governments had been between 1906-1951 as a whole rather than in specific periods.

### Question 4

*Was the status of the Welsh language the most challenging issue facing Wales in the period from 1900-1967?*

This question was attempted by 33 candidates. Most candidates were able to describe developments in the status of the language across the period 1900 - 1967 but few could provide any concrete knowledge about specific events or Parliamentary Acts that impacted on the development of the Welsh language. In very general terms candidates were able to address the status of the Welsh language in terms of the decline in the number of speakers but there was little evidence of candidates addressing the key concept, namely whether or not the status of the Welsh language was *the most challenging issue* facing Wales in the period from 1900-1967. The listing approach was popular and focussed on providing individual paragraphs about 'other challenging issues' such as economic problems, the effects of war or the decline of religion. A general lack of knowledge was evident and little focus was given to explaining why these listed issues were 'challenges facing Wales.' Overall, this question was not well answered.

## PERIOD STUDY 5

### POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CHANGE IN EUROPE, c.1500-1598

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*'Philip II dealt effectively with the problems he faced in Spain between 1558 and 1592.'*  
*Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 33 candidates. In order to reach a substantiated judgement on this specific question it was hoped that candidates would present an argument on the concept of *Philip's effectiveness* in dealing with his problems in Spain including religious and political problems such as the need to reform the administration of Spain, the centralization of power, the championing of the Catholic Reformation in Spain and the annexation of Portugal and the unification of the Iberian Peninsula. It was also hoped that candidates might also consider a challenge to the preposition in the question by arguing that in some respects Philip was not as effective in dealing with some specific problems in Spain. They could have supported this argument with specific examples. This specific support might include discussion of his financial policies, the Revolt of the Morisco and of Aragon. The date 1558 used in the question allowed for the aftermath of his first bankruptcy and 1592 would have allowed inclusion of the Revolt of Aragon. All of these examples were internal to Spain and it would have also been appropriate to include problems with the Netherlands between these dates deemed necessary. The question does state "in Spain" and candidates should have noted this and argued within this confined area.

Some candidates were fully focused and engaged with the key concept and entered into a debate throughout their response. However, there were candidates who failed to engage with the key words *dealt effectively* and merely concentrated on describing problems in Spain and Spain's wider empire. There was also a tendency for success/failure and yes/no responses and not an integrated debate on the set question.

##### Question 2

*How far do you agree that rivalry with the Hapsburgs had the most significant impact on France in the period 1515-1547?*

This question was attempted by 30 candidates. This question was on the whole well done with many candidates attempting to make a case for the Hapsburg / Valois rivalry having a significant impact because of its long and draining effect on French resources and policies. Some candidates did also challenge the preposition in the question by considering the significance of alternative factors which impacted on France in this period. These included the growth of heresy, the influence of the Renaissance, the impact of financial issues as well as the potential growth of the absolute power of the king. It needs to be noted, however, that there were many examples of essays with limited reference or inaccurate dates regarding historical support. For example, dates for the Treaty of Madrid, the Battle of Pavia and the Concordat of Bologna were often not offered in an argument which demanded a reference to the chronological development of a specific rivalry that had an impact on France in the period 1515-1547.

Sadly there was a minority of candidates who only offered a narrative with a limited judgement which means that lower bands are the only appropriate award for this type of response.

## Section B

### Question 3

*How far was European division mainly responsible for Ottoman expansion into Europe in this period 1520-1571?*

This question was attempted by 25 candidates. This was the least popular question on this paper. However, candidates appeared to be more able to engage with the key concept offered for debate, namely *mainly responsible*. There was some narrative and there was some drift but generally candidates were able to attempt an analysis and an evaluation of the extent to which European division was *mainly responsible* for the expansion of the Ottoman Empire. They also were more able to offer a challenge to the preposition in the question by arguing that the wealth, strength and ambition of the Turks was also partially responsible for their expansion into Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean. Perhaps the greatest disappointment in these responses was the failure to break away from a formulaic, rote judgement at the end of each paragraph which was usually repeated at the end.

### Question 4

*To what extent was Martin Luther mainly responsible for religious change in the period 1517-1564?*

This question was attempted by 38 candidates. This was the most popular question on the paper. However, despite an obvious wealth of historical knowledge on Martin Luther, this was the question where many struggled to engage in a debate. Many wanted to write all they knew about Luther and produced narratives seemingly finding it difficult to use their knowledge to answer the particular question set. In particular they failed to engage with the key concept *mainly responsible* for religious change. They could have discussed what religious change was but instead focused on the spread of the Reformation. By failing to engage with “religious change” their focus was different from that posed by the question. Some listed events from 1517-1564 and some drifted into a narrative on Martin Luther.

Better responses answered the question set and argued that Martin Luther was to a certain extent responsible for the change and development from one Catholic Church in Europe to the establishment of various forms of Protestantism in different parts of Europe. Some of these candidates also considered that there were other factors which had as much responsibility in causing religious change such as the feeling that Germany was politically, economically and socially ripe for change, the availability of the printing press, the support of the Princes in Germany, the engagement of Charles V, the later reform of the Catholic Church and the influence of Zwingli and Calvin in promoting Protestantism in Europe.

There was a conscious effort by many candidates to cover the period as defined in this question but unfortunately this appeared to push many towards a narrative account with addition of a formulaic pre-learnt judgement.

## PERIOD STUDY 6

### EUROPE IN THE AGE OF ABSOLUTISM AND REVOLUTION, c. 1682-1815

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*'The greatest achievement of Peter the Great was his policy of Westernisation'. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 31 candidates. Candidates were invited to discuss whether the policy of westernisation was the greatest achievement of Peter the Great. Most candidates took the opportunity to argue and debate this issue. However, weaker candidates saw this as an opportunity to offload their class notes - often in great detail and at great length - about the process of westernisation ignoring the key concept of whether this was his greatest achievement. Those candidates who adopted a more considered approach presented with great persuasion the benefits of westernisation for Russia - namely opening up the Russian economy to European trade, establishing Russia as a great power and challenging Swedish hegemony of the Baltic. The policy of westernisation was balanced by a consideration of a range of other notable achievements which Peter attained. These included his reforms of the nobility and expanding his state in the south and also generally modernising Russia. Candidates were duly rewarded for their engagement with the key concept posed in the question. Many noted that westernisation could not be considered in isolation of his policy of establishing the Russian navy and also his military reforms which played such a crucial role in bringing about the defeat of Sweden.

##### Question 2

*To what extent was the War of the First Coalition the most significant development during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1793-1815?*

No candidates attempted this question. If there had been any answers seen, candidates were invited to consider whether the War of the First Coalition was the most significant development during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, 1793-1815. The war was in many ways the response of the great powers to the French Revolution. The widening of the conflict between 1792 and 1793 suggested the gravity with which the rest of Europe viewed events in France. Powers which had little in common before 1792-93 were now prepared to co-operate against a common cause. A compelling case could be made in support of the assertion in the question. However in order to provide a balanced response candidates should challenge the view. A significant development was the emergence of Napoleon who defeated convincingly the First Coalition. His seizure of power laid the basis for the formation of the Napoleonic empire which threatened to the very fabric of Europe destroying old institutions and creating new states. Arguably this was a more significant development than the actual war itself.

## Section B

### Question 3

*How far do you agree with the view that the Diplomatic Revolution had the greatest influence on Great Power relations, 1700-1763?*

This question was attempted by 30 candidates - the overwhelming majority. They were asked to consider the extent to which the Diplomatic Revolution had the greatest influence on Great Power relations during the period 1700-1763. Clearly a balanced and coherent response was called for. To support the view offered in the question a range of arguments could be presented. The Diplomatic Revolution changed the whole dynamic of Great Power relations during this period by bringing about a realignment of the major European powers that had fought the War of Austrian Succession. The new alignment suggested a renewal of international conflict. In many ways this was a defining moment in international relations. Weaker candidates went no further than arguing in support of the view. Those candidates who engaged with the question pointed out a number of other events/conflicts and developments which could claim equal status as having the greatest influence on Great Power relations during this period. Among these were the outbreak of the War of Austrian Succession (1740-48) which posed a very significant challenge to Great Power relations. Among other influences, the emergence of Britain as a major colonial power and changes in the balance of power in the Baltic stemming from the Great Northern War which saw the emergence of Russia as a great power, also merited serious consideration within the context of the question.

### Question 4

*'Louis XV dealt effectively with the problems which he faced during his reign from 1715-1774.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 1 candidate only. The question required candidates to examine carefully the extent to which Louis XV was effective in dealing with the problems which he faced during his reign. A reasonable starting point would be identification of these problems. Once a range of problems had been identified, an analysis could be offered of whether or not Louis was successful in dealing with them. An initial problem given the very young age at which he succeeded his great-grandfather was negotiating the potential pitfalls of a minority and regency and overseeing the transformation to a majority rule. This was by and large achieved effectively and able ministers were appointed. Other examples could also be provided. This would be balanced by an examination of the failure of the crown to resolve the chronic shortage of revenue available to it. The structure of the ancien regime contributed to this and Louis was unable to reform this.

## PERIOD STUDY 7

### REVOLUTION AND NEW IDEAS IN EUROPE c. 1780-1881

#### Section A

##### Question 1

*How effectively did Tsar Nicholas I deal with the problems that he faced in Russia between 1825 and 1855?*

This question was attempted by 8 candidates. Most of the candidates who attempted this question did not debate the key concept of the extent of *effectiveness*. The candidates were expected to debate the effectiveness of Tsar Nicholas in dealing with the problems that he faced. Most candidates dealt with the problems in isolation rather than placing them within the context of how a repressive autocrat may have dealt with or even responded to the problems that he faced. This led to a very mechanistic issue by issue approach rather than a holistic debate on the effectiveness of Tsar Nicholas. The majority of the responses lacked effective coverage of the period with some stuttering to a halt after 1833. There was clearly a lack of appropriate knowledge of the problems facing Tsar Nicholas as some candidates chose to drift into a discussion of Alexander I. Most candidates wrote about the codification of laws and the establishment of the secret police with the emphasis upon asserting, sometimes without clear justification, that Tsar Nicholas was effective. The responses lacked balance with little focus on the problems which remained unresolved or indeed the reluctance of the Tsar to deal with them.

##### Question 2

*'The unification of Germany between 1834 and 1871 was mainly due to the growth of the Prussian Zollverein'. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 78 candidates. This was a popular question where unfortunately most candidates provided formulaic and mainly prepared responses which as a result failed to focus on evaluating the particular concept required regarding *causation*. Candidates needed to adopt a holistic understanding of this topic area by considering how far the unification of Germany was achieved through the growth of the Zollverein with its emphasis on 'coal and iron'. This would have allowed them to consider the role of the Zollverein within the economic unification of Germany and to weigh its contribution up against for example the theory of 'blood and iron'. Candidates needed to consider the concept of causation within the relationship between the economic growth of Germany and Prussia in particular, and the political achievements of individuals especially Bismarck. This would have led to a focussed debate on the issue of causation instead of a random factor by factor trawl of the forces which affected German unification. This factor by factor approach led to very predictable judgements which failed to bring together key elements and different forces related and inter-related to the unification of Germany.

## Section B

### Question 3

*How far do you agree that Cavour was mainly responsible for the creation of a united Italy in the period 1815-1870?*

This question was attempted by 74 candidates. This was again a very popular question but the overall quality of response was disappointing. Candidates needed to adopt a holistic understanding of this topic area by considering the key concept of *responsibility*, for example whether the unification of Italy was achieved through the work of Italians or the influence of external forces. This would have allowed them to consider whether Cavour was *mainly responsible* for the unification of Italy within the context of Cavour being the main champion of the nationalist cause. Candidates needed to consider the key concept within the relationship between the nationalist forces at work within Italy and the importance of foreign intervention to the unification of Italy. This would have led to a focused debate on the key concept of responsibility instead of a prepared trawl of the factors which influenced Italian unification. Weaker responses provided a general listing approach of the key individuals and countries which influenced Italian unification. Some candidates attempted to rank the contribution of key individuals such as Cavour, Garibaldi and Mazzini but they drifted away from the key concept of whether or not Cavour was mainly responsible for the creation of a united Italy.

### Question 4

*To what extent did the Congress System have the most significant influence on relations between the Great Powers in the period 1780-1848?*

This question was attempted by 11 candidates. Overall the quality of response to this question was disappointing. Candidates needed to demonstrate an overall understanding of the complex relationship between the Great Powers in the period 1780-1848. Candidates needed to debate the key concept of *significance* within the context of the chaos caused by twenty two years of war, the overthrow of regimes and the spectre of revolution. However, the majority of candidates provided an unconvincing generalised trawl of a few related factors such as the Congress of Vienna and the Eastern Question. Full coverage was rare as few candidates explored the influences upon international relations in the period before 1815. Indeed, many of the responses actually began in 1815 and ended with the Congress of Verona! It is essential in the Period Study that the period set is covered. It was evident that candidates found it difficult to bring together and debate the influences on relations between the powers. Given the narrow scope of the Congress System few candidates chose to evaluate the impact of the Eastern Question which at least would have covered the entire period within the question. Candidates seemed too intent on adapting prepared notes to fit any question that may have appeared rather than focussing on the precise nature of the question in front of them within the context of Great Power relations within the period.

## PERIOD STUDY 8

### EUROPE IN AN AGE OF CONFLICT AND CO-OPERATION, 1890-1991

#### Section A

#### Question 1

*'The collectivisation of agriculture had the greatest impact on the lives of the Russian people in the period 1924-1945.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 228 candidates. Candidates needed to debate the extent to which the collectivisation of agriculture had the greatest impact on the lives of the Russian people. Candidates needed to adopt a more holistic approach to addressing the key concept of *greatest impact*. There needed to be a greater overall awareness of how the lives of Russians were changed in the period either for the better or the worse. Candidates needed to consider the question within the context of the developments within Russian government and society within the period. They needed to focus more closely on the evaluative wording of this question as in many cases routine factor by factor developments were listed or sometimes ranked against each other. The judgements reached were often unsubstantiated and didn't revolve around *greatest impact*. Usually candidates weighed up the impact of the collectivisation of agriculture, the terror and the Five Year plans in isolation rather than bringing together elements of the whole specification. A few candidates did choose to weigh up the impact of various policies upon different groups in society and they usually fared better than those candidates who adopted a listing approach. A few candidates considered the impact of collectivisation within the context of Stalin's totalitarian regime. However, there was often no real attempt to debate the impact of the reconstruction of the Soviet agriculture or to link it to the subordination of the peasantry in order to meet the requirements of urban workers.

#### Question 2

*How far do you agree that Mussolini maintained control in Italy between 1924 and 1943 mainly through the use of terror?*

This question was attempted by 338 candidates. There were some promising responses to this question. Many candidates adopted a holistic approach towards the key concept of *maintaining control* by considering the totalitarian nature of Mussolini's regime. In this way candidates were able to take a measured approach to evaluating whether or not Mussolini maintained control in Italy mainly through the use of terror. As a result they were able at least to argue that the use of terror was one feature of totalitarian control. However, there were a considerable number of responses which drifted into a discussion of how Mussolini attempted to make himself popular which had only marginal relevance to the key concept of control set within the question. The majority of the responses were formulaic at best with a whole range of different policies being described as an alternative to terror. However, many of these responses made a series of unsupported assertions or mini judgements in relation to a range of social, economic and foreign policies without entering into a worthwhile debate in relation to the key concept.

## Section B

### Question 3

*Was Germany mainly responsible for the increase in tension in international relations in the period 1890-1939?*

This question was attempted by 352 candidates. Most candidates did not debate the key concept within the question namely *mainly responsible*. The majority of candidates attempted to outline a range of different factors which caused tension in international relations. This approach led to a generalised listing of factors that may or may not have been responsible for increasing tensions. Unfortunately these responses did not address the question of whether Germany was mainly responsible and neither did it lead to a meaningful holistic debate of the key concept. Usually candidates asserted that at different times Russia, Italy, Britain and Germany were responsible for creating tensions in international relations, and basic judgements followed. However, this was not the precise question. Candidates needed to consider the key concept in the question in relation to an understanding of the wider causes of tension in international relations in the period. Period coverage was often a problem with many responses beginning after the First World War. Candidates did not take the opportunity to examine the forces at work in the period 1890 -1914 and more worrying some candidates chose to write exclusively on Germany even though this meant that they could not engage in a meaningful debate on the key concept.

### Question 4

*To what extent was a divided Germany the main obstacle to greater European co-operation in the period 1945-1991?*

This question was attempted by 212 candidates. Far too often the candidates readily accepted the premise of the question and then offered a range of alternative factors as a limited counter-argument in a yes/no style. This led to a range of often unsupported assertions with predictable judgements. Few candidates took a more holistic approach to this question by considering the complexity of international relations in the period or the inter-relationship between the division of Germany and other conflicts of interest. Few considered the division of Germany within the context of acute post-war distrust, the painful task of reconstruction or the desire for economic security. Candidates should have placed the division of Germany within the general context of international relations. Whilst the arguments supporting the key concept of *main obstacles* were often detailed and relevant the counter-argument was often presented as a list of other factors rather than debating a common theme. Most candidates failed to grasp that the division of Germany was part of a whole process of security and not an isolated development. Once again responses tended to drift away from the key concept of *main obstacle* to the more neutral 'list of obstacles' approach which meant that meaningful debates did not develop.

# HISTORY

## General Certificate of Education

Summer 2016

### Advanced Subsidiary

#### UNIT 2

#### INTRODUCTION TO UNIT 2

At Unit 2 both Assessment Objectives 2 and 3 use the key phrase “historical context” so that candidates in Questions One and Two need to be able to base their use of the particular sources and extracts provided for them in the appropriate historical context rather than just commenting on the provided content and attribution / authorship. Many candidates adopted a mechanistic and formulaic approach (including unnecessary source evaluation comments on the extracts in Question 2) which restricted their responses.

#### QUESTION ONE

The focus of Question 1, which is entirely based on Assessment Objective 2, is on assessing the value of presented sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period of time. The question is no longer about how useful the sources are to an understanding of the period as in the previous HY2 but about analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context

In Question One the better performing candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the sources for their value to an historian by considering each source in the context of its origin and in the context of the question set. They were able to show that they understood the historical context surrounding the enquiry and are able to offer some judgement on the value of the provided sources to an historian undertaking a specific enquiry. They were able to demonstrate that value through consideration of the content and provenance of the presented sources with appropriate reference to the different historical context linked to each of the sources.

In Question One many candidates used “useful” in their responses which was a hangover from the legacy HY2 question. However the better focussed responses showed an understanding that “utility” has a different focus from “value”. The issue goes beyond the use of the two different words to something fundamentally different about the approach of candidates. The better responses were from candidates who were able to analyse and evaluate the three sources to show an awareness of the place of the source(s) in the context of the issue being studied by the historian. They were able to discuss the value of the given sources to a historian in the context not only of when they were produced but how the sources relate to the context of the issue being studied over a specific time period. This is why the three sources cover a defined chronological period.

## QUESTION TWO

In Question Two, which is entirely based on Assessment Objective 3, many candidates appeared knowledgeable about the issue presented in the questions as clearly they are derived from one of the nominated issues identified in the Specification. However, fewer candidates seemed aware of the different ways in which these issues have been interpreted and the main developments in the wider historical debate about these issues which is the main focus of Assessment Objective 3.

Some candidates appeared unaware that the two extracts provided were not “sources” and – as there are no marks at all for AO2 – wasted a fair amount of time making “source evaluation” comments on the historians. The better candidates were instead able to analyse and evaluate the validity of the two extracts and use their knowledge of the historical context to support their arguments and to show an understanding of different ways in which the issue has been interpreted.

A number of candidates seemed to provide a pre-learnt series of notes on the work of different historians and the historiography related to each which is largely a knowledge based exercise. The better responses were able to go beyond that and discuss how and why historians have formed different historical interpretations of the same event(s) based on the content and authorship of the provided extracts and their understanding of the wider historical debate but without outlining the historiography. Specific knowledge and recall of particular historians and their careers is not required nor do candidates need to discuss how one historian has influenced another in this Unit.

Some of the better responses focused on explaining why historians were able to form different interpretations because they were able to show an understanding that historical events and developments can legitimately be seen in a variety of ways by historians. They were able to appreciate why interpretations are formed for certain reasons and that these interpretations are provisional and open to challenge and change. Many of the weaker responses relied on lifting the authorship and offered speculative comments on the education, nationality or name of the historian or pre - learnt mechanistic comments on the availability of evidence.

**Further comments follow on the specific questions set in each paper.**

## DEPTH STUDY 1

### THE MID TUDOR CRISIS IN WALES AND ENGLAND c. 1529-1570

#### PART 1: PROBLEMS, THREATS AND CHALLENGES c. 1529-1553

There were 190 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying protest and rebellion in the period 1536-1549.*

The majority of candidates opted to discuss the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian studying protest and rebellion in a concluding paragraph. Most concluded that the sources were valuable in understanding some of the main causes of protest and rebellion. The majority of candidates showed a reasonably good understanding of the context which led to protest and rebellion in the years between 1536 and 1549.

Source A proved reasonably accessible to most of the candidates who focused on its value in showing the causes of the Pilgrimage of Grace rather than on the threat posed by this rebellion. Basically the people rebelled because they were deceived by the rebel leader Robert Aske. The source offered more than this but many candidates could not see beyond the causes. The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of Source B being able to demonstrate some awareness of the economic crisis that was affecting the people in the mid-1540s – high price of food and the resulting rise in famine. Many candidates appreciated the warning issued by John Barlow that government inaction or indifference was making the situation worse and would likely lead to serious rebellion. The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the value of Source C stating that it offered a broad set of reasons to explain why the people of the West Country rebelled at the end of the 1540s.

The more able candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the three sources and to place them in the context of the issue being studied by the historian, namely of protest and rebellion in the reigns of Henry VIII and Edward VI. A number of candidates made a valid attempt to discuss the value of the sources to a historian in the context not only of when they were produced - 1537, 1544 and 1549 - but how the sources related to the historical context of the motives behind protest and rebellion. Some candidates used the phrase 'this source is *valuable* to an historian because ...' but were unable to offer a meaningful explanation. A significant number of candidates preferred to use the phrase 'this source is *useful* to an historian because ...'. These candidates did not fully appreciate or understand that 'utility' has a different focus from 'value'.

A number of candidates did not make sufficient use of the attributions. Some simply copied them whilst others copied and offered only token comments. A minority of candidates even ignored the attributions. Many candidates were aware of the need to use and discuss the significance of the attributions but the quality of the response varied greatly. Some candidates noted that one of the authors was a politician and therefore likely to be untrustworthy while the other two were from churchmen, so they were unlikely to be biased!

A significant number of candidates discussed the tone of the language used in the sources but they did so in a mechanistic taught manner without any real understanding of what they were meant to be discussing.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that corruption in the Church was mainly responsible for religious reformation after 1529?*

This question proved accessible to many candidates with a significant number able to recognise the different interpretations in the given extracts: Interpretation 1 that corruption in the Church was responsible for the Reformation and Interpretation 2 that the political and personal ambitions of Henry VIII was mainly responsible for religious reformation. Many candidates were also able to express a wider opinion that religion seemed to have little to do with causing religious reformation.

The majority of candidates were able to use - unfortunately a number copied - the content of the extracts to discuss differences in the given interpretations. Equally, a significant number of candidates discussed the attributions, albeit in a mechanistic way, focusing on reliability or generalised comments about how historians set about researching significant topics or events in history. Some candidates simply copied the attribution and offered speculative comments on the specialism, nationality or name of the historian or pre-learnt mechanistic comments on the availability of evidence. Many candidates failed to demonstrate a specific awareness of the different ways in which the causes of religious reformation have been interpreted within the wider historical debate.

Some candidates made basic 'source evaluation' comments on the extracts by commenting on the author's specialism e.g. the focus on Tudor political history in extract 1 as opposed to Tudor religious history in extract 2. A significant number of candidates discussed historiography often in a pre-learnt series of notes on the work of different historians which is a knowledge-based exercise and is not allowed any reward in AO3. This was often done in a mechanistic manner with the majority of candidates unable to clearly link the extracts to any particular school of thought. On the other hand, some candidates did demonstrate an awareness of the top-down and bottom-up schools of historical thought in regard to this issue.

The better prepared candidates set about the task of analysing and evaluating the validity of the interpretations in the two extracts. These candidates used their knowledge of the historical context to support their arguments by showing a sound understanding of the different ways in which the issue - what was mainly responsible for religious reformation after 1529 - has been interpreted. A significant number of candidates were also able to offer at least one alternative interpretation to the two presented. Some of the better responses attempted to explain why historians were able to form different interpretations but some were unable to clearly articulate the fact that interpretations are formed for specific reasons, at certain times and in different circumstances. Few candidates showed any awareness of the fact that most historical interpretations are often provisional and open to challenge and change as the debate develops.

## DEPTH STUDY 2

### ROYALTY, REBELLION AND REPUBLIC c. 1625-1660

#### PART 1: THE PRESSURE ON THE MONARCHY AND THE DRIFT TO CIVIL WAR, c.1625-1642

There were 230 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the problems faced by Charles I before 1640.*

The majority of candidates opted to discuss the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian studying the problems faced by Charles I in a concluding paragraph. The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the problems experienced by Charles I before and during Personal Rule up to 1640.

Source A proved accessible to the majority of candidates who were aware of and were quite comfortable in discussing the problems associated with the king's patronage and protection of the Duke of Buckingham. Fewer mentioned the context regarding the threatened impeachment of Buckingham. The vast majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the issues connected with ship money as demonstrated by Source B. However, few showed any awareness of the economic crisis that was engulfing the monarchy at this time hence the desperation of the king in trying to intimidate local officials into raising as much money as possible from reluctant tax payers. The value of Source C presented something of a challenge to many candidates who were aware of the problems associated with the Personal Rule but were unsure as to why Wentworth was so keen to explain and justify the king's antipathy to parliament at this particular time.

The more able candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the three sources and to place them in the context of the issue being studied by the historian, namely the problems faced by Charles I before 1640. A number of candidates made a valid attempt to discuss the value of the sources to a historian in the context not only of when they were produced - 1626, 1637 and 1638 - but how the sources related to the context of the problems faced by Charles I in the period between 1625 and 1640. Some candidates used the phrase but were unable to discuss or explain *the value* of the sources to a historian. Almost inevitably some candidates used *useful* in their responses which is likely to be a hangover from the legacy HY2 question.

Disappointingly, a number of candidates did not make good use of the attributions. Some simply copied them whilst others copied and offered only token comments. Many candidates were aware of the need to use and discuss the significance of the attributions: some noted that two sources were from Charles though only a minority were perceptive enough to spot the significance of Source A in that the king had written the note himself rather than employ a royal clerk to do so. This was unusual and suggests the importance the king attached to his relationship with Buckingham and his need to defend him from his critics.

A significant number of candidates discussed the tone of the language used in the sources with some pointing out the defensive tone of Source C as coming from a naturally biased close advisor to the king (and another royal favourite). The king's aggressive tone in Sources A and B were also noted although few linked this with any value to the historian making this enquiry.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that Parliament was mainly responsible for the outbreak of civil war in 1642?*

This question was accessible to the majority of candidates with a significant number able to recognise the different interpretations in the given extracts: Interpretation 1 that the king was responsible for the outbreak of the Civil War and Interpretation 2 that Parliament was responsible.

The majority of candidates were able to use the content of the extracts to discuss the validity of the given interpretation. A significant number of candidates discussed the attributions in a mechanistic way, focusing on reliability or generalised comments about how historians research their subject area. Some candidates simply copied the attribution and offered speculative comments on the specialism, nationality or name of the historian or pre-learnt mechanistic comments on the availability of evidence. Many candidates failed to demonstrate a specific awareness of the different ways in which the causes of the Civil War has been interpreted within the wider historical debate.

Some candidates made 'source evaluation' comments on the actual extracts from the historians by focusing on the author's specialism e.g. the focus on Stuart political history in extract 1 as opposed to a general text-book in extract 2. A significant number of candidates discussed historiography - often in a seemingly pre-learnt series of class notes on the work of different historians which is a knowledge-based exercise and is not allowed any reward in AO3. This was often done in a mechanistic manner with the vast majority of candidates unable to clearly link the extracts to any particular school of thought. Some commented on historiography along the lines of 'Marxist historians might say or interpret this in this way ...'

The better rewarded candidates wasted little time in setting about the task of analysing and evaluating the validity of the two extracts. These candidates used their knowledge of the historical context to support their arguments by showing a sound understanding of the different ways in which the issue - who or what was mainly responsible for the outbreak of the Civil War by 1642 - has been interpreted. A significant number of candidates were also able to offer at least one alternative interpretation to the two presented. Some of the better responses attempted to explain why historians were able to form different interpretations but some were unable to clearly articulate the fact that interpretations are formed for specific reasons, at certain times and in different circumstances. Very few candidates showed any awareness of the fact that these interpretations are often provisional and open to challenge and change over time.

### DEPTH STUDY 3

#### REFORM AND PROTEST IN WALES AND ENGLAND c.1783-1848

##### PART 1: RADICALISM AND THE FIGHT FOR PARLIAMENTARY REFORM, c.1783-1832

There were 254 candidates entered for this option.

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying radicalism and the demand for parliamentary reform in the period 1819-1832.*

The emphasis in this question is on analysing and evaluating the value of the presented sources in their historical context. The area of enquiry was radicalism and the demand for parliamentary reform in the period 1819-1832. The context of the aftermath of Peterloo in Source A, the impact of the French Revolution in Source B and the fierce debate on parliamentary reform 1830-32 in Source C should have formed the focus of the discussion of the value of the sources to an historian.

Source A is a report of a reform protest meeting in the *Leeds Intelligencer*. The date is significant, being after the Peterloo incident and other major protests. According to the report it is a very large meeting and the context is the revival of the parliamentary reform movement at a time of considerable social and economic dislocation. The report mentions some of the key objectives of the reform movement including annual parliaments, universal suffrage, voting by ballot with a sharp reference to the corrupt influence of borough mongers. The post-war context of Corn Laws, Combination Laws and the unfairness of indirect taxation is highlighted. The language and tone employed is also significant, including the sarcastic reference to the “grand wishes” of the radical reformers and the reference to the caps of liberty. The report appears in a conservative newspaper although traces of bias are not that prominent - it does accurately report the grievances of the protestors and their aims without being too disparaging although the size of the crowd and its demands might alarm a conservative audience. It is contemporary and based presumably on eyewitness accounts so it has value in presenting to the historian the context of reform, the activities and popularity of the reform movement. Most candidates were able to comment on the appropriate context including the significance of the date.

Source B conjures up an unflattering portrayal of radical reform as thinly disguised Death with his acolytes of slavery, starvation, blasphemy and immorality. The wearing of the French revolutionary bonnets of liberty is telling as is the mask to conceal the reality of death. The country, Britain, is portrayed by the mythical figure of Britannia who is fighting back aided by the sword of the laws and the lion of loyalty plus the support of the rock of religion. The cartoonist is clearly hostile to radical reform believing it to be inspired by an alien influence-the French revolution. The strength of loyalty was a factor in the survival of the government as was the use of emergency laws so the contemporary nature of the cartoon from 1820 is valuable. Cruickshank was unusual in not following a particular party line and was equally offensive to all brands of politics and politicians. His patriotism was never in doubt and that comes through strongly in the cartoon. Cartoons are by their nature tendentious but they can be valuable in the study of events and ideas provided the historian is aware of these possibilities. Candidates were mostly able to address the attribution effectively and the specific context was often discussed well.

Source C is from a speech to the House of Commons by Sir Robert Peel. The immediate context is the debate on Lord John Russell's Reform Bill introduced in March 1831. The case presented by Peel is the classic anti-reform stance: reform would be the thin end of the wedge, the clamour for reform had been exaggerated and the current system of government had stood the test of time and was, moreover, uniquely successful. He has a care for the rights and privileges of the Crown and the Houses of Parliament all of which would be undermined by reform. The language and tone is revealing, the metaphor of the opening door is clever and there is a touch of hyperbole as he extols the "vigour" of the executive power of the state which is greater than "in any age and in any country". It was a speech crafted by a noted orator to appeal to the rank and file of his party and to present the anti-reform case. As a reliable record it has considerable value to the historian studying the demand for parliamentary reform in revealing the thinking of a key player at a crucial stage in the reform debate.

Specific source evaluation was generally well done but there were fewer successful attempts to comment on the whole context of the issue raised in the question. Examiners also noted that whilst understanding of the post-war context was generally sound there was less security about the Reform Bill crisis in Source C - a significant number of candidates thought Sir Robert Peel was Prime Minister at the time of the Reform Bill crisis.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the Liberal Tory reforms were meaningful and effective?*

Most candidates had little or no difficulty in understanding the different interpretations given in the extracts. The better candidates were able to suggest why the interpretations differed with reference to their authorship. If candidates are to reach the higher bands they have to consider not only why the interpretations differ but also why historians might come to different conclusions when faced with the same evidence. They also need to have a firm grasp of alternative interpretations and how these might have been formed. Named historians are not required but an understanding of the wider historical debate on the issue will always be rewarded. Unfortunately some candidates only focused their answers on the two given extracts and did not consider, at all, the wider historical debate on the issue in the question. Nearly all candidates were able to give a judgment of sorts regarding validity of the interpretation in the question.

Interpretation 1 argues that there was a change of direction in 1822. There were significant ministerial changes, presenting a "bright new look" to the ministry and one which reflected a more stable and peaceful state of the country. Liverpool was also looking to the emerging mercantile and industrial classes for more enlightened support to balance the more agricultural interests of the backbenchers. The word "liberal" is explicitly used by Briggs to describe the new ministry. Briggs is a well-known historian, one of the most eminent in the Victorian period and his views should command respect. His textbook would have been a synthesis of historical research as it was in 1959 and his account is a modified version of the classic interpretation of the Liberal Tories in that Liverpool is portrayed as reaching out to the new classes in society, a view that is fiercely contested by more modern historians.

Interpretation 2 is frankly sceptical about the whole concept of Liberal Toryism. Evans doubts that Liverpool had the imagination to change direction dramatically. The new men were not trying out new policy—they were just more efficient and convincing in administering existing policy. Evans is implying that it is the way policies are being implemented that matters, they had not really changed. He does agree with Briggs that times were more prosperous after 1822 but he emphasises the limitations of Liberal Toryism in displaying no interest in parliamentary reform. Evans too is a respected historian who has written textbooks galore including several topic books on this period so his views deserve respect and suitable consideration as the product of mature reflection and substantial research.

Candidates were expected to show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding the Liberal Tory reforms. In particular candidates should be aware of other interpretations such as the classic interpretation of a definite change in 1822 from repression to reform whilst the revisionists question whether there was any change at all. Neither Evans nor Briggs in these extracts deal with the interesting question of emancipation which was of crucial importance in the fortunes of the Tory party in the late 1820s. A more radical approach has been suggested which puts the Tories in the dock for an inadequate defence of the *ancien regime*, especially on the issues of emancipation and nonconformity, which unintentionally ushered in a period of major reform in church and state.

## DEPTH STUDY 4

### POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN WALES AND ENGLAND 1900-1939

#### PART 1: POLITICS, SOCIETY AND THE WAR: WALES AND ENGLAND, c. 1900-1918

There were 98 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the effects of war on the people of Wales and England 1901-1916.*

Most candidates discussed the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian studying the effects of war on the people of Wales and England. Sometimes this was done at the end of each paragraph and sometimes as a bolt on paragraph at the end of the overall answer. Both approaches have some merit: however fully evaluative responses successfully addressed the issue of 'value to an historian' throughout the response, concentrating on 'value' rather than 'utility'. Better performing candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the sources for their value to an historian by considering each source both in the context of its stated origin and in the context of the issue in the question set

Source A proved accessible to most of the candidates who focused on its value in providing evidence linked with the Boer War of the poverty in British society. Some were able to contextualise this by reference to the raising of the profile of poverty at this time often making reference to the influence of the reports of social investigators. However, the specific question set was about the effects of war on the people of Wales and England and this clearly needed more attention rather than the blanket 'shows us this' approach. Source B was recognised by most as a political speech aimed at promoting the war effort however very few were able to put the source in context of the shell crisis of 1915 and the need to promote war production as the war was clearly not going to be over by Christmas. More importantly the value to an historian studying the effects of war on the people of Wales and England was not the main focus of the discussion by many who seemed to want to focus on the course of the war by 1915. Source C was a letter written by a contemporary of the period expressing her view about women's role during the war and how attitudes changed towards them and their right to vote. This could have led to a discussion about the 'effects of war' rather than a general discussion about the power and influence of the WSPU over the developing role and status of women.

The authorship of the sources was discussed by the majority of the candidates but mostly in a mechanistic fashion typical of the previous HY2 question (d) rather than in relation to their value to an historian studying a particular issue namely the effects of war on the people of Wales and England. Some merely copied the attributions while others devoted time to discussing their strengths and limitations with various degree of depth. Stronger answers discussed the value of both the content and the provenance to an historian studying the 'effects of war' on the people of Wales and England. Doing this allowed these candidates to show an awareness of the place of the sources in the context of this issue. A significant number of candidates discussed the tone of the language used in the sources but they did so in a mechanistic rehearsed manner without any real focus on the specific enquiry set in the question.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the Liberal social reforms of 1906-1914 were largely designed to address the problems of poverty?*

Many candidates appeared knowledgeable about the Liberal social reforms of 1906-1914 which is not surprising because it is an issue derived from one of the nominated issues identified in the Specification. However Question 2 is entirely based on Assessment Objective 3 and candidates need to show they are aware of the different ways in which the issue has been interpreted and of the main developments in the wider historical debate about the Liberal social reforms.

Interpretation 1 claims that the Liberal social reforms were not largely designed to address the problem of poverty but to gain political advantage. Interpretation 2 claims otherwise, the reforms were largely designed to address the issue of poverty. Other possible interpretations could place the onus for the reforms more on economic reasons or even the influence of the Boer War or the fear of the growing popularity of the labour movement. The better candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the validity of the two extracts and use their knowledge of the historical context to support their arguments and to show an understanding of these different ways in which the issue has been interpreted.

The responses at the lower bands mostly copied the content of the extracts to discuss differences in the given interpretations. Somewhat better, but still weak, were those candidates that paraphrased the content of the extracts to show how the content differed. Reference to the attributions improved these answers but the comments were a basic 'strengths and weaknesses' source evaluation exercise with little focus on the actual question set. Mechanistic evaluations on reliability were also seen and a number of candidates seemed to provide a series of notes on the work of different historians and the historiography related to each which had clearly been pre-learned and placed within the answers with little or any focus on the actual question set.

At the higher bands some candidates were able to discuss how and why the historians formed different historical interpretations of the Liberal social reforms based on the content and authorship of the provided extracts and their understanding of the wider historical debate. Rather than provide pre-learned narratives on the historiography they were able to focus more on the 'how and why' the interpretations differed which is the focus of this AO3 based question referring to the fact that interpretations are formed for specific reasons, at certain times and in different circumstances.

## DEPTH STUDY 5

### RELIGIOUS REFORMATION IN EUROPE, c. 1500-1564

#### PART 1: THE OUTBREAK AND SPREAD OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY c.1500-1531

There were 63 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the outbreak of the Reformation in Germany by the early 1520s.*

This question is based on the analysis and evaluation of three primary/contemporary sources set in their historical context. The candidates were expected to assess their value to a historian studying the outbreak of the Reformation in Germany. Source A was from Tetzel speaking in a public sermon in Germany in 1516 about the value of Indulgences. Source B was an extract from one of Luther's influential tracts of 1520 and Source C was a woodcut by Cranach the Elder c. 1522. In this question, it is essential that the candidates display an understanding of the historical context surrounding the enquiry and the sources provided before reaching a substantiated judgement on their value to an historian making a specific enquiry. They can achieve this through considering the content, provenance, tone and historical context of each of the sources.

Source A is an example of the type of financial abuse, the selling of Indulgences, that was exciting the ire of Humanists, reformers and some members of the catholic clergy, namely one Martin Luther. This source is particularly valuable to a historian studying the outbreak of the Reformation in Germany as it gives an example of Tetzel's methods and what provoked Luther into making his protest the following year. Source B helps the historian to appreciate how in the space of three years, Luther's protest had moved beyond the issue of Indulgence selling. This was one of a series of tracts that challenged the authority of the papacy and the nature of central catholic doctrines. The source helps in understanding how Luther's writings and their spread across the Empire was now a direct cause of the Reformation in Germany. Source C is of real value as it also suggests the power of the printing press in the outbreak of the Reformation. It is an example of the type of propaganda that attacked a corrupt papacy and appealed to a different audience from that addressed in Source B. It followed on quickly from Luther's appearance at Worms and suggests a broadening of his support and the range of issues that were encouraging the protest, that is, papal greed and unfair taxation. This anger would manifest itself in the peasant uprisings of 1524-25.

Those candidates who were better rewarded responded directly to the question set and the sources provided, placing them within their historical context and explaining their value to a historian studying this specific issue. Some candidates however, who were less successful, merely dealt with the general usefulness / limitations of the sources and made generic, mechanistic references to their authorship. They then concluded not with a judgement but an exhaustive list of omissions. This approach will not help the candidates achieve the higher bands and should be discouraged.

Overall, the focus must be on discussing the value of the sources to a historian studying this specific topic. Historical knowledge is required to place these sources in context and illustrate their significance in the wider causes of the outbreak of the Reformation in Germany.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the use of the printing press was the main reason for the spread of the Reformation in Germany?*

In Question 2, the candidates were provided with two interpretations by modern historians on the role of the printing press in the spread of the Reformation. They were required to analyse and evaluate how and why different historical interpretations have been made and demonstrate an understanding of the wider historical debate surrounding the reasons for spread of the Reformation. This response must always be rooted in the interpretations provided in the extracts and focused on the key issue of debate, the reasons for the spread of the Reformation in Germany.

Interpretation 1, provided by three traditional historians in a general overview of sixteenth century Europe, produced at the end of the 1980s, argued that the availability of the printing press allowed for more debate on the nature of scripture and the authority of Rome to interpret them. It enabled scholars and ruling elites to have access to the bible and formulate their own judgements. These historians, who have collaborated on the book, claim that the printing press had a pivotal role in the spread of the Reformation. It enabled men like Erasmus, Luther and Zwingli to undermine the church and influence the literate, book buying classes who ruled society.

Interpretation 2 however, is more in accordance with those modern historians who take a broader view of the process of historical change and shy away from single cultural, economic or social causes of the spread of the Reformation. For Cameron the focus is on what the critics of Rome had to say rather than the means by which it was transmitted. Luther and Zwingli were justifiably lauded at the time for the power of their sermons and their impact on all classes. Furthermore, those that were inspired by these calls for reform followed them for a diverse range of reasons, not always religious. Printing alone cannot explain the success and subsequent spread of the Reformation.

Candidates were expected to show awareness of the wider historical debate about the reasons for the spread of the Reformation. They could refer to general schools of thought, but there is no need to outline the specific historiography. Some care also needed to be applied to the terms used by candidates to describe the historians: Koensberger, Mosse, Bowler and Cameron were variously described as traditional, great men historians, modern, post-modern and Marxist! While these may be appropriate terms which can show how various schools of thought have developed and differed, these were tossed around with abandon and perhaps would be better off not used at all if uncertain.

## DEPTH STUDY 6

### FRANCE IN REVOLUTION, c. 1774-1815

#### PART 1: FRANCE: THE CAUSES AND COURSE OF REVOLUTION, c. 1774-1792

There were 180 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the development of the French Revolution, 1789-1791.*

The weaker candidates used this question as an opportunity to trawl through the collection for content. The better responses adopted an overview approach that focused on the strengths of the sources and, in particular, their value to an historian studying the development of the French Revolution in the period 1789–1791. For example, the issues concerning the theoretical abolition of the feudal system (Source A), the controversy regarding the new voting requirements (Source B) and the King's restricted role within the new constitution (Source C) are all referred to.

Consideration needs to be given not only to the sources' content, but also to their historical context, attributions and tone of language. A clear judgement on the sources' value to an historian carrying out the specific enquiry is also required. In a number of responses candidates insisted on transposing *useful* for *value*. The attention of teachers is drawn to the fact that the words do imply different features and that all candidates need to become familiar with using and applying the concept of value rather than utility.

Candidates are reminded of the fact that the sources are used within the context of an historian studying a particular aspect of history and that responses need to clearly allude to this.

#### QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the weaknesses of the ancien régime were mainly responsible for causing the French Revolution?*

Most candidates were able to identify and discuss the main interpretations offered in the two extracts and also the other key arguments which the two historians presented. Most candidates also tried to link the authorship to the creation of these interpretations. For many candidates, however, this explanation was rather simplistic and mechanistic. It is essential that careful consideration is given to all the information contained in the attributions. Only some candidates showed an awareness of other possible interpretations of the causes of the French Revolution, even though this topic is clearly stated in the specification. Of those that did show some awareness of the wider debate, and in many cases this awareness was underdeveloped. Not all candidates reached a judgement on the validity of the view that the weaknesses of the ancien régime were mainly responsible for causing the French Revolution.

## DEPTH STUDY 7

### THE CRISIS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC c. 1840-1877

#### PART 1: SECTIONAL DIFFERENCES AND THE ROAD TO CIVIL WAR c. 1840-1861

There were 220 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the impact of slavery on the USA before the Civil War.*

The emphasis in Question 1 should be on analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context. The area of enquiry was the impact of slavery on the USA before the civil war. The context of Source A was the conditions on a plantation in the 1840s and 1850s, the anti-slavery movement was the context in Source B and the impact of sectional tensions about the issue of slavery in Source C

Source A is a first-hand account from a freed slave about his experiences on a Louisiana plantation in the 1840s. The account is a bleak description of the grinding toll of labour, the meagre diet and the atmosphere of fear and violence. It has value as first hand evidence, immediacy and was written up not long after the events described. As an unwilling participant in the institution of slavery, Northop's account is as compelling now as it was when published in the 1850s. Questions that arise regarding its value as a source in an enquiry are whether his experience was typical, whether the plantation he worked in was unusual and whether there were other plantations where conditions were better, whether slaves were treated more kindly elsewhere. All these affect the value of the source. Nonetheless it is still an account of slavery however cruel or benign it was in practice. However, in terms of impact, candidates did gauge the importance of this evidence compared to other evidence fuelling the anti-slavery debate which was gripping the nation and its politicians in the 1850s.

Source B is a record of a speech by one of the leading black American abolitionists. The speech makes clear the salience of the slavery issue and the influence of slave power in politics. Douglas mocks, only five years after the event, the Compromise of 1850. However he also draws attention to the impact of the Fugitive Slave Bill which ignited passions in the North and fuelled a revival of the abolitionist movement in the North, a development which kept the sectional pot boiling. Insight into the thinking and outlook of a prominent abolitionist is provided by the source. It is first hand evidence of the context in which meetings of this sort were being held in the North and reveals the importance of the anti-slavery movement. The source is a speech and the use of language and its tone are significant - the image of oil and fire is evocative and the horror of slavery is conveyed with passion. Many candidates pointed out that Douglas is speaking to a captive audience which would have needed little persuasion. Equally speeches of this kind are sometimes constructed to tell the audience what they want to hear and this was an anti-slavery society in the heart of the North. This too was commented on as having an impact on its value to an historian looking at the slavery issue.

Source C is a different speech, this time from an up and coming Republican politician seeking office and keen to make a name for himself. The date is significant, a time of rising sectional tensions after the Dred Scott case and the impact of the 1857 depression. The immediate context is the senatorial race in which Douglas and Lincoln were to hold their celebrated debates on the issue of slavery which would electrify the nation. This speech is a foretaste of what was to come. Lincoln aptly describes how the anti-slavery agitation is growing and vividly illustrates how the slavery issue will have to be resolved one way or the other. That Lincoln was an accomplished orator is clear from this extract where his logic and powerful use of language encapsulate the issues in a few sentences. The source also has value as first hand evidence on the seriousness of the slavery issue at this time, its effect on politics (note how Lincoln casually discusses the fate of the Union and dismisses the prospect of dissolution) and the thinking of Lincoln at a critical point in his career. It is a powerful source of great value to the historian of the civil war era.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the election of Abraham Lincoln as President was mainly responsible for the outbreak of the American Civil War?*

Most candidates had little or no difficulty in understanding the different interpretations given in the extracts. The better candidates were able to suggest as well why the interpretations differed with reference to authorship. If candidates are to reach the higher bands they have to consider not only why the interpretations differ but also why historians might come to different conclusions when faced with the same evidence. They also need to have a firm grasp of alternative interpretations and how these might have been formed. Named historians are not required but an understanding of the wider historical debate on the issue will always be rewarded. Unfortunately some candidates only focussed their answers on the two given extracts and did not consider, at all, the wider historical debate on the issue in the question. Nearly all candidates were able to give a judgment of sorts regarding validity of the interpretation in the question.

Interpretation 1 argues that Lincoln's election was of fundamental importance in causing the civil war. It underlines the sectional nature of Lincoln's victory and the mind-set of the secessionists who saw Lincoln's victory as meaning the abolition of slavery. The moderate southern voice is mentioned but Ashworth points out that this was drowned out by the hardliners. The interpretation here is strong on the southern reaction to Lincoln's victory and the perception of the north shared by the hardliners influencing events. In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 1 answers did argue that Ashworth is a well-respected historian who has spent a lifetime researching the topic and who has deployed evidence to back up his views in a textbook which will have synthesised both primary and secondary material. It is a recent publication and can be presumed to be up to date on Civil War discussion. As a leader in his field Ashworth would be expected to be in command of the accumulated material which supports his view that there was a direct connection between Lincoln's victory and the secession of the southern states. Some argued that even at that stage war could have been avoided if the North had backed down. As A J P Taylor once remarked it takes two to make a war.

Interpretation 2 argues that conflict was not inevitable and the election by itself need not have been decisive. It argues that there had been attempts at compromise before and they had worked. Wright points out that Lincoln was eminently reasonable in public, presenting no threat to the institution of slavery. Wright does however point out Lincoln's firmness on not allowing the extension of slavery. Wright's interpretation is accurate in terms of Lincoln's thinking in 1860-61 but he underplays the perception of Lincoln in the South. The important issue is what the South actually perceived Lincoln's message to be. Many believed, rightly or wrongly, that Lincoln as leader of the Republican Party was out to destroy slavery. In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 2 candidates argued that Wright was an eminent historian who had spent his whole professional life studying the USA and its history. The textbook was a synthesis of current work and so has value as the product of a leading specialist. The clue in the attribution was Wright's conservative views and whether this affects the value of his work. He plays down abolitionism as a minority interest which begs the question about why then it upset the South so much and there is no doubt that Wright was sympathetic to the southern point of view which of course is not necessarily the same as agreeing with it.

Candidates did show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding the causes of the civil war. In particular candidates were aware of other interpretations which may have emphasised the impact of the campaign for abolition, the breakdown of the old party system, the failures of leadership in North and South, the economic differences between North and South and the view that the secessionists used Lincoln's election as the occasion for, rather than the cause of, secession.

## DEPTH STUDY 8

### GERMANY: DEMOCRACY TO DICTATORSHIP c. 1918-1945

#### PART 1: WEIMAR AND ITS CHALLENGES c. 1918-1933

There were 2080 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the problems facing the Weimar Republic between 1919 and 1930.*

The majority of candidates were able to engage with the three sources but at different levels and to different degrees. Most candidates adopted a source by source approach but they did not always consider the specific context, why each source was produced or in what way it was valuable to an historian studying the specific issue, in each or every case. This led to some incomplete or unbalanced responses. Rarely did candidates adopt a more holistic consideration of the three sources in reaching a judgement about value in relation to the precise question set.

The candidates were required to evaluate the sources for their value to an historian by considering each source in the context of its origin and in the context of the specific enquiry set in the question. In most cases the candidates were able to show a secure understanding of the historical content referred to in each source with references to the Spartacist revolt in Source A, German foreign policy in Source B and the problems of Weimar government after 1929 in Source C. However, candidates were not as secure in establishing the specific historical context of each source or in establishing a reasoned judgement as to how valuable each source was to an historian in a particular enquiry. In many cases the source evaluation remained largely mechanistic with many candidates providing routine comments about types of sources instead of the precise sources within the context of the enquiry. Many chose not to consider the importance of the date of each source which should have enabled the candidates to place the sources within the precise historical context. This was particularly true of Source C where few candidates considered the importance of the election of September 1930 and Brüning's solution to the problems created by the growing depression. This precise lack of contextual knowledge led to some generalised narratives of Weimar Germany which lacked relevance to the precise source or the enquiry set. Some candidates had difficulty with the context of Source B with some arguing that the problems of hyperinflation in 1923 caused problems for the Weimar Republic.

Candidates should be advised that the more secure their knowledge of the period studied the easier it will be for them to place the sources within their precise historical context. Some candidates offered very mechanistic judgements about the value of the sources to an historian by using a prepared codes such as 'medium', 'small' or 'large value'. What this actually meant in reality was difficult to fathom and restricted the more able candidates from thinking about what was in front of them. This inevitably led to considerable drift away from the precise question set. Candidates should be advised to consider exactly the given sources and the precise question set instead of adapting prepared notes and displaying mechanical source evaluation skills.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that Hitler was mainly responsible for the rise to power of the Nazis by 1933?*

The majority of candidates were able to identify the two different interpretations provided within the extracts which focussed upon the role of Hitler and chance events in the rise to power of the Nazis. However, few candidates chose to point out the differences in timescale referred to. Of more concern was the fact that many candidates seemed unaware of the different ways in which these issues have been interpreted and the main developments in the wider historical debate about the rise to power of the Nazis. Clearly some candidates had been advised to blend the two interpretations provided in order to show a third alternative interpretation. However, this approach amounted to only a partial solution and led only to a general awareness of alternative interpretations to the set question. Indeed, often the blending approach used was not even viable or accurate. Assessment Objective 3 now expects candidates to show an understanding of the wider historical debate in order to produce quality responses.

Some candidates showed a mechanistic and prepared approach to the consideration of the authorship of each extract with many making no attempt other than to copy word for word the origins of each extract. Many more chose to concentrate on showing how each extract may have been formed often by consideration of the content of each extract. However, there were some worthy attempts to show why each interpretation had been formed and furthermore some candidates were able to link interpretations 1 and 2 to general schools of thought on the rise to power of the Nazis. Most pointed out that Kershaw was typical of the revisionist school of thinking and that these historians reject the great man theory of history provided by historians such as Overy. Candidates were also expected to show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding the Nazi rise to power such as the longer term circumstances associated with the ending of the Great War and the fear of communism. This approach meant that the candidates were at least able to provide a meaningful discussion of why interpretations are formed and they were able to show how historical judgements are often provisional and based on a variety of different factors including use of supporting evidence.



WJEC  
245 Western Avenue  
Cardiff CF5 2YX  
Tel No 029 2026 5000  
Fax 029 2057 5994  
E-mail: [exams@wjec.co.uk](mailto:exams@wjec.co.uk)  
website: [www.wjec.co.uk](http://www.wjec.co.uk)