



GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

**GCE
HISTORY
AS/Advanced**

SUMMER 2022

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.

Unit	Page
1 – Period Studies	1
2 – Depth Studies, Part 1	10
3 – Breadth Studies	17
4 – Depth Studies, Part 2	27
5 – Non-examination assessment	35

HISTORY

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2022

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

UNIT 1 – PERIOD STUDIES

General Comments

For the 2022 summer examination session, Unit 1 was adapted across all optional units with one of the five “concepts and perspectives” removed for each option. The layout of the paper remained the same with candidates required to respond to one of the focused questions in Section A and one of the broader questions in Section B. WJEC received a handful of queries regarding the perceived narrowness of some of the Section A questions; however, these more focused questions were shaped by the material available in the remaining concepts and perspectives, and we ensured that such questions were only asked on issues of significant change, where there was sufficient material to support the range of arguments expected by the question. Further, centres were notified on the adaptation released in autumn 2021 of the possibility of there being shorter timeframes for some questions. One area that received some attention from centres was Unit 1.1 – government, rebellion and society in Wales and England c. 1485–1603. Several centres were dissatisfied by the lack of inclusion of a question on Henry VII. Unfortunately, we are unable to always provide a question on a popular area of the course as that would make the paper predictable, which is prohibited by the regulatory guidance.

One of the common themes that emerged across the range of options was the lack of period coverage evident in the Section B questions. It is expected that candidates will offer historical material that covers the scope of the question, and so candidates are strongly encouraged to have an overview of the period as well as knowledge of individual developments. We also noticed an increased number of candidates – compared to 2019 – offering what appeared to be a write up of their class notes. Perhaps given the experiences of the past few years, this is to be expected; however, candidates are strongly advised to ensure that they are consistently and effectively directing historical evidence to answering the question set.

Finally, it was noted in reviews of scripts that several candidates had made rubric errors. Several candidates answered more than the required two questions, and a few candidates answered two questions only, but from only one section (usually Section A). Perhaps this was the result of limited examination practice or a loss of confidence during the examination; however, candidates must be made aware that they can only be credited in line with the instructions of the paper. Where candidates answered more than the required questions in a section, they were only awarded the highest mark they achieved in that section.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Period Study 1: Government, rebellion and society in Wales and England c.1485–1603

Question 1 required candidates to discuss the relative effectiveness of Cromwell and Wolsey as chief ministers of Henry VIII. Many candidates responded well to the question and provided a reasoned debate of the key issue. However, there was a significant imbalance in many responses with the majority focusing on Cromwell at the expense of Wolsey.

A significant minority of candidates were confused and tended to mix up the policies pursued by the pair. Another feature was the descriptive-style response which failed to address the issue of effectiveness. Some candidates inexplicably included Sir William Cecil in their answers which, of course, is irrelevant to the set question. There were 240 responses to this question.

For Question 2, candidates were required to gauge the extent to which political grievances were responsible for causing rebellions between 1549 and 1569. The 554 candidates who attempted this question tended to adopt two main approaches to answering it: thematic and chronological. The latter approach tends to elicit repetition and a listing framework, which makes debate harder, though not impossible, to achieve. The quality of the answers varied quite widely due, in part, to the fact that in most responses, analysis and evaluation were sacrificed in favour of narrative accounts. While these were often detailed, they offered little by way of debate, and judgements tended to be tacked on throughout the response with no effective summative conclusion. Some candidates inexplicably included the Pilgrimage of Grace which is irrelevant to the set question. There were 554 responses to this question.

In answering Question 3, candidates were encouraged to identify the religious challenges faced by successive Tudor governments in the period between 1540 and 1588 and to judge how effectively they dealt with them. The debate centred around the conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism as each monarch sought to establish and enforce their preferred religious option. Most candidates responded to this question chronologically, with many of them judging the effectiveness of each monarch's government in turn. Where this approach was adopted, it was essential that candidates drew all the arguments together. However, many candidates either did not understand the question or who answered the question they wished had been set. For example, it was evident that many candidates simply substituted *challenge* with *change*. This led to narrative responses listing the changes in religion. There were 670 responses to this question.

Finally, those candidates who opted for Question 4 were invited to consider and debate the most significant social and economic changes in the period 1530 and 1603, weighing the development of towns against other possible changes such as the rise of the gentry, poverty and vagrancy and the effects of enclosure and inflation. In the responses seen, there was a tendency to a chronological approach though, thankfully, not reign by reign. It was clear that many candidates did not go far beyond merchants and trade in their discussion of towns and were far more confident in dealing with the wider socio-economic changes (particularly poverty, vagrancy and government legislation) which led to a noticeable imbalance in many responses. There were 97 responses to this question.

Period Study 2: Government, revolution and society in Wales and England c.1603–1715

Candidates who responded to Question 1 were required to discuss the Instrument of Government and the significance of its impact on government and politics in the period 1653 to 1685. The key to successfully negotiating this question was in assessing the impact of the Instrument of Government and weighing it against other issues such as the Humble Petition and Advice, the Restoration, developments and legislation in successive Parliaments and royal policies enacted during the reign of Charles II. Apart from those candidates who seemed to know very little about the Instrument of Government and simply ignored it, the majority tended to split their answers in two: Interregnum (1653–1660) and the reign of Charles II (1660–1685). Such an approach is not entirely satisfactory as many candidates suggested that the Instrument dominated government and politics until the Restoration in 1660. This is not the case as the Instrument was virtually replaced (or at least substantially modified) in 1657.

Thus, those candidates who offered a two-sided response pitching events in the Interregnum against developments in the reign of Charles II were unlikely to provide a balanced debate and judgement on the impact of the Instrument. The most significant weakness in the responses to this question lay in those candidates who simply provided a narrative history of politics and government in the period between 1653 and 1685. Inexplicably, some candidates either failed to mention Cromwell or included James II in their responses. There were 72 responses to this question.

For Question 2, candidates were encouraged to evaluate the impact the Commonwealth had on the lives of people between 1649 and 1660. Simply put, the debate centred on whether the Commonwealth significantly affected the lives of the people or not. Most candidates showed some understanding of the question, but the quality of analysis and evaluation varied widely. In some cases, the word “evaluate” was read as “describe”, and although some of these descriptive essays exhibited some impressive knowledge, they did not fulfil the requirements of the set question. The more enlightened candidates reasoned that the greatest impact was felt by the political and propertied classes. In contrast, it was suggested by many that the population at large was mainly affected by the rule of the Major-Generals. Surprisingly, little attention was devoted to the impact of religious changes though much was made of the influence of radical groups and ideas. There were 43 responses to this question.

Question 3 asked candidates to discuss the causes of tension between the Crown and Parliament in the period from 1603 to 1642. The first task was to identify the causes of tension such as finance, religion, Parliamentary privileges, royal favourites, and Personal Rule, before planning a response that sought to analyse and evaluate them. The key to successfully negotiating this question was in weighing the contribution divine right made to escalating tensions against the other identified causes. Most candidates were well versed in the reasons for tension between Crown and Parliament, but this often resulted in knowledge-driven responses. Knowledge alone does not fulfil the range of requirements of assessment objective 1, and candidates need to deploy what they know in order to structure a meaningful debate. Those candidates who adopted a chronological approach (by focusing on James I and Charles I in turn) to answering the question often fell-foul of repetition, which was largely avoided by those who opted to pursue a thematic approach. There were 110 responses to this question.

Question 4 required candidates to judge the extent to which the power and authority of the Crown was greater in 1715 than it had been in 1660. By analysing and evaluating the changing position and power of the Crown in the 55 years between the Restoration and Jacobite rebellion, candidates would then be able to come to a judgement regarding the nature of Royal authority: had it become stronger or weaker? Candidates favoured the chronological approach by dealing with each reign in turn. This had a listing effect which lent itself to description rather than evaluation.

That said, there were examples of solid evaluative essays that adopted a more thematic approach insofar as they focused on key issues such as finance, politics, Parliament and legislation such as the Bill of Rights, and party politics, around which they framed a debate. Reference was made to the fact that three of the five monarchs during this period ascended the throne by Parliamentary invitation. There were 7 responses to this question.

Period Study 3: Politics, protest and reform in Wales and England c.1780–1880

For Question 1, few candidates had problems in covering the period specified (1812 to 1820), and most were able to identify the key protests required. The question required a focus on the effectiveness of the government’s response with many candidates arguing that while the response prevented a complete breakdown of law and order it failed to deal with the economic, social and political grievances underlying the protests.

By and large, the knowledge seen was detailed; however, there needed to be a clearer focus on demands of the set question. There were 333 responses to this question.

For Question 2, candidates were required to discuss the significance of the social reforms of the period from 1833 to 1848, in particular whether the reforms of public health were the most significant. The nature of the public health problem was generally well known but the provisions of the 1848 Public Health Act were not often critically assessed. Alternative reforms were often listed in the weaker answers and lacked debate. The reform of the Poor Law was surprisingly absent in a significant minority of answers. There were 279 responses to this question.

In answering Question 3, candidates were required to take a longer view perspective of the period 1815–1867, and debate whether economic hardship was responsible for popular protest. Period coverage is an important consideration in Section B answers, and it was striking that many answers were far more comfortable discussing the period from 1815 to 1832 than the subsequent decades. As a result, discussions of the Chartist movement and the Anti-Corn Law league were rather brief in many answers. There were 419 responses to this question.

Finally, the candidates who opted for Question 4 had to debate the significance of the Corn Laws and their impact upon the fortunes of the Conservative Party in the period from 1815 to 1880. Again, there was evidence that the whole period had not been covered adequately. Examiners found that many candidates preferred to focus on the leadership of the Party and whether Peel or Disraeli was the more successful leader, which was, of course, not the question set. However, many candidates did at least know of the arguments about the Corn Laws and their repeal, assessing their impact upon the fortunes of the Conservative Party in the mid-Victorian period. There were 181 responses to this question.

Period Study 4: Politics, people and progress in Wales and England c.1880–1980

For Question 1 candidates needed to provide a judgement as to what extent did the Liberal governments dealt effectively with the challenges facing Wales and England between 1906 and 1914. Candidates in the higher mark bands were rewarded because they considered the question and noted that, in order to answer the question, the challenges facing the Liberal governments had to be identified. It was only then that the responses could come to a judgement as to how effectively these challenges were addressed. Failure to note the challenges often led to descriptive answers as to what the Liberal governments did, and a general discussion of success and or failures, which were not linked to any specific challenge. Overall, candidates seemed quite knowledgeable about the challenges and the range of possible issues including, health and poverty, women's suffrage, the challenge from the Labour Party and industrial relations.

There were some good responses overall about the challenges, with much background information about the social reports of Booth and Rowntree, the impact of the Boer War and the call for National efficiency. Where candidates fell short was on the discussion of whether the actions of the Liberal governments were effective, partly effective or ineffective, with few candidates engaging in a nuanced analysis. There were 180 responses to this question.

It was clear that many candidates who answered Question 2 had insufficient knowledge about the economic impact of the First World War despite it being a topic in the specification for this unit. Most knew the negative side of the debate, drawing upon the failure of 'Homes for Heroes', the disruption to trade and the cost of war generally. However, comments were general in nature with few specifics, and few candidates were able to provide any meaningful detail on the period from 1920 to 1928.

Often the discussions were generalised without reference to the economic impact of the First World War as required. Further, the General Strike of 1926 and worsening economic relations between Government, owners and employees and Trade Unions were largely ignored. Few attempted to evaluate, and discuss the positive economic developments, for example employment, new industries and technologies and the general rise in the standard of living. This balance is important in evaluation questions, but here it was often overlooked. There were 86 responses to this question.

Question 3 demonstrated a trend in which candidates who answered the question either misread or attempted to subvert the question by writing copious amounts on the period prior to 1914. Others emphasized the period during the world wars, but not the interwar period, this meant that a sizeable amount of period coverage was wanting and severely restricted the marks awarded to some candidates. Knowledge about the extension of the franchise in 1918 and 1928 was included by many, but it was not always focused on how this influenced the changing role and fortunes of women. This may have provided women with a political voice that allowed further developments in other spheres of life. Some well-crafted answers considered changes to education, health, housing, popular culture and entertainment and crucially their influence on changing the role and status of women, which was very important when addressing the issue of 'to what extent'. Stronger responses also covered the period from 1945 to 1951 and were able to raise the question of whether changes in the period gave women more freedom or cemented the stereotype of the women as homemaker and mother. There were 178 responses to this question.

Finally, Question 4 also demonstrated a tendency to overlook the entire period of the question set. Many did not deal with the period from 1931 to 1939, while the period from 1951 to 1979, if dealt with at all, was dealt with in a general manner. By and large, in this Unit the post-1951 period has been treated as a poor relation and better focus is needed if candidates are to improve their responses to what is in essence an outline paper. In terms of the requirement to gauge the issue of most important development, the higher-performing candidates were able to grapple with this by considering other developments and whether they were more or less important than the creation of the welfare state. These were comparative responses as they attempted to explain why other developments were either more or less important rather than just producing unsupported assertions. Another important distinction between higher-performing candidates and others was the attention to the question, that is, the focus on "affecting the lives of the people of Wales and England". This was important to keep responses focussed on the actual demand of the question set rather than vague narratives about general developments. Most candidates were able to provide some knowledge about the welfare state although many were only able to discuss the NHS. The welfare state was far more comprehensive than that. Other issues discussed tended to focus on entertainment and immigration in general but clearly, given the scope of the question, issues surrounding the depression years and the war, as well as social developments up to 1980 were also important. There were 81 responses to this question.

Period Study 5: Political and religious change in Europe c.1500–1598

There were few responses to this option and so the feedback is necessarily limited.

The 14 responses to Question 1 generally showed a sound understanding of the range of challenges facing Philip II but did not evaluate the relative effectiveness of how he dealt with them.

Meanwhile, the 7 candidates answering Question 2 focused more on the foreign than the domestic problems facing Francis I. As with Question 1 the range of problems seemed to be well understood but most of the candidates did not then go on to evaluate the relative effectiveness of how Francis dealt with those problems.

For Section B, the 19 candidates who responded to Question 3 tended to focus almost exclusively on the German Reformation and Martin Luther rather than mentioning events in Switzerland and elsewhere. Neither Calvin nor any of the other reformers apparently merited a mention on this question which specified Europe and went beyond the death of Luther. While the Catholic Church was mentioned, it was only as a cause of change: there few attempts to recognize its efforts to change itself during the stated period. This was perhaps a consequence of the candidates' apparent reluctance to move beyond Luther's revolt in the 1510s and 1520s. Only 2 candidates opted for Question 4. There was a pronounced focus on the weaknesses of the Catholic Church, and it would have been beneficial if there had been further coverage of the Council of Trent and events up to 1564. In many ways responses to this question were almost indistinguishable from responses to Question 3, which demonstrated the tendency of candidates to both Questions 3 and 4 to bend the questions to their will rather than to address the specific nature of those two questions.

Period Study 6: Europe in the age of absolutism and revolution c.1682–1815

Candidates who responded to Question 1 were asked to evaluate the impact of the war of Austrian Succession on relations between the Great Powers up to 1756. Most were aware of the detail of the pre-emptive strike by Frederick the Great of Silesia and recounted – often in considerable detail – the military campaigns. While this was interesting it did not address the question set. Better responses, however, noted the shifting alliances that resulted from the conflict in the wake of the Diplomatic Revolution. There were 17 responses to this question.

For Question 2, candidates had to consider the extent to which financial problems between 1756 and 1789 caused the French Revolution. They were required to weigh the key issue – financial problems – against a range of other factors, and the more successful responses did this accurately and persuasively, offering a consideration of the personal failings of Louis XVI, the impact of the Enlightenment, and the frustrations of the bourgeoisie within the ancien régime. Too often the reign of Louis XV was ignored. There were 7 responses to this question.

In answering Question 3, most candidates offered good period coverage and identified the problems Frederick the Great encountered between 1740 and 1786. These candidates also gauged his responses to such issues as the economy and security of Prussia, the defence of his country, developing state institutions, and international relations. Weaker responses were, however, little more than narrative accounts of his reign. There were 18 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates were asked to judge whether the French Revolutionary wars (1792–1802) had a bigger impact on Great Power relations than any other issue during the period from 1756 to 1815. While some responses erroneously conflated the Napoleonic Wars and the Revolutionary Wars, most candidates covered the period well and included the Seven Years' War.

Analysis of the Napoleonic Wars as a counterpoint to the Revolutionary Wars formed the core of most responses, and many candidates offered plausible and balanced arguments in relation to each. There were 7 responses to this question.

Period Study 7: Revolution and new ideas in Europe c.1780–1881

Most of the candidates who answered Question 1 were familiar with the key congresses that followed the Vienna settlement.

Some of them just offered a narrative account of the congresses and did not extend the coverage to include Greece and the Eastern Question; however, better responses offered material on most of the issues and provided effective analysis of why, ultimately, the attempts at international cooperation between 1815 and 1832 were unsuccessful. There were 18 responses to this question.

For Question 2, the responses seen were mixed. Many candidates provided detailed and narrative accounts of the emancipation of the serfs in 1861 and little else. The question had sought balanced responses that weighed up the way society changed against the continuation of the status quo. The reforms of ‘Tsar Liberator’ needed critical appraisal rather than narrative coverage. There were 16 responses to this question.

Most candidates used Question 3 as an opportunity to roll out their knowledge of the contribution of Cavour, Garibaldi, Mazzini and – occasionally – others to the cause of unification. Those who responded correctly measured their contributions against several other factors, such as the attitude of the Great Powers, before offering a balanced judgment. There were 16 responses to this question.

Finally, the candidates who opted for Question 4 were required to evaluate the importance of the German nationalist movement, between 1815 and 1871, to the creation of a united Germany. Generally, there was good knowledge and understanding of the emergence and importance of the German nationalist movement, with several balanced responses singling out the importance of other contributory factors, primarily the creation of the Zollverein and the role of Bismarck. In some instances, more effective period coverage was needed. There were 15 responses to this question.

Period Study 8: Europe in an age of conflict and cooperation c.1890–1991

Question 1

Most of the responses to Question 1 demonstrated the candidates’ awareness of some international agreements (and some of those in detail). A few candidates wrote generally about agreements, but did not name any, although they recognised the existence of two rival blocs in Europe. The knowledge of agreements and ententes are key to understanding the causes of the First World War and must receive due attention from candidates. Other issues to emerge included imperialism, militarism, and the role of Germany, but evaluation of these was more limited. Evaluation needed to be developed in this respect – either to evaluate whether international agreements caused or eased tensions in Europe, or whether other factors were responsible for causing tensions. Either route was acceptable, but evaluation was key and, in many cases, underdeveloped. There were 143 responses to this question.

For Question 2, candidates were required to debate the extent to which fascist domestic policies changed the lives of the Italian people. Instead, too many candidates merely noted what the changes were, although many of these were able to do so confidently. Overall, there was a tendency to list the changes, but not to discuss the extent to which those changes changed lives. Candidates should have emphasized what the policies were, and how and how far they changed lives. More nuanced responses were expected to have addressed if some groups experienced a greater or lesser degree of change than others, but few candidates took this approach. There were 171 responses to this question.

This was the most popular Section B question in this option, with candidates required to assess how effectively Russian governments dealt with the challenges they faced in the period from 1905 to 1945. Stronger responses showed consideration of the question and noted that the challenges facing Russian governments had to be identified. It was only then that the responses could come to a judgement as to how effectively these challenges were met. Failure to note the challenges often led to descriptive answers as to what the Russian governments did, and a general discussion of success and or failures, which were not linked to any specific challenge. Generally, for this question, there was reasonable period coverage with responses outlining the rule of the Tsar and the regimes of Lenin and Stalin, albeit in a chronological rather than a thematic way. There were 212 responses to this question.

It was possible to discern three approaches to Question 4. Firstly, most candidates approached it as an opportunity to argue that the Cold War was responsible for increased European cooperation but at other times, that it was a cause for increased tension. This response was entirely valid and produced the best answers. The second type of response involved candidates rewriting the question to argue that the Cold War was 'mainly responsible' for increased co-operation in Europe, before bringing in other factors. This approach was also valid to a degree, but the problem was that these other factors were often directly related to the Cold War, for example the Berlin Airlift or the Berlin Wall. Thus, statements such as *The Cold War was not responsible for European Co-operation because it was the Berlin airlift* made little sense. Those that discussed European co-operation via economic ties as opposed to the Cold War, however, did so with some sophistication. The third approach was to ignore 'European co-operation and concentrate on superpower rivalry between the US and the USSR. Invariably these types of responses did not do very well as they were not focussed on the demands of the question. Period coverage was an issue with many not taking the discussion further than the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961. In an outline paper the period coverage is very important, and candidates need to ensure that responses offer material from across the period. There were 96 responses to this question.

Summary of key points

Please cover the period stated in the question. In a period study, coverage of the period is expected.

Please ensure that answers include relevant historical material, but that it is utilized effectively. That is, historical material needs to be used to answer the set question, not to tell a story linked to the set question.

Judgements are important, and while it is perfectly acceptable for candidates to make interim judgements to support a specific point at a specific time, these need to be revisited in an overall judgement that ties up the main threads and offers a succinct answer to the set question.

Please avoid listed responses that trot through a range of factors. If a listed approach is necessary for some candidates to help them structure their ideas, then they should remember that they must then link those ideas to the set question, using them to make a point, argument, or judgement.

Some questions lend themselves to chronological responses, for example change over a period; however, these are very difficult to write effectively, as often they will become narrative and/or descriptive responses. As such, it is usually preferable for candidates to respond to questions thematically, for example identifying why “A” was significant at certain times, and why “B” was significant at others.

Finally, please remind candidates to focus on the command terms – these are chosen carefully to elicit responses from candidates that will help them offer the analysis and evaluation required by the assessment objective in this unit.

HISTORY

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2022

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

UNIT 2 – DEPTH STUDIES, PART 1

General Comments

It was noted in 2019 that greater contextual awareness was emerging in the responses to both Question 1 and Question 2. This trend has continued in 2022.

The most common approach in response to Question 1 is to adopt a source-by-source approach for evaluation. Whilst this can cover some of the ground required it precludes a collective approach which the better answers reveal. The nominated issue in Question 1 is usually developmental, requiring candidates to contextualise the sources with reference to the date range in the question and to assess their value to an historian studying the nominated issue. Examiners found that there was still a significant amount of mechanical and formulaic source evaluation in answers. All too often sources are dismissed as biased and therefore of no use to the historian (when bias can, at times, be a value in understanding a contemporary source). This approach ignores the skill of the historian's craft. Another problem encountered by examiners is the argument that a source is valuable to an historian because of its content which leads, in many cases, to answers which are little more than summaries of the sources. The best answers were able to provide the specific context of the sources and, by discussion, assess the reliability, purpose and tone of the sources commenting on their value to an historian studying the nominated issue in the question. The wider context and the identification of change over time was best seen in those answers which provided a collective analysis.

Question 2 continues to present a challenge to candidates. Examiners found that while many candidates could identify the interpretations provided, many were hindered by a lack of knowledge about the wider historical debate and were unable to address *how* and *why* the debate has changed over time. Only a minority of candidates could contextualise the debate in the question, instead many relied entirely upon the material in the extracts. Comments on authorship were mostly speculative and carried no great weight. Alternative interpretations were often deployed as an afterthought with no discernible link to the discussion of the question set. Unfortunately, many candidates did not even offer an alternative interpretation.

It is perhaps worth emphasising the purpose of Question 2. Each Unit 2 Depth Study has a list of four key issues in the specification which candidates must study. For each of those key issues candidates should study a range of historical interpretations. They should contextualise these interpretations by reference to the knowledge gained in their work on the whole depth study, and they should study how and why the historical debate on the key issue has evolved over time, addressing why historians arrive at different interpretations of the same issue.

For both the source-based and interpretation-based questions, it was apparent that many candidates were processing a mental tick list of things that must be commented on rather than focusing on the details of the sources and their attributions and using them to answer the set questions.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Depth Study 1: The mid-Tudor crisis in Wales and England c.1529–1570 Part 1: Problems, threats and challenges c.1529–1553

For Question 1, candidates were invited to focus on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period in this instance the response to protest and disorder (Pilgrimage of Grace, the Western and Kett Rebellions) in the period 1537–1549. Most candidates opted to deal with each source in turn and there was a fair amount of description. Candidates feel the need to explain what the author of each source is saying rather than analyse and evaluate the content in relation to the question set. Candidates must focus on the question set – *response* – and attempt to deal with the sources collectively rather than individually. Only a minority of candidates opted to put the rebellions at the heart of their answers and thereby gauge the response of the contemporary authors to the cause, act and possible consequences of rebellion. Two of the authors responded in an aggressive and unsympathetic way to the rebellion – Cromwell, representing the Crown and government and determined to uphold law and order, and Sotherton representing the class of wealthy merchants worried that their businesses were being put at risk. Only one, the anonymous Catholic priest, responded with sympathy and understanding, aware that the rebels had been pushed into rebellion by an aggressive Protestant government. Much was discussed in terms of how useful and reliable the sources were, and their strengths and weaknesses, but there is an unmistakable mechanistic element in the way that many of the responses are framed. For example, it is important to note that even an obviously biased source may still be of value to an historian. This is the key to success in this question, candidates must focus on value and discuss this in a meaningful way rather than repeat the phrase with no real intent. Candidates are advised that appropriate context is date specific and cannot consider what has already occurred, or what may develop in the future. There were 136 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, candidates were expected to demonstrate an understanding of how and why aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways by historians. They were invited to analyse the extracts and engage with the debate on the extent of change in Wales and whether those changes were especially significant in the 1530s and 1540s. This question was accessible to most candidates with almost all of them able to recognise the different interpretations in the given extracts: Interpretation 1 argued that Wales experienced little change whereas Interpretation 2 suggested that the changes were indeed significant. Most candidates were able to use the content of the extracts to discuss the given interpretations. A significant number of candidates persist in explaining why one extract was more reliable or valid than the other, rather than focusing on the key issue of how these historians had formed their opinions and why they had arrived at different conclusions. The authorship comments were mechanistic and offered little focus on the wider historical context. That said, a minority of candidates did at least note the geographical limits of each study which, it was suggested, might have affected their interpretation. Unfortunately, many candidates failed to provide an alternative interpretation, and when they did, a significant proportion of them drifted away from the set question. There were 131 responses to this question.

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

For Question 1, candidates were invited to focus on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period, in this instance the impact of the Personal Rule in the period 1637–1641. Most candidates opted to deal with each source in turn and there was a great deal of description. Candidates feel the need to explain what the author of each source is saying rather than analyse and evaluate the content in relation to the question set. Candidates must focus on the question set – *impact* – and attempt to deal with the sources collectively rather than individually. Only a minority of candidates opted to put the Personal Rule at the centre of their answers and thereby gauge the impact as recounted by the contemporary authors. Two of the authors suggested that the Personal Rule had a significant impact – Culpepper, representing Parliament and determined to hold the king to account, and Pym a fellow Parliamentarian representing the radical wing of the Commons. Only one, Burgh a courtier, suggested that the Personal Rule had made little if any impact. Candidates discussed how useful and reliable the sources were and their strengths and weaknesses (some focused on motive) but the mechanistic element in the way that many of the responses are framed is ever present. For example, it is important to note that even an obviously biased source may still be of value to an historian. This is the key to success in this question, candidates must focus on value and discuss this in a meaningful way. Candidates are advised that appropriate context is date specific and cannot consider what has already occurred, or what may develop in the future. There were 106 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, candidates were expected to demonstrate an understanding of how and why aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways by historians. They were invited to analyse the extracts and engage with the debate on why the Civil War broke out and if Charles I should be held responsible. This question was accessible to most candidates with almost all of them able to recognise the different interpretations in the given extracts: Interpretation 1 argued that Charles I was not responsible for the war whereas Interpretation 2 lay the blame on the king. Most candidates were able to use (in some cases overuse) the content of the extracts to discuss the given interpretations. The authorship comments tended to be mechanistic and offered little focus on the wider historical context. Further, many candidates failed to suggest an alternative interpretation, but a significant proportion did make the attempt by suggesting that the King's favourites, Laud and Wentworth, bear greater responsibility for the outbreak of war. A few candidates showed an awareness of the Marxist interpretation that a class war was almost inevitable given the social and economic tension that prevailed at the time. There were 104 responses to this question.

Depth Study 3: Reform and protest in Wales and England c.1783–1848

Part 1: Radicalism and the fight for parliamentary reform

For Question 1, the nominated issue was the campaign for parliamentary reform in the period from 1820 to 1832. Source A, from a radical journalist, presented candidates with a critical view of the unreformed electoral system. The source could be contextualised in the immediate post-war period; its language and tone were highly critical. Source B provided candidates with a source critical of the political unions, which had a profound impact on the revived debate on reform in the crisis years 1829–1832. The adulatory content of Source C revealed its pro-reform perspective. Those who produced a collective judgement reflected on the post-war failure of the campaign, its revival after 1829 and the outcome of the crisis in 1832. There were 114 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, candidates had to discuss the view that the Younger Pitt's policies were effective in meeting the challenge of radicalism in the 1790s. Many candidates were able to contextualise the debate about the Younger Pitt's policies and could identify the differences between Trevelyan's critical interpretation and Hague's more sympathetic approach. The wider debate about the threat posed by radicalism and the success of governments in meeting that challenge was commented upon by a few candidates. There were 104 responses to this question.

Depth Study 4: Politics and society in Wales and England c.1900–1939

Part 1: Politics, society and the War: Wales and England c.1900–1918

For Question 1, most candidates were able to discuss the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value. Candidates who gained the highest marks were able to do so by focussing on their value to an historian studying the impact of war, rather than making general comments about value. Higher marks were awarded to those candidates who considered each source in the context of its origin and in the context of the question set. These types of answers focused on what was influencing the author to say what he/she said at that time. Too many candidates continue to make superficial comments about reliability, for example "the source has no value because it is biased" without realising that a historian would know this, and that it is often a reason for its value to an historian. Mechanistic source evaluation continues to be an issue, as do comments that debate the limitations of the source material due to the omission of specific information. Both these approaches indicate little appreciation of the value of the sources in context, which is the key issue to address in this question. Source A conveyed the poor state of health of people in 1901, which directly affected the performance of the British army during the Boer War. More attention was directed to the issue of poverty and the debate about national efficiency, which ultimately led to calls for social reform. The impact of war, therefore, in this case was to increase the demand for social reform and government intervention. Source B is a clear indication of government intervention as the 'additional sacrifice' mentioned by the King in his letter is the introduction of conscription. Source C is a further indication of state involvement in the affairs of the people as the role of women is being appreciated: by 1918 women had been granted the right to vote, albeit only when they reached a certain age. The impact of war therefore can be seen between 1901 and 1918 as the state takes more and more steps to direct and intervene in the lives of the people of Wales and England. There were 19 responses to this question.

For the interpretation question, candidates needed to show they were aware of the diverse ways in which the issue in the question have been interpreted, and the main developments in the wider historical debate about the Liberal social reforms. Interpretation involves the candidates reflecting upon how and why historians have interpreted this issue differently over the passing of time, mindful that interpretations are open to reflection and change. This is very important if candidates are to access the higher mark bands, but it was only done successfully by some candidates. Most of the candidates were able to correctly identify what the two interpretations were trying to say. Interpretation 1 implied that the Liberal social reforms were limited in their scope and impact, whereas Interpretation 2 claimed they were extensive and laid the foundations for the modern welfare state. The question of how the interpretations differed was addressed confidently by most candidates. Differentiation usually occurred when candidates addressed the issue of why these interpretations differ. Mechanical responses discussed the provenance of the sources, discussing the type of publication, possible audience and the biased nature of the authorship. Answers that were more successful attempted to explain why Hopkins held this view in 1979 and why Laybourn's view in 1999 was so different. Only some were able to do this successfully with reference to issues such as the changing political and social landscape which may have informed the opinions of historians in the interpretations and those of earlier historians of the Liberal government.

As this is a designated area for study it is expected that candidates are aware of the contribution of other historians and schools of thought to this debate. Only by addressing the changing nature of interpretations over time can candidates access the higher mark bands in Unit 2. There were 18 responses to this question.

Depth Study 5: Religious reformation in Europe c.1500–1564

Part 1: The outbreak and spread of the Reformation in Germany c.1500–1531

For Question 1, candidates dealt in general terms with the views in the sources and did the same in their analysis of the sources' strengths and weaknesses. Few picked up on the elements of specific context that would have given more meaning to their evaluation. These elements included the Zwickau prophets (Source A), the origins of the Peasant's War (Source B) and the Protest of Speyer (Source C). Few candidates addressed these collectively and saw them as a collection of different responses to the Reformation, and fewer still addressed the attribution so f the sources, which is an important aspect of this task. There were 30 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, candidates were largely able to contextualise the interpretations, but a lot of analysis was mechanistic and did not make good use of the attributions. Many responses did not consider what the political, religious or social interpretations of the outbreak of the Reformation might be, although there were some sound attempts to link the interpretations given to the wider historical debate, especially linking Interpretation 2 to revisionist views of the Reformation. There were 30 responses to this question.

Depth Study 6: France in revolution c.1774–1815

Part 1: France: causes and course of revolution c.1774–1792

For Question 1, candidates were asked to use the three sources provided and assess their value to an historian studying the development of political change in France between 1786 and 1791. The three sources comprised a confidential memorandum from Calonne to Louis XVI on the relative merits of an Assembly of Notables as opposed to calling an Estates General; a contemporary print showing the destruction of the Bastille in the aftermath of its storming; and a private letter from a constitutional priest to his brother, a prominent Jacobin relating the events of the Champ de Mars massacre. The overall theme to be drawn from them collectively was the way in which events were unfolding, and the escalating extremism and violence. There was a clear and perceptible move to the left and the extent to which the hapless Louis was responsible for this: his mishandling of the situation was a factor that drew many well-observed comments from the more nuanced responses. Louis was losing the ability to shape and control events and was instead being swept along by them. It is essential that the sources are set in both their general and wider context, and more candidates need to demonstrate their ability to do this. There were 105 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, candidates were asked to consider the views of two historians and consider the validity of the suggestion that the flight to Varennes was the turning point in the development of internal political conflicts in France. The first interpretation supported this view and outlined the tensions in the National Assembly, which led to calls for Louis to be deposed and a republic created. This view was from a leading Marxist historian, and there were many well-made observations about how his political beliefs might help shape his interpretation. In the second interpretation, McManners suggests a counter view: that it was the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy that was responsible for opening the deep fissures which tore France apart and set it on the road to a brutal civil war.

As an historian of religion his view gives a different perspective. Most candidates were able to offer another possible interpretation and these varied from the rise of the *sans-culottes* to the character and personality of Louis XVI. The form of this question remains challenging, and students need to be aware of the need to introduce relevant contextual background to support their answers in a meaningful way. There were 105 responses to this question.

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

In both questions, many candidates tried to use the sources or interpretations to reach a judgement about the question with varying degrees of success, but there were several candidates who just dealt with each source or extract in isolation without relating their points to the question. Several responses did not make clear specific reference to the details of the attributions to evaluate the issues.

For Question 1, candidates focused on the pro- and anti-slavery views expressed in the sources, and to an extent were able to explain why these people had these views. However, fewer responses were able to place these different views in their specific contexts, particularly Sources B and C in relation to the 1850 Compromise. While references to the earlier compromise from the 1820s and the growth of abolitionism in the 1830s were valid general context, candidates tried to also make events like Bleeding Kansas and the Dredd Scott case part of the context of sources from the 1840s and 1850s, but this was a less valid approach. Once again, candidates should attempt to handle these sources collectively as well as individually to ensure they provide a cohesive analysis of the emerging picture across the period specified. There were 73 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, most candidates related both interpretations to relevant events such as the 1850 Compromise, the inflaming of difference by decisions such as the Fugitive Slave Act and the Dredd Scott case, as well as the circumstances of the 1860 election. Where responses were weaker was in using the attributions of the interpretations to explain why these historians had these views, and why possible alternatives to those views may have developed, for example the view that it was economic issues that drove a wedge between the northern and southern states. There were 172 responses to this question.

Depth Study 8: Germany: Democracy and Dictatorship c.1918–1945

Part 1: Weimar and its challenges c.1918–1933

For Question 1, the nominated issue was political developments in the Weimar Republic between 1920 and 1932. Source A was a proclamation by Wolfgang Kapp and most candidates were able to highlight the strengths and limitations of a source from a right-wing political activist, although comments on his language and tone were not so prominent. It was pleasing to see that the specific context of the Kapp Putsch was correctly identified in many answers and the wider context of the years 1918–1920 was generally well known. Identification of the specific context was less assured with Sources B and C although the wider context of the Wall St. Crash in Source B and the political developments before July 1932 in Source C were better explained. Although candidates commented readily on the strengths and limitations of sources it was noted that there were still far too many mechanistic and formulaic answers on the provenance of sources. Collective judgements about the line of development in the question were rare. There was confusion in many answers about the exact chronology of events in Germany in 1932–1933: when discussing Source C, a significant minority asserted that Hitler was made Chancellor in July 1932. There were 1,504 responses to this question.

For the interpretation task in Question 2, candidates had to discuss the view that the foreign policy of the Weimar Republic was successful in the period from 1924 to 1929. Whilst the difference between the two interpretations was identified by most and discussed by many, examiners noted that few candidates were able to satisfactorily explain how and why historical interpretations were formed. The wider debate on the issue was hardly touched upon in most of the answers. On a more positive note, it was pleasing to see many candidates contextualise their answers using knowledge gained from their work on the Depth Study. However, too often alternative interpretations were not focused upon foreign policy, and the trend towards producing the synthetic answers that were noted in 2019 was again noticeable in a few responses. Many candidates did not offer any alternative interpretations and were content to discuss only the given extracts. There were 1,485 responses to this question.

Summary of key points

Examiners hope that the trend of improved contextual awareness in both questions in Unit 2 is continued.

Please note that candidates are strongly encouraged to make collective judgements about the value of sources to an historian in Question 1. For example: *Sources A and B suggest that... While this is challenged by Source C in which it is implied that..., there are elements of similarity between Source C and Source A, in which it emerges that ... Across all three sources, it is apparent to see the shift in...*

Comments about reliability, purpose and tone must be related to the context of the sources and their value to an historian. Mechanistic and formulaic comments cannot be rewarded highly.

Bias and limitations do not make sources less valuable to historians if they are considered, especially with support from other sources.

Answers to Question 2 should always refer to the wider historical debate about the key issues listed in the specification. They must show **how** and **why** interpretations are formed and that they are subject to change (i.e., please consider what factors influence the formation of judgements, and what developments may have subsequently encouraged the emergence of differing views).

Alternative interpretations must be clearly identified and linked to the debate in the question set. These could be the views of historians, the views of schools of history, or views that would be developed from a different perspective, for example a political view to counter the provided interpretations' social and religious views.

HISTORY
General Certificate of Education
Summer 2022
Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced
UNIT 3 – BREADTH STUDIES

General Comments

For the 2022 summer examination session, Unit 3 papers [the Breadth studies] were adapted across all optional units with the removal of Section A. This was replaced with a range of questions ordinarily reserved for Section B. The removal of the narrow-timeframe questions reduced the depth of knowledge that is usually required for Section A, allowing learners to focus on the broader, “similarities and differences across the period” questions of Section B. Having a choice of two questions for each theme reduced pressure on learners in the examination as it enabled them to focus on areas for which they have a more comfortable grasp of the scope or limitations of change across the set period. In order to enable centres to prepare for the examinations, they were notified of the adaptation last autumn. This summer we received some very positive feedback from centres in relation to the adaptation – thank you to those teachers who took the time to write to us with this positive response. However, please be aware that the regulator has not requested WJEC to adapt next summer’s examinations, and so we regret to inform you that we cannot repeat this adaptation next year.

In terms of the work that was seen this summer, many candidates had a solid grasp of the sweep of the period and were able to deploy historical information from the breadth of the timeframe; however, sometimes this material was not focused on the requirements of the question as persuasively as it might have been. For example, in several responses the work was generic, with the answer being broadly applicable to any question that may have been set on the timeframe. This sometimes led to lists of events with only the most tangential links to the question being offered. These were also, often, chronological lists that did not identify the factors that encouraged or prevented change. There was also some evidence of candidates being unable to effectively answer “evaluate” questions, either by not considering both positive and negative implications of the issue set, or not considering that issue against other factors.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Breadth Study 1: Wales: resistance, conquest and rebellion c.1240–1415

There were few responses to this option and so the feedback is necessarily limited.

In Question 1, candidates were invited to consider changes in the culture and economy of Wales in the period from 1240 to 1370. They were required to debate the extent to which those changes were because of the Edwardian Conquest. There were some valid attempts to debate the key issue, but knowledge tended to trump analysis and evaluation. No matter how impressive the knowledge it needs to be deployed in a way that supports an argument/debate. There were 5 responses to this question.

Those candidates who responded to Question 2 were required to consider the changes in Welsh and Marcher law and to debate the significance those changes had on the culture, society and economy of Wales in the period 1282–1415. Here again, there was some impressive knowledge on display especially regarding Welsh and Marcher law, but the evaluation and judgements could have been stronger. There were 3 responses to this question.

Question 3 provided few responses, and these showed an attempt to analyse and evaluate the question. There needed to have been a better understanding of the term ‘colonial settlement’, as responses were more focused on the governance of Wales, offering a somewhat narrative account with less evaluation than we would have liked to have seen. There were 2 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates were required to analyse, evaluate and debate the significance of the changes in the governance of Wales in the period from 1284 to 1415. Candidates tended to list the changes in governance and in so doing were constrained into offering narrative/descriptive answers. Candidates who attempted to evaluate the changes did so by offering mini judgements along the way. There were 7 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 2: Poverty, protest and rebellion in Wales and England c.1485–1603

In Question 1, candidates were invited to debate the significance of local initiatives in the treatment and relief of poverty in the period from 1500 to 1603. Most candidates displayed an impressive depth of knowledge but only those who used this to provide a meaningful debate were rewarded with the highest bands. Listing and narrative-style responses were evident but there were genuine attempts to analyse and evaluate the impact municipal schemes, philanthropic groups and charitable foundations had on the treatment of the poor. It was pleasing to witness several candidates attempting to trace the changes in attitude to the poor as they progressed (or otherwise) over time. Almost inevitably, government legislation formed the core of the counterargument, but it was disappointing to witness a lack of appreciation or understanding of the changing role of the Church. There were 58 responses to this question.

Candidates who answered Question 2 understood and were fully prepared to focus on the key term ‘criminalisation’ of vagrancy. In fact, the key issue generated a great deal of opinion regarding the differing attitude to and treatment of the mobile, able-bodied poor (vagrants) when compared to the deserving or impotent poor. Although much was made of parliamentary legislation, which led some candidates into listing and description, many more did attempt to track and evaluate the changes in the treatment of the poor and vagrant over the whole timeframe. A significant number of candidates embraced the demands of this question to provide a debate that weighed the criminalisation of vagrants against other developments in the treatment of the poor in the period 1495–1601. Once again, candidates’ knowledge of this theme, overall, was impressive. There were 40 responses to this question.

In Theme 2, candidates were required to choose one of the two available questions. Those who answered Question 3 were required to identify and debate the causes of protest and rebellion in the period from 1485 to 1603. Candidates were not expected to list and discuss every protest and rebellion as this would have promoted a listing, narrative-style response. Suffice to say, some candidates did attempt to do this, but it was an almost impossible task given the period to be covered and the time allotted to answer this question. This question demanded a thematically driven, structured response that explored the causes of protest and rebellions during this timeframe.

Candidates were invited to weigh the role of Tudor monarch in fomenting rebellion against other possible causes, such as the political causes, which includes dynastic and factional issues, as well as religious, social, cultural and economic fields. In this way, candidates could use individual protests and rebellions to illustrate and support their argument/debates. There were 62 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates were invited to consider the nature and seriousness of the threats facing the Tudor monarchy in the period between 1485 and 1603. Unfortunately, this led some candidates to list and discuss the threats in turn, a mammoth task given the timeframe and the time allocated for completing this question. The majority realised that this was not simply a threat-listing, or in some cases, a cause-listing exercise, it required a more robust approach to the material evidence. The simplest approach was to classify the threat as internal (such as plots and rebellions) or external (foreign intervention and invasion). The better responses realised that the threat posed by Mary, Queen of Scots straddled both internal and external threats. Most candidates tended to respond reign-by-reign which resulted in some repetitive answers. There were 35 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 3: Reformation and discovery: Europe c.1492–1610

There were few responses to this option and so the feedback is necessarily limited.

In Question 1, candidates tended to focus mostly on the impact of Lutheranism on Germany, with the impact of Calvinism, especially in France, dealt with to a much lesser extent. There were very few mentions of the Catholic and Counter Reformations, although a few responses outlined the 1609 founding of the Protestant Dutch state to cover the period. At the opposite end of the scale there were some responses that devoted considerable space to discussing Jan Huss, even though he died nearly a century before the beginning of the period covered by the question. Very few responses had material beyond the Peace of Augsburg in 1555. There were 5 responses to this question.

Those candidates who responded to Question 2 covered a lot of religious changes in Europe but spent less time considering wider social or political changes as was the focus of the question. Many responses were centred around Germany, and Switzerland, notably Geneva, but did not consider changes in other countries such as France, Spain or the Netherlands. There were 3 responses to this question.

Again, in Theme 2, candidates were required to choose one of the two available questions. Those who answered Question 3 limited their responses to mostly talking about Spain, or about the financial reasons for exploration, largely ignoring religious reasons. They also mostly focused on the earlier part of the period, rather than considering the motives for English, French and Dutch interests in the Atlantic and North America. There were 3 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates appear to have misread the question and wrote extensively about the impact of exploration and discovery on indigenous peoples rather than on Europe itself as in the question. There were 5 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 4: Royalty, revolution and restoration in Wales and England c.1603–1715

There were few responses to this option and so the feedback is necessarily limited.

In Question 1, candidates were invited to analyse the reasons or causes of political instability in the period from 1603 to 1715 and to evaluate the role played by changing attitudes to royal power. To cover the period, most candidates opted to discuss the issues reign by reign though a few did attempt to focus on political instability at certain times throughout the period which avoided repetition. These candidates tended to identify and track the changes in attitudes to monarchy particularly from a Parliamentary perspective and frame their debate around key events such as the Civil War, Regicide, abolition, restoration, deposition, invitation and Bill of Rights. There were 13 responses to this question.

Responses to Question 2, on the extent to which the governance of Wales and England changed in the period from 1603 to 1715, tended to offer a narrative approach with a few relevant comments. However, it would have been more beneficial to the candidates if there had been deeper analysis and evaluation, and more emphasis on reaching a summative judgement. There were 2 responses to this question.

Those candidates who answered Question 3 were invited to compare the impact religious change and the scientific revolution had on changing attitudes and ideas in the period 1603–1715. Again, many candidates adopted a chronological approach to answering this question; however, this question does not lend itself to a reign-by-reign approach. The key is framing the debate around significant events and/or developments in religion (such as Laudianism, Puritanism and nonconformism) and science (Harvey, Hobbes, Locke, Newton and the Royal Society). Such an approach would have been more than sufficient to satisfy the requirement for reasonable period coverage, as well as helping to avoid repetition and description. There were 8 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates were encouraged to analyse and debate the extent to which attitudes to radicalism and dissent changed in the period from 1603 to 1715. This tended to elicit narrative-style answers with candidates determined to display their knowledge of radicalism and dissent without necessarily evaluating the nature and scale of changing attitudes over time. Some candidates offered a before, during, and after the Civil War approach to frame their responses. This served to cover a substantial part of the period and to track changes in attitude over time. Most candidates agreed that the high point of radicalism and dissent was during the Civil War and Interregnum (c.1642–1660). There were 7 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 5: France: Ancien Régime to Napoleon c.1715–1815

In Question 1, candidates were asked to discuss whether the rise of the bourgeoisie was the most significant development in the society and economy of France in the period from 1715 to 1815. Lack of period coverage was an issue for some candidates. Some of the discussion regarding the rise of the bourgeoisie was a little patchy, and their role in commerce was not fully developed or explained. Responses were more assured when considering alternatives to the key issue, for example the reduction in the position of the Catholic Church because of the revolution, or the destruction of feudalism. There were 30 responses to this question.

Those candidates who responded to Question 2 were asked to consider whether the economic changes made during the revolution (1789–1799) were the most significant of the period from 1715 to 1815. Many answers were imbalanced in that they focused overwhelmingly on the many economic changes brought about by the revolution, to the exclusion of those that occurred during the ancien régime, for example the rise of the bourgeoisie and the emergence of capitalism and the mercantilist economy. More candidates needed to offer a balanced discussion. There were 23 responses to this question.

Those who answered Question 3 were asked to discuss whether the most significant changes to politics and government of France during the period from 1715 to 1815 were introduced by Napoleon. It would be difficult to challenge the alternative that the revolutionary period from 1789 to 1799, with its four constitutions and different systems (constitutional monarchy and democratic republicanism) more significant changes, yet more adept responses pointed out the significance of Napoleon's changes and a seeming return to the quasi autocracy of the ancien régime shrouded in the thin veneer of democracy. Once again, a challenge for all students was to ensure period coverage. There were 36 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates were asked to consider to what extent was there continuity in the politics and government of France between 1715 and 1815. It would be relatively easy to suggest that the ancien régime gave way to the turbulence and seismic upheavals of the revolutionary period before giving way to Napoleon, who reintroduced a hereditary monarchy and vestiges of the ancien régime that the revolution had swept away. Yet the Napoleonic era was different from the ancien régime, and the most effective responses perceived that the continuity was less real than apparent. There were 15 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 6: Parliamentary reform and protest in Wales and England c1790–1885

Candidates who responded to Question 1 had to evaluate the importance of the French Revolution in the demand for parliamentary reform in the period from 1780 to 1885. Adequate coverage of the breadth study period is an important consideration for examiners, and it was noted that candidates were far more confident in handling the earlier period, 1780–1848. It was a reasonable point of view that the greatest impact was seen in the earlier period, but this did not preclude analysis of other significant influences upon reform and better responses focused on social and economic changes and the political agendas and ambitions of the political parties. There were 19 responses to this question.

Those candidates who responded to Question 2 were asked to assess the significance of the 1832 Reform Act in the overall development of parliamentary reform. Whilst the debate about, and the changes brought in by, the 1832 Reform Act were well known, many answers simply covered other pieces of legislation in 1867 and 1884–1885 without assessing other developments and their significance. There were 70 responses to this question.

Again, in Theme 2, candidates were required to choose one of the two available questions. Those who answered Question 3 had to assess the significance of the threat posed to government by popular protest in the period from 1780 to 1885. Many answers simply assumed that the threat to government was seen off in the period of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars as repressive measures worked. While a broad argument to that effect can be made, the crises of 1797–1798, 1800–1801 and 1811–1812 were highly dangerous and required massive security operations. A similar exercise was conducted by the government in the capital in 1848 in response to the Chartist demonstration. These examples are important areas for debate on the significance of the threat to governments in the period. The impact of improved economic conditions needed more attention in the period after 1848. There were 37 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates had to debate the issue of whether popular protests achieved their aims during the period from 1780 to 1885. The consensus was that they did not, with radicalism effectively repressed in the earlier period. The exception most often referred to was the success of the Anti-Corn Law League in achieving its aim.

However, answers that argued persuasively that governments did, in fact, respond to popular protest by adopting extensive social and economic reforms so that this was a measure of indirect success were rewarded. Similarly modest measures of success achieved by the Rebecca Riots and the early trade union movement were brought into the argument in the more convincing responses. There were 51 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 7: Social change and reform in Wales and England c.1890–1990

Most candidates who responded to Question 1 had good knowledge on the Liberal reforms and were able to discuss issues such as free school meals, medical inspections, Labour Exchanges and National Insurance reforms, and many of these were able to see this as a move away from the *laissez-faire* attitude of the past, toward a more interventionist approach. Where candidates struggled was focusing on the effect these reforms had on the alleviation of poverty and there was a tendency to list the Liberal reforms prior to a statement that the alleviation of poverty was secured, often without any analysis to back up the claim. Another area of difficulty for some was the issue of ‘most significant advances’ – many candidates resorted to a list of advances that occurred between 1890 and 1990 with little evaluation of the significance of the Liberal reforms in the context of the broader period. Finally, candidates are encouraged to cover the timeframe of the question, as many of them stopped at 1951 or did not mention periods of significance such as 1890–1906, 1919–1939 and/or 1951–1979. There were 138 responses to this question.

For Question 2, the tendency of candidates to avoid the post-war period was once again evident. While candidates seemed to know quite a bit about the achievements of the Labour governments between 1945 and 1951 and some things about the Thatcher governments, only some could provide further knowledge about the period from 1951 to 1979. Overall, performance was reasonable here with some good answers emerging, but a minority did not fully answer the question because they did spend time discussing issues indirectly related to the lives of the poor and unemployed for example the emancipation of women or the development of popular culture. More focus is therefore needed on the demands of the question, especially the proposition that little was done to improve the lives of the poor and the unemployed. When candidates did focus on the key words, they were able to structure well-informed essays and produce convincing responses often arguing that in some areas little was done while significant improvements were seen in other areas. It was, in these types of responses, clear that some candidates could see the wider picture and appreciate that the situation was far from one dimensional and that there were grey areas throughout the period. There were 54 responses to this question.

Question 3 required candidates to discuss the importance of developments in education to changes in society, and they approached the question in largely in two different ways: some weighing up the developments in education over the period, others comparing the importance of education when compared to other important developments. Both routes were valid but to fully answer the question set there needed to be clear evaluation based on their importance to changes in society over the 100-year period. Most were able to provide some evidence about developments in education, but some could only mention the Butler Act, 1944 without referencing earlier developments in education dating back to the Welsh Intermediate Education Act, 1889, and other acts which are specifically mentioned in the specification. Again, being an outline paper, depth is not really what we are looking for but more of a recognition that important developments occurred between 1890 and 1990 and that these led to change in society. Generalised discussions were often seen with issues such as popular culture and the changing role and status of women being at the forefront of these approaches.

However, there was some good knowledge shown about the developments in basic rights during the 1960s and 1970s that led to a fairer society, and which had an impact on immigration. In contrast to other questions, there was more focus on post-1944 issues than pre-Second World War issues, still, coverage of the whole period is important in order to access the marks in the higher bands. There were 75 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, the focus of the question was on whether the Beveridge Report led to the most significant changes in society between 1890 and 1990. Most, if not all, of the candidates that attempted this question were able to discuss the Beveridge Report in relation to other events that led to significant change in society. Good knowledge was shown about the Report and the subsequent reforms introduced by the Labour governments between 1945 and 1951 in response to the report. Most candidates were able to produce a response that discussed other significant changes, but as with Question 3 the matters dealt with were often anecdotal and generalised, for example popular culture or the role and status of women. Firmer answers based their responses on a discussion about health and housing, education, immigration and race relations, providing detailed responses and covering most if not all the period of study. Where several responses were found wanting was on their treatment of whether the Beveridge Report led to the most significant changes in society. Many candidates were discussing significant change rather than producing a comparative essay discussing the relative merits of the Beveridge Report against other developments. There were 113 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 8: The American century c.1890–1990

In Question 1, candidates addressed the importance of the Second World War, although often as part of a chronological approach rather than just focusing on it as the first of several factors that led to civil rights advances. There were also several extended introductions which covered the events of the Civil War, Reconstruction and the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments, even though the period in the question began in 1890. As was seen across this paper, and across several other options, several responses to this question were so vague it was difficult to distinguish which question their author had attempted, save for the number included at its start. Candidates must ensure that they are dealing effectively with the set question if they wish to access the upper mark bands. There were 1,154 responses to this question.

Those candidates who responded to Question 2 either evaluated the impact of the Supreme Court across the period or compared the impact of the Supreme Court to other influences on civil rights. The effectiveness of the approach taken depended on the candidate's focus on addressing the issue in the question set. There were several references to black American culture, even though this was not made explicitly relevant to the question. Several candidates also seemed to be unclear about what the Supreme Court does, often attributing congressional and presidential decisions to it. As emerged elsewhere in the answers to this paper, there were many uses of unrecognized abbreviations, such as AA for African Americans and SC for the Supreme Court. This is not appropriate in extended responses for which communication is a key aspect of the assessment. There were 474 responses to this question.

Those who answered Question 3 tended to take a chronological approach with varying degrees of success. The more sophisticated responses showed that there was a range of issues that could be labelled isolationist, so that actions in Latin America could still be considered isolationist as they did not breach the Monroe Doctrine. In many cases the chronological approach held candidates back for the higher bands as they tended to attribute one influence on each sub-period they had identified, rather than considering how several influences could be around at a particular time. There were 1,325 responses to this question.

Finally, many candidates took a chronological approach to answering Question 4 as well, even though Reagan and Bush are at the end of the period. It was pleasing to see that many candidates who answered this question did know what contributions Reagan and George HW Bush had made to US foreign policy. However, there were also a few responses that got Nixon, Carter and Reagan confused. This was also the case with Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt. There were 279 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 9: Changing leadership and society in Germany c.1871–1989

There were few responses to this option and so the feedback is necessarily limited.

For Question 1, candidates had good knowledge on Bismarck's policies, but were unable to provide a comparative answer in respect of the question set. There was a tendency to list some things that happened or were done under a limited number of leaders, and as a result, narrative responses were the norm with candidates not engaging with the idea of efficacy. Unit 3 is an outline paper and as such, focus must be given to the entire timeframe of the question. This was an issue for many candidates who did not have sufficient knowledge about leaderships and regimes beyond Stalin's regime. Candidates must endeavour to cover the beginning, middle and end of the period stated in the question. There were 4 responses to this question.

There was a tendency among some of the candidates who answered Question 2 to not fully comprehend the requirements of the question, as there was little focus on domestic political challenges. Without identifying what the domestic political challenges were, responses were unable to discuss in any detail how or if they were responsible for shaping leaderships and regimes. Consequently, responses mostly focused on issues confronting some leaders in general, providing a narrative description of what those issues were. Further, there needs to be a greater emphasis on the post-1945 period, as coverage of the timeframe is important in synoptic questions. There were 4 responses to this question.

In Question 3, knowledge about the First World War was generally good, as was knowledge about life during the Nazi dictatorship. However, candidates did not engage enough with the key words in the question – if the First World War had the most significant impact on the lives of the German people. There were some general narratives about things that happened during the First World War and during the Nazi regime but little focus on how these events affected the lives of the German people, and this was key to providing an evaluative response. Period coverage was also an issue and once again the post-1945 period rarely made much of an appearance on the answers seen. There were 3 responses to this question.

Finally, Question 4 was the most successful in terms of the quality of responses seen in this paper. There was a clear focus on whether certain social and economic changes benefitted the lives of the German people, and most candidates could discuss events at the start, middle and end of the period, thus offering better coverage of the period. The responses discussed various events and provided a series of mini judgements as to whether people in Germany benefitted from them or not. However, these tended to be of the *yes they did/no they did not* persuasion and would have benefitted from a deeper discussion of how changes could have affected different people in different ways. This is especially true of the post-war period, where the division of Germany led to different social and economic changes being experienced, which could have provided a basis for further evaluations. There were 3 responses to this question.

Breadth Study 10: Changing leadership and society in Russia c.1881–1989

In Question 1, candidates were asked to evaluate the methods used by Russian leaders in dealing with the political problems that confronted them during the period from 1881 to 1989. Most candidates were able to provide period coverage by adopting a chronological approach that ensured content on every ruler from Alexander III to Gorbachev. Often this led to a stylised approach which lacked sufficient analysis and simply focussed on outcomes. More effective responses rejected the chronological approach and adopted one based on themes such as the use of propaganda, terror, reforms, and incentives. There were 55 responses to this question.

Those candidates who responded to Question 2 had to discuss whether Gorbachev's rule was the period of greatest political change in Russia during the period from 1881 to 1989. While arguing – with some persuasion – that the collapse of the Soviet Union occurred on his watch, there was a much more plausible case that it was the Revolution of 1917 that brought about the greatest political change in this period, for reasons which most candidates were very familiar with. While weaker answers followed a chronological approach the better ones adopted an overview of the period. There were 36 responses to this question.

Candidates who answered Question 3 had to discuss whether the most significant period of economic growth and social change in Russia during the period 1881 to 1989 occurred during the rule of the Tsars. When considering this it was noticeable that several candidates erroneously chose to irrelevantly include the contribution of Alexander II, which clearly predated the period under consideration. Good coverage of the Tsarist period was noted, as were the vast changes brought about in the Soviet era, particularly with the five-year plans. The most effective responses offered good coverage of themes such as the status of women and religion. There were 29 responses to this question.

Finally, for Question 4, candidates were asked to consider whether the lives of Russian people changed more significantly under Stalin than at any other time during the timeframe of the option. The terror and the vast changes to industry and agriculture during the Stalinist era was a plausible case for having the most significant impact on people's lives but good alternatives were to be found in the wartime era of 1914 to 1917, which culminated in the Revolution, which led to far-reaching and systemic social and economic change. Towards the end of the era the policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika* unleashed forces that proved to be ultimately terminal for the Soviet system. Even under the Tsars, reforms were brought in that altered people's lives. Maintaining balance and coverage while addressing the question was the great challenge. There were 51 responses to this question.

Summary of key points

These notes specifically apply to Section-B questions, which made up the content of the 2022 Unit 3 examination papers.

Please remember that the Section B questions require period coverage. This does not mean that every year, nor even every decade, must be covered; however, candidates should be able to offer examples of historical material from the breadth of the timeframe in the question: that is, periods close to the beginning, several periods across the duration, and periods close to the end of the set questions.

Assessment Objective 1 questions will always require discussion of a specified theme or issue, and candidates must ensure that they address this considering the command term used to challenge them. Providing information of the period that is only tangentially linked to the question cannot score well. Candidates must try and focus on answering the specific question set.

Chronological approaches are less effective as they tend not to be focused on evaluating the issues in the question, instead candidates are encouraged – strongly – to adopt a more thematic approach. For example, how did the issue in the question evolve, and how did it compare to the evolution of other issues? Were there periods of change? Were there periods of stagnation? These kinds of responses can only be facilitated by a cogent understanding of the history, and by the selective and effective deployment of historical material to support and challenge the contentions being made.

Where there is a question that specifically requires evaluation, candidates should aim to offer at least two interpretations: why was something good/important/successful? Why was something bad/unimportant/unsuccessful? Was there something better/more important/more successful? Was there something worse/less important/less successful? Why?

HISTORY

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2022

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

UNIT 4 – PERIOD STUDIES, PART 2

General Comments

It was noted in 2019 that greater contextual awareness was emerging in the responses to both Question 1 and Question 2. This trend has continued in 2022.

The most common approach in response to Question 1 is to adopt a source-by-source approach for evaluation. Whilst this can cover some of the ground required it precludes a collective approach which the better answers reveal. The nominated issue in Question 1 is usually developmental, requiring candidates to contextualise the sources with reference to the date range in the question and to assess their value to an historian studying the nominated issue. Examiners found that there was still a significant amount of mechanical and formulaic source evaluation in answers. All too often sources are dismissed as biased and therefore of no use to the historian (when bias can, at times, be a value in understanding a contemporary source). This approach ignores the skill of the historian's craft. Another problem encountered by examiners is the argument that a source is valuable to an historian because of its content which leads, in many cases, to answers which are little more than summaries of the sources. The best answers were able to provide the specific context of the sources and, by discussion, assess the reliability, purpose and tone of the sources commenting on their value to an historian studying the nominated issue in the question. The wider context and the identification of change over time was best seen in those answers which provided a collective analysis.

For the essay questions, Questions 2 and 3, the same trends emerged as for the other AO1 questions seen this summer. Some of the responses were excellent and reflected the candidates' excellent knowledge of the history and their ability to deploy this material to effectively debate and discuss the set question before arriving at a confident, coherent and substantiated judgement. These responses were a pleasure to mark and reflected the abilities of the candidates and the skills of their teachers in drawing out these abilities. However, there were also responses that were vague, offered little more than narrative, and belied their authors' limited understanding of the period. They were left clinging to a pre-learned framework that did not suit the question.

Most responses were somewhere between these two points; they indicated that while teachers are telling the candidates what they should be doing, a few more candidates need to pay heed to that message.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Depth Study 1: The mid-Tudor crisis in Wales and England c.1529–1570 Part 2: Challenges facing Mary and Elizabeth c.1553–1570

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, candidates were invited to focus on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period, in this instance the problems facing Mary and Elizabeth in the period 1556–

1567. Candidates must refrain from describing the content of the source and focus on analysing and evaluating the content in relation to the question set. Candidates must focus on the question set – *problems* – and attempt to deal with the sources collectively rather than individually. Some candidates did attempt to put the problems facing the monarchs at the heart of their answers and thereby gauge the response of the contemporary authors to the nature, extent and seriousness of those problems. The sources highlighted religious and social and economic problems confronting the monarchs. Many candidates simply go through each source in turn, which makes for a mechanistic element in the way that many of the responses are framed. Candidates must focus on value and discuss this in a meaningful way rather than repeat the phrase with no real intent. Candidates are advised that appropriate context is date specific and cannot consider what has already occurred, or what may develop in the future. There were 81 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 were required to assess the extent to which Mary I was herself responsible for the many challenges she faced as queen. Most candidates were able to respond positively to this question, especially in terms of identifying (and then unfortunately, listing) the challenges faced by Mary, but only those who understood the significance of the key word *responsible* were able to frame an effective debate. Many did not fully embrace the word, unaware of the fact that this question required them to assess how far Mary was personally responsible for the challenges (and misfortunes) she was confronted with. There were 72 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 were invited to consider developments in the society and economy of Wales and to gauge the extent to which the rise of the gentry was the dominant feature. Almost inevitably, some candidates simply listed the developments with some discussion on how important or effective they were. Others simply described rather than discussed. Only those who evaluated and debated the extent to which the rise of the gentry was the main development were rewarded for highly for their efforts. There were 8 responses to this question.

Depth Study 2: Royalty, rebellion and republic c.1625–1660

Part 2: Civil War, Commonwealth and Protectorate c.1642–1660

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, candidates were invited to focus on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period, in this instance the changes in government in the period from 1648 to 1652. The source-by-source approach to this question, consisting of a mixture of description, discussion, and sometimes, evaluation, was very much in evidence. Candidates must refrain from describing the content of the source and focus on analysing and evaluating the content in relation to the question set. Candidates must focus on the question set – *changes* – and attempt to deal with the sources collectively rather than individually. Some candidates did attempt to focus on the issue of change and how it related to or affected government during this timeframe. The sources highlighted changes such as the transition from monarchy to anarchy (royalist view) or a form of proto democracy (Republican view), adopting a Parliamentary form of government and the radical desire for universal suffrage. Candidates must focus on value and discuss this in a meaningful way rather than repeat the phrase with no real intent. Candidates are advised that appropriate context is date specific and cannot consider what has already occurred, or what may develop in the future. There were 92 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 were required to assess the extent to which the Royalist defeat in the Civil War was due to the actions of Charles I. This question proved accessible to most candidates, many of whom attempted to frame a debate on the balance between the king's actions (or arrogance/incompetence) and the skill and material resources available to Parliament.

The New Model Army seems to have been the decisive factor in the Royalist defeat rather than anything Charles did or did not do. Many candidates adopted a more simplistic approach by providing a two-sided response – basically a yes/no answer. There were 81 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 were invited to consider the new experiments in government in the period between 1653 and 1660 and to determine how successful they were. Many candidates began by identifying the experiments in government and then assessing their success or failure. This approach proved very effective in several responses. Inevitably, there were a few listing responses, detailing the new experiments in government with the rule of the Major-Generals very much at the forefront of most answers. There were 12 responses to this question.

Depth Study 3: Reform and protest in Wales and England c.1783–1848

Part 2: Protest and campaigns for social reform c.1832–1848

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, the nominated issue was social reform in the period 1837–1848. Source A was an article written by Edwin Chadwick in 1837, and it was hoped that most candidates would discuss the wider historical context of utilitarianism and the Poor Law Amendment Act. Better responses focused on the specific context of the implementation of the Poor Law Amendment Act and the contrast between its implementation in the south and north of Britain. With Source B the wider historical context of the debate about factory reform and the principle of government intervention into the economy was generally well known, as was the specific context of the debate about the Factory Act of 1844. The importance of public health and the specific context of the cholera epidemic and the Public Health Act of 1848 was identified by many candidates. Although most candidates could discuss the strengths and limitations of the sources and debate their value to an historian, the examiners are still observing too much mechanistic and formulaic source evaluation. Less common were collective judgements about the value of the sources to an historian studying social reform. There were 130 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 had to debate whether poor leadership was responsible for the failure of the Chartist movement. The best answers examined the differences between moral force and physical force Chartists and measured the impact of these clashes upon the leadership of the movement. Strong counter arguments offered an analysis of Parliament’s determination to reject Chartist petitions, the strength of the state in dealing with Chartist protests, the impact of economic cycles and the importance of government social and economic reforms in the 1840s. Less assured answers provided narratives of the movement with occasional references to the question set. There were 65 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 had to assess the significance of Sir Robert Peel’s changes to the policies of the Conservative Party. The best answers assessed Peel’s response to the 1832 Reform Act and the importance of the Tamworth Manifesto coupled with a discussion of the social, economic and financial reforms of the 1841–1846 ministry. Most answers agreed that the repeal of the Corn Laws represented a significant development for a predominately protectionist political party. The resulting split in the Conservative Party received much attention. Weaker answers were unable to distinguish between “changes to policies” and “success”, the latter being a different issue and one which they preferred to address. There were 69 responses to this question.

Depth Study 4: Politics and society in Wales and England c.1900–1939

Part 2: Economic and social challenges in Wales and England c.1918–1939

Most candidates discussed the three sources of Question 1 in turn, and most were able to offer an overall general judgement on their value to an historian. However, those that focussed their answers on 'value to an historian studying the impact of social and industrial changes in Wales and England during the period from 1926 to 1936' were rewarded well. Focus on the question set is very important if candidates wish to access the marks in the higher bands. Sometimes the focus on 'value to an historian' was only seen in the final paragraph when attempting a judgement but higher 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. Source A proved accessible to most of the candidates, and most were able to identify it as government propaganda during the General Strike of 1926. It is important to contextualise the source but doing this successfully involves focusing on developing the answer to comment on the value it gives to an historian looking at a specific enquiry. In this case, it shows that industrial change has led to social and political conflict as the general strike is being portrayed as a threat to society. Source B was discussed in context by most candidates, who were correctly able to identify it as an unemployed man venting frustration at the unfairness of the means test. More importantly the value to an historian studying social and industrial change is that it shows how closely linked social and industrial changes were. Source C was referring to the Jarrow March of 1936, when industrial change had decimated many communities and saw working class societies come together in a show of unity. Most candidates understood this context but struggled to develop the debate and explain its value to an historian studying social and industrial change. There were 16 responses to this question. The authorship of the sources was discussed by most of the candidates, but in a largely mechanistic fashion rather than in relation to its value to an historian studying social and industrial change between 1926 and 1936. Some devoted time to discussing their strengths and limitation with various degrees of depth, but stronger answers discussed the value of the provenance to an historian studying a particular enquiry. Doing this allowed these candidates to show an awareness of the place of the sources in the context of this issue. Too many continue to say things that are not valid, for example 'the source is biased so of no value to an historian'. Clearly, an historian would know this, and being 'biased' is often the reason why the source provides value for a particular enquiry. Also, exhaustive list of issues not mentioned in the source (that is, limitation through omission) is not needed and should be discouraged. A source could not possibly inform the historian of events after its creation, and so the historian would not expect to find this and would certainly not dismiss the source because of it. It would be a development to see less of both these types of comments in future. There were 31 responses to this question.

For Question 2, most candidates were able to discuss the significance of the rise of the Labour Party at a time when the support for the Liberal Party was in decline. Most directed their response towards the significance of the first Labour Government of 1924 and the second Labour Government of 1929, which was valid enough. However, it was not just a matter of what the Labour Party did when in office; it was a case of the general rise of the party itself as a credible alternative to the Conservative Party dominance seen in this period. For the most part, candidates were aware of the significance of the rise of the Labour Party and could discuss the significance of other developments, especially the fall of the Coalition Government in 1922, the dominance of the Conservative Party and the formation of the National Government in 1931. These were indeed significant political developments, but fewer candidates discussed whether they were the most significant political development, which was the thrust of the question set. Some candidates did not focus their answers enough on political development and tended to discuss things such as developments in education, health or housing which meant they were not directly addressing the issue at hand. There was also much narrative writing about what the Labour Party did when in office as opposed to what other Governments at the time did.

Although historical knowledge is important, it is only one part of the mark scheme and the issue of analysis and evaluation and providing a judgement on the question set is especially important to access marks at the higher bands. There were 16 responses to this question.

Knowledge about the abdication crisis for Question 3 was generally good; however, the need to recite the story of the abdication crisis overwhelmed some responses and turned answers into a narrative of events rather than a discussion of the question set. It is clearly an issue well covered by centres, but more focus was needed on the extent that the abdication was a challenge to the National Government at the time rather than a *what happened* approach. Knowledge is an important part of the mark scheme, but evaluation and analysis is the key to a successful answer. Certainly, the abdication crisis was a constitutional challenge but whether this as 'the most significant challenge' facing the National Government was open to debate given the various social, economic or political challenges seen in the period. Most candidates were able to discuss 'other challenges' facing the National Governments namely the depression, introducing the means test to cut spending, the rise of minority groups and the fear of war and by doing so they were providing good coverage of the period. The more meaningful answers got to grips whether the abdication crisis was the most significant challenge, identifying other challenges and discussing them against the abdication crisis. These comparative answers invariably gained the higher marks. There were 15 responses to this question.

Depth Study 5: Religious reformation in Europe c.1500–1564

Part 2: The spread of Protestantism and counter-Reformation c.1531–1564

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, candidates overall were able to at least begin to contextualise the three sources, although this was mostly done in isolation rather than considering them collectively. Candidates tend to see this issue as reformers versus Catholics, but the better responses were able to highlight the conflicts within the Protestant movement, noting that radicals such as Bernard Rothman in Source A criticised both Lutherans and Catholics, and that ultimately the peace settlement was between Lutherans and Catholics and left the radicals out. There were 44 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 responded in two different ways to this question – some just considered the positives and negatives of the significance of the Jesuits, while others compared the significance of the Jesuits to other factors. While better responses were able to balance the pros and cons of the factors they were considering, some responses were just lists of factors made relevant by their conclusion, giving little sense of relative significance. There were 21 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 understood Calvinism well, although their responses were not always well focused on the demands of the question. Some responses focused solely on the impact of Calvinism on Geneva, while others considered its impact in France within the period of the question. Calvinism's impact on the Netherlands and Scotland was hardly mentioned at all. Another limitation to some responses was that they only considered the positive impact of Calvinism, and did not consider any negatives, particularly the divisions it engendered. There were 24 responses to this question.

Depth Study 6: France in revolution c.1774–1815

Part 2: France: Republic and Napoleon c.1792–1815

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, candidates were asked to assess the value of three sources to an historian studying the impact of Napoleon as Consul and Emperor between 1801 and 1810.

It was essential that candidates focus on the key word in the question namely, that is, impact, so that they avoided narrative accounts of Napoleon's rule, which weaker responses were prone to do. The three sources covered Napoleons rehabilitation of the state's relations with the Catholic church in the Concordat (Source A); a letter to his who had been placed on the throne of Westphalia advising him on how to approach ruling his new state (source B); and finally, a print illustrating the execution of prisoners by French forces during the Peninsular War (source C). The sources collectively illustrated the power, diplomatic skills, and brutality of Napoleons rule. There were 133 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 were asked to discuss whether the fall of the Girondins was the most significant impact on the development of the Revolution between 1792 and 1795. In several responses, the detail and analysis of the overthrow of the Girondins was a little weak and its impact could have been developed more fully. In offering alternatives to the key issue, candidates provided a good range with the most plausible involving the emergence of government by Terror and all its associated policies. Some opted for the overthrow of the King – a key event that led to the establishment of the First Republic, and even the rise of the sans-culottes. There were 44 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 had to consider whether financial problems posed the most significant challenge to the Directory between 1795 and 1799. Of the two essays this drew the weaker responses. Only a few candidates seemed to have a good grasp of the financial problems facing the Directory. Those who did were able in many instances to suggest how these were solved. Candidates were much more assured in dealing with the problems faced by the Directory, whether they were its structural weakness, which allowed the rise of extreme left-wing republicans, or the emergence of powerful monarchical factions. Many candidates were able to identify its increasing reliance on the army to maintain support – an approach that ultimately proved to be fatal to its survival. There were 55 responses to this question.

Depth Study 7: The crisis of the American Republic c.1840–1877

Part 2: Civil War and Reconstruction c.1861–1877

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, candidates were able to identify elements of the Union's policy towards slavery, but only the better responses began to connect the sources together, and were able to judge the sources in relation to the evolution of that policy: limited in the early years of the war by the need to keep the northern slave states on board (Source A); timidly suggesting emancipation could happen if the military picture improved in the autumn of 1862 (Source B); or confidently looking forward to implementing the emancipation policy by the summer of 1864 as the military situation improved for the Union (Source C). There were some sound attempts to contextualise individual sources, although there was also evidence of very formulaic source evaluation. There were 72 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 tended to focus just on economic issues for the Confederacy during the Civil War, rather than comparing the impact of economic issues to political and military ones. Another opportunity for evaluation, comparing the situation of the Confederacy to that of the Union, was also missed. There were 56 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 seemed to evaluate the issues in the question much better overall than those who answered Question 2. There was good understanding of the difference between what was intended to happen as a result of Reconstruction and what happened.

The higher-marked responses also took change over time into consideration – the five years it took the Reconstruction amendments and laws to be put into place, and the undermining of them in the 1870s as Southern states were gradually allowed back into the Union. There were 14 responses to this question.

Depth Study 8: Germany: Democracy and Dictatorship c.1918–1945

Part 2: Nazi Germany c.1933–1945

In Question 1, the compulsory sources question, the nominated issue was foreign policy developments during the period from 1933 to 1941. Source A was a memorandum from a British military adviser at the Geneva Disarmament Conference. Many candidates were able to discuss the wider historical context of this source including the establishment of Hitler's authority in Germany; the specific context of Hitler's foreign policy objectives in 1933 proved more elusive. Candidates were more confident in handling the context of Source B both in its wider and specific contexts. The general background to Source C, notably the history of the Nazi–Soviet Pact, was generally well known; less convincing was the grasp shown about the war on the Eastern Front in 1941, with a significant minority of candidates confused about the Battle of Stalingrad, which was much later than the source in question. Most candidates were able to identify the strengths and limitations of the sources although much commentary on source evaluation was mechanistic and formulaic. Examiners noted that the most common approach is a source-by-source evaluation, whereas only a minority attempted a collective judgement on the value of the sources to an historian studying the nominated issue. There were 1,551 responses to this question.

Candidates who opted for Question 2 were asked to debate the extent to which the Nazi regime maintained control over the German people during the period from 1933 to 1945. Where candidates could focus on the different ways the Nazis maintained control they were along the path to a good answer. However, many candidates did not discuss “extent” and asserted that the Nazis controlled Germany without significant opposition until the last year of the war. The extent of Nazi control during the war years is an interesting topic, which many ignored. More worrying was the large number of candidates who wanted to write about racial and social policies without adjusting their focus towards “maintaining control”. Many of these essays described who was controlled rather than how the Nazis maintained control. Better essays were able to discuss, at some length, the varied opposition to Nazi rule and the extent to which it was significant. There were 1,161 responses to this question.

Those candidates who opted for Question 3 were generally more successful when they focused on racial policies and debated the significance of the Nuremberg Laws. There were, however, a few problems with candidates who did not know the chronology of significant events and developments. The question posed an end date of 1941, and a significant minority went into far too much detail about the Wannsee conference and the later history of the Final Solution, neither of which were required by the question set. There were 390 responses to this question.

Summary of key points

Candidates need to focus on value to an historian but to frame their response in a way that relates to a particular enquiry.

They must concentrate on the actual context of the source – consider the circumstances that may have been influencing the authors to say or write what they did at that time.

It is important that candidates consider the importance of dealing with the sources collectively rather than solely considering them in isolation.

Avoid mechanistic source evaluation comments, for example, the source has no value because it is either biased or unreliable.

Candidates need to concentrate on the key issue in Section B and frame their responses in an evaluative way by providing a debate within the specified period coverage

In essays, candidates need to cover a range of factors, including their strengths and limitations in terms of the overall argument.

Candidates are reminded that they must cover the period specified in the question. This means that the majority (not all) of the period stated in the question has been acknowledged and covered by the response.

Candidates should be able to identify change over the set period, focusing on, for example, how attitudes, treatment or legislation evolved and how this affected the issue raised by the question.

Candidates must remember that the questions are intended to encourage debate. This means that no matter how deep or impressive the knowledge its deployment to support an argument or debate is always the key to unlocking the highest bands in the mark scheme.

Candidates are free to challenge the question and arrive at an entirely different view to the one proposed. However, they cannot simply ignore the key issue in the question and provide an answer that they either desired or expected. Candidates are expected to analyse and evaluate which means they must explain their train of thought and justify their decisions and conclusions.

HISTORY

General Certificate of Education

Summer 2022

Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

UNIT 5 – NON-EXAMINATION ASSESSMENT

General Comments

Considering the challenges faced by centres over the past two years, it is important that we recognize the hard work that has gone into ensuring candidates have been provided with the best opportunities possible to get them through their courses; however, to ensure progression in future series we must highlight some of the issues that have been seen in the submission of NEAs this summer, many of which have not achieved the standards seen previously. We think it is important for us to draw your attention to the rigidity of much of the work moderated this year. The NEA, by design, is an individual assessment, but individuality was not seen across most of the responses. Instead, there appeared to be an increased use of templates, frameworks and guides, some of which had been included in the submission of the moderated sample. This is a breach of the regulations, and it is very much against the spirit the assessment, which is to allow candidates to independently explore a topic and find their own way of formulating an assessment of an historical event. One which encompasses the detailed analysis and evaluation of a range of contemporary sources and explores how and why they may have contributed to the development of a range of interpretations. This was the final year of questions approved for the 2020 to 2022 triennial cycle. They covered a broad range of themes from the Crusades and medieval Welsh history through witchcraft and various revolutions down to the twentieth century. By and large, a few twentieth century themes dominate the entries. Among the most popular were those that examined the suffragettes, Britain and the First World War, appeasement. the civil rights movement in the US, and the Cold War. In the next round (2023-2025) it is anticipated that a more diverse range of topics will be covered. Centres will not be able to suggest titles which overlap in any way with those done in the two previous cycles. WJEC has suggested a range of sixty approved questions grouped in four sections covering - Wales, Britain and Ireland, Europe, and the Wider World. Many of these are very different from questions offered in the past and explore themes encompassing diversity, discrimination, and culture to name but a few. The new questions have been carefully selected with an emphasis on accessibility to contemporary sources and will, hopefully, be engaging for candidates, allowing them to enter into a more meaningful discussion. In addition to these new questions, centres will continue to be able to offer their own, and learner-devised titles. To ensure accessibility each of these submissions will have to provide detail about arguments for and against, what sources are available and how the theme has been interpreted by historians. All questions must be submitted to WJEC for approval.

Comments on individual questions/sections

Not relevant to this unit.

Summary of key points

Centres are reminded that the NEA is to be undertaken on an individual basis by candidates with minimal input from class teachers.

There was clear evidence that many centres had provided a template for candidate by which to structure their responses. This is to be actively discouraged and is against the regulatory requirement.

There was evidence that many centres were overmarking the work of their candidates. Candidates need consider the value of their selected sources in showing how and why the historical debate has developed before they can access Bands 5 and 6.

It was evident from feedback received from moderators, and from the work moderated by the Principal Moderator that some centres need to review the requirements of the NEA. The recommended number of primary/contemporary sources that can be used in the NEA is at least six. All candidates in some centres used only five, and candidates' work had to be moderated accordingly to ensure fairness against the peers in other centres.

Sources need to be clearly identified and numbered sequentially, with an attribution below which indicates what the source is and when it was produced. Sources should be set within the body of the NEA and ideally contained in a frame, or indented, so that they are clearly delineated from the body of the assignment.

The NEA is required to be an assignment that is both coherent and integrated, but much of the work seen consisted of a brief overview of the question followed by some reference to different historians, followed by a source, followed by an evaluation, followed by a reference to how it might have been of use to an historian, followed by another source, followed by... Only occasionally was there a coherent link between any of these elements. Listing sources with no links does not equate to an integrated assignment. In many instances the only reference to the question appeared in a concluding paragraph.

NEA assignments need to be concise, which is defined as being fewer than 4001 words. If candidates use any extracts (by historians) then they should be considered as part of the developing historical debate and should not be evaluated as primary and/or contemporary sources. It is required that a word count (minus the sources) be provided at the end of the exercise along with a bibliography.

All assessed work must be annotated. This does not need to be extensive but should be clearly and concisely deployed throughout the script. A simple AO1 would indicate that the candidate was deploying appropriate facts to discuss the issue in that stage of the exercise.



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