



---

# **GCE EXAMINERS' REPORTS**

---

**GCE (NEW)  
HISTORY – FULL REPORT  
AS/Advanced**

**SUMMER 2018**

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

### **Online Results Analysis**

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

### **Annual Statistical Report**

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

<b>Unit</b>	<b>Page</b>
Unit 1	1
Unit 2	24
Unit 3	46
Unit 4	69
Unit 5	91

# HISTORY

## General Certificate of Education (New)

Summer 2018

### Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

#### UNIT 1

#### INTRODUCTION

In 2018 the examiners reported that there was no substantial evidence that most of the candidates were aware of the increase in demand at Unit 1 following the transition from the old AS to the new A Level specification, now in its third year. Although there was some evidence among the minority that the essay-writing skills of candidates were good, it was equally clear that most candidates needed to further develop these skills. The standard at Unit 1 is that of the traditional A Level, and that means the skill of writing open-ended essays, rather than the shorter evaluation essay at HY1, should be taught to the candidates.

A minority of candidates were clearly engaged with the debate required by the question set although the majority relied too heavily on simply recalling a range of factors, events and developments. The examiners felt that far too many candidates appeared to have been taught to provide a structured essay response in which they listed a series of factors in the opening paragraph and then outlined each factor followed by a series of judgements on the evaluative word in the exercise. This approach is not going to be well rewarded at this Unit which is set at the traditional A Level standard and focused on the key concepts of history outlined in Assessment Objective 1. Centres need to focus on teaching candidates to engage with the exact concept in the question set, focus on analysing the issues and evaluating their importance before coming to a supported judgement.

The examiners were disappointed that centres appeared to be teaching the period as a series of issues, in a restricted and compartmental topic manner rather than the more holistic approach of the current specification. Centres should ensure that candidates understand that the questions set are meant to test aspects of the whole specification and are not restricted to any sub-theme. Candidates are expected to draw from their understanding of the historical developments to make links and comparisons rather than simply narrate the developments. In Unit 1 we have holistic questions based entirely on Assessment Objective 1 and we need to see and reward holistic responses that analyse, evaluate and reach a balanced and substantiated judgement on the historical concept in the set question. Far too often candidates focus on the main issue (or listing “factors” as they call them) and the evaluative word rather than the set debate.

The examiners recognised that some candidates were able to engage with the exact concept in the question set, analyse the issues and evaluate their importance before coming to a substantiated judgement. These candidates were able to gain Band 5 marks but few were able to sustain and develop the more holistic debate to the set question that Band 6 requires at the A Level standard. The examiners accept that candidates at Unit 1 are generally in the first year of the A Level course but this specification is set at the A Level standard in every unit.

Most candidates were constrained to Band 4 marks by the rather limiting practice in many centres of setting out a list of three or four “factors” or developments in the introduction and then writing a paragraph on each before coming to a conclusion. These essays did offer some analysis and evaluation and a judgement or a series of judgements but they did not engage with the key concepts of change, continuity, cause, consequence, similarity, difference and significance in a coherent essay that Assessment Objective 1 demands. In general these responses were dominated by recall rather than by a debate on the question set. A number of candidates gained Band 3 by listing a series of developments, sometimes ignoring the main development in the question set. At Band 2 the responses were simply recollections of what happened or generalised knowledge of the topic studied.

Finally the examiners stress that the candidates need to ensure that in the Period Study they pay particular attention to considering developments over the full chronological period set.

## PERIOD STUDY 1

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

#### QUESTION 1

*How far was there a revolution in government in the reign of Henry VIII 1509–1547?*

This question was attempted by 467 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the nature and scale of the changes in government in the reign of Henry VIII. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which these changes amounted to a revolution in government. By the same token, candidates were encouraged to consider the nature of change and continuity in government during the reign of Henry VIII. There were certainly changes but some aspects of government remained the same. Reference to Geoffrey Elton's thesis was often seen as this provided a convenient framework with which to debate the nature and scale of the changes in government. Surprisingly few candidates attempted to define the term 'revolution'. By way of contrast, candidates were expected to discuss the roles played in government by Wolsey and Cromwell. Many candidates did this, but they tended, understandably, to focus more on Cromwell's tenure as the king's chief minister. The majority of candidates all but ignored Henry VIII's input.

While a number of candidates displayed relevant topic knowledge on the operation and evolution of government in the tenures of Wolsey and Cromwell, few were able to engage with and debate the key concepts of the extent of change and continuity. While many listed the changes made by Wolsey and Cromwell they failed to argue whether or not these changes amounted to a 'revolution'. Of those that did engage with the concept of revolution, there was a marked reluctance to challenge the notion of a 'revolution' in government during this period. Virtually all the candidates accepted the premise that a revolution had, in fact, occurred.

In terms of content, many candidates were able to discuss the creation of the Privy Council, the development in the status and use of parliament, the transformation of government in Wales (with some reference to the Council of the North but no mention of the short-lived Council of the West) and the development of the role of chief minister. However, a significant number of candidates drifted away from the political area by focusing on the Reformation and the break with Rome. Although a case could be made to link a discussion of the religious changes to the changes in government, few candidates were able to articulate this.

## QUESTION 2

*To what extent did the Kett rebellion pose the most serious threat to the Crown in the period 1549–1569?*

This question was attempted by 598 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the extent to which the Kett rebellion posed the most serious threat to the Crown in the given period. In short, if Kett did not pose the most serious threat to the crown during this period, then which of the remaining rebellions did so? The majority of candidates exhibited an impressive degree of relevant knowledge of the Kett and other rebellions during this period. A number attempted to engage with the key concept in the question, but they tended to drift in listing the causes or events of each rebellion before finally engaging with whether or not it could be considered the most serious threat. The better-rewarded candidates identified the key concept and were focused throughout on debating the severity of the threat to the Crown during this period. Those candidates who adopted an integrated approach to the question were able to discuss the rebellions collectively, making relevant comparisons between Kett's rebellion and other insurrections, namely, the Western or Prayer Book rising (1549), Wyatt's rebellion (1554) and the rebellion of the Northern Earls (1569). Many concluded that the Wyatt rebellion posed the most serious threat to the Crown and their reasons for doing so were, on the whole, well supported with relevant examples.

Although this question proved popular and accessible to the majority of those candidates who opted to engage with it there were some significant weaknesses in the responses. Many candidates did not take account of the time limit set by the question, 1549–1569, which led to lengthy discussions of the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536–1537). Some even moved into discussing the Babington plot. This lack of awareness of the date limits set by the question was also evident last year. Far too many candidates were dismissive of Kett's rebellion, making only scant reference to it. There was a tendency to deal with each rebellion in turn, which led to a great deal of repetition and hindered rather than assisted the process of holistic debate.

## QUESTION 3

*How far do you agree that Elizabeth's Church Settlement was the most significant change in religion in the period 1534–1588?*

This question was attempted by 1010 candidates.

Candidates were expected to debate the extent to which Elizabeth's Church Settlement (1559) represented the most significant change in religion in the period between the break with Rome (1534) and the publication of the newly translated Bible in Welsh (1588). The vast majority of candidates worked within this date range. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the nature and substance of Elizabeth's Church Settlement and thereby assess its significance in relation to other factors that contributed to religious change. In short, was Elizabeth's Church Settlement the most significant of the many changes in religion that occurred during this period?

The majority of candidates covered the period set by the dates given in the question, usually by framing their answers in a chronological way beginning with Henry VIII and moving through the reigns of each monarch. As occurred last year, this approach tended to elicit narrative responses interspersed with mini-debates and judgements. The significance of Elizabeth's Church Settlement tended to be lost in this list-like approach. Unlike last year, candidates did not ignore the changes enacted during Mary's reign (1553–1558) though they were unsure as to how these aspects of the Marian counter-reformation fitted in to the overall pattern of religious change. The more effective responses engaged immediately with the key issue in the question, beginning with an assessment of the significance of Elizabeth's Church Settlement rather than starting with Henry VIII and working towards it chronologically. It must be noted that a number of candidates were too dismissive in their treatment of the Elizabethan settlement.

Many candidates concluded that Henry's break with Rome was the most significant change in religion because it promoted a reformation in religion and facilitated the other changes. Reference was also made to the longevity of Elizabeth's reign as a measure of the success of her changes.

In spite of the popularity of this question there were a number of weaknesses in the responses. Some candidates appeared to have an overly simplistic understanding of Elizabeth's attempt to create an inclusive Church with a number asserting that the queen allowed both Protestants and Catholics to practice their religion freely. Also, too many candidates continue to assert that Henry VIII turned England into a Protestant country. He did not. He may have inadvertently established the conditions in which a future Protestant state might be established, but he remained a Catholic. At best, it might be argued that he adopted an Anglo-Catholic approach to religion. Almost inevitably, a minority of candidates confused Mary I with Mary Queen of Scots.

#### **QUESTION 4**

*'The most important social and economic development in Wales and England between 1536 and 1603 was the rise of the merchant class.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 50 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider and debate the extent to which the rise of the merchant class represented the most important social and economic development in Wales and England between 1536 and 1603. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the nature, substance and extent of the social and economic developments during this period. Candidates were expected to display an awareness of change and continuity over the given period.

A small minority of candidates attempted this question, and among those that did even fewer showed any awareness of the significance of the merchant class. The majority of candidates simply discussed a list of the main social and economic developments, mainly in Wales, such as the growth of towns and industry. Some discussed the rise of the gentry and the importance of gentry estates particularly after the dissolution of the monasteries.

## PERIOD STUDY 2

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

#### QUESTION 1

*To what extent was the Personal Rule the most significant development in government and politics in the period 1625–1660?*

This question was attempted by 33 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider and debate the extent to which the Personal Rule (1629–1640) can be considered to have been the most significant development in government and politics in the period 1625–1660. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to identify, analyse and debate the most significant developments in government and politics in a period that spanned a 35-year period from the accession of Charles I (1625) to the restoration of his son, Charles II (1660). In short, was the Personal Rule the most significant development in government and politics or not? Candidates were encouraged to avoid a list-like approach to this question based simply on monarchs and leaders though some inevitably adopted this limiting framework. One suggested way to avoid this is by adopting a more thematic approach to the question, such as identifying and discussing those political developments that have acquired an historical label. For example, the Eleven Years Tyranny (1629–1640); Pride's Purge and the Regicide (1648–1649); the Rump (1649–1653); rule of the Major-Generals (1655–1657) and the Restoration (1660).

The majority of candidates made an effort to discuss (in many cases describe) the period of the Personal Rule though few effectively debated its significance when weighed against other developments at this time. In fact, this was the favoured mode of response—the two-sided essay—personal rule compared to the 'other' developments. This tended to elicit a debate only in the concluding paragraph, which, in some cases, was significantly long.

#### QUESTION 2

*How successful was Charles II in dealing with the challenges that he faced during his reign 1660–1685?*

This question was attempted by 24 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider how successful Charles II was in dealing with the challenges facing him during his reign. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were expected to identify the major challenges facing Charles II such as in government, politics, religion, finance and foreign affairs, and then to debate the extent of his successes and failures in dealing with them.

Inevitably, many candidates simply listed and described the challenges or problems that the king faced though some did try to discuss the success of his approach in dealing with each of them. Again, the greatest weakness in respect of this question was not historical knowledge but the inability to properly evaluate the key concept of the extent of success. Some candidates discussed his successes without any reference to possible failures whilst others were content to focus on a narrow list of challenges such as finance, religion and

parliament. The question required candidates to consider the possibility that Charles enjoyed partial success in some areas of policy, such as in religion and politics, but that over the course of a long reign, the division between success and failure became blurred by compromise. In some instances, candidates quite rightly pointed out that his greatest success was, unlike his father Charles I, to die peacefully in his bed as king. On the other hand, some candidates suggested that his failures outweighed his successes and that his greatest failure was in not securing the dynasty by having a legitimate son to succeed him: hence the Monmouth rebellion in 1685 followed by the generally unpopular succession of James II.

It must be noted that several candidates confused Charles I and Charles II resulting in an inappropriate response.

### QUESTION 3

*'The main cause of tension between the Crown and Parliament in the period 1603–1649 was the influence of royal favourites.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 53 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the reasons for tension in the relationship between the Crown and Parliament during the reigns of James I and Charles I. In line with the demands of the question candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which the influence of royal favourites was the main cause of this.

In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the contribution that rivalry and jealousy over the influence of royal favourites at court made to the increasingly tense relationship between the crown and Parliament during this period. Candidates were expected to explore and discuss the nature and impact that the likes of Cecil, Carr, Buckingham, Laud and Wentworth had on the relationship between the Crown and its parliaments and to weigh this against the other possible causes of tension. In short, was influence of royal favourites the main cause of tension or not.

Some candidates tended to concentrate on the reign of Charles—which was discussed reasonably well—and largely ignore the equally significant reign of James I. For example, there was little mention of Cecil and Carr with the preferred villain being Buckingham closely followed by Laud. Even Wentworth's (or Strafford) influence was underestimated by the majority of candidates. The key was in understanding the influence these favourites had over their royal masters and in framing royal policy. Some of the better rewarded candidates did make the link between the influence of royal favourites and the problems encountered over religion and finance. It was pleasing to witness a number of candidates take the opposite view that the main cause of tension came from over ambitious members of parliament such as Pym, Eliot and Hampden. In fact, some candidates stated that these parliamentarians and others like them were simply jealous of the fact they had tried and failed to persuade the monarchs to favour them. It was argued by some that the MPs most determined to seek greater rights and privileges for Parliament did so in anger at failing to secure royal patronage. Principles such as rights, justice and freedom of expression were pursued because there was not enough royal patronage to go around.

#### QUESTION 4

*How far do you agree that the Glorious Revolution had the most significant impact on government and politics in Wales and England in the period 1660–1715?*

This question was attempted by 4 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the major features of government and politics in the period between the Restoration and the first year of the Hanoverian Succession. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which the Glorious Revolution had an impacted on government and politics in Wales and England in the period 1660–1715. In short, did the Glorious Revolution have the most significant impact on government and politics in Wales and England in this period or not?

For this question, the quality of the responses suggests that some worthwhile work has been done by centres in addressing the demands of this later period of the specification. The reigns of James II, William and Mary dominated, but some attempt was made to discuss the reign of Queen Anne and there was even mention of the Jacobites and the Hanoverian Succession.

It was evident that, to the majority of candidates, the Bill of Rights (1689) was considered to have had the most significant impact on government and politics, but better-prepared candidates made the link between the two: the one would have not occurred without the other.

## PERIOD STUDY 3

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

#### QUESTION 1

*How successful were Tory governments in dealing with the problems they faced in the period 1812–1830?*

This question was attempted by 541 candidates.

The key concept that had to be addressed was the extent of success enjoyed by the Tory governments in dealing with the problems they faced in the period 1812–1830. This would require a definition of those problems and an evaluation of the extent of success. Most answers focused on the post-war social and economic issues, the problem of radical protest, the Queen Caroline debacle, the degree of success enjoyed by the liberal Tories and the vexed question of Catholic emancipation. Examiners found a good understanding of the key issues outlined above and the marks awarded for this question were relatively high.

Many candidates argued that the Tories were unsuccessful in dealing with problems in the period 1812–1830 as they failed to address the underlying social and economic problems. Fewer candidates considered that the Tories were relatively successful in maintaining public order in the face of a sustained campaign of radical protest. The failure to address parliamentary reform was regarded as a great shortcoming. Most agreed that the reforms of the liberal Tories were a limited success in dealing with the issues of trade, trade unions and penal reform. The reforms of the 1820s and the issue of Catholic emancipation were generally well understood. The achievement of Catholic emancipation figured large in answers and many commented on its role in dividing the Tory Party at the end of the 1820s. The best answers identified the range of problems faced by the Tories, recognising that a debate on success was required rather than a blow-by-blow account of all the reforms with throwaway judgements about each one. Period coverage was usually satisfactory and most candidates could debate a range of problems and Tory policies within the period 1812–1830.

#### QUESTION 2

*To what extent did Chartism present the most serious challenge to governments between 1830 and 1848?*

This question was attempted by 388 candidates.

The key concept that had to be addressed was whether Chartism presented the most *serious* challenge to governments in the period 1830–1848. The better answers considered the impact the movement made rather than just asserting that because there were petitions and uprisings these must have been a challenge. The nature of the movement, its tactics and demands, and the main events were generally well known. The rejection of the petitions, the government's effective use of the police, military and railways, especially in 1848, were put forward as arguments that not only was the government challenged but that its response also suggested it was all under control.

A common approach was to argue that other protest movements were as, or more, serious, for example the Merthyr Rising and the Rebecca Riots. Some good responses commented upon the impact the Swing Riots made on the debates about parliamentary reform and the reform of the Poor Law. The effectiveness of the Anti-Corn Law League was held up as an example of a protest movement that seriously challenged Peel in the 1840s. The important issue was that there should be a debate about the concept of 'serious challenge'. The divisions within the Chartist movement, the strength of the government's response in upholding law and order and the impact of the social and economic reforms in the period persuaded some candidates that the threat from Chartism was not that great. Less successful answers dismissed Chartism and launched into a listing approach of other protests which, it was asserted, were equally challenging.

### QUESTION 3

*'Gladstone's first ministry (1868–1874) was the government responsible for the most significant reforms in the period 1830–1880.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 624 candidates.

The key concept in question 3 was whether Gladstone's first ministry was responsible for the *most significant* reforms in the period 1830–1880. This should have given candidates plenty of scope to comment on significance over a period that included some well-known reforming ministries. Unfortunately the reforms of 1868–1874 were not that well known it seems. Far too many asserted that because a reform was made it must therefore be significant. The best answers considered the case for the first ministry commenting on why the Irish reforms were ground-breaking, how the army, legal and education reforms marked a new departure and commented upon the significance of the Secret Ballot Act.

There was plenty of scope for a comparative approach. The Reform Act of 1832 was rightly seen as worthy of debate and quite a few dismissed it as it did not add that many new voters. The other reforms of the Whig governments did not figure large and the Poor Law reforms ought to have been considered as highly significant. Many answers saw it as a comparison between Gladstone and Disraeli, which to a degree it was, but the timescale of the question required a broader approach than that. It is not necessary in a period study for candidates to go into huge detail about reforms. Certainly they need to be known but it is more valuable for candidates to consider why they are important and what the potential impact of them is. Far too often examiners have to read long descriptive passages that do not aim at the debate in the question. Full period coverage was not strong in the answers with many ignoring the period before 1867.

#### QUESTION 4

*How far was social reform mainly motivated by the need for efficiency in the period 1830–1880?*

This question was attempted by 295 candidates.

The key concept in this question was causation: whether social reform was mainly motivated by the need for efficiency in the period 1830–1880. This question was awarded the lowest marks on the paper mainly because of significant misunderstandings about the nature of social reform in the nineteenth century. It was reported—on a different question last year—that many candidates confuse the motives of utilitarians and humanitarians. These ideas are fundamental to understanding the nature of social reform in this period. The best answers did consider the springs of motivation and understood the philosophy of utilitarianism in action. In particular the operation of the Poor Law reforms and the drive for public health reform should have given ample scope for discussion on the concept of efficiency. A minority considered the meritocratic reforms inspired by the shortcomings in the Crimean War.

The significance of other influences were considered in some of the answers. The humanitarian influence on factory reform, mines, and chimney sweeps was covered in many answers with some debate about whether the reforms to working conditions made a difference to the efficiency of the workers. Few considered the motivation behind the significant educational reforms of the period or whether social reforms were a response to economic distress. These considerations would have widened the debate, which was rather narrow in many responses and not that well understood. The role of individual reformers and the influence of religion might also have increased the range of responses to this question.

## PERIOD STUDY 4

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

#### QUESTION 1

*To what extent was poverty the most significant challenge facing Wales and England in the period 1880–1918?*

This question was answered by 453 candidates.

In order to fully address the question set candidates needed to evaluate the extent to which poverty was the most significant challenge facing Wales and England in the period 1880–1918. It seemed that while most candidates had knowledge on the period 1900–1918, few had any specific information on issues relating to poverty, especially between 1880 and 1900. This is a period paper and as such we expect period coverage if candidates are to access marks at band 5 or above. Relevant knowledge about poverty would have included issues such as the poor state of soldiers during the Boer War campaign, the work of Booth and Rowntree and some attempts by the Liberal Government to address issues surrounding poverty from 1906 onwards. Although most candidates discussed poverty in general, the best responses were able to justify their comments by focussing on how poverty provided a challenge during the period, which was the key concept in the question set. The challenge was clearly the inadequate provision with the 1834 Poor Law still being the main avenue of support with an over-reliance on charities and friendly societies. Tackling poverty meant political and social change, which was an immense challenge given the prevailing attitudes towards the poor, which would have to change dramatically in order for things to improve.

Candidates usually challenged the proposition in the question by arguing that in some respects poverty was not the most significant challenge facing Wales and England between 1880 and 1918. However, for the most part this involved the listing of ‘other factors’ or ‘challenges’ during the period, notably ‘war’ and ‘women’s rights’. The better answers did more than list these issues, they discussed in what way these were a challenge, and whether these challenges were more or less significant than the challenge posed by poverty. Sadly these responses were few and far between and it was clear to see that in some centres candidates had been taught to respond with precise specific issues (‘war and women’) and there was little attempt to discuss in what way these were challenges, or whether they were more or less of a challenge than poverty. A debate engaging with the key concept in the question rather than listing ‘developments’ would have served many candidates better.

#### QUESTION 2

*How far did cultural change have the most significant impact on Wales between 1945 and 1980?*

This question was attempted by only 29 candidates.

The key concept up for debate was ‘significance’, specifically whether cultural change had the most significant impact on Wales 1945–1980.

Most candidates were aware of some aspects of cultural change in this period but lacked specifics to be able to provide a developed and coherent response. For the most part candidates brushed over cultural change but some were able to discuss, in general terms, the decline of Welsh speakers and in some cases, the decline of religion. Candidates in the vast majority of cases then went on to discuss the reforms of the Labour Governments of 1945–1951 in some detail. Clearly they had revised the reforms in much detail but few could relate this to the key concept of their ‘significant impact’ on Wales between 1945 and 1980. For the most part, candidates could state what the reforms were but not discuss their significance. Women’s issues were discussed by some in relation to the appointment of Mrs Thatcher as prime minister in 1979, but again its significance in relation to its impact on Wales between 1945 and 1980 was not discussed.

The discussion of this ‘key concept’ and coverage of the period in the question was generally not well developed. In order to discuss cultural change candidates could have looked at the significance of the impact of such things as the rise of new leisure activities, rural depopulation and internal migration, the rise of popular entertainment and cinema in Wales or the significance of Welsh national consciousness. The significance of these developments could have been evaluated against the impact of economic change such as the collapse of staple industries and the nationalisation of heavy industries or political developments that directly influences Wales.

It is clear that the period 1945–1980, and in particular, the Welsh aspect is not well covered in the teaching programme of some schools. The whole specification is to be taught as this is a period study and we would be expecting coverage of Wales and England for the full period of 1880–1980.

### **QUESTION 3**

*How far do you agree that granting the vote to women was the most important political development in Wales and England in the period 1880–1951?*

This question was attempted by 195 candidates.

The key concept in the question was ‘importance’ and whether extending the franchise was the most important political development in Wales and England in the period 1918–1980. Candidates would have profited from taking time out to reflect on the overall issue (how was Wales and England politically different in 1980 to what it was in 1918?), and then use this holistic view to address the question set. Most candidates knew that the Representation of the People Act, 1918 gave most men over 21 and women over 30 the right to vote and the Act of 1928 gave men and women an equal voice in politics for the first time. The better answers were able to discuss the importance of these developments in relation to political developments between 1918 and 1980. Only a minority were able to discuss the Voting Act of 1969 which gave all men and women over 18 the right to vote and thus created a fully democratic society. Some candidates went off on a tangent to discuss social aspects such as the Labour Social Reforms of 1945–1951: this clearly means they had not reflected enough on the question set and its focus on political development.

Political issues discussed post–1945 were few and far between and again a timely reminder is needed that this is a period study paper and as such post 1945 issues need to be addressed in as much detail as the pre–1945 period.

#### QUESTION 4

*To what extent was the impact of war mainly responsible for change in society between 1929 and 1980?*

This question was attempted by 287 candidates.

In order to fully address the question set candidates needed to evaluate the extent to which the impact of war was the most significant change in society 1880–1918. Again following on from the advice given last year perhaps a little reflection at the start would have been beneficial. Candidates who took time to reflect on how society changed from 1929 to 1980 before beginning to discuss whether the impact of war was mainly responsible for that change or not, invariably were better rewarded than those who plumped for the ‘developments’ approach – an approach by which candidates come into the exam with a set number of themes or developments and try to weave what they have learnt to answer the question set. Often these are preceded with comments like ‘Another development in the period...’ and then fail to give sufficient attention to the key concept in the question set. A period of reflection at the start of essay writing is very important if candidates want to focus their answers on the specific question set. As it was, many candidates did not reflect enough on the key concept and produced a ‘by the numbers’ approach discussing the Second World War, Labour reforms and women’s rights as ‘changes in society’ but were not able to develop their answers to provide an evaluative response in relation to the impact of war being ‘mainly responsible’ for change in society. Having not identified initially what the main changes were between 1929 and 1980, this approach did not lend itself well to providing a focused response. Also, period coverage is important and candidates need to address the whole period in order to access marks at the higher bands.

## PERIOD STUDY 5

### POLITICAL AND RELIGIOUS CHANGE IN EUROPE C.1500–1598

#### QUESTION 1

*To what extent was the Ottoman Empire the greatest threat to European stability in the period 1520–1555?*

This question was attempted by 50 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the extent to which the Ottoman Empire posed the most serious threat to European stability in the given period. In short, if the Ottomans did not pose the most serious threat to European stability during this period then what did? The majority of candidates exhibited an impressive degree of relevant knowledge of the Ottoman Empire but tended to focus mainly on its growth. A number did attempt to engage with the key concept in the question, but they tended to drift in listing other possible threats before finally engaging with whether or not the Ottomans could be considered the greatest threat to European stability.

There were a number of references to events that were beyond the period covered by the question, such as the foreign policy of Philip II even though he only became king in 1556 and the Battle of Lepanto, which did not happen until 1571.

A significant number of answers did not address the key concept of the question at all. Some candidates only referred to the issue of 'greatest threat' in their conclusions.

#### QUESTION 2

*How far do you agree that the development of absolute monarchy had the greatest impact on France during the reign of Francis I from 1515 to 1547?*

This question was attempted by 37 candidates.

Most responses to this question simply considered absolute monarchy as one factor affecting France, and compared it to the impact of other factors with a judgement at the end. The better-rewarded responses considered a similar range of factors but also argued that they were all connected to Francis I's attempts to establish an absolute monarchy in some way. A number of responses missed the thrust of the question and instead evaluated the extent to which France was an absolute monarchy in this period or just discussed the extent to which Francis I was successful as a king. These were both past questions and suggest a degree of anticipating questions by the centres concerned.

### **QUESTION 3**

*'The exploration of the New World had the most significant impact on the development of Spain between 1516 and 1588.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 18 candidates.

Responses to this question considered the exploration policy of Philip II to a much greater extent than they considered that of Charles I when they should have been considering the impact of both. Some responses ignored the issue of the exploration of the New World and just focused on the development of Spain in the period, especially economically. There was also some discussion of Columbus who was from before the period covered by this question.

### **QUESTION 4**

*To what extent did criticisms of the Catholic Church have the most significant influence on religion in Europe in the period 1500–1564?*

This question was attempted by 69 candidates.

In addressing this question, most candidates didn't really cover the period in the question. Most focused exclusively on Lutheranism and Germany, even though the dates and wording of the question point to a wider European focus, as well as an end date that is significant for Calvin and the Counter Reformation as well. Little attention was given to criticisms of the Catholic Church from before 1517. There was some confusion about the French Wars of Religion and the Dutch Revolt, which do not fall within the period covered by the question.

## PERIOD STUDY 6

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

#### QUESTION 1

*How far do you agree that Peter the Great was mostly successful in dealing with the challenges that he faced during his reign 1696–1725?*

This question was attempted by 16 candidates.

For this question candidates were asked to consider whether or not they agreed with the view that Peter the Great was mostly successful in dealing with the challenges that he faced during his reign 1696–1725. There was ample opportunity for most candidates to argue and debate this issue. The key concept which they were invited to consider was the degree of success that Peter managed to achieve so this involved considering both change and continuity in Russia during this period.

From the outset the response required that candidates identify what the challenges facing Peter might be. This should be considered an essential prerequisite to being able to address the key concept in the question. Many were indeed able to identify some of the challenges Peter faced, for instance in the field of foreign policy. However having identified some challenges, most then went on to unload all their class notes on Peter and even his involvement in the Great Northern War. Similarly, the challenge of modernising Russia became subsumed in copious detail about his various reforms. Where candidates did show clear understanding of the key concept they were duly rewarded with higher band marks. In the lower bands, few candidates considered the key concept of whether he succeeded in any way.

#### QUESTION 2

*To what extent did the Great Northern War bring about a significant change in the balance of power in the Baltic between 1700 and 1721?*

This question was attempted by 7 candidates.

The question asked candidates to consider the extent to which the Great Northern War brought about a significant change in the balance of power in the Baltic between 1700 and 1721. The key concept was the extent of change in relations in the area and this needed to form the fulcrum around which candidates engaged with the question in their responses. Sadly the few responses received were very limited. Candidates clearly knew a great deal about the Great Northern War and could relate in fine detail the campaigns fought and the personnel involved. Where they tended to let themselves down was not giving due concern to whether the war altered the balance of power in the Baltic in a significant way. There were issues here of change and continuity in the relations between the powers. While Sweden for instance did suffer significant losses, Finland was returned to her. Sweden's enemies were unable to sustain their coalition beyond 1721. Too much narrative blighted many responses and these failed, consequently, to provide a meaningful discussion. As was noted last year candidates must avoid the temptation to see the question as a green light to offload all the content they have learned whether it is relevant or not and they must appreciate the need to argue and present on the set question if they wish to access the upper bands.

### QUESTION 3

*'The financial problems of the ancien régime during the period 1715–1789 were mainly responsible for the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789.' Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 4 candidates.

Candidates were asked to consider whether the financial problems of the *ancien régime* were mainly responsible for the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789. The key concept was causation—termed as 'mainly responsible'—and answers needed to be balanced and coherent in arguing this point. It was clear that all the candidates could offer some understanding of the reasons for the outbreak of revolution. They knew about the financial problems of the *ancien régime*, the issues relating to the structure of the state, concerns about the suitability of the monarch and his wide entourage to be able to hold together the country in the face of the mounting clamour for reform. In doing so they were able to measure the importance of a range of alternative factors against the one presented in the question and offer a meaningful discussion. The problem is that a number of responses chose to ignore or avoid the key concept of 'mainly responsible' and merely offer a list of alternative factors. Where candidates engaged with the question and supported their assertion on the importance of other issue, for example the way the *philosophes* of the French Enlightenment helped to weaken the structure of the *ancien régime* – they were duly rewarded for their efforts.

### QUESTION 4

*To what extent was commercial rivalry the main cause of conflict between the Great Powers during the period 1756–1815?*

This question was attempted by 19 candidates.

Candidates were asked to consider the extent to which commercial rivalry was the main cause of conflict during the period 1756–1815. Responses in general were rather disappointing. Some candidates chose to consider a range of potential causes of the rivalry between great powers at this time—revenge, ideology territorial aggrandizement—without, unfortunately, considering the key concept of whether commercial rivalry was *the main cause*. Some candidates adopted the approach of examining a range of conflicts in strict chronological fashion without any obvious analysis relating to the question or the key concept. The weakness of this approach in some ways was that it led to the temptation to slip into just offering a narrative account with little analysis. Where candidates entered into a meaningful discussion of the key concept their answers were suitably rewarded.

## PERIOD STUDY 7

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

#### QUESTION 1

*How far do you agree that Tsar Alexander II was mainly successful in dealing with the challenges he faced in the period 1855–1881?*

This question was attempted by 21 candidates.

Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of Alexander II as the ‘Tsar liberator’. This inevitably led to detailed discussions of the emancipation of the serfs, important political developments, and the legal, military and educational reforms. However, candidates were expected to debate whether or not Alexander II was mainly successful in dealing with the challenges he faced. A good starting point for this question for many would have been to identify the challenges that he faced at the outset. This would have allowed candidates to debate the extent of Alexander’s success in dealing with them. The answer would still revolve around Tsar Alexander’s reforms, but the focus would have been on answering the question directly, rather than focusing on developments, issues and events that only had an indirect relevance to the question. The candidates would still need to consider the challenges posed by serfdom, agricultural backwardness, basic political, economic and social freedoms, a backward-looking society or opposition, but they would have been in a position to debate the key concept within the set question and come to a supported, balanced and appropriate judgement on the extent of success in dealing with challenges. As a result, many of the responses, although often beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, tended to take the form of a range of mini-judgements on a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept. This approach inevitably led to many candidates drifting away from the precise question and resorting to listing of knowledge and unsupported assertions.

#### QUESTION 2

*How effectively did Napoleon III deal with the challenges he faced in France in the period 1848–1870?*

This question was attempted by 43 candidates.

Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of the policies of Napoleon III. This inevitably led to detailed discussions of foreign and domestic policy. However, the candidates were expected to debate whether or not Napoleon III was mainly effective in dealing with the challenges he faced. This was not about the effectiveness of his rule, but about the way he dealt with the challenges he faced which wasn’t quite the same thing. A good starting point for this question would have been to identify the challenges that he faced at the outset. This would have allowed the candidates to debate how effectively Napoleon III dealt with them. The answer would still revolve around Napoleon’s policies, but the focus would have been on answering the question directly, rather than focussing on developments, issues and events that only had an indirect relevance to the question. The candidates would still need to consider a range of challenges—those posed by poverty, social and economic imbalances, basic political, economic and social freedoms, foreign policy status, and the position of the Catholic Church or opposition—but they would have been in a position to debate the key concept

within the set question and come to a supported, balanced and appropriate judgement on the extent of success in dealing with those challenges. As a result, many of the responses, although often beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, tended to take the form of a range of mini-judgements on a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept. This approach inevitably led to many candidates drifting away from the precise question and resorting to listing or unsupported assertions.

### **QUESTION 3**

*'The impact of war was mainly responsible for the creation of a united Italy in the period 1815–1870'. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 51 candidates.

Candidates needed to analyse and evaluate whether the impact of war was the main driver for Italian unification. Quality of response was achieved when candidates were able to link the various key individuals in the movement for Italian unification to the wars that punctuated the period. Some meaningful debates occurred when Cavour and Garibaldi were linked to the Wars of 1859. Furthermore, some candidates were able to link the territorial expansion of the boundaries of the Italian States with individual wars. Many underplayed the role of Mazzini, who pursued the politics of insurrection. Some candidates were able to link diplomacy to the outbreak of war, although few candidates were able to discuss the political machinations that led to the wars in the period. This provided an opportunity to weigh up the impact of war within the context of external factors and the endeavours of Italians. However, too often candidates were content to offload their class notes, which focused on the main developments, events and factors that shaped Italian unification in the period. Many candidates tended to adopt a generalised approach to this question. In one case the candidate changed the focus of the question entirely by discussing the successes and failures of the movement for Italian unification.

#### QUESTION 4

*To what extent did the Eastern Question have the most significant effect on relations between the Great Powers in the period 1780–1856?*

This question was attempted by 13 candidates.

A good starting point for this question for many would have been to analyse and evaluate international relations at the start of the period and to judge whether the Eastern Question had the most significant effect on those relations by the end of the period. This would have allowed candidates to weigh up the significance of the Eastern Question against a range of other developments. However, many of the responses, although beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, tended to take the form of a range of mini judgements on a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept. This approach inevitably led to many candidates drifting away from the precise question and resorting to unsupported assertions. Some candidates had a very simplistic appreciation of the main issues at stake within the Eastern Question, which amounted to little more than a consideration of the Crimean War and its impact. Few candidates pointed out that the Eastern Question was a recurring theme across the period and challenged the notion of the Great Powers working collectively. The Eastern Question reflected the conflict of interests that lay at the heart of relations between the powers following the defeat of France. Rarely did candidates take the opportunity to discuss the Eastern Question in terms of the wider issue of the balance of power or the emergence of revolutionary ideas.

## PERIOD STUDY 8

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

#### QUESTION 1

*How successfully did Italian governments deal with the challenges they faced in the period 1918–1940?*

This question was attempted by 369 candidates.

A number of candidates misinterpreted the question set. Some focused on Mussolini's regime entirely, which meant that they missed an opportunity to focus on the challenges facing the earlier liberal regime. Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of Mussolini's domestic policies. This inevitably led to detailed discussions of Mussolini's political, economic and social policies. However, the candidates were expected to debate whether or not Italian governments were mainly successful in dealing with the challenges they faced. A good starting point for this question for many would have been to identify the challenges that the Italian governments faced at the outset. This would have allowed the candidates to debate the extent of their success in dealing with them. The answer would still revolve around social, economic and political policies, but the focus would have been on answering the question directly, rather than focusing on developments, issues and events that only had an indirect relevance to the question. The candidates would still need to consider the challenges posed by the Catholic Church, opposition, coalition government, the "Red Two Years" or unemployment, but they would have been in a position to debate the key concept within the set question and come to a supported, balanced and appropriate judgement. As a result, many of the responses, although beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, tended to take the form of a range of mini-judgements on a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept. Those candidates who dealt with the challenges faced by both the liberal and the Fascist regimes often turned their response into a comparison of the relative effectiveness of one regime against another, which wasn't the question set.

#### QUESTION 2

*How effective was the Weimar government in dealing with the threats it faced between 1919 and 1933?*

This question was attempted by 295 candidates.

Many of the responses to this question drifted into a general evaluation of the effectiveness of the Weimar government. This often led to a discussion of the perceived weaknesses of the Weimar Republic rather than a debate on the effectiveness of the Republic in dealing with the challenges it faced. Some candidates adopted an approach to answering the question by almost looking at the issues from a third person point of view: Their responses often began: "Some historians believe that..." or "Some historians would agree that..." or "It can be argued that..." However, these responses still tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of the domestic policies of Italian governments. As a result, the responses often took a success/failure approach to the question. A better starting point for this question for many would have been to identify the challenges that the Weimar government faced at the outset. This would have allowed the candidates to debate how effectively the government dealt with them. The answer would still revolve

around political, economic and social policies, but the focus would have been on answering the question directly, rather than focussing on developments, issues and events which only had an indirect relevance to the question. As a result, many of the responses, although beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, tended to take the form of a range of mini-judgements on a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept. This approach inevitably led to many candidates drifting away from the precise question and resorting to unsupported assertions.

### **QUESTION 3**

*'Stalin's domestic policies had the most significant impact on Russia between 1905 and 1945'. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 268 candidates.

Most candidates did not debate the key concept within the question effectively. A number of candidates did not discuss Stalin's domestic policies within the context of other policies and developments in the period. They therefore did not adopt a holistic approach to answering the question. Their entire responses often amounted to a discussion of Stalin's domestic policies in isolation. Some even discussed Stalin's foreign policies, which are not even in the specification. This led to a deconstruction of Stalin's policies, usually in the form of a general list, which were then ranked in importance in terms of their impact on Russia. As such, candidates were unable to reach a balanced judgement on the question set. As a result, many of the responses, although beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, inevitably drifted away from the precise question and resorted to unsupported assertions. Those candidates who attempted to answer the question concluded that Stalin's domestic policies had the greatest impact, but the quality of the supporting evidence was not always secure. Many candidates did not even consider the policies of the Tsarist period, so that the responses tended to focus upon Stalin and occasionally Lenin. Whilst the analysis and evaluation were meaningful, and debates on the key concept did emerge, the quality of the response was often restricted due to the lack of period coverage.

### **QUESTION 4**

*To what extent was the League of Nations the most significant development in international relations in the period 1890–1939?*

This question was attempted by 394 candidates.

Most candidates did not debate the key concept within the question effectively. A number of candidates did not discuss the League of Nations within the context of other policies and developments in the period. They therefore did not adopt a holistic approach to answering the question. Their responses often amounted to a discussion of the strength and weaknesses of the League of Nations, or even a discussion of its successes and failures. Candidates were therefore unable to reach a balanced judgement on the question set. Many of the responses, although beginning to discuss the key concept within the question, tended to take the form of a range of mini-judgements on a series of developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept. Those candidates who attempted to answer the question concluded that the League of Nations was the most significant development in international relations because it established the principle of collective security and the politics of reconciliation, but the quality of the supporting evidence was not always secure. Few challenged this notion by arguing that the self-interest of the powers undermined the management and direction of international relations. Many candidates ignored the period from 1890 to 1918 and the gradual realignment of the powers. While the analysis and evaluation were meaningful, and debates on the key concept emerged, the quality of many responses was restricted due to lack of full period coverage.

**HISTORY**  
**General Certificate of Education (New)**  
**Summer 2018**  
**Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**  
**UNIT 2**

**INTRODUCTION**

The examiners reported that many candidates appeared unaware of the demand in Unit 2 to frame their responses in relation to the historical context and the question set. Most candidates adopted a formulaic approach to analysing and evaluating the sources and extracts without being able to focus on the demands of both assessment objectives to consider the historical context. Centres should ensure that candidates are aware that both Assessment Objectives 2 and 3 demand that candidates address the historical context in their response.

The examiners noted that most candidates did not fully address the question set for Question 1, and did not discuss the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular issue over a particular period. The majority of candidates presented what appeared to be a source-by-source evaluation, commenting on the content, bias, tone and reliability of each source before attempting some judgement on their value or, quite often, utility. Centres should strongly advise candidates from copying out sections of the sources or providing a summary of what the source had to say. A number of candidates from some centres provided introductions or sections of background material that were irrelevant to the appropriate historical context. Centres should discourage candidates from listing omissions and attempting to rank the sources.

Centres should encourage candidates to develop greater awareness of the demand of the question to analyse and evaluate the sources in their different historical context in terms of their value to an historian by undertaking a specific enquiry over a specified period of time. Candidates need to focus more closely on the appropriate historical context linked to each source—they need to be aware of the range of dates offered and developments over that timeframe. Centres need to encourage candidates to move away from comprehension exercises on the sources, and move toward a more evaluative approach that considers the value of each source, in its historical context, to an historian studying a particular issue over that particular period.

The interpretation exercise set at Question 2 has proved very demanding for most candidates. They tend to rely on a comprehension exercise on the content of both extracts, followed by making general comments on the authorship and then providing a paragraph, or more than one paragraph, on other interpretations. Some of the weaker responses approached this assessment as a source-evaluation exercise based on making speculative comments on the historians using the same techniques as at Question 1, which is inappropriate to meet the demands of Assessment Objective 3.

Centres should encourage candidates to show greater understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate concerning the set issue, which is one of four identified in the specification. Centres need to focus on teaching the wider historical debates surrounding these identified issues, as well as the factual history, so that candidates are able to discuss the different ways that the set issue has been interpreted, as well as the main developments in the wider historical debate about these issues that are the focus of Assessment Objective 3. Centres are informed that the WJEC will be amending the layout of Question 2 from 2020 to encourage candidates to focus more on the debate required. Further details will be provided to Centres in the autumn.

## DEPTH STUDY 1

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

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

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Henry VIII's relationship with his ministers in the period 1529–1540.*

The focus of Question 1 is on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period of time, in this instance studying Henry VIII's relationship with his ministers in the period 1529–1540. The question is also about analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context. The general historical context associated with these sources was politics and government in the period that witnessed the downfall of the king's chief ministers; Wolsey in 1529 and Cromwell in 1540.

In order to address the set enquiry, there needed to be reference to the specific historical context in which each source was created. This may have included reference to Henry VIII's character and his attitude to and treatment of his chief ministers, the role played by Anne Boleyn and the political intrigue that shaped the king's relationships with his senior advisers.

The majority of candidates opted to discuss the sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian in a concluding paragraph. Many of the better-rewarded candidates concluded that the sources were most valuable in understanding the nature of the master and servant relationship that existed between the king and his ministers. However, many candidates were limited in their answers by simply evaluating the sources in turn and discussing their strengths and weaknesses, and whether they were trustworthy or not.

With regard to Source A, the majority of candidates recognised the problems facing Wolsey as chief minister, most significantly, Anne Boleyn. This source gave the candidates the opportunity to appreciate and comment on the complexity of the relationship between king and minister. That a third party had so much influence on the king in shaping his attitude to his minister said much about Henry's relationship with Wolsey. Some of the more aware candidates made the link—through the date of 1529—between this source and the imminent fall of Wolsey. Even given the author's obvious bias, being Wolsey's secretary, historians would have found this source of enormous value to the set enquiry.

With regard to Source B, many candidates tended to dismiss the value of this extract to an historian simply on account of its detailed description of Cromwell. Candidates mistakenly believed that this source revealed little or nothing about the king's relationship with his minister. However, the source reveals much about Cromwell's powerful position, his authority over ministers more senior than him in the government and the inference that Henry VIII was happy to allow his principal secretary to manage the political affairs of the kingdom. This suggested that either the master–servant relationship was intact—the king was in control—or that Henry had lost control and was being manipulated by Cromwell.

With regard to Source C, the majority of candidates clearly understood the context in which the source was set and that, by this time, the relationship between king and minister had broken down. Cromwell was pleading for his life. All his previous good work counted for nothing, that the “power” he enjoyed (as expressed in Source B) was an illusion; his status and position was based entirely on the support and will of the king. The majority of candidates did not avail themselves of the opportunity to link Sources B and C and discuss the contrast in the changing relationship between king and minister.

Unfortunately, the same weaknesses as last year were evident. For example, many candidates simply could not resist describing or explaining the content of each source in turn. The better-rewarded candidates made a valid attempt to discuss the value of the sources to an historian in the context of when they were produced (1529, 1534 and 1540), which was a period of significant change in the government and religion of the kingdom. On the other hand, some candidates used the stock phrase “this source is *valuable* to an historian because...” but were unable to offer a meaningful explanation for its value.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that rebellion posed a serious threat to the Crown in the period 1529–1553?*

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 whether rebellion posed a serious threat to the Crown in the period between 1529 and 1553.

This question was accessible to the majority of candidates who, almost without exception, were able to recognise the different interpretations in the given extracts: Interpretation 1 states that Henry VIII and Edward VI were never seriously at risk from rebellion whereas Interpretation 2 argues that the two monarchs were very much at risk.

The majority of candidates were able to use the content of the extracts to discuss, if not necessarily debate, different interpretations of the issue. Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates discussed the attributions in a mechanistic way, some persisting in focusing on reliability or generalised comments about how historians set about researching significant topics or events. Some candidates simply copied the attributions and offered speculative comments on the specialism of the historian. On the other hand, some candidates did make much of the difference in the date of writing (1884 and 1977), which led them to conclude, not unreasonably, that the more recent historian was perhaps more modern and professional in his approach hence the contrasting interpretations. Although there were examples of pre-learned mechanistic comments on the availability of evidence, a number of candidates argued, quite convincingly, that modern techniques of accessing archives and their administration had changed considerably in the century after 1884.

Many candidates were well versed in recalling the causes of rebellion (which was not required) and the main events (again not strictly required), but some attempted to relate the content of the extracts to the question. For the more discerning candidates the second extract provided ample material for debate. Some noted that it was the boy-king Edward who was more at risk than his father Henry VIII. It was suggested that the strength of the crown and aura of kingship under Henry VIII lessened the risk to his crown. However, it was noted by a few that the Pilgrimage of Grace was the largest rebellion of the entire period, affecting most of northern England, whereas the Western and Kett rebellions were more localised and geographically isolated. By the same token, mention was made of the fact that only two rebellions were specifically mentioned in the extracts; the Western, or Prayer Book, and Kett, both of which broke out in the same year (1549) and in the reign of Edward VI.

The better-prepared candidates were able to go beyond the content contained in the extracts to discuss the wider implications of rebellion. The very nature of resistance, be it protest or rebellion, posed a threat to the Crown's power and authority. Some of the better responses attempted to explain what influenced some historians to reach their conclusions, but they were unable to clearly articulate the fact that interpretations are formed for specific reasons, at certain times and in different circumstances. Few candidates showed any awareness of the fact that these interpretations are often provisional and open to challenge and change and that the extracts form part of a wider and developing debate over the threat posed by rebellion in this period.

## DEPTH STUDY 2

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

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

There were 158 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the drift to Civil War 1637–1642.*

The focus of Question 1 is on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period of time, in this instance the drift to Civil War in the period 1637–1642. The question is also about analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context. The general historical context associated with this source was the mounting political crisis due to the rising tension between the crown and parliament that led to war.

In order to address the set enquiry, there needed to be reference to the specific historical context in which the source was created. This may have included reference to the conflict over Ship Money in particular and taxation in general, the Personal Rule, the actions of the king, his ministers and leading MPs such as Pym and Strode.

The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the complex and difficult relationship between Charles I and Parliament in the five years leading to the end of Personal Rule and the beginning of the Civil War. The majority of candidates opted to discuss the sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian in a concluding paragraph. Most concluded that the sources were valuable in understanding the reasons why the relationship between Charles and Parliament broke down and why the country drifted towards Civil War (mainly the king's fault).

With regard to Source A, the majority of candidates were able to understand the significance of the source if not the context in which it was formed. They rightly placed it within the period of the Personal Rule and understood the king's motive for demanding Ship Money. Most were able to link the demand for Ship Money with the drift to war because the issue had soured the king's relations with the political nation—landowning and mercantile elites upon whom the burden for payment fell. However, all but a few took the opportunity to note that far from behaving like a dictator, the king had, in fact, consulted widely before deciding to extend the collection of Ship Money beyond the traditional remit for such an old-established prerogative tax. Trevor came from and represented the views of the very class that would later oppose the king in Parliament on its recall in 1640. This would be of value to an historian because a contemporary legal opinion stated that the king had the right to extend and levy this tax. The key here is the critical difference between legality and morality.

With regard to Source B, many candidates took it at face value that Wentworth was to blame for the misgovernment of the kingdom rather than the king. In their opinion, Pym was simply stating that an innocent king had been badly advised by an ambitious ‘evil councillor’, which explains why the country drifted towards Civil War. However, there was more here than meets the eye because it is clear that the king was Pym’s real target. Pym took advantage of Charles’s weak character to pressure him into sacrificing his chief adviser to placate an increasingly hostile Parliament. Wentworth’s trial and execution damaged the king’s reputation; he was depicted as a weak and cowardly man. However, candidates missed the opportunity to explore the disreputable role played by Pym and his political supporters who, like the king, were prepared to see an innocent man die to satisfy their aims and objectives. If the king was weak, some of the more radical MPs were ruthless, which suggests that they rather than the king were responsible for the drift to war.

With regard to Source C, the majority of candidates accepted Strode’s assessment of the king; that he was to blame for the tension and conflict with his Parliament. In short, Charles was to blame for the drift to Civil War. Some of the more aware candidates did take note of the fact that Strode was equally, if not more so, damning of the king’s advisers, which they used as a link with source B. Disappointingly, all but a handful of candidates noted that both Strode and Haselrig were two of the five members that Charles had entered the Commons chamber to arrest only to find that the ‘birds had flown’. This action precipitated the Civil War.

A number of candidates made a valid attempt to discuss the value of the sources to a historian in the context not only of when they were produced—1637, 1641 and 1642—but also how the sources related to the worsening relations between Charles I and Parliament that led to Civil War. On the other hand, some candidates used the phrase ‘this source is *valuable* to a historian because...’ but were unable to discuss or explain the value of the sources to a historian. A number of candidates did not make sufficient use of the attributions. Some simply copied them while others copied and offered only token comments. A minority of candidates even ignored the attributions.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that Parliament’s decision to enact the Petition of Right in 1628 was motivated by the attitude and policies of Charles I?*

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 whether the Petition of Right was motivated by the attitude and policies of Charles.

This question was accessible to the majority of candidates with almost all of them able to recognise the different interpretations in the given extracts: Interpretation 1 argued that Charles I was to blame for the Petition of Right whereas Interpretation 2 lay the blame on an ambitious member of Parliament.

The majority of candidates were able to use the content of the extracts to discuss the given interpretations. Some candidates liberally sprinkled their discussion with quotations taken from the extracts. This sometimes served to enhance the discussion where it was shown, in the first extract, that the king’s attitude and policies were indeed to blame for the framing and passing of the Petition of Right; and, in the second extract, where radical MPs were deliberately trying to provoke the king into stubborn resistance.

Unfortunately, a significant number of candidates discussed the attributions in a mechanistic way, focusing on reliability or generalised comments about how historians research their subject area. Some candidates simply copied the attribution and offered speculative comments on the specialism of the historian. On the other hand, some candidates did offer some telling comments on the fact that Cust's book had a narrow focus compared to that of Quintrell. Many candidates showed some awareness of the different interpretations of why the Personal Rule was established in the context of the wider historical debate.

Some candidates discussed historiography often in a pre-learned series of class notes on the work of different historians, which is really a knowledge-based exercise. This was often done in a mechanistic manner with the vast majority of candidates unable to clearly link the given extracts to any particular school of thought.

The better-rewarded candidates set about the task of analysing and evaluating the validity of the two extracts within the wider debate. These candidates used their knowledge of the historical context to support their arguments by showing a sound understanding of the different ways in which the issue—who or what was mainly responsible for the Petition of Right—has been interpreted. A significant number of candidates were also able to offer at least one alternative interpretation to the two presented: that the blame lay partially or wholly on the shoulders of the king's advisers such as Buckingham. It was interesting to witness a candidate suggesting that James I be blamed for the passing of the Petition because his son, Charles, was simply following a well-established method of governing and in dealing with a difficult Parliament. In short, he was simply following the lead of his late father. This is a valid alternative interpretation.

Some of the better responses attempted to explain why historians were able to form different interpretations but some were unable to clearly articulate the fact that interpretations are formed for specific reasons, at certain times and in different circumstances. Few candidates showed any awareness of the fact that these interpretations are often provisional and open to challenge and change and that the extracts form part of a wider and developing debate over the reasons for passing the Petition of Right.

### DEPTH STUDY 3

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

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

There were 267 candidates entered for this option.

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying radical protest in the period 1816–1820.*

The emphasis should be on analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context. In particular their value to an historian studying radical protest in the period 1816–1820 should have been the focus of the answer. Although centres have responded to the demands of the revised specification, candidates are still spending too much time on lengthy source evaluation and not enough time on placing the sources in context. Too many candidates waste time copying content rather than evaluating the material in front of them. The appropriate context of Source A was the debate on taxation and the radical protest of 1816, the context of Source B was the ‘Peterloo Massacre’. The Queen Caroline debacle and the Cato Street conspiracy was the appropriate context for Source C. The general context for all the sources was the post-war situation in Britain and the growing demand for parliamentary reform. A discussion of value to an historian should have included placing these sources in their varying contexts.

Source A is a newspaper article, crafted by one of the most famous radical writers. It begins with the importance of labour and has a swipe at the government for its description of the labouring classes. The radical bugbear of heavy taxation to support government expenditure on the army, placemen and pensioners is well articulated as well as the usual target of the interest payments on the national debt. The remedy according to Cobbett is reform of parliament. The source is valuable as it provides the context for the radical demands and the preferred solution of parliamentary reform. It also has value in providing insight into the thinking of a prominent radical publicist in the early days of post-war agitation. Of course, it is a partial view but nonetheless valuable in showing the context of the post-war situation.

Source B is an eye witness account of the infamous Peterloo incident. It is, from a reading of the language and tone, an account sympathetic to the protesters, and questions the actions and motives of the Yeomanry. According to Tyas, nothing illegal was taking place. Candidates were aware of the controversial incident and the context of the growing agitation for reform. The source is valuable to the historian as an eyewitness account published in a leading newspaper, so its evidential value is as strong as a first-hand account. The source is valuable in providing one version of the incident and candidates may discuss that value in the context of strong government support for the local magistrates and its repressive legislation. Once again the source emphasises the main aim of the radicals, which was reform of Parliament, and it mentions the name of Hunt, one of the prominent radical spokesmen of the time. There were comments on the measured prose and its sympathetic deployment of details such as the number of women, the casualties, and the behaviour of the cavalry. There were comments on the provenance of the source, its appearance in a prominent newspaper and its value as a first hand, eyewitness account.

Source C is a cartoon satirising the radical movement and showing it hanging on to Queen Caroline's coat tails. The context of Queen Caroline's trial and the major public disturbances that accompanied it in 1820 showed that protest wasn't always about reform of parliament or economic conditions. The cartoon reveals the radicals' alleged link to French revolutionary symbols and to the Cato Street Conspiracy. They are portrayed in an unflattering light, on their way to topple the Crown and Parliament. The source has value to the historian in revealing the fevered atmosphere of 1820 with references to Queen Caroline and the Cato Street conspiracy. The fear of radical protest is revealed via the cartoon's association between radicalism and the dangers of revolution, anarchy, ruin and dangerous conspiracies such as Cato Street.

Specific source evaluation was generally well done but there were fewer successful attempts to comment on the specific *context* of the sources. The examiners noted that there were fewer examples of candidates listing omissions or addressing utility rather than value.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that popular agitation was mainly responsible for the Reform Act Crisis 1828–1832?*

Most candidates had little or no difficulty in understanding the different interpretations given in the extracts. The better-rewarded candidates were also able to suggest why the interpretations differed with reference to the context of the Reform Act crisis. If candidates are to reach the higher levels they have to consider not only why the interpretations differ but also why historians might come to different conclusions when faced with the same evidence. They also need to have a firm grasp of alternative interpretations and how these might have been formed. Named historians are not required but an understanding of the wider historical debate on the issue will always be rewarded. Unfortunately some candidates only focused their answers on the two given extracts and did not consider, at all, the wider historical debate on the issue in the question. Few had any real grasp of the wider historical debate, which would allow them to access the higher bands.

Interpretation 1 emphasises the importance of the working class and the size of the demonstrations in support of reform. Thompson believes, as a result, that Britain is close to revolution, mentioning the key periods of the autumn of 1831 and May 1832. He makes a clear connection between agitation and the need for reform. The fact that revolution was avoided, he argues, was because the radical leaders compromised with the Whigs and as a result both the state and property rights were strengthened against a perceived threat from working class pressure.

In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 1 candidates often argued that as Thompson is a Marxist historian he is bound to place an emphasis on the importance of class in determining historical events. He could certainly use the abundant evidence of popular interest in the reform issue to make a case that popular pressure was significant. Candidates identified the implied criticism of the radical leaders who compromised and did not go along with popular pressure. Others pointed out that the pressure on the government was not solely from the working class and that the political unions embraced all sections of society.

Interpretation 2 concedes that there was indeed popular agitation during the reform crisis and that it helped Grey to get the dissolution of Parliament from a reluctant king. However, thereafter Fraser contends that popular agitation had no significant impact on events – the run on the banks did not take place, Place’s much-vaunted plan of an uprising in May 1832 fizzled out and there are doubts about his motives in any case. Importantly, Wellington might well have formed a government in May 1832; the main problem was that Peel would not serve with him (a second volte-face on a major issue was too much for him after Catholic Emancipation). The main hurdle against reform was the House of Lords and it was the fear of additional Whig peers that broke the impasse.

In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 2, some candidates pointed out that Fraser is a professional historian who will have considered the same evidence and drawn a different conclusion from Thompson. He emphasises that popular agitation was not as important as political decisions. These political decisions may have been influenced by the fear of popular agitation—a reform bill had to be passed in order to assuage it. Nonetheless, it is a revisionist position and it was hoped that candidates might argue that the same evidence could suggest different interpretations.

There were opportunities for candidates to consider the extracts within the wider historical debate about the Reform Bill crisis. The traditional Whig interpretation was that the Reform Act was a sensible, timely concession to appease the middle classes and prevent them from allying with the working class. The left-wing interpretation emphasised the revolutionary situation, drawing parallels with 1848 and the importance of working class protests. Revisionist work took two possible lines: that the middle class leaders made the protests seem more dangerous in order to extract concessions from the government; or that popular agitation was in fact seriously divided about aims, and was linked to local grievances (especially in Bristol). An additional interpretation pointed out that the Whigs’ own motivation was important—Grey originally hoped to pass a reform bill in March 1831 without needing either a dissolution or the creation of peers. Ergo, it could be argued that the government found the popular agitation useful and not dangerous. It also suggests a government in control of the agenda; it did pass its Reform Bill and there was no revolution.

Only a minority of candidates showed any awareness of the fact that these interpretations are often provisional and open to challenge and change and that the extracts form part of a wider and developing debate over the reasons for the Reform Bill crisis.

## DEPTH STUDY 4

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

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

There were 117 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying political developments in Wales and England 1906–1912.*

Most candidates were able to discuss the sources in respect of their value in general rather than their specific value to a historian studying political change in Wales and England 1906–1912. Better-rewarded candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the sources for their value to an historian studying political change in Wales and England by considering each source in the context of its origin and in the context of the question set. The focus of these responses was to explain how and why the sources' authors were compelled to say what was said at that particular time. This means that the sources were placed in the context of political developments between 1906 and 1912. There were still some who spent too much time making general and mechanistic comments about authorship. Typically this means phrases like "this source would not be useful/reliable because it is biased", but candidates should always keep in mind that the question is about value to an historian and, often, it is the biased nature of the source that makes it of value to an historian.

The author of Source A was known to most candidates. Candidates may have considered the general historical context of this source by reference to the need for social reform at this time. However, more focus was needed on the appropriate context of 1906, such as the fact that New Liberal ideas were gaining momentum and Lloyd George was expressing his views on the need for the Liberal Government to adapt to the political climate of the time. The Liberals had no firm policy on social reform at the time, but it was the views of Lloyd George and similar proponents of reform that paved the way for state intervention in welfare, partly to counter the threat of the growing Labour movement. This clearly showed how the source would be valuable to those studying political developments at this time. However, the blanket "the source shows us this" approach was still evident, as was a discussion of source utility.

Source B was discussed in relation to it being a satirical cartoon. Candidates may have considered the general historical context of this source by reference to the need for social reform and how some opposed it. However, more focus was needed on the appropriate context of 1909, such as the conflict between the Commons and the Lords and the debate about who should be paying for social reform.

Source C clearly has value in studying political developments in that it shows the demand for women's rights and the frustration felt at the lack of political change in the period 1906–1912. Candidates may have considered the general historical context of this source through references to the campaign for women's suffrage. However, more focus was needed on the appropriate context of 1912, such as the fact that militancy was at its height and the type of action seen in the source was not untypical at the time due to the government's failure to positively respond to the demand for the enfranchisement of women. Certainly there was development in some areas but clearly not in others and this source would be of value in showing the position of women in this period when the campaign for reform was at its height.

The authorship of the sources was discussed by nearly all of the candidates. Some were able to do so while focusing their answers on their value to an historian studying political change in Wales and England between 1906 and 1912. Others discussed the sources' utility or value in general terms, which could have been related to any general question about the period. Again the difference lies between the 'general' and the 'specific'

## **QUESTION 2**

*How valid is the view that economic reasons were mainly responsible for industrial conflict in the period 1900–1914?*

The issue was derived from one of the nominated issues identified in the Specification. Question 2 will always be entirely based on Assessment Objective 3 and candidates need to show they are aware of the different ways in which the named issue has been interpreted and the main developments in the wider historical debate about, in this case, industrial conflict. The assessment 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.

Interpretation 1 argues that industrial conflict was a politically motivated assault on the ruling classes and a call for political change in a period of tension between capitalism and the workers. In analysing and evaluating interpretation 1, candidates might have argued that the extract is heavily influenced by its provenance, it being a clearly left-wing publication aimed at supporting the spread of communist ideology at a time when the debate between left and right was at its height in America as well as the rest of Europe. The source is aimed at Communist-sympathising readers, which accounts for its left-wing standpoint on this issue. Its American origins may also raise questions about the nature of any research undertaken at the time.

Interpretation 2 claims the workers were beginning to form themselves into a distinct group and the idea of a class consciousness was being formed. Clearly the author sees the period as a period of class warfare. Interpretation 2 argues that industrial conflict had primarily economic reasons and militancy was mainly a reaction to government tactics that were heavy handed. Economically, it was poverty and the need for improvement in the treatment of the workers that were the root cause of the disputes but this was not recognized at the time. The extract also dismisses these conflicts as genuine threats to the government of the day and sees the violence as a reaction to government tactics rather than action instigated by disgruntled workers. In analysing and evaluating interpretation 2, candidates may argue that historians such as Robert Pearce form part of a school of thought that seems to consider industrial conflict as a primarily economic concern. Other schools of thought would focus on the social aspects associated with industrial areas as a more valid cause of industrial tension.

## DEPTH STUDY 5

### RELIGIOUS REFORMATION IN EUROPE, C.1500–1564

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

There were 52 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the extent of support within Germany for the Reformation up to 1531.*

Many responses failed to address the key issue at the heart of this question—not who supported the Reformation but the extent of support for it. This resulted in a lot of analysis that was general both in terms of the context and in terms of value to the historian.

Source A suggested that support for Luther by 1521 must have threatened Charles V for him to have to consider action against the reformer, while Source B showed that Luther was in enough danger after his excommunication and imperial ban that he needed a prince's protection to survive. He had the support of some princes at this time but not to the extent that he was completely safe by 1522. By the time of the production of Source C, Luther and his supporters seem confident enough of the extent of their support that they can confidently and publically lay out the ideas and practices of their new Church. The candidates who were best rewarded linked the dates and production of the sources specifically to events relevant to the question and avoided copying out large chunks of text from the sources in the process.

There was a lot of consideration of general historical context surrounding Luther and the Reformation that could have been considered as more specific context with more focus in relation to the question set. The same is also true of value, which was often discussed using a wide range of terms including utility, reliability and tone but without linking directly to what the historian was suggesting. Very few conclusions considered value of the sources to the issue in the question but rather just in general terms with occasional references to the limitations of the selection. The most successful candidates were able to link the sources provided to their specific historical context to show how support for Luther changed in its nature and extent throughout the period covered by the question.

#### QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that Martin Luther was mainly responsible for the outbreak of the German Reformation?*

There were a number of candidates who misunderstood the question and focused on what the interpretations said in relation to the spread of the Reformation, rather than what they said about its outbreak. This was clearly seen by the large number of generic overview introductions that covered the whole Reformation did not focus on the set question and, ultimately, added nothing to the response.

Some candidates provided a very detailed analysis of the authorship of both interpretations, but without any attempt to contextualise the creation of the interpretation, to consider other possible interpretations or to place the interpretations within the wider historical debate.

Others relied too much on copying out chunks of the interpretations provided. Awareness of other interpretations was usually apparent through a few bolt-on and/or pre-learned sentences about the printing press or humanism that were rarely contextualised or linked to the question set. Similarly a lot of analysis of authorship tended to be generic about the authors being academic and specialist. Although a few candidates picked up on the terms 'traditional' and 'revisionist' or that the focus of each book was different, when they did, it tended to be with sweeping generalisations such as "traditional historians only consider one view."

The wider historical debate was considered with varying degrees of success. Some candidates went into great detail about the Marxist interpretation of the Reformation, or they emphasized a more social/cultural focus, but they didn't relate these to either of the interpretations given or to the focus of the question set. The candidates who scored in the higher bands were able to engage with the different views, provide contextual support for those views, analyse the authorship in an attempt to explain why the views were different, and link other possible interpretations to the wider historical debate.

## DEPTH STUDY 6

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

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

There were 168 candidates entered for this option.

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the causes of the French Revolution. 1775–1788.*

The majority of candidates were generally able to offer some evaluative comments on the provided sources including their bias, utility and reliability and also their value to an enquiry into the causes of the French Revolution. Weaker candidates continued to approach the question by trawling through the collection for content, and their comprehension-style responses were rewarded accordingly. Nearly all candidates offered some comments on the strengths and limitations of each source to an understanding why the Revolution took place.

Responses from candidates who achieved higher marks were developed with analysis and evaluation of the sources in their different historical contexts that fully showed their value to an historian undertaking a specific enquiry over a specified period of time. Most candidates understood that the general historical context of the sources and the enquiry were the various pressures that arose in France in the period 1775–1788. Some were able to be more specific; for example the appropriate historical context associated with Source A from 1775 was an attempt to denounce absolutism by a radical lawyer showing the influence of the Enlightenment. Source B was created in the growing pressure about the inequality of the feudal system while Source C clearly is influenced by the febrile atmosphere that pervaded large areas of French society as the 1780s progressed.

A number of candidates appeared to have been encouraged to write lengthy and general, maybe pre-learned, introductions or conclusions and to include sections on what was missing from the sources. They would be better advised to analyse the presented sources in their historical context and focus their evaluations on forming a judgement of their value to an historian studying the causes of the French Revolution. It is essential that candidates focus on assessing the value of the sources to an historian: too often they merely repeated the content of the source, without seeking to support their judgements or consider the sources holistically for the purpose of the set enquiry.

##### QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the National Assembly was largely successful in reforming France 1789–1791?*

Nearly all the candidates were able to identify the interpretations given in the extracts. Interpretation 1 generally supported the view that that the National Assembly was largely successful in reforming France between 1789 and 1791 and interpretation 2 took the opposite view. Most candidates, however, failed to develop their responses further, largely relying on a comprehension exercise on the contents of both extracts, followed by their making general comments on the authorship and then providing one or more paragraphs on other interpretations. Many candidates relied too strongly on making generalised and occasionally mechanistic comments on the use of hindsight or the research undertaken by

the authors. A number of the weaker responses simply replicated the source evaluation approach to the extracts and authorship use in Question 1, which is inappropriate as this question tests Assessment Objective 3 and not 2.

Some candidates were able to show greater understanding of the historical context and the wider historical debate concerning the reforms of the National Assembly by considering the success or otherwise of the reforms in the context of the irreconcilable difficulties within French society brought about by the Revolution. These candidates were also able to show an understanding why different historians have come to different interpretations on the issue. Only a few candidates were able to explain in any meaningful way why the two authors had different views based on their understanding of the historical context of 1789–1791 and how their interpretations represented differing schools of history or thought or where they sat in the developing historical debate over this issue.

## DEPTH STUDY 7

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

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

There were 195 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the tensions caused by the acquisition of new territories by the USA in the period 1847–1852.*

The emphasis should be on analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context, in particular their value to an historian studying tensions caused by the acquisition of new territories in the U in the period 1847–1852. Although centres have responded to the demands of the revised specification, candidates are still spending too much time on lengthy source evaluation and not enough time on placing the sources in context. Too many candidates wasted time copying content rather than evaluating the material in front of them. The appropriate context of Source A was the outcome of the Mexican War and the issue of slavery in the newly acquired territories, and it was hoped candidates would identify the author of the famous Wilmot proviso. The appropriate context for Source B was the compromise of 1850 and in Source C it was the admission of the new slave state of Texas. The general context of all three sources was the growing sectional tension in the US. A discussion of value to an historian would have considered the varying contexts of the three sources.

Source A is a speech in 1847 from David Wilmot opposing the expansion of slavery. The general context was the annexation of Texas and the war against Mexico. The specific context was the issue of slavery in the newly acquired territories. Many candidates were aware of the clue to the previous Wilmot proviso in 1846 (that which sought amend a military expenditure bill to forbid slavery in any territory gained from Mexico). The proviso passed the House but could never pass the Senate. The issue remained unresolved until 1850. Wilmot's speech in Source A goes over the same ground. It shows his aversion to the extension of slavery but it also reveals his toleration of slavery in its current form. The value of the source to an historian lies not only in the context of the Mexican War and its consequences, but also in what it reveals about the racial attitudes of politicians such as Wilmot. Wilmot's use of the free soil argument was going to be central to the thinking behind the new Republican Party in the 1850s. Source A clearly illustrates the issues caused by the Mexican War, prevailing racial attitudes amongst Northern politicians and the developing sectionalism in US politics. This was a telling foretaste of the polarising attitudes thrown up by the slavery issue. It is a contemporary document with strong evidential value in presenting the context of the Mexican War and its consequences as well as the fallout from the creation of free/slave states in the Union.

Source B is a record of a Convention, in a southern state, called to discuss the Compromise of 1850. The general context was the debate in Congress that led to its formulation and some of the specific issues are revealed in the source. The fact that few were happy with the Compromise of 1850 is referred to directly in this contemporary source. Georgia, for example, “does not wholly approve.” Moreover, and alarmingly, the Convention is directly referring to the possibility of secession if the North interferes with slave states and the implementation of the Fugitive Slaves Act. The salience of the Fugitive Slaves Act could not be clearer in Source B. The admission of California as a free state was not popular in the South and the fragility of the compromise is brought out in Source B. The language of sectional controversy and secession is a strong feature of Source B and this would be of considerable value for an historian in understanding the issues. It has good evidential value as an accurate record of the Convention’s current and future concerns. The grudging acceptance of compromise and the allusion to secession does not augur well. It does not look like a strong endorsement of “our much loved union.” Most candidates were able to analyse the context of the compromise and its prospects for success.

Further evidence of the sectional divide is provided by Source C, which is an offensive portrayal of the new state of Texas in an abolitionist poster. The unflattering portrayal of the new state as a monstrous, heavily-armed oppressor of slaves does not pull any punches. Its date, 1852, only two years after the Compromise of 1850 when moderate politicians brokered a deal in Congress to resolve the dispute about the extension of slavery reveals the strong emotions in the North about the admission of slave states into the Union. The context of the opposition to the Fugitive Slave Act in stoking the flames of the abolitionist movement was identified by many candidates. The poster, although partisan, is valuable to an understanding of the passions generated by the slavery issue. The poster is valuable evidence of the strength of sectional controversy, and of the ferocity of political debate in spite of the best efforts of Clay, Calhoun, Webster and Douglas to manufacture a way of preserving the Union in 1850.

Specific source evaluation was generally well done but there were fewer successful attempts to comment on the specific context of the sources. The examiners noted that there were fewer examples of candidates listing omissions or addressing utility rather than value. The new specification requires candidates to provide accurate and appropriate context for the sources and to assess their value to an historian studying the particular issue in this case tensions caused by the acquisition of new territories in the US between 1847 and 1852.

## **QUESTION 2**

*How valid is the view that slavery was mainly responsible for causing the American Civil War?*

Most candidates had little or no difficulty in understanding the different interpretations given in the extracts. The more highly-rewarded candidates were able to suggest, as well, why the interpretations differed with reference to the context of slavery and the causes of the American Civil War. If candidates are to reach the higher levels they have to consider not only why the interpretations differ but also why historians might come to different conclusions when faced with the same evidence. They also need to have a firm grasp of alternative interpretations and how these fit into the developing historical debate over the issue. Named historians are not required but an understanding of the wider historical debate on the issue will always be rewarded. Unfortunately some candidates only focused their answers on the two given extracts and did not consider, at all, the wider historical debate on the issue in the question.

Interpretation 1 argues that slavery was in such marked decline by the 1850s that, with a little patience from the North, the institution would have withered away within a generation. In other words slavery was not responsible for the war; this was the fault of blundering politicians and a minority of agitators who brought about an unnecessary war. Ramsdell clearly believes that slavery had reached the limits of its expansion. In analysing and evaluating the interpretation, candidates should have picked up the wider historical debate about slavery. In particular they might have challenged the position that slavery was doomed and point to evidence about the incredible wealth generated by the system. The debate about the strength of racial feeling in the south and the desperation to defend the institution of slavery in 1860–1861 encouraged some to question Ramsdell's assertion that slave owners would change their attitudes so readily. Ramsdell's position as a revisionist historian and the date of his work suggested that historians like him are deeply influenced by what many saw as an unnecessary war for the US in 1917–1918 with all of its consequences for the country. Blundering politicians according to this view were also responsible.

Interpretation 2 rejects this and Macpherson directly contradicts the interpretation that slavery would have died peacefully. He stresses the economic power of slavery and its tremendous market value in 1860. Moreover, he also highlights the point that slavery was also about racial control and that there was a political dimension to slave power. Macpherson stresses the importance of slavery in the decision for secession and how Lincoln's election was the trigger for secession. In analysing and evaluating interpretation 2, candidates might argue that Macpherson is typical of a generation who came to prominence in the wake of the 1960s and the civil rights movement, which was a very different context to the revisionists at work after the First World War.

Candidates had the opportunity to place these extracts within, and to show awareness of, the wider historical debate surrounding the causes of the US Civil War. In particular, candidates should have been aware of other interpretations such as the impact of the breakdown of the old party system, the failures of leadership in North and South, the economic differences between North and South and the view that states' rights was a key issue in the developing conflict. The original interpretation about the salience of slavery can be seen in Stephens' 1861 speech and Lincoln's 1865 inauguration. Post-revisionism has made slavery central to an understanding of the Civil War. However, only a minority of candidates were able to demonstrate such awareness of the wider historical debate: in many cases it was just a mechanical throwaway reference to another interpretation.

## DEPTH STUDY 8

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

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

There were 2068 candidates entered for this option.

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the growth of the Nazi Party between 1920 and 1930.*

The candidates were expected to assess the value of the three sources to an historian in context of their origin and within the context of the question set. In other words, when each source was written or produced, who produced each source and what it says will have a bearing upon its value to an historian in terms of studying the growth of the Nazi Party between 1920 and 1930.

Many candidates spent too much time outlining the content of each source. In one case the candidate began with *'The source says...'* followed by *'It tells me...'* followed by *'The source mentions...'* and on it went with a range of different lead words. These types of responses often descended into narratives of the period that clearly some candidates seemed to feel would cover the appropriate historical context.

In most cases the candidates were able to show a secure understanding of the content and general context of each source with references to the general emergence of the Nazi Party from the right-wing opposition in Source A, the fact that the Nazi Party now had a National organisation with a newspaper in Source B and the electoral breakthrough for National Socialism in Source C. However, few candidates asserted that the three sources showed the development of the Nazi Party from a fringe movement in Source A with a limited audience in a beer cellar, to a political party in Source B and a mass movement in Source C.

Quality of response was achieved when the candidates were able to place the sources within the correct historical context. For example, in Source A, many candidates referred to the Kapp Putsch; in Source B, the redevelopment of the Nazi party to embrace a legal route to power; and the impact of the Depression on the political fortunes of the Nazi Party in Source C. Unfortunately, many candidates were not as secure in establishing this specific historical context of each source or indeed in establishing a reasoned judgement as to how valuable each source was to an historian. In many cases the source evaluation remained largely mechanistic. Some candidates became confused about the origin of Source A confusing it with the Munich Putsch of 1923. Some spoke of the development of the SA even though it had not yet been established in 1920. In the case of Source B, many candidates saw 1928 as the origin of the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression. Conversely, there were many enlightened candidates who referred to Brüning and the context of the economic meltdown. Many candidates again ignored the precise date of each source, which should have enabled them to place the sources within the appropriate historical context. Appropriate context by its very nature is date specific.

## QUESTION 2

*How valid is the view that the problems of the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–1923 were mainly caused by political instability?*

The majority of candidates had little difficulty in identifying the two different interpretations provided within the extract that focused on the years 1919 to 1923. However, many candidates still seemed unaware of the different ways in which the Weimar Republic within these years has been interpreted. Many candidates continued to blend the two interpretations provided in order to show a third alternative interpretation which they now call the 'synthesis school'. However, this approach can often only lead to only a general awareness of other possible interpretations and will not lead to overall quality of response. The candidates must show an understanding of the wider historical debate in order to produce quality of response. There were numerous other interpretations that they could have included, such as the impact of the First World War, the attitude of the powers towards Germany; the growth in extremist politics and the more common economic explanation. Some candidates took a different but valid approach by arguing that foreign policy successes led to short-term success.

Most candidates confined their responses to concentrating on showing how each extract may have been formed, often by consideration of the content of each extract, but this should be related to placing each interpretation within the developing historical debate about the issue. There were some clear and valid attempts to consider the context of each of the extracts. For interpretation 1, for example, many candidates took the view that the problems of Weimar were caused by an external event in the shape of the Treaty of Versailles. This led to conspiracy theories and collaborationist history, but this ignored the political and economic schools of thinking. Conversely, they asserted that interpretation 2 was based on a political interpretation that laid the blame for the problems of Weimar on a flawed constitutional system and an alienated political tradition. However, few considered the timescale of each extract, one being produced in 1979 and the other in 1995. This meant that the candidates missed an opportunity to show how one interpretation may have been influenced by the groundswell of popular indignation against the Treaty of Versailles whereas the other may have ignored the causal version of history and instead looks at long term political explanation.

**HISTORY**  
**General Certificate of Education (New)**  
**Summer 2018**  
**Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**  
**UNIT 3**

**INTRODUCTION**

In the Breadth Study, the examiners expected that candidates would debate the main skills and concepts outlined in Assessment Objective 1. Centres should focus on ensuring that candidates are aware that Breadth Study essays are designed to encourage fuller chronological coverage of the concepts set in the question. The examiners were looking for responses that considered issues such as the pace of change over the period, the significance and importance of individuals, and the terminology associated with the period studied.

Assessment Objective One is not just about knowledge, it is about using knowledge of the historical developments to debate the historical concepts of change, continuity, cause, consequence, similarity, difference and significance. Candidates tended to rely on recall of the events rather than analysing, evaluating and debating the issues to make a judgement—that was supported by knowledge of the historical developments—on the question set. Many candidates provided detailed knowledge of the themes but without focussing on the more holistic demands of the Breadth Study, including the period coverage required in both questions.

Weaker candidates tended to focus almost exclusively on a narrative of events or on listing a series of developments with (and sometimes without) addressing the main development provided in the question (or even offering a judgement on the question set). These candidates tended to gain marks at Band 2 and at Band 3 for the latter type of response.

Most candidates were able to begin a discussion of the issues and offer a judgement by reference to the key concept in the question (for example, “responsible” or even “mainly responsible”) or they make a ranking effort (“x was more responsible than z”), often at the end of every paragraph. Both practices are mechanistic and formulaic and tend to feature in most if not all the scripts from particular centres and these candidates tended to gain marks at Band 3 and Band 4.

The examiners reported that many candidates appeared to have been taught to provide a “debate” by outlining a number of factors in a series of paragraphs each followed by a judgement on the evaluative word set in the exercise or a concluding paragraph. This approach is not going to be well rewarded as the candidates need to engage with the exact concept in the question set, focus on analysing the issues and evaluating their importance before coming to a supported judgement in a well-written and coherent essay to gain the higher marks.

The higher bands reward candidates who are able to provide a debate on the key concept set in conjunction with the evaluative term to demonstrate their ability to make links and comparisons between different aspects of the period studied. In the higher bands, the examiners expect candidates to engage with the exact concept in the question set, focus on analysing the issues, and evaluating their importance before coming to a substantiated judgement covering the greater part of the chronological period set. These candidates tended to gain Band 5 marks and those who were to sustain and develop the debate over the fuller or entire period set in the question gained Band 6 marks.

Essays at Band 5 and 6 were holistic in nature, debating the key concept set, rather than the various developments, with appropriate factual support. Extensive factual support is not the main demand of the Breadth Study—the examiners are principally looking for period coverage and conceptual understanding.

## BREADTH STUDY 1

### WALES: RESISTANCE, CONQUEST AND REBELLION c. 1240–1415

#### QUESTION 1

*How far did the governance of Wales change in the period 1240–1284?*

This question was attempted by 13 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider changes in the governance of Wales in the 44 year–period between the death of Llywelyn the Great and the enacting of the Statute of Rhuddlan. In line with the demands of the question and in order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the extent of change and continuity in the governance of Wales in this period.

The majority of candidates opted to describe rather than debate the nature and extent of change and continuity in the governance of Wales in this period. This unloading of class notes hindered rather than assisted the exercise in historical debate. That said, some candidates attempted to offer a meaningful discussion of the salient points in the changing nature of governance in this period, focusing on the creation of an independent Welsh state under Llywelyn ap Gruffudd between 1258 and 1267. Only a minority of candidates made reference to the fact that the other native princes were diminished by this power grab. This attempt to unify the state under a single leader had implications for the nature of governance in Wales. Where once the princes of Powys and Deheubarth ruled as absolute monarchs now they governed on behalf of their superior. Llywelyn was no longer *primus inter pares* (first among equals) because he had no equal. The other Welsh ‘princes’ were now his vassals.

Some candidates believed, not unreasonably, that the Statute of Rhuddlan, marked the greatest change in the governance of Wales because the English Crown conquered and divided the country into two distinct administered blocks – the Principality and the marcher lordships.

#### QUESTION 2

*‘The failure of Welsh rebellion and resistance in the period between 1370 and 1415 was mainly due to the lack of effective leadership.’ Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 4 candidates.

Candidates were expected to identify and consider the reasons why rebellion and resistance in Wales failed in the period between 1370 and 1415. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the extent to which the lack of effective leadership was responsible for the failure of rebellion and resistance to English rule in Wales during this period. Candidates explored and discussed the leadership qualities of Owain Lawgoch and Owain Glyndŵr, and then weighed these against alternative reasons for the failure of Welsh rebellion and armed resistance.

Although this was the less popular of the two questions in Section A, the candidates who opted to answer this question did so with a fair degree of confidence. They engaged with the question set by responding to the key concept in a meaningful way by focusing on the evaluative phrase *mainly due*.

Although Owain Lawgoch's leadership was questioned, the candidates thought Glyndŵr was a strong leader who was only defeated by the superior military and financial resources of the English state. No mention was made of Glyndŵr's failure to support his English allies at the decisive battle of Shrewsbury in 1403.

### QUESTION 3

*How far do you agree that the growth of towns was the most significant development in the economy and society of Wales in the period 1284–1415?*

This question was attempted by 17 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the nature and scale of economic and social development in Wales in this period. Candidates were invited to debate, and thereby reach a substantiated judgement on, the extent to which the growth of towns can be considered to have been the *most significant development* in the economy and society of Wales in the 131 years between the enacting of the Statute of Rhuddlan and the end of the Glyndŵr rebellion.

In the main, the answers to this question were reasonable but could have been improved. In discussing the growth of towns, candidates focused on the importance of trade but did not fully appreciate the significance of the plantation towns established by Edward I. These walled towns transformed the social and economic landscape in Wales by supplanting native centres of trade via the exclusion and exploitation of Welsh merchants and traders, and by strengthening trade links with England. Candidates were encouraged to explore the nature of continuity and change in this period. Initial exclusion from these towns turned to inclusion until the Glyndŵr rebellion, which threatened to undo this social and economic integration. More might have been made of the developments in law making and its application or enforcement, for example the mix of English, Welsh and Marcher laws.

For many candidates, the only alternative development to the growth of towns was the impact that the Black Death had on economic and social developments in Wales. This was rewarded, but many did not go on to consider the significance of the rise of the native gentry class and the creation of landed estates. Linked to this was the importance of office holding. The gradual adoption of the English language and customs was also an element overlooked by many candidates.

## BREADTH STUDY 2

### POVERTY, PROTEST AND REBELLION IN WALES AND ENGLAND c. 1485–1603

#### QUESTION 1

*To what extent did protest and rebellion pose a significant threat to the monarchy during the reign of Henry VII (1485–1509)?*

This question was attempted by 76 candidates.

Candidates were invited to consider the nature and scale of the threats and challenges facing Henry VII during his reign. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which protest and rebellion posed a threat to Henry VII. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were expected to debate the seriousness of the threat posed by the various protests, rebellions and other challenges to royal power. The question offered candidates the opportunity to identify and discuss the key rebellions in this period; the Pretenders Simnel and Warbeck; the Yorkshire and Cornish rebellions; Lovell and the Staffords; and plots such as the one involving Sir William Stanley. Allied to this was the threat, both real and potential, posed by foreign powers—Margaret of Burgundy in particular—and the nobility.

The question proved to be accessible to the majority of candidates, almost all of whom focused mainly on the Pretenders Simnel and Warbeck. Although this was expected it was disappointing to witness a number of candidates ignore the rebellions in Yorkshire and Cornwall. This would have enabled them to debate the threat level in a more discerning way. For example, it could be argued that the Cornish and Yorkshire rebels were less threatening than Simnel and Warbeck. The first were essentially protests over tax whereas the latter were dynastic in nature. In addition, the Pretenders involved members of the nobility and drew in support from abroad. In short, the Pretenders aimed at the usurpation of Henry VII whereas the protesters from Cornwall and Yorkshire were venting their anger in the hope that the king would reduce or remove the punitive taxes.

Some candidates did try to employ hindsight as a means of enhancing their debate by suggesting that what may have appeared threatening at the time might have been considered less so later. These tended to take the view that, apart from the Battle of Stoke, Henry VII was never seriously threatened during his reign.

The major weakness in the responses to this question was the tendency to describe each Pretender—their backgrounds and lives before rebellion—rather than debate the extent of the threat they posed to Henry VII. The Battle of Stoke was a key component in the debate because it was the most serious threat faced by Henry who might have been killed.

#### QUESTION 2

*How far do you agree that protest and rebellion posed a significant threat to the monarchy during the reign of Elizabeth I (1558–1603)?*

This question was attempted by 27 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the nature and scale of the threats and challenges facing Elizabeth I during her reign. In line with the demands of the question candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which protest and rebellion posed a threat to the crown. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were expected to debate the seriousness of the threat posed by the various protests, rebellions and other challenges to the queen in her 45-year reign. The question offered candidates the opportunity to identify and discuss the key rebellions in this period, the Northern Earls (1569–1570) and Essex (1601), along with a consideration of the threat posed by plots such as Ridolfi (1570–1571), Throckmorton (1583), Parry (1585) and Babington (1586), and protests such as the food riots in Oxfordshire (1596).

Many candidates opted to debate the issue by adopting a chronological approach that discussed each rebellion and plot in turn. This led to considerable repetition that could have been avoided if the candidates had adopted a thematic approach: for example, by identifying and discussing the most to the least serious threats to Elizabeth. To their credit, some candidates did try to distinguish between the 'plots' and 'rebellions' and in so doing attempted to assess their threat level. Candidates also showed commendable awareness of the religious dimension and of the threat posed by Catholic recusants and Puritan extremists.

The most significant weakness here was in the number of candidates who opted to describe and/or narrate the events connected with the rebellions and plots without really debating the threat posed to Elizabeth.

### **QUESTION 3**

*To what extent can the dissolution of the monasteries be considered the major turning point in the treatment of the poor and vagrants in the period 1495–1601?*

This question was attempted by 103 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the link between the dissolution of the monasteries and the treatment of the poor and vagrants in the period 1495–1601. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the extent to which the dissolution of the monasteries can be considered the major turning point in the treatment of the poor and vagrants in the period. The question hinges on the extent of change and continuity over the century indicated by specific dates that mark the beginning and end of the legislative programme designed to deal with the problems of poverty and vagrancy.

Rather than deal with the dissolution and its impact on the treatment of the poor, the majority of candidates opted for a chronological survey of the whole period, and in some instances, the monasteries were barely mentioned. The key feature in many answers was the impact and/or influence of government legislation over this period. Many candidates seemed to have been prepared to respond to a different question and were able to use the passing of legislation as a barometer of change in the attitude to and treatment of the poor and vagrants. While some did so with only a passing mention of the monasteries, others did try to fit the monasteries into this framework.

It was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates avoided simply listing the Acts passed by successive parliaments, and there was an effort to evaluate the selected Acts by linking them to events in the wider historical context. The influence of the municipalities was prominent among the counter arguments with many candidates demonstrating a sound understanding of the changing attitudes to the poor and vagrants and how these local initiatives influenced national reform programmes. The better-prepared candidates were able to trace the subtle change in the government's attitude to the poor and vagrants through the legislation passed at various critical times during the period, though many did so without due regard to the impact and/or influence of the dissolution of the monasteries.

Few candidates resorted to narrating the events connected with the treatment of the poor and vagrants. Indeed, the majority were well aware that they needed to analyse and evaluate the concept of turning points and even the narrators made an attempt to highlight specific developments and their impact on the differing attitudes to and treatment of vagrants.

## BREADTH STUDY 3

### REFORMATION AND DISCOVERY: EUROPE c.1492–1610

#### QUESTION 1

*To what extent did the motives for exploration and discovery change in the period 1492–1532?*

This question was attempted by 4 candidates.

Responses to this question considered the key issue of change, but did not directly address the key concept, which was the extent of change. Many responses were also very vague, making assertions that were not factually supported. A particular problem with responses to this question was the inclusion of a number of examples that did not fall within the timeframe covered by the question; Henry the Navigator was from the period before 1492–1532 and the Jesuit mission to Japan was not until after this period.

#### QUESTION 2

*'The impact of discovery and exploration was largely positive in the period 1520–1556.'*  
*Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 2 candidates.

Responses tended to focus on the earlier part of the period covered by the question, rather than the later years. Again, there was reference to a lot of material that went beyond the period covered by the question, such as the Portuguese mission to Ethiopia in the 1440s at one extreme and the founding of English colonies in North America at the other extreme.

#### QUESTION 3

*How far do you agree that the publication of Martin Luther's Ninety Five Theses was the major turning point in religion in the period 1500–1600?*

This question was attempted by 6 candidates.

Responses to this question were much stronger on the earlier rather than the later parts of the period in this question, with very little consideration of anything before 1517. The vast majority of responses only focused on Protestant reformers and did not consider developments from the Catholic Church, or more surprisingly the 1555 Peace of Augsburg. There was also a general lack of understanding about what constitutes a turning point; an event or issue that had such a significant impact that it could be seen in retrospect as a major change in direction or perception. Most responses tended to focus more on wider developments and trends.

## BREADTH STUDY 4

### ROYALTY, REVOLUTION AND RESTORATION IN WALES AND ENGLAND c. 1603–1715

#### QUESTION 1

*'The most significant development in radicalism and dissent in the period 1625–60 was the growth of the Leveller movement.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 27 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider developments in radicalism and dissent in the period between the accession of Charles I and the restoration of Charles II. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss and debate the extent to which the growth of the Leveller movement represented the most significant development in radicalism and dissent.

Candidates were expected to explore and discuss the nature and scale of developments in radicalism and dissent in general. However, this proved more than a little challenging for a significant number of candidates who opted to discuss only radicalism, focusing on selected MPs and on developments in Parliament. These essays tended to be narrower in focus, which restricted the discussion. The question required candidates to consider the broader picture by identifying and discussing radical groups such as the Diggers, Fifth Monarchists, Baptists and Quakers alongside the Levellers. Those candidates who linked and debated the radicalism in Parliament with the wider radical movement in the country were amply rewarded. As were those, though few in number, who included in their answers a discussion of the role and influence of the Anglican Church: powerful in the reign of Charles I, almost crushed by the republicans in the Interregnum before its restoration as the state Church alongside the newly restored monarchy.

Some of the better responses tended to discuss the nature and scale of radicalism as a precursor to a mainly two-sided debate on the growth and influence of the Levellers on the one hand, and the development of the other radical and dissenting groups on the other. Some candidates pointed out that the strength of the Levellers lay in the fact that it was an essentially army-based movement. However, the more discerning candidates were able to conclude that dissenting groups such as the Baptists and Quakers outlasted the Levellers, which suggested that the Leveller movement was not the most significant development in radicalism and dissent in the period.

#### QUESTION 2

*To what extent was the Restoration mainly responsible for the changes in radicalism and dissent in the period 1660–1702?*

This question was attempted by 16 candidates.

Candidates were expected to examine and consider the changes that occurred in radicalism and dissent in the post-Restoration period up to the accession of Queen Anne in 1702.

In line with the demands of the question candidates were invited to discuss and debate the extent to which the Restoration was mainly responsible for the changes in radicalism and dissent in this period. Candidates were expected to explore and discuss the nature, influence and impact of the restoration and weigh this against the other possible reasons for the changes in radicalism and dissent.

The greatest weakness in these responses was the tendency to describe rather than debate. That said, a number did attempt to discuss the issue of responsibility, stating that the restoration of the monarchy was a significant cause of radicalism and dissent because it heralded the return of the state Church and the restoration of the privileged position of Anglicanism in the country. Thus the more aware candidates were able to argue that the restored monarchy's support for the established Anglican Church was mainly responsible for the decline of radicalism and dissent.

It was pleasing to witness the attempt by the majority of candidates to discuss the impact and influence of science, technology and intellectual inquiry on religious belief in general and on radical and dissenting ideology. It was refreshing to see that almost all the candidates attempted to cover the period up to (though some insisted on including) the reign of Queen Anne.

### **QUESTION 3**

*How far do you agree that the greatest challenge to political stability in the period 1603–1715 was weak leadership?*

This question was attempted by 43 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the nature of and challenges to political stability in the period 1603–1715. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which weak leadership was one of the greatest challenges to political stability when weighed against 'other' challenges.

In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the impact that weak leadership had on political stability. The majority of candidates understood the premise of the question, that 'weak leadership' involved the nation's decision makers: from monarchs and republican dictators to parliamentarians and senior clerics.

As expected there was a heavy emphasis on rating the leadership qualities of each ruler. Those that did this in a chronological manner, leader by leader, might have covered the period, but the responses tended to be descriptive. The better-prepared candidates were selective in their choice of national leader enabling them to engage in a meaningful debate about the challenges they faced. For example, Charles I (1625–1649), James II (1685–1688) and Richard Cromwell (1658–1659) were identified as 'weak' leaders whose respective 'reigns' had an impact on political stability. By contrast James I (1625–1625), Charles II (1660–1685), Oliver Cromwell (1649–1658) and William III (1688–1702) were considered strong leaders. It was a little disappointing to witness so few candidates consider the impact and influence of favourites and ministers such as Cecil, Buckingham, Laud, Wentworth and Clarendon. They did much to influence and shape the political and religious landscape in the kingdom.

Equally, few candidates strayed far beyond the monarchs to consider other aspects such as financial problems, religious differences and, of course, civil war, which also challenged the political stability of the kingdom. For the majority of candidates, the tension and hostility

between parliament and the monarchs (including Cromwell) provided the key challenge to political stability.

## BREADTH STUDY 5

### FRANCE: ANCIEN REGIME TO NAPOLEON c. 1715–1815

#### QUESTION 1

*'The growth of the bourgeoisie was the most significant development in the society and economy of France in the period 1715–1763.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 22 candidates.

Candidates who attempted this question were required to focus on the key concept of significance and offer an evaluation of the impact of the growth of the bourgeoisie in the context of change in the society and economy of France over the set period. Some candidates were able to focus their response on analysing the opportunities presented for the growth of the bourgeoisie by economic and social change and then evaluating that development by debating its significance in relation to other developments such as the impact of the Regency, the reforms of Fleury and the influence of the Enlightenment, each of which had a real impact on the society and economy of France. A number of candidates set their responses on the influence of the bourgeoisie on the causes of the French Revolution, which was not required.

#### QUESTION 2

*How far do you agree that Napoleon had largely preserved the social and economic changes of the French Revolution by 1815?*

This question was attempted by 76 candidates.

Candidates who attempted this question had a reasonable grasp of some of the social and economic changes made by Napoleon, especially the Concordat and the Code Napoleon. Candidates were expected to focus on the concept of similarity and difference by identifying the main social and economic changes made by the Revolution and debating the degree to which Napoleon preserved them. A few candidates focused on identifying the changes made by the Revolution in their response but the majority simply outlined a number of reforms made by Napoleon and asserted a judgement without entering into a debate covering the changes over the period from 1789.

#### QUESTION 3

*To what extent was weak leadership mainly responsible for changes in politics and government in France during the period 1715–1815?*

This question was attempted by 98 candidates.

This type of question, requiring an overview of a century, still proves challenging for many candidates but it is the essence of the Breadth Study. Identifying the key concept, providing relevant content and then executing a coherent response that is well argued and offers a balanced judgement is a challenging assessment but it can be done.

A number of candidates focused exclusively on the latter half of the period despite the requirement for holistic coverage of the whole period. Too many candidates simply identified the 'weak leadership' of Louis XVI and contrasted that with the 'strong leadership' of Robespierre and Napoleon. Others listed a range of governments and offered a series of judgements on each. Better-rewarded responses considered, evaluated and debated the concept of the significance of weak leadership among a range of developments in bringing change to the politics and government of France. They also reached an appropriate and balanced judgement.

## BREADTH STUDY 6

### PARLIAMENTARY REFORM AND PROTEST 1780–1885

#### QUESTION 1

*How far do you agree that governments dealt effectively with popular protest in the period 1780–1820?*

This question was attempted by 111 candidates.

The key concept to debate was whether governments dealt *effectively* with popular protest in the period 1780–1820 and to reach a substantiated judgement on the question set, that is, “*how far do you agree?*” Most candidates had some grasp of how governments responded to popular protest in this period and there was support for the proposition that the governments of Pitt and Liverpool dealt effectively with protest. This was countered by other arguments that the failure to deal with economic and social problems stimulated unrest so these governments could not be said to be effective. The Gordon Riots in 1780 were not well understood and these could have figured in the discussion. Some very good answers questioned whether the government had enough resources to police disorder effectively anyway. The persistence of the parliamentary reform issue persuaded some candidates to argue that the government’s failure to address the issue encouraged radical protest. The examiners noted that period coverage was usually satisfactory in answers to this question.

#### QUESTION 2

*To what extent did rural protests have a greater impact upon government policy than any other popular protest in the period 1815–1848?*

This question was attempted by 42 candidates.

The key concept to debate was whether rural protests had a *greater* impact upon government policy than other forms of protest. Some very good responses considered the impact of the Swing Riots on the Reform Act crisis and government policy towards poor law reform, making comparisons with the later Rebecca Riots. The Chartist movement was regarded as an urban protest and much attention was given to the impact of the movement on government policy. Weaker responses lapsed into lengthy descriptions of the movement without focusing on the impact on policy. The Reform Act crisis was seen as providing strong evidence for the view that popular protest had a direct impact on the decisions of the Whig government. There was less debate on the earlier period in the question, especially 1815–1820. The trade union movement deserved more attention than it received, especially the campaign to pardon the Tolpuddle Martyrs. Period coverage was rather patchy, with a significant minority ignoring the immediate post-war period and the 1840s.

### QUESTION 3

*'The Second Reform Act 1867 was the most significant turning point in the campaign for parliamentary reform in the period 1780–1885.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 153 candidates.

The key concept was whether the Second Reform Act was the *most significant* turning point in the campaign for parliamentary reform. The important issue was the quality of debate and the understanding shown of the concept of a turning point, that an event or issue had such a significant impact that it could be seen in retrospect as a major change in direction or perception. A substantiated judgement carried a great deal more weight than a throwaway comment not tied into the structure of the previous paragraphs. Examiners noted that candidates were often insecure about the terms of the significant Reform Acts, which made it difficult to argue about the issue of whether 1867 was a turning point. In fact many asserted that the working classes were not enfranchised in 1867. Coverage was definitely an issue with many ignoring the first 50 years of the period and also giving cursory consideration to the 1884–1885 Acts. A few good responses did make the case for regarding 1832 as a breakthrough turning point and also considered the ballot and corruption reforms of the 1870s and 1880s as worthy of serious consideration as alternative turning points. The importance of adequate period coverage cannot be stressed too much in a breadth study paper and this was seen in answers to Section B questions where a focus on developments over 100 years will always be expected.

## BREADTH STUDY 7

### SOCIAL CHANGE AND REFORM IN WALES AND ENGLAND c. 1890–1990

#### QUESTION 1

*How far do you agree that developments in public health and housing had the most significant impact on British society from 1918 to 1951?*

This question was attempted by 161 candidates.

The better-rewarded candidates took time to reflect upon the question set and this could be seen by the fact that the answers were far more focused. Clearly the candidates had thought about how British society was different in 1951 compared to 1918 and then reflected on whether developments in public health and housing had the most significant impact on society during that period.

Many were able to discuss public health and housing in some detail citing various acts such as the Addison, Chamberlain and Wheatly Housing Acts as well as developments in housing and public health under the Labour Governments of 1945–1951. Where some faltered was on the discussion of the impact of these Acts, which was paramount to the question set. It was notable, however, that in some centres candidates had been taught specific issues to discuss rather than given free rein to discuss the topic as they wish. As a result, some candidates discussed housing and health, then war, then education followed by a judgement. When nearly all candidates from a centre do this it is clearly pre-prepared and it constrains the more able candidates, who could widen the debate and provide a more meaningful discussion of the key concept. Evaluation of the key concept is the skill and examiners do not require candidates to study a set series of developments as this is a period study where coverage is the key.

#### QUESTION 2

*To what extent were changes in the role and status of women the most important development in British society from 1945 to 1990?*

This question was attempted by 70 candidates.

Candidates that received the highest marks did so because they focused on the key concept in the question and provided an evaluative response concerning 'the most important development' over the period 1945–1990. Less successful candidates provided a series of developments with weak focus on the key concept in the question set.

Developments in the lives of women certainly led to significant moves towards equality in Britain. These included the introduction of contraception in 1961, the Family Planning Act of 1969, the Divorce Reform Act 1969, the Abortion Act 1967, the Sexual Discrimination Act 1975, and the Equal Pay Act 1979. Each of these acts contributed to putting Britain on its continuum towards creating an equal society. However, the importance of these developments are debatable given the slow nature of change and continuing opposition from various corners of society.

Many candidates concerned the importance of the developments introduced due to the Beveridge Report and the Welfare State. It was argued—well in some cases—that these developments may have outweighed the developments in the lives of women in their impact on society. Other candidates managed to argue the case for the growth of a consumer society, developments in popular culture, race relations and immigration, and economic growth.

As stated in previous reports, the post-war period deserves as much attention as the earlier period but it is an area not well covered given the responses seen. Whereas candidates seemed knowledgeable about the achievements of the Labour Governments (1945–1951) and sometimes about the Thatcher Governments post-1979, very few could provide further knowledge about the period 1951–1979. There were a few sketchy comments about popular culture and migration but by and large there remains a dearth of knowledge concerning this period.

### **QUESTION 3**

*‘The reforms of the Liberal Governments 1906–1914 were the most effective attempt at tackling the problem of poverty in the period 1890–1990.’ Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 231 candidates.

The key concept in the question was ‘most effective’ and therefore the impact of the various reforms associated with poverty needed to be addressed rather than the ‘what they did approach’. Candidates, for the most part, were knowledgeable about the Liberal reforms and their effect on poverty, but a significant number tended to discuss more reforms of all kinds without focusing on the issue of poverty.

Another issue was those candidates who did not cover the period in the question set which was 1890–1990. Very many discussed the Liberal reforms between 1906 and 1911, Labour reforms 1945–1951 and some reforms of the Thatcher Governments 1979–1990. This only really covers 22 years and is not in keeping with the demands of a breadth study of 100 years. Such patchy coverage is not going to allow candidates to access high band marks.

Again, as previously noted, it appears as if the post-1951 period is not given enough focus in the teaching and learning programme, which is a problem given that the 100–year question is a compulsory question and will make an appearance every year.

## BREADTH STUDY 8

### THE AMERICAN CENTURY 1890–1990

#### QUESTION 1

*‘Migration from south to north was the most important development affecting the lives of African Americans in the period 1890–1929’. Discuss*

This question was attempted by 501 candidates.

The key concept to discuss was the extent to which migration was the *most important* development affecting the lives of African Americans in the period 1890–1929. Many candidates were able to assess the impact of migration in the north although relatively few considered the consequences for those left in the south. The advantages and disadvantages of the migration were generally well known and there were good discussions of the relative importance of other developments such as the contribution of individuals, the activism of the NAACP, the experience of segregation in the south and the revival of the KKK in the 1920s. Several answers concentrated on the Jim Crow laws and the operation of the Supreme Court as significant developments. Weaker responses did not focus on the key concept. Examiners also noted that a significant minority had a hazy grasp of chronology and these answers strayed into the 1930s with lengthy descriptions of the New Deal. In a breadth study the correct period coverage is vital as is the necessity of a substantiated judgement on the key concept.

#### QUESTION 2

*How far do you agree that the work of President Johnson had the most significant influence upon the achievement of civil rights for African Americans in the period 1941–1968?*

This question was attempted by 933 candidates.

The key concept here was whether the work of President Johnson had the *most significant* influence on the achievement of civil rights for African Americans in the period 1941–1968. Many candidates had a good knowledge base about Johnson’s achievement. His southern background, previous commitment to civil rights and his political skill in steering the crucial legislation through in 1964–1965 were analysed well. Some of the better answers also considered the wider impact of Johnson’s domestic agenda beyond the specific legislation. A commonly-argued viewpoint was that his work was essentially the legacy of Kennedy’s conversion to a more proactive approach to civil rights. There were some firmly-argued responses that claimed that others had a more significant influence, notably Martin Luther King Jr and the civil rights movement, and other presidents such as Truman and Eisenhower. Some responses focused just on individuals and did not consider the impact of the Second World War and the Supreme Court decisions of the 1950s.

Weaker responses decided on a narrative approach with only occasional references to the concept of *most significant* required by the question. The importance of a genuine debate and a substantiated judgement within the framework of appropriate period coverage cannot be stressed too much in a breadth study.

### QUESTION 3

*To what extent was the Truman Doctrine the most significant turning point in the foreign policy of the USA in the period 1890–1990?*

This question was attempted by 1430 candidates.

The major issue with this question was period coverage. Although the period from 1945 was generally well evaluated, examiners noted that the earlier and later periods required by the question were not so confidently handled by candidates. The key concept required in the question was a debate about a significant turning point, in this case the Truman Doctrine. This was a different exercise to identifying significant influences that weaker responses tended to concentrate on.

The Truman Doctrine could be seen as a significant turning point as it heralded the policy of containment. Many candidates debated its importance as a contrast to earlier phases of American foreign policy. Candidates explained that it underlined a hardening of attitudes toward the USSR and assessed its impact on later stages of the Cold War. Alternative turning points were offered, with many candidates opting for the entry of the US into the First and Second World Wars, or the onset of détente. Responses that were less successful listed many turning points without much thought given to their relative importance. The important issue was the quality of debate and the understanding shown of the concept of a turning point: that an event or issue had such a significant impact that it could be seen in retrospect as a major change in direction or perception. A substantiated judgement carried a great deal more weight than a throwaway comment not tied into the structure of the previous paragraphs.

The importance of adequate period coverage cannot be stressed too much in a breadth study paper. In Section B questions a focus on developments over 100 years will always be expected.

## BREADTH STUDY 9

### CHANGING LEADERSHIP AND SOCIETY IN GERMANY c.1871–1989

#### QUESTION 1

*To what extent did Bismarck's social and economic reforms have a largely positive impact on the lives of the German people in the period 1871–1914?*

This question was attempted by 89 candidates.

The confidence about the Bismarckian period that emerged last year was not as apparent this year. Many of the responses lacked a balanced consideration of the key issues. Many candidates chose to accept the premise of the question and very one-dimensional responses emerged. Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of a range of Bismarck's domestic policies, focusing upon different developments or features or characteristics rather than a precise and meaningful debate of the key concept. This was to consider the effects of Bismarck's social and economic reforms on the lives of the German people.

Some candidates were unable to debate the impact of the domestic policies on the German people due to a lack of appropriate knowledge. Some of the responses were vague and candidates were unable to support the assertions which they made. Knowledge of protectionism and the *Kulturkampf* was usually sound, but there was little awareness that Bismarck's domestic policies were directed more by consideration of class struggle, so that their impact on the general public was largely negative. Bismarck left a legacy of unresolved social and economic problems. Indeed, it might have been a better approach to focus upon the impact of social and economic policy on different groups in society, rather than adopt an approach to society in general. This would have allowed for a more meaningful debate of the key concept to emerge.

#### QUESTION 2

*'Ideological differences were mainly responsible for the contrasting social and economic development of East and West Germany in the period 1947–1989'. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 26 candidates.

Many of the responses were limited and it seems that many candidates did not fully understand the implications of the question. For some candidates, the idea of ideological differences were clearly a step too far. Furthermore, few candidates were able to link ideological differences to the capitalist economic reconstruction of West Germany as opposed to the rejection of Marshall Aid in East Germany. Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of a range of different developments in both West and East Germany—almost always centred around leadership—rather than a precise and meaningful debate of the key concept. In fact, many candidates began their response with *"Ideological differences were responsible for contrasting economic and social development but there were also other factors."* This inevitably led to a generalised listing approach that did not debate whether ideological differences were the driving force. Few candidates argued that the complex relationship between politics and economics underpinned the economic and social development of each country. Furthermore, the fact that West Germany had access to the liberalised global economy was often overlooked.

### QUESTION 3

*How far do you agree that the downfall of the Weimar Republic was the most significant turning point in the political development of Germany in the period 1871–1989?*

This question was attempted by 115 candidates.

Most candidates were able to recognise that the downfall of the Weimar Republic was a significant turning point in the political development of Germany because Germany had for the first time engaged with democratic government and it had failed. However, many failed to consider whether it was the most significant turning point and then drifted into a general discussion of the main reasons for the collapse of the Weimar Republic instead of weighing up the significance of the collapse of the Weimar Republic against other turning points such as the fall of Bismarck or the Nazi totalitarian regime. Few actually debated the significance of the downfall of the Weimar Republic as the political development in terms of what it represented: the failure to embrace democracy and the rejection of liberal politics. Candidates tended to argue that the collapse of the Weimar Republic was a significant turning point because it led to the Nazification of Germany. Even fewer argued that the collapse and failure of the Weimar Republic was not unexpected, so it should not be seen as the most significant turning point. It was thus an aberration rather than a turning point in the political development of Germany. Most, in the end, plumped for the Nazi regime as marking the most significant turning point even though it marked a point of continuity with other types of authoritarian regimes inside Germany. The division of Germany as a counter argument was surprisingly overlooked as the most significant turning point and, furthermore, the fact that it was ignored by some meant the responses lacked balanced coverage overall. Some candidates considered changing leadership as the focus of the response, but the best responses focused upon providing a sustained, substantiated and integrated judgement about Weimar in relation to other systems, and those responses covered the whole period.

## BREADTH STUDY 10

### CHANGING LEADERSHIP AND SOCIETY IN RUSSIA c.1881–1989

#### QUESTION 1

*How far do you agree that War Communism had the most significant impact on the lives of the Russian people in the period 1881–1924?*

This question was attempted by 49 candidates.

Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of a range of different economic developments in the period, rather than a precise and meaningful debate of the key concept of ‘significant impact.’ In fact, many candidates following a routine introduction, began their response with *“Although War Communism had a significant impact on the lives of the Russian people in the period, there were other significant developments which also had an impact on the lives of the Russian people.”* More surprisingly, there was an upsurge in the number of pure narratives on the theme. While the quality of factual knowledge was often impressive, candidates were unable to enter into any form of debate on the set question, however limited.

The weaker responses offered a generalised list of the major developments that characterised the period 1881–1924. Many candidates began with War Communism and did not refer to the earlier period of Tsarist Russia. For these candidates, period coverage therefore became a serious issue. Candidates are advised to read the question carefully and to focus on constructing their response within the parameters of the precise question (some answers drifted into the Stalin’s regime). Most candidates argued that the effects of War Communism were catastrophic, although many chose not to weigh this up against the impact of the abolition of serfdom. The First World War was almost universally ignored.

#### QUESTION 2

*‘The most significant changes in the society and economy of Soviet Russia in the period 1953–1989 were made by Khrushchev’. Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 17 candidates.

Candidates were required to weigh up the social and economic changes of Khrushchev against the social and economic changes of the other leaders in the period. Sadly, this rarely occurred. There appeared to be evidence here of candidates not reading the question carefully. A number of candidates misread the question and wrote entirely about the Khrushchev era. Additionally, some argued that the social policies of Khrushchev were more significant than the economic changes, which was not the question set. This meant that balanced evaluations of the question could not emerge because of the one-dimensional nature of the responses.

Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a generalised discussion of a range of different developments in Russia between 1953 and 1989, rather than a precise and meaningful debate of the key concept within the theme. In fact, many candidates began their response with “*There were many significant changes in the society and economy of Soviet Russia in the period 1953–1989.*” This inevitably led to either a generalised, listing approach that did not debate whether the most significant changes in society and the economy were made by Khrushchev.

In relation to Khrushchev, many candidates drifted into an analysis and evaluation of the political aspects of Destalinization. Most candidates showed promising awareness of the social and economic changes under Brezhnev and Gorbachev, but they often failed to weigh up their significance in relation to Khrushchev. Many candidates had an oversimplified understanding of the processes, which they saw as making a decisive break with the past. Stalin’s legacy still made it difficult for Gorbachev and others to solve the problems that they faced. There was often too much description and narrative so that a balanced analysis and meaningful comparison of the various changes in the society and economy of Soviet Russia did not emerge.

### **QUESTION 3**

*To what extent did Lenin provide the most effective leadership of Russia in the period 1881–1989?*

This question was attempted by 66 candidates.

Most candidates chose not to define what they saw as the features and characteristics that they would expect to see under the umbrella of “the most effective leadership.” Did it mean the quality of political control and repression? Did it mean the extent of political change or the effectiveness of political reform? This would have opened up many diverse avenues of analysis and evaluation of the key concept. Instead of which, the majority of candidates drifted into a trawl of the policies of each of the respective leaders of Russia in the period. This usually resulted in two possible outcomes: either a general listing of the political changes in Russia or a mechanistic outline of the major features and characteristics associated with the theme, followed by a mini-judgement.

Overall, the quality of the supporting evidence was sound but the application of it to meet the demands of the question was often suspect. There were still some rather routine and mechanistic “for and against” responses that considered leadership in a positive versus negative structure. Some of the responses went no further than comparing the political authority of Lenin and Stalin. Such an approach did not allow sufficient coverage of the theme. Some responses, although dealing with the impact of political leadership upon diverse groups within society, often reached very routine and rehearsed judgements in relation to the success or failure of the various leaders. Many candidates trawled through the leadership of Russia, arguing that individuals were either strong or weak leaders. Many candidates did not even consider the leadership of Russia in the period 1881–1914, and a few concentrated mainly on the period 1894–1965.

The better-rewarded candidates focused upon providing a sustained, substantiated and integrated judgement that covered the whole period. They engaged with the key concept and covered the greater part of the period and debated the fuller range of features and characteristics associated with the most effective leadership.

**HISTORY**  
**General Certificate of Education (New)**  
**Summer 2018**  
**Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced**  
**UNIT 4**

**INTRODUCTION**

The responses at Question 1 showed many of the same traits as at Unit 2 with most candidates unable to focus on the historical context of the sources or address the particular question set in the examination. Candidates need to be more aware of the particular question set, especially to discuss and debate the value of the sources to an historian studying a particular issue over a particular period of time.

A significant number of candidates were unable to go beyond simple comprehension or copying of the sources while others provided considerable amounts of background material that was often irrelevant to the appropriate historical context. Candidates are, in this the Depth Study, expected to have an appropriate understanding of the historical context of the sources and show their value to an historian undertaking a particular enquiry over a set time period. Discussion of the appropriate historical context demands an understanding of the place of the source in the developments being investigated by the historians rather than providing a narrative of events or large sections of background material as was noted from some candidates.

The majority of candidates presented a source-by-source evaluation commenting on the content, bias, tone and reliability of each source before attempting some judgement on their value or, quite often, utility. These responses tended to gain Band 3 and 4 marks. Candidates need to move away from comprehension exercises on the sources towards a more evaluative approach to discuss the value of each source, in its historical context, to an historian studying a particular issue over a particular period of time.

At the higher bands candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the sources in their different historical context for their value to an historian undertaking a specific enquiry over a specified period of time. These candidates were able to discuss the appropriate historical context linked to each source in the context of the developments over the time period set.

The essays in this Depth Study did not generally suffer from a lack of knowledge, but even so, candidates need to do more than rely on recall of the developments and events studied. The examiners noted that many candidates relied on a rather mechanistic approach to writing an open-ended essay that involved the listing of “factors” followed by an asserted judgement, which is not a satisfactory technique to meet the demands of the mark scheme at the higher bands. The examiners expect, at the upper bands, to find responses with a convincing attempt to analyse, evaluate and debate the key concepts and issues leading to a substantiated judgement. There was some evidence that candidates at the upper end of the mark scheme were engaged with the actual question set and were able to provide a debate and an appropriate and balanced judgement.

A number of candidates tended to list a series of developments and provide a judgement on the question set. These candidates tended to gain marks at Band 3 for that type of response. Most candidates were able to begin a discussion of the issues and offer a judgement by reference to the key concept in the question. These candidates tended to gain marks at Band 3 and Band 4. The higher bands reward candidates who are able to provide a debate on the set question and who demonstrate their ability to make links and comparisons between different aspects of the period studied.

## DEPTH STUDY 1

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

#### PART 2: CHALLENGES FACING MARY AND ELIZABETH c. 1553–1570

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the problems facing Mary I in the period 1554–1556.*

This question was attempted by 108 candidates.

The focus of Question 1 is on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period of time, in this instance the problems facing Mary in the period 1554–1556. The question is about analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context. The general historical context associated with these sources was the security of the kingdom and safety of the queen and her government in the face of threats from Protestant opponents, both at home and abroad, following the failure of the Wyatt Rebellion.

In order to address the set enquiry, there needed to be reference to the specific historical context in which each source was created. This may include reference to the publication of Protestant propaganda attacking Mary based on her gender and religion, the fear of plots involving Elizabeth to usurp Mary in the wake of the Wyatt Rebellion and the unrest stoked by the persecution and burning of Protestant heretics.

The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the nature and scale of the problems facing Mary in the years 1554–1556. The majority of candidates opted to discuss the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian in a concluding paragraph. Many concluded that the sources were most valuable in understanding the nature, scale and impact of the religious problems facing the pro-Catholic Mary, although a number considered the misogynistic tone evident in at least two of the sources.

In regard to Source A, many candidates focused on the misogynistic tone of the Protestant exile Thomas Becon and his criticism of the religious policies of Mary. Candidates rightly considered Becon to be an unreliable, biased and bitter critic of the queen but missed the opportunity to suggest that his misogyny may well have been shared by many Pro-Catholic subjects. Thus, even some of her own supporters may have had misgivings about her right and ability to rule, which ties in with the problems she encountered in Source C. Nevertheless, the majority of candidates clearly appreciated the value of this source to an historian because it related in clear terms the type of opposition facing Mary and the nature of the problems she had to resolve early in her reign.

With regard to Source B, the majority of candidates simply took it to be a declaration of innocence by Elizabeth without really appreciating that this hinted at the possibility of her becoming the figurehead for further plots and rebellion. Elizabeth posed a significant problem for Mary because she was of her blood, her heir (in the event of a childless marriage) and a Protestant. This is particularly valuable to an historian because it shows that some of the problems facing Mary at this time were insurmountable. Whichever option she chose to deal with Elizabeth—execute, imprison or release—the consequences would be serious.

With regard to Source C, many candidates did not appreciate the possibility that this was potentially the most valuable source of all. This source highlighted the fact that Mary herself was struggling to rule the kingdom effectively. Her plea for help to her father-in-law for the return of her husband seems to confirm Bacon's criticism of her in Source A. This suggests that the biggest problem of all by 1556 was Mary herself. She seemed to be breaking down under the strain of ruling an increasingly turbulent kingdom. A female ruler seeking the aid of a male counterpart to help resolve the problems in the kingdom shows the considerable pressure that she was under.

Even some of the stronger candidates began their answers with content descriptions, although most of them did make some attempt to analyse and evaluate the sources and to place them, with varying degrees of success, in the context of the issue being studied by the historian. More might have been made of the attributions which would have enabled the candidates to offer a more considered response on the nature and scale of the problems facing Mary. A significant number of candidates discussed the tone of the sources, but they did so in a mechanistic manner. It is also a concern that, yet again, far too many candidates seem intent on stating that the sources are primary and therefore reliable.

## QUESTION 2

*To what extent was the Puritan challenge mainly responsible for the problems facing Elizabeth I in the period 1558–1570?*

This question was attempted by 59 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the nature, scale and impact of the problems facing Elizabeth I between her accession and the outbreak of major rebellion in 1570. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to discuss the role, nature and scale of the Puritan challenge and to debate whether it was mainly responsible for the problems confronting Elizabeth and her government. Many candidates opted to debate the issue by first identifying and listing the problems facing Elizabeth: political, religious, economic and social. This was encouraging as it had the benefit of avoiding a purely chronological approach to the question, but some did little beyond this listing.

The better-rewarded candidates linked the religious and political challenges facing the queen, stating that the most serious problem facing Elizabeth was the threat to her person, in particular, and to the monarchy in general. In this respect, many concluded that religious conflict was the primary cause of her political problems. The threat posed by the Catholics was considered more serious than that offered by the Puritans; one aimed at her removal while the other did not. However, taken together they posed a significant threat to the political and religious stability of the kingdom.

A large number of candidates argued that the Puritan challenge was not responsible for the problems facing the queen, rather it was the ambition of powerful nobleman, allied to rivalry and jealousy over the promotion of royal favourites such as Cecil and Leicester. Social and economic changes were either ignored or briefly mentioned. Considering the problems caused by these changes was a significant omission in some otherwise well-written essays.

### QUESTION 3

*How far do you agree that enclosures were mainly responsible for the changes in the lives of the people of Wales and England in the period 1553–1570?*

This question was attempted by 48 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider a range of social and economic issues in Wales and England during the period 1553–1570. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which enclosures were *mainly responsible* for the changes in the lives of the people of Wales and England. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the nature, scale and impact enclosures had on the population at large and to weigh these against other possible causes of change that may have affected the lives of the people.

This was the less popular of the two essay question choices available to candidates and this manifested itself in generally weaker answers. The majority of candidates opted to tackle this question by providing a two-sided response; enclosures weighed against the other changes. There was a fair degree of description on enclosures and only when candidates considered issues such as the growth of towns, landed estates, unemployment, inflation, poverty and vagrancy, was there an attempt to offer a meaningful discussion. What was lacking was any meaningful discussion of social developments such as social advancement and concepts of gentility enabling merchants and tradesmen to acquire the trappings of gentry status such as coats of arms.

## DEPTH STUDY 2

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

#### PART 2: CIVIL WAR, COMMONWEALTH AND PROTECTORATE c.1642–1660

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the challenges facing the government during the period 1649–1655.*

This question was attempted by 108 candidates.

The focus of Question 1 is on assessing the value of the sources to a historian studying a particular line of enquiry over a specific period of time, in this instance the challenges facing the government during the period 1649–1655. The question is about analysing and evaluating the value of the sources in their historical context. The general historical context associated with these sources was the establishment and functioning of republican government in the period following the execution of the king to the introduction of the rule of the Major-Generals.

In order to address the set enquiry, there needed to be reference to the specific historical context in which each source was created. This may include reference to the growth and influence of radical groups such as the Levellers, Cromwell's assumption of power as Lord Protector, his growing unpopularity and the tension between the army and parliament.

The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of the difficult circumstances that republican governments found themselves in after the six years following the execution of the king. The majority of candidates opted to discuss the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian in a concluding paragraph. Many concluded that the sources were most valuable in understanding the variety of the challenges facing the government in this turbulent period.

All three sources proved accessible to the majority of candidates. With regard to Source A, most candidates recognised its significance in terms of understanding the challenges presented to government by radical groups such as the Levellers. Some were surprised by the fact that the Leveller in question was a woman and was demanding the same rights, liberties and privileges enjoyed by men. In short, the Petition of Women was demanding equality. More might have been made of the fact that in the late 1640s there were a group of politically-aware women who felt that the death of the king had freed them from the constraints of the old social order, and that in a world turned upside down they would become equal citizens.

With regard to Source B, the majority of candidates acknowledged the tension that existed between the army and parliament in 1652, although few made the point that this was barely three years after the abolition of the monarchy. Indeed, many candidates missed the opportunity to explore the value of the source in terms of what it told us about the circumstances leading to Cromwell's assumption of power as Lord Protector. The dichotomy here is that the abolition of monarchy had led to the creation of a monarch in all but name.

With regard to Source C, the candidates suggested that the Venetian ambassador was likely telling the truth about the growing opposition to and unpopularity of the 'dictator' Cromwell. This was valuable because it showed an upsurge in popular feeling against Cromwell's increasingly autocratic style of government by 1655. Candidates missed the opportunity to argue that the ambassador's knowledge of events in England may have been largely confined to London. Did this opposition to Cromwell represent the feeling of the people at large? This would alter the value of the source since the scale of the challenge would have been much less had it applied only to the disgruntled population of London rather than to the whole nation.

The better-rewarded candidates were able to analyse and evaluate the three sources and to place them in the context of the issue being studied by the historian. On the other hand, some candidates used the phrase "*this source is valuable to an historian because...*", but were unable to discuss or explain the value of the sources to an historian. Almost inevitably, some candidates used *useful* in their responses, which hampered their ability to deal with the demands of the question set.

A number of candidates did not make sufficient use of the attributions. Some simply copied them while others copied and offered only token comments. A minority of candidates even ignored the attributions. Many candidates were aware of the need to use and discuss the significance of the attributions but the quality of the response varied greatly. Far too many candidates noted that the authors could be trusted because they were contemporaries who may have witnessed much of what they had written about. This simplistic and repeated reference to the contemporary nature of the sources and their reliability proved an unnecessary distraction.

## QUESTION 2

*'Parliament's control of London was mainly responsible for its victory in the Civil War by 1648.'* Discuss.

This question was attempted by 153 candidates.

Candidates were expected to consider the reasons why the Parliamentarians were victorious in the Civil War. In line with the demands of the question, candidates were invited to discuss the extent to which Parliament's control of London was *mainly responsible* for its victory. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were encouraged to debate the significance of Parliament's control of London when weighed against other reasons to explain Parliament's victory in the Civil War.

Many candidates opted to debate the issue by adopting a listing approach to the question, where the main reasons for Parliament's victory were described, followed by a counter argument suggesting that 'other factors' such as superior military leadership and the New Model Army were largely responsible for Parliament's victory. The roles of Cromwell and Fairfax were given due prominence in helping to explain Parliament's victory. Equally significant was the belief that the weakness of the king and the royalist military command structure contributed to Parliament's victory. In fact, a number of candidates focused more on royalist mistakes and blunders to explain why Parliament gained victory in the war.

It was pleasing to note that the majority of candidates dealt confidently with the importance of London and why the control of the city proved pivotal in Parliament's eventual victory: capital city, centre of government, financial hub, largest port, merchants and the centre of trade. The fact that the king tried to take the city by military force convinced many candidates that it was a prize worth fighting for, even on a symbolic level. The more discerning candidates argued that the king's withdrawal from London to set up his headquarters at Oxford at the start of the conflict was his biggest mistake and set a train of events in motion that proved unstoppable.

### QUESTION 3

*To what extent was the Fifth Monarchy movement the most significant development in radicalism and dissent in the period 1645–1660?*

This question was attempted 8 candidates.

Candidates were expected to examine and discuss developments in radicalism and dissent in the 15 years between 1645 and 1660. In order to reach a substantiated judgement about this issue, candidates were invited to debate the extent to which the Fifth Monarchy movement can be considered to have been the most significant development in radicalism and dissent.

Of the two questions on offer far fewer candidates opted to answer this one. Those that did attempt this question found it a challenge because many of them sought to discuss the Levellers and Diggers rather than the Fifth Monarchists. One candidate mistakenly believed that the Fifth Monarchy movement was a royalist group devoted to the restoration of the monarchy. This was indicative of the general lack of knowledge exhibited by some candidates who simply did not know who or what the Fifth Monarchy movement was. The better-rewarded candidates were aware of how powerful and influence the Fifth Monarchists were during the early 1650s—their opposition to the Rump contributed to its dismissal and they influenced Cromwell into establishing the Nominated Assembly—but even they did not identify, let alone discuss, the role of the leaders such as Thomas Harrison. However, in general the responses to this question tended to be narrative in structure and descriptive in nature. There were some weak attempts to present a simple two-sided response but the lack of knowledge regarding the Fifth Monarchists tended to produce uneven answers.

### DEPTH STUDY 3

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

#### PART 2: PROTEST AND CAMPAIGNS FOR SOCIAL REFORM c.1832–1848

#### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the Chartist movement in the period 1839–1842.*

This question was attempted by 168 candidates.

In this question the emphasis should have been on analysing and evaluating the value of the sources to an historian with particular reference to the precise context of the selected sources. The focus here was the Chartist movement in the period 1839–1842. The appropriate context of Source A was the year of the Chartist convention and the first petition to Parliament; Source B's immediate context was the Newport rising and in Source C the appropriate context was the events of 1842, including the petition and the Plug Plot. The general context of all the sources was the circumstances leading to the development of Chartism and the response of the government. The varying contexts should have played a significant part of any discussion of value to an historian. Source evaluation was generally well done but there were fewer successful attempts to comment on the *specific context* of the sources. Examiners noted that many candidates wasted time copying content from the sources instead of discussing value and context.

Source A is a diary extract from a prominent eyewitness in a position of considerable authority in an area where Chartism was strong. Napier refers to Chartist meetings and the fears of an uprising. A further contextual reference of value to the historian is the reference to physical force, already a significant feature of division within the movement. Napier's language and tone betray his sympathies. Originally fearful, he also reveals pity and comparative leniency in his recommendations to local magistrates. As a senior army commander he is in a position to know about the extent and importance of Chartism as well as being in a position to inform the government of his beliefs and actions. The diary can also provide evidence of the military preparedness of the government, the perception of the Chartist threat and a degree of ambivalence on the part of the authorities. There is considerable value in the provenance of the source and the context revealed about the strength of Chartism in the north.

Source B provides an account of the Newport rising and contextual references to Frost and the Westgate Hotel are clear enough. The reference to the recent Chartist Convention is also important. The size of the insurrection can be surmised from the evidence of the source as well as its possible (serious) scope. The language and tone of the source reveal its sympathies: it clearly abhors violence and the threat of rebellion referring to the foolishness and incompetence of the leadership. The source is of value to the historian as it reveals the divisions within the Chartist movement. William Lovett was a well-known moderate leader appalled by the physical force Chartists. He is writing in a moderate newspaper and seems almost relieved that Frost has been arrested and the rising put down. He says it is fortunate that the rioters did not think of burning the Westgate Hotel down. It is a valuable perspective on the 1839 rising, albeit one to be treated with caution as it is written by the leading advocate of moral force Chartism.

Source C is an extract from the Chartist petition presented to Parliament in 1842. The context is the second wave of Chartist protest coinciding with the continuing depression of the early 1840s. It is of value to the historian as it reveals the scope of Chartist grievances at this time. There are clear references to the unfairness of the electoral system linked to disappointment with the 1832 Reform Act. The operation of the electoral system is also criticised. However the wide range of grievances becomes clear; the operation of the Poor Law, the impact of the economic depression and the new police force all come in for criticism. The remedy is the People's Charter, which provides even more context. The language of oppression and the irresponsibility of the governing class are all illustrated by the source. The value lies in its authenticity as a record of Chartist grievances in 1842 and as a summary of the motivation behind Chartism. It is a public document that was debated in Parliament in 1842, not entirely unsympathetically. Candidates could point to the context of the early years of Peel's government and the impact Chartism made on the direction of Peel's policies after 1842. .

## QUESTION 2

*To what extent were the social reforms implemented between 1833 and 1848 mainly influenced by humanitarian concerns?*

This question was attempted by 65 candidates.

The key concept for debate was whether the social reforms implemented between 1833 and 1848 were *mainly influenced* by humanitarian concerns. The best answers were able to distinguish between the various influences affecting social reform and their authors synthesised their arguments to a perceptive conclusion. These answers were marked by a clear understanding of the differences between the utilitarians and humanitarians. There were successful analyses of the influence of humanitarian campaigners such as Ashley and Oastler, the influence of the enquiries into conditions in the factories and mines as well as issues such as the abolition of slavery in the empire, the Ragged School movement and legislation on chimney sweeping. These were balanced by full consideration of the considerable influence of the utilitarians, the drive for method and efficiency, religion and arguments about social control.

Less successful answers demonstrated no clear understanding of the differences between humanitarians and utilitarians, preferring to describe reforms without reference to the key concept. The candidates tended to deploy an assortment of possible influences with judgements tacked on to the end of paragraphs without any clear links to the previous material.

## QUESTION 3

*How far do you agree that Sir Robert Peel was a successful leader of the Tory party in the period 1834–1846?*

This question was attempted by 103 candidates.

The key concept was the extent to which Sir Robert Peel was a *successful* leader of the Tory party in the period 1834–1846 leading to a substantiated judgement. Some candidates preferred to concentrate on Peel's achievements without making an appropriate link to the issue of leadership. Popular approaches were to argue that Peel met the test of leadership by transforming the policies and appeal of the Party using evidence from the Tamworth Manifesto and the resounding victory of 1841. Peel's social, financial and economic policies were held up as effective responses to depression and Chartism and therefore good leadership. However Peel came under fire for wrecking the unity of the Party with his insensitive handling of backbenchers, pursuing free trade policies without regard for the protectionist instincts of his own Party and administering the final blow to that unity by leading the repeal of the Corn Laws.

Successful candidates weighed the evidence on leadership and reached a conclusion. Less successful candidates did not pay enough attention to the issue of leadership, preferring to unload much material on Peel's reforms. The important point was to generate a debate upon the key concept and come to a substantial judgement on it.

## 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

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying political challenges in Britain 1922–1936.*

This question was attempted by 60 candidates.

Some candidates were able to discuss the three sources in turn before offering an overall judgement on their value to an historian studying political challenges 1922–1936. Other candidates tended to discuss the sources in respect of their value in general rather than their value in respect to a historian studying political challenges. The difference here was between the 'general' evaluation and the 'specific' evaluation. Where historical context is rewarded, it must be related to the value of the sources to the enquiry set, not a discussion of the source content and what else has not been discussed.

Source A clearly is of value in studying political challenges, it being a speech by Stanley Baldwin at a critical juncture in party politics in 1922. Candidates may have considered the general historical context of this source by reference to the unpopularity of Lloyd George following some questionable policy choices and Britain's economic situation. However, more focus was needed on the appropriate context of 1922 such as the fact that Baldwin's speech in the Carlton Club was the final straw in respect to the continuation of the coalition government. This speech led directly to the fall of the coalition government at a time when the Liberals were divided, Labour had yet to find its feet and Conservative dominance was looking more than likely if they could prevent the Lloyd George factor splitting the party. The challenge to Baldwin was to maintain party unity and ensure Conservative dominance while the challenge to the Liberal and Labour Party would be survival in a fractious political climate.

Source B is again a source relating to a key challenge to the political landscape of Britain. Candidates may have considered the general historical context of this source by reference to the economic situation of the period and the result of the Wall Street Crash. However, more focus was needed on the appropriate context of 1931, such as the need for political co-operation in order to provide stable government at a time of division over what needed to be done. The split in the Labour government as a result of the formation of the National Government was a challenge to the political order given the divisions that still existed within the Liberal Party. Conservative dominance of the National Government was a given; however, that co-operation was favourable showed the depth of the challenge faced at the time.

Source C is valuable in indicating that, by 1936, there was a serious challenge to parliamentary democracy. Candidates may have considered the general historical context of this source by reference to the abdication of the king because of his relationship with Wallis Simpson. However, more focus was needed on the appropriate context of 1936, for example the fact that the crisis was actually a constitutional crisis and that Baldwin as prime minister was facing a challenge that no prime minister had faced in modern times. The abdication speech in the source was a culmination of political manoeuvrings to ensure constitutional stability, especially given the economic situation and foreign policy landscape.

## QUESTION 2

*How far do you agree that Government action was largely successful in dealing with the social and economic problems facing Wales and England 1918–1939?*

This question was attempted by 34 candidates.

In order to fully address the question set candidates needed to evaluate whether government action was largely successful in dealing with the social and economic problems facing Wales and England between 1918 and 1939. Most candidates were aware of some things that the governments of 1918–1939 did to tackle the social and economic problems of the time. Where little actual knowledge was deployed candidates tended to churn out two half essays saying how the period was ‘good’ and how the period was ‘bad’ with a tagged-on judgement at the end, which stated that government action was largely successful without any meaningful support for the judgement reached.

The better-rewarded candidates got to grips with the key concept of ‘largely successful’. They discussed various actions taken by governments in the period and debated the extent of success given the regional variations and social variations that existed in society at the time. These answers were well rewarded because they were discussing the key concept rather than generally looking at developments in relation to success and failures in a two-sided mechanical approach. Most candidates were able to cover the set period although more focus was surprisingly given to economic issues rather than social issues such as poverty or women’s rights.

## QUESTION 3

*To what extent did the people of Wales and England benefit from the new social and cultural developments in the period 1918–1939?*

This question was attempted by 26 candidates.

In order to fully address the question set, candidates needed to evaluate whether the people of Wales and England benefited from the new social and cultural developments in the period 1918–1939. The key concept for discussion was ‘benefit’ and those candidates that discussed this issue received the highest marks.

The experiences of people in the period were not homogenous, although many candidates, saw this in terms of ‘good’ and ‘bad.’ Those candidates who evaluated the proposition in terms of the grey areas were rewarded at the higher bands because they were discussing the issues in terms of ‘benefit’ as regards access to opportunities. An example of the distinction would be between those candidates who saw the development of the car purely in terms of a benefit to society rather than discussing whether the car was actually available to all and therefore able to benefit the people of Wales and England. It was the effects of the developments that was open to debate here rather than the development themselves in general terms.

## DEPTH STUDY 5

### THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION IN EUROPE c.1500–1564

#### PART 2: THE SPREAD OF PROTESTANTISM AND COUNTER–REFORMATION c.1531–1564

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the reform of the Catholic Church from 1537–1562.*

This question was attempted by 52 candidates.

Most responses to this question were general in nature in terms of both context and value to the historian. For example, very few were able to consider the fact that Source A was created at the time of the Schmalkalden Articles, which unified Protestant princes in Germany behind a clear set of Lutheran beliefs, but then would not connect this to its value to an historian studying the reform of the Catholic Church. There were several misunderstandings that undermined the point candidates were trying to make. There was an assumption that Paul III was a supporter of reform, and yet he ignored the advice of the Consilium and prevaricated over calling the Council of Trent as he was concerned about undermining papal authority.

Likewise, Source B was from a year after the Society of Jesus had been recognised by the papacy and seven years after it had been founded, so it was not from the year Loyola had begun the Jesuits. It would be more accurately contextualised by reference to the need for a more aggressive strategy after the failure of negotiation with the Lutherans at Regensburg.

There was much on events that were beyond the period of time covered by the selection of sources as well, particularly the Diet of Speyer and the Augsburg Confession. There were a number of similar introductions between responses, which bore little relation to the focus of the question and some concluding paragraphs critiqued the selection of sources or focused on what was missing from the selection, rather than directly addressing the question set.

##### QUESTION 2

*To what extent was the formation of the Schmalkaldic League the most significant development in the growth of support for Lutheranism in Germany in the period 1531–1555?*

This question was attempted by 25 candidates.

There was, rightly, a lot of focus on the importance of the Schmalkaldic League although some answers followed a chronological pattern of the conflicts the League was involved in. Many answers then considered the significance of alternative factors such as doctrinal developments such as the 1536 Wittenberg Accords and the 1537 Schmalkalden Articles, which clarified Lutheranism, or the constant distractions diverting Charles V. In some cases, these distractions had a direct impact on his relations with the Lutherans, as they necessitated his seeking support from the Lutheran princes, as he did at Nuremberg in 1532.

Few candidates considered the Peace of Augsburg to be a significant development, even though it legitimised support for Lutheranism within the territories of sympathetic princes. A number of references to the support of the princes as a factor, a more general point separate from the Schmalkaldic League, tended to reference events from the 1520s rather than from the period covered by the question. This is also true of the responses that considered the support of the peasants, the Imperial Knights, indulgences and Luther's critical tracts as significant developments.

A vague consideration of the influence of the printing press was often offered, even though examples of printed works tended to be from the 1520s. On occasions, nothing specific was mentioned at all, with candidates not considering that the influence of the printing press preceded Luther, let alone 1531, by quite some time. There was also some confusion as to whether or not Zwingli in Zurich and Calvin in Geneva were in Germany and could therefore be considered significant, even though they had nothing to do with support for Lutheranism.

### **QUESTION 3**

*How far do you agree that John Calvin was mainly responsible for the development of the Protestant Reformation in Europe 1531–1564?*

This question was attempted by 27 candidates.

There was a contradictory approach by candidates to this question. Some deployed a considerable amount of knowledge about what Calvin was doing in this period and little about Luther, and vice versa, but very few seemed to have a good grasp of both. Very few responses considered the whole period of time covered by the question, and even fewer considered the full implications of 'in Europe', especially in relation to Calvinism. Again, a vague reference to the importance of the printing press appeared in most responses, not referring to anything that was printed or became more widely available in this period. There was some confusion about the nature of the 1555 Peace of Augsburg, with some candidates considering that it brought about religious toleration, although there were some candidates who evaluated the limitations of the Peace well.

As in the other questions on this paper there was a lot of reference to events that were from the 1520s or even earlier, particularly the influence of humanism and Luther's early complaints.

## DEPTH STUDY 6

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

#### PART 2: FRANCE: REPUBLIC AND NAPOLEON c.1792–1815

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying opposition to the revolution in France between 1792 and 1795.*

This question was attempted by 108 candidates.

In this question, consideration needs to be given not only to the sources' content, but to their historical context, attributions and tone. A clear judgement on the sources' value to an historian is also required. The better responses adopted an overview approach that focused on the strengths of the sources and, in particular, their value to an historian studying opposition to the Revolution. This included a clear understanding of the historical context that framed the creation of each source. For example, the threat posed by the *émigrés* in 1792 (Source A), the federalist revolt (Source B) and the opposition from within the Revolution to government by terror (Source C) were all developments in the period that would have had a great bearing on the creation of each source. The weakest candidates used this question as an opportunity to trawl through the collection for content.

##### QUESTION 2

*How successful was the Directory in dealing with the problems which it faced between 1795 and 1799?*

This question was attempted by 59 candidates.

This question invited candidates to consider how successful the Directory was in dealing with the problems it faced. Unfortunately, many candidates were confused about the exact period of the Directory so they wrote about events during the Thermidorean Convention. However, most were able to discuss problems such as the threat posed by the Counter-Revolution and the military situation and how the Directory dealt with these. Many candidates also considered the Directory's longevity and financial measures (sometimes in rather more detail than was merited or required). Most candidates tried to give a balanced argument by considering some of the Directory's failures such as its undermining of the Constitution and over reliance on the army to stay in power.

##### QUESTION 3

*To what extent was the weakness of Napoleon's opponents mainly responsible for his military success up to 1812?*

This question was attempted by 48 candidates.

This question invited candidates to consider to what extent the weakness of Napoleon's opponents were mainly responsible for his military successes up to 1812. Many candidates were able to discuss examples of his opponents' weaknesses such as the disunity of the various coalitions and their inferior resources at their disposal. Most also offered alternative examples of how Napoleon's own leadership and command system, the vast size of the French army and their *élan* were also responsible.

Fewer candidates attempted to evaluate which of these factors was mainly responsible and, thereby, answer the question set. Unfortunately, many candidates also ignored the date in the question and went into detail about Napoleon's failed invasion of Russia and beyond. Candidates are reminded of the need to read a question carefully before starting their answer.

## DEPTH STUDY 7

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

#### PART 2: CIVIL WAR AND RECONSTRUCTION c.1861–1877

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying reconstruction in the Southern states between 1867 and 1875.*

This question was attempted by 121 candidates.

The emphasis should be on analysing and evaluating the value of the sources to an historian with particular reference to the precise context of the selected sources. The theme here was reconstruction in the southern states between 1867 and 1875. The appropriate context of Source A was the 1867 Reconstruction Act and the confrontation between President Johnson and the radical republicans. Source B's context was the last gasp of the republicans in passing a Civil Rights Act before the Democrats seized control of Congress in 1874–1875. In Source C, the immediate context was Grant's refusal to send troops into Mississippi in 1875, and the spread of the notorious Mississippi plan, which led to widespread violence and intimidation in elections in the southern states. The general context of all the documents was the problem of implementing reconstruction. These varying contexts should have been considered in any discussion of value to an historian.

Source A is an extract from President Johnson's message to Congress in December 1867. The context is the deteriorating relationship between President and the Congressional Republicans about reconstruction. Within a month the House of Representatives had started impeachment proceedings against Johnson. Johnson's uncompromising message to Congress had been the last straw. Johnson had attempted both executive reconstruction and to thwart the Congressional Republican programme of legislative reconstruction. His reasoning is made clear in Source A and he gives reasons why he abhors the Congressional plan and has attempted to veto it. His own lenient reconstruction plan was, by now, in tatters and his attempted justification of his plans in the message only provoked further confrontation. Source A makes clear his racial attitudes and the language and tone of the message give ample proof of reasons why the Radical Republicans felt that Johnson had learned nothing from the experience of the civil war or the South's reaction to his earlier attempt at a lenient reconstruction. The source is of considerable value in exposing the thinking of an embattled President and illustrates the context of the clash between Congress and President about the nature of reconstruction.

Source B reveals the violent and passionate resistance to Congressional Reconstruction and, in particular, the Civil Rights Bill. The context is the experience of radical reconstruction in the South and the white resistance to it—by 1874 that resistance was too strong, particularly for a weakened Grant administration to deal with. The language and tone of the source are powerful, for example 'war of extermination'. The clarion call to violent resistance only nine years after the Civil War had ended and the extremity of the language reveal how little racial and sectional attitudes had changed. Source B is extremely valuable to an historian explaining why reconstruction failed, why white resistance was so determined and why the intractable problem of race was to pervade US society and politics. The provenance of the source was discussed by candidates: a newspaper from the Deep South, its intended audience and its purpose in fomenting resistance to radical republicanism.

Source C is a report from a committee investigating election abuses in Mississippi in 1875. The context was the Southern attempt to undermine Radical Republican rule and restore white supremacy. This showed a blatant use of illegal methods to affect election outcomes. The committee found that the abuses in Mississippi were well documented and the source exemplifies the frustration felt by Republicans in the Senate. The source is of great value to an historian in understanding the effectiveness of the campaign to restore white supremacy. Using these methods, by 1876, most Southern states had reverted to white rule. The general context of the document is the unwillingness, by 1875–1876, of the Federal government to intervene further in the governance of the Southern states, leaving a legacy of sectional and racial bitterness. The document also refers back to the role of Mississippi in the outbreak of the civil war. The language and tone of the document make clear the sympathies of its authorship. The provenance of the source—its origin as a sober senatorial investigation, its intended audience and its purpose—was commented upon. Effectively, the outcome of elections like this one in Mississippi doomed reconstruction: the final blow was the disputed presidential election of 1876.

Specific source evaluation was generally well done but there were fewer successful attempts to comment on the specific *context* of the sources. Examiners noted that many candidates wasted time copying content from the sources instead of discussing value and context

## QUESTION 2

*How far do you agree that the successful use of new methods of warfare was mainly responsible for the Union victory in the Civil War?*

This question was attempted by 88 candidates.

The key concept to be debated was whether the North's victory in the Civil War was *mainly* due to successful use of new methods of warfare. To attain a good mark candidates should have debated the issue and arrived at a supported judgement on the key concept in the question set. The new methods of warfare that were analysed included the use of rifles, trenches, railways and ironclad warships. It was pointed out that although the North made effective use of Sherman's devastating approach to making war on civilians, Grant's war of attrition and the North's naval blockade were not new concepts of warfare. In fact some argued—effectively—that in the use of rifles, trenches and railways, the South made just as good use of these weapons as the North.

Most answers argued that the North's superior resources and leadership explained the victory more convincingly, although some argued that the North's military leadership was not demonstrably superior until 1864–1865, with the appointments of Grant and Sherman to key positions in the North's military campaigns. Most were also keen to show that Lincoln was a far better strategist and leader than Jefferson Davis and that, in any case, the Confederates made serious military errors in 1862–1863 that sealed the fate of the South. All these points can be argued, and in the best answers not only were these issues debated but alternative explanations for the North's victory were examined and weighed. It was commonplace that the North's enormous financial and economic resources made its victory highly likely and that these, coupled with the naval blockade, Lincoln's emancipation strategy and lack of foreign recognition, made Southern defeat equally likely.

### QUESTION 3

*To what extent was the emancipation of the slaves Abraham Lincoln's most significant achievement as President 1861–1865?*

This question was attempted by 31 candidates

The key concept to be debated was whether the emancipation of the slaves was Lincoln's *most significant* achievement. To attain a good mark candidates should have debated the issue and come to a substantiated judgement on the key concept in the question set.

There were many convincing answers to this question. Lincoln's route to emancipation was well known and there were discussions of his racial attitudes, changing perceptions of slavery, his interest in earlier schemes of colonisation and compensation, and his border strategy before reaching the crucial decision in 1862. The impact of emancipation on the war and reconstruction was effectively discussed in the best answers, which also pointed out that the achievement on emancipation needed to be weighed against Lincoln's other significant achievements notably leadership in war, his role as commander-in-chief, his political skills and the 1864 election victory against the odds. A few debated his approach to reconstruction, suggesting that this might have taken a different route to the experience of 1865–1877. Less successful answers consisted of a descriptive approach or were narrowly focused on emancipation.

## DEPTH STUDY 8

### GERMANY: DEMOCRACY AND DICTATORSHIP c.1918–1945

#### PART TWO: NAZI GERMANY c.1933–1945

##### QUESTION 1

*With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying opposition to the Nazis in the period 1934–1944.*

This question was attempted by 1410 candidates.

The candidates were expected to assess the value of the three sources for an historian in context of their origin and within the context of the precise question set. In other words, when each source was written or produced, who produced each source and what it says will have a bearing upon its value to an historian in terms of studying opposition to the Nazis in the period 1934–1944. Candidates that begin their response with ‘*The source shows an historian; the source even shows...*’ will not provide a complete analysis and evaluation of the sources.

Most candidates adopted a source by source approach, but they did not always give a balanced consideration to context, source evaluation or indeed the value to an historian for the precise enquiry. A reasoned judgement on the value to an historian will inevitably be linked to placing the source within its appropriate context.

In most cases the candidates were able to show some understanding of the content and general context of each source with references to opposition being driven underground in Source A, the disillusionment of the Catholic Church over the Concordat in B, and the growth of open hostility to the regime during the end of the Second World War. However, there was often a lack of awareness of the implications of the establishment of a one-party state in Source A, and the specific impact on Catholic organisations and the Catholic Youth, and D-Day landings in C. Many candidates were not as secure in establishing the specific historical context of each source, and were, therefore, unable to reach a reasoned judgement as to how valuable each source was to an historian. In many cases the source evaluation remains largely mechanistic.

##### QUESTION 2

*‘Young people were the group most affected by Nazi social and racial policies in the period 1933–1939.’ Discuss.*

This question was attempted by 930 candidates.

Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of either a narrative approach to the groups affected by the Nazis, with the young, Jews and/or women featuring predominantly. A series of mini-judgements usually emerged on the different groups in society and how they were affected. In these responses, a precise and meaningful debate of the key concept did not emerge. Some candidates spent the entire essay debating the impact of social and racial policy on young people. Overall, there was far too much focus on considering developments, events or factors in relation to the key concept rather than debating ‘the group most affected’.

While candidates were clearly informed with regard to the transformation in social values and psychological attitudes, they did not attempt to weigh this up against the way in which women, for example, found themselves in a more vulnerable position, or the impact upon social elites. This did not allow either a convincing or a balanced debate to emerge.

While the quality of the knowledge was often first rate, the way in which it was adapted to meet the precise demands of the question was often flawed. Quality of response was achieved when candidates weighed up the impact of social and racial policies upon different groups. Some wrote in terms of different degrees and pace, which often added a different dimension to the responses. At the same time, those candidates were actively involved in analysing and evaluating the issues and reaching a balanced judgement. Some candidates argued that the policies had a mixed impact on the various groups, which was a step further than merely reaching mechanistic judgements about the lives of women, Jews and young people.

### **QUESTION 3**

*To what extent was Nazi economic policy mainly responsible for Hitler's defeat in the Second World War?*

This question was attempted by 480 candidates.

Most of the responses to this question tended to take the form of a discussion on the role of economic policy in the defeat of Germany, followed by generalised discussion of a range of different developments that led to Hitler's defeat in 1945, rather than a precise and meaningful debate of the key concept. The better-rewarded candidates considered economic policy within the context of other related developments and so were able to weave an integrated response regarding the reasons for Hitler's defeat.

While the candidates were clearly informed about the relative success of the Four-Year Plans, and Speer's reorganisation as Minister of Armaments, they did not attempt to weigh this up against the way in which leadership, the balance of military power or the resistance of the allies in its many forms also played their part in Hitler's defeat. This did not allow either a convincing or a balanced debate to emerge.

Some candidates were content to drift into general narratives of developments, events or factors that were related to the key concept, but that did not allow them to debate it in a meaningful way. These responses continued to have a limited relevance to the question set and usually ended with a routine conclusion that provided a very formulaic judgement to the key concept but had no bearing upon the rest of the response. Quality of response was achieved when the candidates engaged with the key concept and offered a convincing debate regarding the range of issues arising from within the question.

## HISTORY

### General Certificate of Education

Summer 2018

### Advanced Subsidiary/Advanced

#### UNIT 5

An individual centre report on **Unit 5** is now available on the secure website. However, the following general comments on Unit 5 should be noted.

In 2018, the moderators reported there was considerable evidence that most of the responses lacked the individualism and independence that the guidance from JCQ required. Some moderators reported that there appeared to be less evidence this year that Centres were promoting an independent and individualised approach to the NEA. In many centres a number of candidates not only analysed and evaluated a limited and similar range of sources but also adopted a highly formalised structure to the construction of each response.

In a substantial number of centres, the moderators reported that the candidates used a number of extracts from historians as primary sources, which cannot be accepted in the NEA given the clear definition of primary and contemporary sources that is outlined in Assessment Objective 2. Centres are strongly advised to give advice to their candidates that they must use six to eight primary and/or contemporaneous sources and that extracts from historians, together with non-primary and/or non-contemporaneous material (such as memoirs, biographies and recollections) are not acceptable as primary sources given the definition in AO2. These issues were highlighted in the 2017 report and in reports to individual centres, although there was little evidence that matters had improved in some centres.

The moderators reported that many candidates concentrated too much on comprehension of the sources and extracts they had selected rather than on developing a balanced argument of how historians are able to construct their interpretations from the evidence base that is available to them. There was a tendency to write a section on the historiographical background, followed by a section analysing and evaluating a series of sources and then a conclusion. That approach tended to lose sight of the investigation set and become rather mechanistic and formulaic.

The moderators reported that the better responses were able to consider the value of the selected sources to a number of historians making and amending interpretations over time with a clear focus on the content and provenance of each source. Such responses tended to take a more holistic view of the exercise than the more mechanistic approach noted above. Candidates who were well rewarded were able to produce an essay that integrated the requisite skills to produce a clear and coherent argument using a range of primary source material to explain how the historical debate has developed on the issue set.

Centres are encouraged to make fuller and better use of the Formal Review opportunity to benefit candidates by discussing the progress of their essay in relation to the generic mark scheme. It is permissible to use the opportunity to give general advice on the use of a range of six to eight primary sources and to discourage the use of historians as primary sources. The moderators reported that, quite frequently, the evidence from the Formal Review sheets seen indicated that centres had not taken the opportunity to provide meaningful general advice and guidance to the candidates. Centres are also strongly advised to offer "specific advice" to candidates who need more guidance and support than is permissible under

“general advice” guidance. Such specific advice must be duly recorded on the form provided and taken into account in the assessment of the exercise as outlined in the guidance.

In 2018, it was noted that more centres were outside tolerance in their application of the mark scheme, and where the tolerance was breached deductions were made and the individual centres concerned informed in their report. The majority of such deductions were as a result of centres allowing and accepting extracts from historians and other commentators that were not primary. Indeed, there were examples of candidates basing their responses mainly and sometimes only, on extracts from historians and later commentators. There were also instances of candidates offering sources not directly related or focused on the investigation either by using primary sources from outside the chronological period or from outside the focus of the question or not utilising the range of six to eight sources that is expected.

Centres are informed that the current Unit 5 question(s) are approved for use until May 2019. Centres will have to seek approval for revised questions for use in the 2020–2022 cycle. This approval can be sought in the period from February to December 2019.

In connection with the new approval cycle, centres are informed that they may apply for approval for one to four investigations in the 2020–2022 cycle. Centres will be able to propose any historical issue they find of interest but will not be allowed to continue using their currently approved investigations. In addition individual candidates are allowed to submit for approval an investigation that is of interest to them but such submissions must not be from the booklet on “Suggested Questions” published by the WJEC. The individual candidates are allowed to follow a personal interest but the opportunity should not be used to increase the range of investigations available to candidates at a centre.



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