



GCSE EXAMINERS' REPORTS

HISTORY REPORT

SUMMER 2015

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.

HISTORY

General Certificate of Secondary Education

SUMMER 2015

4271/01 – POPULAR MOVEMENTS IN WALES AND ENGLAND, 1815-1848

Question 1

- (a) This was well answered with the majority of candidates being able to access Level 2 by identifying the harsh attitude of the authorities to industrial protest. Balanced use of the sources, set in their historical context, was required for full marks. Some candidates suggested that the authorities were prepared to show lenience after the Newport Rising and this was credited as a valid use of the source material.
- (b) An increased mark tariff for this question resulted in the need for candidates to demonstrate good contextual knowledge in their response. However, this was not widely evident and as a consequence relatively few candidates accessed high Level 3, due to a narrow focus upon the source and somewhat generalised comments about the difficulties in people's lives during this period. Stronger candidates were able to contextualise the issue by referring specifically to political issues and demands, enabling Chartism to appeal to a wide range of people. Disappointment with the limited change enacted in the 1832 Reform Act was evidenced as a good starting point.
- (c) This question was reasonably well answered, with candidates being able to follow the well-established evaluation of the origin and purpose of the sources. However, it was once again disappointing to see that more was not made of the content, specifically the language and audience, which are the key to formulating an answer that effectively contextualises the evidence. As is often the case, candidates tend to focus upon what the sources do not tell an historian and as a result they fail to evaluate the evidence as it stands. An overall judgement is also needed to consider the utility of the sources in relation to other evidence.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates accessed Level 2 by providing more than one tactic used by the Rebecca Rioters. As always, the best responses displayed detailed historical knowledge of the Biblical aspect to the riots, as well as the range of tactics, such as attacks on salmon weirs, threatening letters and the attack on the Carmarthen workhouse, that were features of the riots.
- (b) It was pleasing to see many candidates understand what was required of them in relation to this new question and as a result the majority were able to access Level 2 by referring to the depiction of poverty in the source as well as by beginning to address the attribution and more importantly, the audience. Stronger candidates provided accurate contextual support by referring specifically to the issues surrounding the Swing Riots and the cartoon's rather sympathetic portrayal of the problems rural families faced as a way of informing a middle class readership. Several candidates were able to develop sophisticated responses by appreciating the desperation of the rioters as depicted by the Devil whispering in the labourer's ear, driving him to violent protest.

- (c) This new style interpretation question, the most challenging one on the paper, saw the majority of candidates achieve high Level 2, low Level 3 by offering a basic judgement with limited support. It was noticeable that many candidates merely trawled through the sources, mainly identifying the differences between the interpretations, without developing the historical context within which the interpretations were formed. Candidates need to consider the narrow perspective of Evidence 3, formed with little appreciation of the wider context. Evidence 2, a reflection, takes a wider perspective, when time has elapsed and a more considered interpretation may be arrived at. Evidence 1, the modern historian, is writing from a more distant, presumably objective perspective and as always, candidates are expected to consider the respective audiences of the interpretations. These issues, as well as a clear judgement supported by contextual knowledge, are required to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Question 3

This year saw an improvement in the quality of responses provided for this well-established 'essay' question. A minority of candidates lacked focus on the specific issue and provided generalised material relating to the Merthyr Rising and/or Chartist activities, but the majority were able to provide the necessary two-sided response, with varying degrees of accurate contextual support. It was noticeable that some candidates displayed excellent subject knowledge and were therefore able to construct sophisticated responses that took account of the repressive attitude of the authorities and the short-term failure of Radicalism, but also the degree to which Radicalism could be considered a success by referring to the widespread urban support for the movement and the longer-term impact it had. It was pleasing to see a slightly stronger focus this year on the government's use of agent provocateurs and the Six Acts in particular, as a means of curtailing Radical activities.

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved full marks in this question. There were some excellent answers as there was plenty to be taken out of the sources. However, some candidates did focus more on one of the sources and only made a brief mention of the second, which meant that they were unable to gain full marks. Some are still giving a great deal of background information which is not what is needed, and did not gain any additional marks.
- (b) This style of question has been asked now for many years, and most candidates are clear on what to do in order to achieve high marks. Many candidates were able to achieve full marks here by referring to the source and making a clear explanation as to why there was industrial unrest in Llanelli. This topic has obviously been taught extremely well by most centres as the majority of candidates were able to give their own reasons which showed a good understanding of the subject. Some candidates are still being quite descriptive and some make no reference to the source whatsoever. However, some candidates gave a very generalised answer, focusing on various reasons for industrial unrest overall.
- (c) The two sources here worked very well. Candidates showed how the sources were different by discussing their content, although this still needs to be done in a lot more detail. Most explained the reasons behind the two viewpoints extremely well. They could clearly see that Source D was the opinion of an historian, but one that was being paid by the coal owners, therefore, would have an element of bias. They could see that Source E was by an eyewitness, but one who would be on the side of the miners, therefore, clearly contrasting with the historian. Some candidates continued to give the usual mechanical response to the historian having the benefit of hindsight and having done a lot of research, but they did not really understand this; rather they were offloading what they had been taught in class. Most were able to achieve 6/8, which is a very good mark, by giving a generalised answer about how the sources were different and why. Very few made the jump into Level 4, but where they did, they gave excellent answers. Many candidates try to apply the COP formula to this question but in a very mechanical way without actually trying to explain why the sources differed. This was not what was required and scored fairly low marks.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to describe the role of David Lloyd George during the First World War. They discussed his role as Minister for Munitions, Prime Minister, his war cabinet and war socialism policies extremely well. This topic has been taught very well by the majority of centres. In most cases, candidates scored full marks easily. There were others who described his role before the war – Chancellor, Liberal Reforms, which was incorrect and scored no marks. Others described in detail how he introduced DORA, a very common misconception, but again, inaccurate, and scored no marks.

- (b) This was a new question, appearing for the first time, but one that was answered extremely successfully. Many very impressive answers were seen, with the majority of candidates scoring between 4 and full marks. Most candidates were familiar with the poster and could clearly see why it was produced in 1915, discussing the failing war campaign, the decline in the number of volunteers etc., and were able to give three reasons easily. Most candidates focused on the situation in 1915. Some candidates did discuss its lack of effectiveness leading to the policy of conscription being introduced in 1916, but this was irrelevant to the question. Overall a very well answered question.
- (c) This was another new question, giving candidates a great deal of information to read and analyse. Again, this was done very successfully by the majority of candidates, which is very promising for the future. Most candidates understood the differing interpretations very well, and could see why Evidence 1 and 2 would have such different interpretations. Most also used Evidence 3 to add to their discussion. Most were able to point out the reasons why the interpretations were different. On average the majority of candidates were able to reach 6/10; others were able to take it to 8 by a more concise discussion of the attribution, and some did achieve full marks. Full discussion of the attribution is needed. I expected them to discuss the fact that Charles Messenger was a military historian who had served as an officer in the armed forces in the 1940s and 1950s and how this experience would have led to the development of his interpretation. Mention should have been made of the title of the book – Trench Fighting – and how his research would have added to his interpretation. Many candidates gave a generalised view that he was a historian who had the benefit of hindsight and had carried out research in order to write his book.

Some candidates did find it difficult, and only described how the content was different, but made no mention of the attributions whatsoever. This is a great shame as this is where the marks are to be found. It is also not enough to repeat the attribution in short form; candidates must explain the attributions in great detail to score the highest marks. Some made the mistake of thinking that Charles Messenger was in the First World War himself, when it clearly states in the attribution that he served as an officer in the 1940s and 1950s. Others incorrectly claimed that Evidence 3 showed many dead bodies in the trenches, when it actually does not. These points led them down the wrong path, and meant that for some candidates, they did not score very highly here. Some did not mention Evidence 3 at all. Candidates must use all three in order to gain the highest marks.

Question 3

This question was answered very well, with most candidates giving a clear, detailed two sided answer. Most were able to achieve Level 3 answers, with some good information on both sides, although lacking some specific information. Level 4 answers were very intelligent and very detailed. Candidates' knowledge of this period was excellent. The majority of candidates did deal with both social and political problems, which meant they could reach the highest levels. There was a minority who only focused on the social reforms, but these were few and far between.

4271/03 – THE USA: A NATION OF CONTRASTS, 1910-1929

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates were able to use the sources to select relevant information. Most candidates were able to achieve Level 2. The best candidates focused on the 'panic' selling of shares and used Source B in detail to achieve the highest mark. Some candidates unfortunately either didn't provide enough detail, or used too much own knowledge, and were therefore confined to Level 1.
- (b) This question proved accessible to the vast majority of pupils. Lower level answers tended to only use the information in the source, especially regarding black Americans. Better answers referred to the racist attitude of some Americans, and would develop their explanation of segregation and the 'Jim Crow Laws', but with particular focus on economic not social impact. Also, many of the higher achieving candidates mentioned traditional industries like farming, mining and textiles which were under threat from new industries. There were also references to Native Americans and members of trade unions. There were some excellent responses to this question, and most pupils offered a coherent and substantiated answer.
- (c) Responses to this question were rather mixed and few achieved full marks. Lower ability candidates took the sources at face-value or did not evaluate the evidence at all. At this level, there were many who merely paraphrased the sources, rather than trying to develop the content of the sources or evaluate them. Many of the answers tended to be in the Level 3 range. Candidates were able to develop the content of the sources well, with references to mass production, the moving-assembly-line and the impact of the Model T on other industries. There were also references to advertising and the introduction of mail order catalogues which led to the growth of consumerism. Evaluation of the sources at this level referred to Ford's bias, but were not developed sufficiently. In order to achieve the highest level, candidates need to reach a reasoned and substantiated judgement with a balanced evaluation of content, authorship and context.

Question 2

- (a) This question was answered very well indeed by the vast majority of candidates. There were clear references to the types of sports available to the watching public, including baseball, American football, boxing and golf. As expected, many candidates referred to the popularity of sporting icons like Babe Ruth and Jack Dempsey, as well as a few others. The importance of convenient means of travel through the Model T and the building of new stadia also contributed to this social phenomena. The role of the media, particularly the radio, increased wealth and leisure time, were also identified as factors. The weaker answers tended to lack detail.
- (b) Most candidates were able to attempt this new style question and provide reasons for production as well as some context in order to answer the question correctly. Most were able to identify flappers, Jazz music and dances like the Charleston as important cultural developments in 1920s America. Better answers speculated that the magazine cover was produced to influence young people to embrace these changes and to reflect this new society. The best answers developed this further, but speculated that the magazine would be cashing in on the cultural changes, and specifically targeted young city dwelling Americans. Many candidates demonstrated impressive knowledge about Jazz performers, dances and famous contemporary flappers like Clara Bow and Joan Crawford from the movies. This was generally a very well answered question with many pupils achieving Level 3. However, some candidates failed to address the 'why' part of the question and just described the cultural changes taking place.

- (c) This was also a new style question but most candidates were able to make a fair attempt at it. The weaker candidates tended to find it difficult to consider all three pieces of evidence, or they paraphrased the evidence rather than trying to develop it further by including their own knowledge. Level 2 answers included more of a balance between the evidence and their own knowledge - referring to flappers, new dances, Jazz music and the popularity of the movies. These pupils showed that there was an alternative interpretation as illustrated by Evidence 2. However, these responses did not really speculate about why this issue has been interpreted in such different ways, and failed to comment on the attributions. Level 3 answers were able to develop the evidence contained in the sources with their own knowledge. Crucially, they were able to refer to the strengths and limitations of each of the pieces of evidence, and attempt to explain how and why the issue had been interpreted in different ways. Weak comments on attribution were awarded low Level 3 marks, (6 marks), with better references to the attribution with judgements achieved high Level 3 marks (7-8 marks). There were very few who achieved a Level 4 because of the sophistication of the response required. These excellent candidates provided substantiated comments and gave a clear judgement considering the given interpretation in the historical context. They were able to infer that religious fundamentalists in the Bible Belt would not have enjoyed the Jazz Age as they believed that it lowered moral standards, and that William Hays was clearly biased as he was the author of the Hays Code. This would contrast with Evidence 1 and 3 as they were concentrating on American cities where many Americans did benefit from, and enjoy the Jazz Age.

Question 3

This question was answered very well on the whole whereby most candidates were able to produce two sided answers which gave a judgement on whether organised crime was the main political and social challenge facing America during this period. Most candidates knew a great deal about organised crime, particularly the activities of Al Capone. They referred in detail to gang rivalry and violence, corruption, racketeering, speakeasies, bootlegging and prostitution. Many also knew about other gangsters in a variety of American cities.

A great number of pupils also mentioned other problems facing American society. The most popular alternative problem was the role of the KKK and the treatment of African-Americans. Many excellent answers also included details about the 'Red Scare', immigration, Sacco and Vanzetti and the Teapot Dome Scandal. Excellent answers also had a good focus on the question with a clear judgement throughout.

Sadly, some answers lacked enough depth, or enough focus on the question, and some brought in irrelevant detail information from other sections of the syllabus, such as the Wall Street Crash or even the Jazz Age. Some also lacked enough balance, or provided generalised answers, or would merely list the factors without explanation. On the whole, however, many candidates managed to write at length a good answer to this question.

4271/04 – GERMANY IN TRANSITION, 1919-1947

Question 1

- (a) A large majority of candidates here were able to reach Level 2. There is no need to comment here on the attribution of both sources. There is no requirement here for candidates to provide their own knowledge. Candidates need to use the content of both sources to answer the question set.
- (b) This question was answered successfully by a great many candidates. Candidates need to use the content of the source and their own knowledge to answer the question successfully. They were able to understand the content of the source and add appropriate details of Nazi anti-Semitic policies in the 1930s. The focus was on the 1930s and therefore no merit was given to answers discussing Nazi policies post 1939.
- (c) This question was answered in an acceptable manner and there was evidence that schools had prepared candidates well. Most were able to use the content and attribution of both sources. Candidates needed to use the content of both sources, using the attribution and contextual support to make a judgement as to the utility of the sources. Answers that used the content of both sources were kept at Level 2. In order to reach Level 4 there needed to be a clear and balanced discussion of both sources, placing the sources in their historical context. There was some imbalance with weaker candidates, with many focusing on one source. The focus has to be the utility of the sources for an historian.

Question 2

- (a) A surprising number of candidates had little idea of the conditions in Germany in May 1945. The key word is 'conditions' – impact of Allied bombing, destruction of infrastructure, disease etc. Many focused on the political consequences; these answers missed the point.
- (b) A relatively well answered question. Candidates were expected to use the content of the source, its attribution and their own knowledge to explain why a source was produced. By studying the source many candidates were able to construct an answer based upon why the Volkssturm was formed in 1944. The key to reaching Level 2 is using the attribution. The better answers were able to support their opinion of the source with detailed own knowledge. To reach Level 3 a candidate needed to make sure that more than one reason for the production was given, using the content of the source, the attribution and their own knowledge.
- (c) In answering this question candidates were required to use the content and attribution of three different sources to give a balanced opinion on the validity of the interpretation in the question. Many candidates gave content only responses to this question, using the content of the three sources in order to make a judgement on the validity of the interpretation. Many also answered using the content of the three sources and their own knowledge only. By doing this, candidates were kept to the top of Level 2 – 5 marks at best. In order to reach Level 3, candidates have to use the attribution of the three sources in order to answer the question set. Many candidates didn't appreciate the need to understand the content of the three pieces of evidence and evaluate the value of the attribution. The majority settled for answering the question only by referencing their differences in content – evidence 1 supported the interpretation, but evidence 2 and 3 suggested an alternative. The key to reaching Level 3 is use of the attribution. Mechanistic responses were kept at Level 3. Level 4 responses require a discussion of the content of the three sources in their historical context. There needs to be a good use of the attributions with a clear judgement as to the validity of the interpretation. The answers need to deal with 'why' the sources are different.

Question 3

The extended answer was generally well done. Candidates were able to provide a range of factors on the rise to power of the Nazi party. A balanced and reasoned response was required with a sound judgement. This question is a familiar one but there was some confusion with a minority of candidates giving detailed accounts of the Nazi consolidation of power. It was anticipated that candidates would give details of the Great Depression and its impact on Germany. However this was only one of many factors. Candidates needed to evaluate these other factors e.g. political scheming, Nazi propaganda, Hitler's appeal, impact of the SA etc. It was not expected that there would be detailed responses focusing on the Reichstag Fire, the Enabling Act, the Night of the Long Knives, none of which were considered to be relevant. Candidates should be advised to read the questions carefully.

4271/05 – CHINA UNDER MAO ZEDONG, 1949-1976

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to use information from both sources to answer the question. Answers that described the relevant content gained Level 1 marks. Candidates who placed the relevant points from the sources in their historical context gained Level 2 marks.
- (b) This question was answered very well. The majority of candidates were able to identify the relevant information in the source and provide accurate additional own knowledge to explain why Mao introduced the Cultural Revolution gaining Level 3 marks. Answers that used the content of the source and provided some general background knowledge achieved Level 2 marks. The few candidates who paraphrased the content of the source material gained Level 1 marks.
- (c) The majority of candidates achieved Level 3 marks for this question by evaluating both sources in context with relevant points regarding both content and authorship, before reaching a conclusion regarding their utility to a study of the downfall of the Gang of Four. Candidates who adopted a mechanistic approach in their discussion of the source content and authorship achieved low Level 3 marks. Candidates who considered the content of the sources only with no reference to the attributions did not progress above high Level 2 marks. Candidates who dealt with only one source well could not gain higher than high Level 2 marks. Answers that considered the content and authorship of both sources but lacked a clear conclusion regarding their usefulness to a study of the downfall of the Gang of Four gained Level 2 marks. A full evaluation of both sources in their specific historical context, together with a reasoned and substantiated judgement regarding why an historian would find the sources useful enabled candidates to gain Level 4 marks.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates who had knowledge of the Korean War gained Level 2 marks. Generalised answers that neglected to focus on China's involvement in the Korean War gained Level 1 marks. Accurate and detailed points describing China's specific involvement gained Level 2 marks.
- (b) This question was answered well with many candidates achieving Level 3 marks. The majority of answers clearly engaged with the question by presenting clear reasons why the source was produced at the time. Level 3 responses displayed detailed contextual knowledge with reference to the relationship between China and the Soviet Union in the early 1950s. Level 2 responses offered knowledge of the source in its historical context and suggested some reasons for its production. Level 1 responses were generally focused describing the content of the source with little focus on why it was produced at the time.
- (c) Candidates who offered weak answers that paraphrased the content of the given evidence with simple comments about the interpretation gained Level 1 marks. Level 2 marks were awarded to candidates who clearly identified the different ways the issue has been interpreted and offer a basic judgement supported by some of the evidence and/or own knowledge. Candidates who discussed the content of the evidence only and neglected to include reference to the attributions achieved top Level 2 marks. Answers that clearly provided comments on how and why the issue had been interpreted in different ways with support from the evidence provided and their attributions gained Level 3 marks. Top Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates who offered a clear judgement on the issue set. To gain Level 4 marks it was necessary to provide well supported comments on how and why the issue had been interpreted in different ways with a clear judgement in considering the interpretation in its historical context.

Question 3

This was a well-answered question with the majority of candidates able to show a sound understanding of the positive and negative impact Mao had on improving the lives of the Chinese people from 1949-1962. The wording of the question invited an evaluative response and the majority of candidates achieved this by following the guidance given in italics. Some candidates answered the question by adopting a chronological framework for their response; other candidates dealt with the issues relating to improvements to the lives of the Chinese people before progressing to deal with the lack of improvement – both types of answer were rewarded equally dependent on the quality of their knowledge and judgement reached. Generalised answers with limited support gained Level 1 marks. Candidates achieved Level 2 marks by offering a one sided answer with some support or a very weak two sided answer gaining four marks. The award of 5-6 marks was given to answers that presented a reasoned one-sided answer or a weak two-sided answer with some contextual support. Candidates who presented a very well supported one-sided answer reached Level 3/7 marks, as did unbalanced two sided answers with contextual support. Answers that presented a reasoned analysis of the relative improvement of the lives of Chinese people but lacked some detail or balance achieved 8-9 marks. Level 4 marks were gained by presenting a reasoned and well supported two-sided answer using accurate and relevant historical detail; the higher marks awarded for the degree of accurate and relevant contextual support.

4271/06 – WESTWARD MIGRATION: THE AMERICAN WEST, 1840-1895

Question 1

- (a) This question was very well answered on the whole, with most candidates using the content from the sources in their historical context and getting into Level 2. A few did not refer to content and skipped straight to context, which limited these answers to Level 1. There were still some candidates, though fewer than in previous years, who ignored the sources completely and answered from their own knowledge. There were no marks awarded for these answers.
- (b) Overall this question was generally well answered across most centres, with many candidates reaching Level 2 and above, with quite a few Level 3 full mark answers. Many candidates made good use of the source, referring to the desire for a 'new start' and the impact of the railroad, and then expanding on these points. The level of own knowledge was pleasing. Many candidates included at least one other reason, and the variety of different reasons discussed by pupils was very wide. However, there were a few mentions of the California Gold Rush or the role of fur trappers in opening up trails for which no credit could be given.
- (c) There were very few Level 4 answers for this question. The mark scheme requires candidates to reach a "reasoned and substantiated judgement" for a Level 4 response and few achieved this. Most candidates got either top Level 2 or Level 3. The vast majority made good use of the content of the sources, getting them to Level 2 (4), while others provided, at least, basic comments on authorship as well, which took them into Level 3. The authorship of Source D was analysed much better than Source E, with many candidates merely stating that it was a cartoon and therefore must be an exaggeration. Some candidates also provided contextual support to aid discussion of both sources, but then often only made basic comments on authorship. There were some candidates who also discussed the reliability rather than the usefulness of the sources and thought that they needed to decide which source was the more reliable.

Question 2

- (a) A majority of candidates produced Level 2 (3) and Level 2 (4) answers, by discussing the uses of the buffalo and then going on to describe how the loss of the herds either destroyed the nomadic lifestyle or made the tribes dependent on the government. The better answers did both, with some candidates also referring to the impact on religious life and rituals e.g. hunting. Unfortunately there was a substantial minority who only discussed the uses of the buffalo and did not discuss the effect of the destruction the buffalo. These answers could only be credited with a Level 1.
- (b) Most candidates produced Level 2 answers by reference to the content and also, briefly, to the attribution, to consider the reason for sending the telegram. However, in many cases candidates did not consider the attribution in enough detail, or did not address the content and relied only on background knowledge to provide an answer. The better responses focused more clearly on the 'why', discussing the fact that the officials did not understand the ritual dance and were frightened of what the Indians might do, so felt they needed help from the government to control the situation.

- (c) This was the least well-answered of the questions on the paper. The vast majority of candidates achieved only Level 2 (4 or 5 marks). They were able to explain, by reference to the content, **how** the interpretations differed and were able to reach a basic judgement. In many cases they also used their own knowledge in support. However, to reach a Level 3 candidates needed to comment on “how and **why**” interpretations differ. Relatively few candidates made any references to the attributions and so answers lacked consideration of ‘why’ there are different interpretations. Those who did often commented on the attributions only briefly and tended to focus on their reliability, instead of using them to help explain why those who wrote the different pieces of evidence may have come to that particular interpretation.

Question 3

This question was looking for a reasoned two-sided answer with good contextual support and this was achieved by a pleasing number of pupils. However, this year, though most answers were two-sided, they tended to be unbalanced. As a result most answers were in the Level 2 (4, 5 and 6 marks) to Level 3 (7 to 8 marks) range. There were few top Level 3 or Level 4 responses. Though some candidates demonstrated a very good knowledge of the impact of the gold rush on westward migration, the majority were weak on detail and many just made the basic argument that people moved west to get rich quick. Most candidates were able discuss other factors e.g. push factors from the east, the belief in Manifest destiny, religious persecution, the role of the mountain men in opening up trails etc., but in many cases the range of factors considered was limited or lacking in detail. Many answers also included references to factors that were not applicable to the early pioneers e.g. the building of the railways, the Homestead Act etc.

4272/01 – THE ELIZABETHAN AGE, 1558-1603

Question 1

- (a) This question is now worth three marks and requires detailed information from both the source and own knowledge to access the higher mark. The source showed how Puritans dressed and it was hoped that candidates would then develop their answers by reference to some of the puritan practices and beliefs, such as, disapproval of sinful pleasures and their demand to 'purify' Elizabeth's church of catholic traits, etc.
- (b) To access Level 3 a full explanation of a range of reasons was required as to why Elizabeth chose a 'middle way' in religion. These would have included her desire for a church acceptable to the majority of her subjects in order to secure peace and stability after the period of considerable religious change since 1536. Reference to the Act of Supremacy and Act of Uniformity would have provided the necessary detail.
- (c) The responses to this question were disappointing. To access Level 3 a clear reference to both content and authorship of the sources was required. Too many responses were no more than a paraphrase of the content and copying of the attribution without further consideration. The thrust of the question was why the two sources have different views about the seriousness of the Catholic plots. It was surprising that candidates did not pick up on the obvious seriousness of dethroning Elizabeth, restoring Catholicism and the possible involvement of Spain in the plots outlined in Source B. Too many candidates made bland reference to reliability of the sources; for example, the author of Source B was Catholic and therefore biased. The better answers considered the reason why these sources were produced and their target audience. For example the Ambassador would have wanted to relay accurate information to his King regarding the Catholic plots in England.

Question 2

- (a) To access the full 4 marks for this question, candidates were required to describe an Elizabethan galleon. Those that knew what a galleon was were able to produce a good and full description referring to the fact it was made of wood, large and heavy, had three or four masts and many sails, designed to carry goods and armed with canons, etc.
- (b) This question was well done with many candidates able to provide a range of reasons, including political, religious and maritime rivalry, for the Armada being sent to invade England. There was a tendency, by some, to lose focus and discuss the actual encounter which was not credited.
- (c) Good knowledge of exploration and expansion of trade was provided with most candidates able to detail some of the main voyages and activities of Elizabethan seamen as well as identifying trading developments. This question does not require a two-sided response. However the question does require an evaluation of the extent of success and therefore a consideration of some of the 'failures' was necessary to access the higher level.

Question 3

- (a) Candidates that focused on cruel sports were well rewarded. Good knowledge of bear and bull-baiting and cock-fighting were a feature with some reference to where these activities were held and the betting on the outcome. However some candidates wrote on sport and pastimes in general which was not credited.
- (b) There were many impressive responses on whether all the people in Wales and England had a good lifestyle in the Elizabethan age. Those candidates, who focused on 'lifestyle' and produced fully reasoned and well supported two sided responses with clear judgements were well rewarded. However it was quite dispiriting to read lengthy responses on the effect of Elizabethan religious policy on various groups such as Catholics and Puritans and the Welsh rather than focusing on social trends as required.

4272/02 – DEPRESSION, WAR AND RECOVERY IN WALES AND ENGLAND, 1930–1951

Question 1

- (a) The majority of candidates achieved Level 2 by making reference to the source and providing some relevant background knowledge. However, many answers were very generalised and despite the low tariff, it is to be noted that accurate contextual support and specific use of the source are needed to achieve full marks.
- (b) Many candidates achieved Level 2 by displaying reasonably good knowledge of the steps to war. However, answers needed to be focused upon why Britain went to war with Germany, as opposed to providing generalised descriptions of German foreign policy in the 1930s. Answers that were able to combine the two, making specific references to appeasement and Britain's role in years preceding the start of the conflict, progressed beyond Level 2.
- (c) This question was reasonably well answered, with the overwhelming number of candidates being able to access Level 2 to low Level 3 by identifying the differences in the content between the sources and by making reference to the authors. However, once again it was very noticeable that candidates still appear to have been taught a mechanical content, origin and purpose approach to answering this question. Centres need to appreciate that these responses fail to develop an analysis of the circumstances under which the views have been developed and more importantly, the audience for which they are intended. As such, these mechanical responses fail to achieve more than at best, low Level 3. The best responses attempted to provide some context for the views and clearly evaluate the issue.

Question 2

- (a) The majority of candidates accessed Level 2 by describing the house building programme undertaken by the post-war Labour government, supported by references to the 'Homes for All' policy, construction of prefabricated houses and the development of council estates. As is always the case, the best answers displayed good contextual knowledge, although some tended to drift off into a discussion about the quality of the prefabs.
- (b) Most candidates were able to provide a reasonably good explanation here, although too many focused upon just the contents of the Beveridge Report with generalised references to Labour promises. Many identified the support for Labour as emanating from a desire for change as well as the radical programme of reform that the party were offering. Candidates were expected to focus upon the thrust of the question, in this case, on the Labour Party. Some candidates focused purely on the failure of the Conservative election campaign and its reliance upon Churchill and were therefore unable to effectively develop their response. Answers that achieved Level 3 were able to contextualise these contributory factors with contrasting references to the attitude of the British people, the appeal of the Labour leadership and the party's manifesto.
- (c) Overall, this question was poorly answered with some candidates clearly not displaying knowledge and understanding of what nationalization was. The majority of candidates achieved Level 2 by briefly describing the process and making generalised references to its importance in terms of creating and securing jobs. However, in relative terms, not many candidates were able to develop their response further and there were only a few examples of candidates that were able to achieve Level 4 by fully focusing their response on the importance of nationalization not just in terms of its practical applications, but also in terms of the political ideology that drove the policy. The best responses provided a summative evaluation of the key issue by also referring to its importance in terms of partially explaining why the Labour Party lost the 1951 General Election.

Question 3

- (a) This question was well answered with the majority of candidates being able to provide at least two causes of the Depression, mainly by referring to the Wall Street Crash and the decline of traditional industries. Candidates also identified increased foreign competition and the debt legacy of the First World War as contributory factors. However, it was noticeable that weaker candidates confused cause with consequence and merely described in general terms the effects the Depression had upon people.

- (b) Some very good responses were elicited for this well established question format, with many candidates providing clear, detailed two-sided answers that displayed excellent subject knowledge. It was pleasing to see that some sophisticated answers went beyond the simplistic geographical splits in terms of the effects the Depression had and were able to identify the variations within specific areas. Responses that achieved high Level 3 to Level 4 were also able to move beyond the economic effects of the Depression and consider issues such as culture and entertainment. However, some candidates provided purely descriptive accounts of events such as the Jarrow March for Jobs, or merely described the impact the Depression had on traditional industries in parts of Wales and England. Centres are reminded that a degree of evaluation is needed, backed up by relevant contextual support.

4272/03 – AUSTERITY, AFFLUENCE AND DISCONTENT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, 1951-1979

Question 1

- (a) A lot of excellent knowledge about the wide range of activities that children did in the 1950s which could only be awarded 1 mark under the mark scheme. This is balanced by poor use of the source even though comments on the source were worth up to 2 out of the 3 marks for this question.
- (b) Excellent knowledge of the 1970s equality / discrimination laws, and also of the freedoms granted to women by the 1960s divorce and abortion legislation. Fewer candidates considered the wider reasons for changes in the lives of women such as being released from their domestic role by labour saving devices and supermarket shopping, of the impact of changes in secondary and university education.
- (c) Most candidates got the idea that the differences in view about the influence of punk was down to a question of perspective – a personal view opposed to an overview. Some candidates did not access the higher levels of the mark scheme because they did not mention the views of either author. A small number of candidates also substituted their knowledge of the topic for any reference to the content or authorship of the sources.

Question 2

- (a) There were a large number of very detailed answers to this question, sometimes lacking the specific name of one of the protagonists. A number of candidates did not attempt this question. Some others confused the Profumo scandal with the Vassall case or the Cambridge spy ring.
- (b) Some excellent responses giving a range of reasons including the attraction of how successful the EEC was immediately, weakening trade relations with the Commonwealth, encouragement from the USA and changing French attitudes. Some candidates saw the date 1973 and wrote about industrial unrest in the UK instead of the EEC. There was also some irrelevance with candidates writing about financial support from the USA after the Second World War, or about the consequences of joining the EEC and its impact on immigration.
- (c) The concept of the multi-cultural society was clearly well understood by candidates but the majority of answers tended to describe what it was rather than considering the government actions that had brought it about, which was the focus of the question. Better answers focused on government attempts to address white concerns by limiting immigration, while protecting immigrants from discrimination with the Race Relations Acts. Some responses were entirely negative and did not give any consideration to the 'successful' thrust of the question.

Question 3

- (a) This question was extremely well answered overall with many candidates getting full marks. There were some common misconceptions usually involving immigration, which was a solution to the labour shortage caused by full employment in the 1950s, and unemployment which some candidates argued was high after the war.
- (b) The better responses to this question came from the candidates who clearly understood what consumerism was and who explained clearly how it, and the alternatives they considered, helped to boost economic recovery in the 1950s and 1960s. Some very impressive supporting details were deployed by a number of candidates to support their arguments. A number of low level responses were limited to a brief factual overview of the main topics covered by this question (the Welfare State, nationalisation, the Festival of Britain, the Beeching Axe, etc.) with no attempt to show how these topics helped the UK's economic recovery in the 1950s and 1960s.

4272/04 – RUSSIA IN TRANSITION, 1905-1924

Question 1

- (a) Students were able to use the source and use their own knowledge. Most achieved a Level 3 here, whereas some got Level 2. There were a small number who got level one by making references to the source only. In using their own knowledge students mainly used the facts that the Reds had the industrial parts of Russia and had better transport links e.g. the railways to get supplies and weapons to help them win the war.
- (b) Many students did well in this question and were able to write a range of reasons with explanations thus getting a Level 3. The lower end used the hatred towards the Bolsheviks and the need to restore the Tsar as answers tended to be brief. A number wrote on the death of the Royal family and War communism which happened during the Civil War and were not reasons for the start of the Civil War. The ending of the First World War with the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was used in many answers, bringing out why the foreign armies got involved. If the candidates had learnt this area well they were awarded 6 marks and many did.
- (c) The source question enabled most students to use the content reasonably well. There were few Level 4 responses due to the fact that answers were not developed enough regarding authorship. Many produced rather a mechanical approach writing on content first then purpose and finally origin; this should be discouraged by centres. Answers using authorship tended in many cases to mention the words bias for source B and benefit of hindsight for source C without explaining why it was biased or what the benefit of hindsight was. There were however a number of Level 3 responses which needed to address the authorship in its historical context to get into Level 4. The fact that source C was a book titled The Russian Civil War would imply that it was somewhat specialised in that area and would probably be detailed.

Question 2

- (a) A description question. A large number were able to reach Level 2 for 3/4 marks here. Divorce and abortion changes were common and others involved other aspects such as politics and equality in the work place.
- (b) Probably the question that was one that most students knew a lot about. A range of reasons were given why Stalin replaced Lenin in the power struggle between him and Trotsky. Other rivals were also brought into the answer such as Kamenev and Zinoviev. Level 3 answers gaining 5/6 marks pointed to the fact that Stalin 's position as General Secretary was influential in winning the struggle. Level 1 answers tended to know about the funeral of Lenin. This I felt was the most popular question on the paper and centres had taught this really well.
- (c) Many were able to write detailed analysis on the NEP and only briefly addressed the concept of importance. There were a number that managed to creep into Level 4 which involved balance in analysis and the evaluation. There were some who spent too much time on the effects of War Communism. Centres need to practice on this type of question it being an 8 mark question.

Question 3

- (a) There were some who wrote about the wrong revolution bringing out facts about the events of February 1917 instead of 1905. Good answers tended to realise that Bloody Sunday sparked off the Revolution and wrote detail about the massacre then the promise of a Duma by way of the October Manifesto.
- (b) With this question as with all the indicative content in the units specification it is important the centres teach it thoroughly, it being an extended essay and enough practice needs to be given in preparation for this type of question. The generic level descriptions were used and a guidance sheet to help the markers. This question covers a lot of chronology and perhaps teaching the areas in chronological order would help. This question gave the opportunity for students to stretch themselves and there were a lot of Level 4 answers which were sophisticated detailed responses that involved an overall judgement. A large percentage of students were able to write something about the unpopularity of the Tsar and Tsarina mainly on events during the First World War that led to their abdication after the February 1917 revolution and got into Level 2. Others concentrated on various aspects of their unpopularity e.g. their autocracy. A number involved a combination of revolutions whereas some concentrated on one. Even in writing on one revolution there were scripts written in depth involving the issue and other factors that led to revolution and got Level 4.

4272-05 – CHANGES IN SOUTH AFRICA, 1948-1994

Question 1

- (a) The need was to make reference to the visual source while providing contextual knowledge to describe the Defiance Campaign in order to gain the 3 marks. Candidates were often inhibited from achieving full marks because of either a lack of source reference or scant knowledge of the event.
- (b) Most candidates could explain the various reasons why economic sanctions failed to affect South Africa until the mid-1980s. This question was answered very well with many sophisticated accounts of the strength of the economy, the reliance of neighbouring countries on South Africa, her strategic importance as a buffer to communism during the Cold War and therefore the reluctance of the UK and the USA to embrace sanctions. Many also referenced the profit made by large companies in South Africa and to the low wages being paid to the black workforce which gave strength to the argument that economic sanctions were unworkable.
- (c) Many candidates made a decent attempt to address the question and identify the differences in the sources. Most candidates at Level 2 concentrated on the content of the sources to show how they differed but there was often a surprising lack of contextual knowledge, especially of the controversy surrounding the events which would have added to a discussion of the motives of Montsisi and Kleingeld. Candidates at Level 3 made an attempt to recognise that the Police Chief would attempt to justify the violence. Better answers referenced the context of the sources with many correctly pointing out the attempted 'cover up' and the apparent honest account of Source B. Candidates were too often unable to access Level 4 because of a failure to focus on the provenance and purpose of each source along with a lack of appreciation of the circumstances in which they were produced.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to point out that this was the election where Nelson Mandela became the new President of South Africa and therefore signified the end of apartheid. Many candidates gave impressive detail on the election results and others acknowledged that this was the first free and democratic election held in South Africa and the various challenges faced by the number of voters who demonstrated their right to universal suffrage.
- (b) The vast majority of candidates answered this question well and could give detailed reasons why violence in the townships exploded in the 1980s. Most were able to explain the poor living conditions and frustration of black South Africans by the 1980s while making reference the anger at Botha's reforms to the apartheid system and to 'black on black' violence between Inkatha and other opposition parties. Most were able to explain the call to make South Africa 'ungovernable' and some even referenced the unsettling role of Winnie Mandela and the necklacing phenomenon of the 1980s.
- (c) Most candidates were able to offer some detail of the importance of de Klerk in the ending of apartheid while considering a range of supporting factors. Nearly all candidates could explain his decision to release and work constructively with Nelson Mandela together with the consequences. Many candidates explained de Klerk's role in the formation of the CODESA talks, the organisation of the first full democratic election and the unbanning of the main opposition parties. More sophisticated responses alluded to timing and circumstances surrounding the decision to end apartheid leading to a judgement on de Klerk's importance which was essential to access Level 4.

Question 3

- (a) The performance on this question was disappointing with only a minority of candidates scoring full marks. Many were able to reach top of Level 1 by citing Separate Development and the intentions of Dr. Malan to introduce white supremacy. Those who offered specifics such as the Sauer Report or the fear of the 'black peril' as spread by the National Party were elevated to Level 2. Those who listed later apartheid laws did so without profit. Centres must note that this question does not invite a debate involving other factors. Certainly, the two-sided response is to be discouraged.
- (b) Most were able to consider the main issue along with other factors as part of a two-sided approach and the bulk of candidates were set at top Level 2/bottom Level 3. Virtually all could describe the effectiveness of the Pass Laws in enforcing apartheid along with reference to other apartheid laws in order to arrive at a judgement. Some candidates read the 'Pass Laws' for 'apartheid laws' in general and therefore their answers were unfocused. The better prepared candidates compared the effectiveness of the Pass Laws to a wide range of other laws affecting other areas of life e.g. the Population Registration Act, Bantu Education Act and the Suppression of Communism Act. Many also concluded that the strengthening of the Group Areas Act and the introduction of the Bantustans in the 1950s ensured the effective enforcement and continuance of apartheid.

4282/01 – THE CHANGING ROLE AND STATUS OF WOMEN, 1900 TO THE PRESENT DAY

Question 1

- (a) Most candidates did not focus on the fact that the source showed women post 1945. Very few commented on the increase in the service sector and the 'white blouse revolution' and due to this few candidates gained the top mark.
- (b) This question was not well done. Most candidates were familiar with the concept of the glass ceiling, but few could explain properly why it gave women a problem. Some answers did suggest that employers were reluctant to employ women in senior posts because they did not want women taking maternity leave, but very few other reasons were given. Few candidates referred to the apparent reluctance of women to study maths or science subjects at a high level, as a reason for their failure to achieve senior positions.
- (c) Most candidates were able to discuss the two sources and better candidates were able to explain why the authors had different viewpoints. However, comments on the authorship of the sources tended to be mechanical with candidates assuming that as Freda Sharland was recalling events that she was likely to have forgotten things, or alternatively made them up. Comments on Source C were mostly predictable, suggesting that as the book was written by historians, they would have done considerable research so that their work would be accurate. This resulted in the majority of answers not going beyond Level 3.

Question 2

- (a) Some candidates failed to read this question properly and a number of answers were given on Anita Roddick and JK Rowling. As might be expected most candidates wrote about Margaret Thatcher, but in general terms listing little beyond her being the first woman Prime Minister, and the longest in office in the twentieth century. Due to this few answers reached beyond Level 1.
- (b) This question was not well answered. Some candidates referred to abortion, the Divorce Reform Act and the Pill, all of which were associated with the 1960s. However some candidates were aware of 1970s feminism and people such as Germaine Greer. Many candidates correctly wrote about the Equal Pay Act and the Sex Discrimination Act, though few mentioned that while the Equal Pay Act was passed in 1970, employers were given five years, until 1975, before it had to be completely implemented. Few candidates wrote about the Equal Opportunities Commission, the function of which was to make sure that the other acts were properly observed. Generally these acts were only considered in terms of jobs, or the removal of certain 'male' or 'female' subjects in schools
- (c) The majority of candidates produced a narrative answer here rather than engaging with the key concept of importance. There were some references to the Suffragists, though usually to dismiss them as ineffective. Most knew about Mrs Pankhurst, and often her daughters. Only some candidates considered the role of women in the First World War as a factor leading to the granting of the vote to women. Most candidates were well informed about the two Acts of 1918 and 1928, though there was some confusion about the exact terms of the 1918 Act.

Question 3

- (a) This question was not well answered. The majority of candidates did not seem to understand the term 'family patterns', with a number of candidates including domestic technology in their answers. Most candidates wrote about contraception and abortion. Contraception and abortion led to smaller families, and this was the change in family patterns most often suggested. The other was divorce. There was wide awareness of the existence of the Divorce Reform Act of 1969, but very little awareness of what it actually meant. Some candidates did realise that the increase in the number of divorces led to a considerable increase in the number of one parent families. Few if any mentioned the growth in the number of couples cohabiting, and raising families, without actually being married. Similarly few mentioned step-families or blended families.
- (b) Some candidates had clearly learnt a model essay, which did not in fact fit the question, whilst a number of candidates wrote about all elements of the course, not just 'home and family life.' Most candidates began with a very restricted view of a woman's life in the early 1900s. There is clearly plenty of knowledge about how demanding house work was in the early 1900s, but there is also a view that women were compelled to do this. There was little understanding that conventionally a woman when she married became a housewife and running the house was her main activity. Unmarried women of both the working and middle classes did have paid jobs, but they normally gave up those jobs on marriage. This question was about 'home and family life', so the question of paid work was not really relevant, but it still featured in many essays. Following the war there were various reforms that improved life for women, notably the NHS and council houses, followed by labour saving devices. Some essays gave up at this point. Candidates had usually been taught that they should write a two-sided essay, but these were rarely balanced. At least one candidate was able to find a negative view point saying that labour saving devices caused obesity. The most common negative view point concerned the Great Depression and the extreme poverty that this caused in some areas. Some candidates referred to women starving themselves in order to feed their husband and their children. In most cases essays were entirely or mainly about working class women. Some candidates had a paragraph referring to 'Edwardian upper class women' with their parties, charities and large numbers of servants, and in a few cases there was a brief reference to the middle class women with one servant, a 'maid of all work'. Few if any were aware of the almost complete disappearance of servants by 1945. Some essays stopped around 1945. Interestingly some candidates who had written little or nothing about family patterns in 3a, wrote in some detail about birth control and smaller families in 3b. It seems likely that some simply did not understand the term 'family patterns'.

4282/02 – DEVELOPMENTS IN SPORT, LEISURE AND TOURISM IN WALES AND ENGLAND, c.1900 TO THE PRESENT DAY

Question 1

- (a) Answers were often disappointing as this question should allow candidates to attain the higher level as a visual source facilitates secure inferences. However some able candidates did not refer explicitly to the source or use secure knowledge with reference to the source. Many candidates were able to make considered and accurate inferences from the source and use accurate knowledge such as 'The music halls had acrobats' 'There was a seating area' and accurate knowledge: 'The music halls were popular with the working class' 'famous performers included Marie Lloyd'. Some students mistakenly discussed the Music Halls being popular with upper class members of society.
- (b) Some centres were unclear on the time period they were to address in the question and gave an explanation based purely on the 1960s. Many weaker responses lacked explanations with supportive development and some narratives focused on the 1950s giving a detailed contextual background which was not necessary. Good Level 3 responses concisely focused on a range of factors including protest, fashion, idolisation merchandise, the rebellious nature of teenagers in each subsequent decade as reflected in various styles and musical genres.
- (c) Despite this question being one in which centres are familiar with and anticipate and prepare efficiently, this was not answered well. There was good comparison of content (Level 2/4), but little supportive contextual knowledge was in evidence. Many candidates did not consider the authorship in a sustained manner, and were prepared to paraphrase the content of the source when offering a supportive judgement. Few candidates offered sophisticated responses which took into consideration the context of each source in conjunction with a developed analysis of each source. Candidates that did were able to identify the technological advancements and access to multi-channel televisions compared to the limitations in terms of ownership back in the 1950s. Most candidates seemed familiar with this question and were able to compare the content of the sources well and the more able candidates were able to explain why the sources were different (Level 3/5 or 6). However relatively few candidates were able to access the highest level because they did not submit the supportive contextual knowledge which is required.

Question 2

- (a) This question was answered well by a significant number of centres. Some generalised weakly supported generic statements were submitted such as '*Holiday camps were for everybody, they were fun places*'. Many responses suggested centres covered this part of the specification in some detail with references to '*Billy Butlin established the first holiday camp in 1936; he offered a week's stay for a week's pay*'. Detailed references to red coats and their role in providing entertainment, brightly coloured chalets characterised many good responses.
- (b) Some candidates struggled with this question and many linked their examples of growth in car ownership to the increasing accessibility to holiday camps which had been addressed in question 2a. Simple generalisations were in abundance such as people '*could access the coast more or access holiday camps quicker*', which limited the answers to Levels 1 or 2. However a significant number of candidates could accurately quote the growth in car ownership from the 1960s to the 1970s and give reasons why this benefitted British holidays. Some candidates could offer explanations that linked car ownership to the improvements to local economies, and

sophisticated answers used good supportive knowledge including references to the rise in caravan parks, services linked to cars such as motels and the increase in multi-holidays. Some candidates limited their explanation without referencing modern developments linked to car ownership such as usage of the Channel Tunnel.

- (c) This was a question which should have elicited good response from candidates given the modern time period. Some centres misinterpreted the question; a common error was the word '*fightback*' was interpreted as '*flightback*'. The number of generalised responses suggested that centres had not covered the topic in depth. A common misinterpretation was to discuss the popularity of Britain to foreign tourists.

Question 3

- (a) This new question required a concise overview of developments in spectator sport within a prescribed time period. Many candidates went beyond 1945. Some candidates referred to radio but did not link its development as a catalyst to increasing spectator numbers at the venues that commentaries were from. Unfortunately developments in entertainment were linked to this question as well. However, good answers gave accurate and focused factors such as local derbies and inter-town rivalries in football. Excellent references were seen to increased leisure time, the improvements in transport particularly the railways which were linked to the development of the football league and consequently increased interest and attendance.
- (b) Some candidates could offer an impressive awareness of the developments in and growth of sports since 1900. Sophisticated responses identified '*growth*' and '*development*' as two separate areas to discuss, and consequently gave a balanced response which looked at a range of factors from the media / sporting heroes / sporting controversies and linked each factor to either a development or catalyst for growth. The responses which attained Level 3 and above were characterised by excellent and accurate supporting detail. There were many centres who were not able to exceed Level 2 because of a lack of development: too many of these responses lacked specialist terminology and were characterised by generalised statements, with no recall of accurate knowledge. Candidates who accessed Level 4 identified and accounted for sponsorship being a relatively new development in sport, and identified the latter part of the twentieth century as the main development period in this factor. Good chronological development of factors, with accurate examples, was evident along with a clear evaluation and analysis of the concept of success which required a sustained judgement based on the analysis. There were lost opportunities to gain a Level 4 response because the conclusion would simply offer a summative, rather than an analytical conclusion.

4373/01 – THE DEVELOPMENT OF GERMANY, 1919-1991

SECTION A

Question 1

The number of candidates attempting this question increased by 6% to 91% and performance was marginally better than question 2 and comfortably better than question 3.

- (a) This question was generally answered well. Responses at Level 2 discussed how Hitler made gain of the arson attack in the build up to the March election by blaming the communists leading to arrests and detentions. There were many references to the view that the Nazis had staged the event. More detailed responses at Level 3 considered how Hitler created a state of emergency and to the passing of the Reichstag Fire Decree using Article 48 and the incidence on the communists. There were references to Nazi involvement as part of a 'false flag operation'. Very few referred to the election results but the passing of the Enabling Act was cited as part of the Nazi consolidation of power.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources or offered generalization was set at Level 1. Candidates who used the sources to illustrate change gained Level 2. Here there was reference to Cold War tension in 1961 and to reasons for the building of the Berlin Wall in contrast to moves towards reconciliation by the end of the 1980s and to the euphoria of its demolition. Candidates at Level 3 made good use of both sources together with contextual knowledge to explain more fully why the Berlin Wall was built at a time of heightened Cold War hostility, to changing relations between East and West Germany in the 1960s and 1970s as part of Ostpolitik and the signing of the Basic Treaty. The better prepared focused more sharply on the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and subsequent moves towards reunification as symbolized by the fall of the Berlin Wall. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by analyzing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and requires candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response. Generalized references to Stresemann's involvement in Germany's post-war recovery gained Level 1. Largely descriptive accounts which touched on the invasion of the Ruhr and the resultant hyperinflation rather than assessing Stresemann's importance in dealing with the issues got to Level 2. Candidates at Level 3 were able to focus on Stresemann's central role in stabilizing the economy with reference to American financial support and successes on the foreign front which candidates linked to easing domestic political and economic problems. More sophisticated explanation and analysis of Stresemann's contribution secured Level 4. Candidates here were able to reach a judgement by arguing that as important as Stresemann was in restoring stability, Germany was overly reliant on American economic support. Whilst the majority of candidates were secure with economic improvements during Weimar's Golden Age, very few considered how it was a time of political stability which frustrated the aims of extremist factions.

Question 2

This question was attempted by 92% of the candidates which represented a drop of 4% from last year.

- (a) Many candidates were able to describe Adenauer's 'economic miracle' and offered examples of industrial regeneration and drops in unemployment levels in West Germany during this period. There was some reference to Ludwig Erhard and rebuilding the old smokestack industries and the use of Marshall Aid was often cited which elevated responses to Level 3. Many candidates made reference to denazification in West Germany as well as to Adenauer's efforts to instill a moral re-birth into West Germans and paying reparations to Jews. Too many candidates lapsed into describing life in West and East Germany, making the contrast between liberalism and repression which was not the focus of the question.
- (b) This question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources was set at Level 1. At Level 2 candidates were able to identify the reasons for Germany's changing fortunes by describing life during the two distinct phases of the war. Candidates who used both sources and their own knowledge to contrast the changing conditions while offering reasons gained Level 3. Many candidates were able to explain how military victories for Germany at the beginning of the war meant that German people were confident of a final victory and there was good reference to Goebbels and his clever use of propaganda. Many candidates were able to explain the concept of 'Total War' in the latter phase of the war and to the need for propaganda to improve morale. The better responses focused on the intensification of Allied bombing and how defeats in Russia and North Africa were crucial in Germany's ultimate defeat. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and requires candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response. The majority of candidates were able to describe the means by which Hitler controlled sections of German society. However many failed to take into account the phrase 'social policies' and answers consisted almost entirely on descriptions about the use of propaganda and censorship and to the creation of a police state. Many candidates were able to describe how and begin to explain why Hitler attempted to control the lives of women, children and Jews and other minority groups and so gained Level 3. Level 4 candidates gave substantiated judgements which factored in the opposition which Hitler faced from the youth and the churches to conclude that he could not totally control all Germans. A minority of candidates veered off the focus of the question by assessing in detail the different types of opposition which Hitler faced. On the whole, this question was very accessible and well answered.

Question 3

This question was attempted by 16% of candidates and represents a drop of 3% from last year. Performance was lower than questions 1 and 2 which is in line with previous years.

- (a) This question was generally answered well and candidates were able to describe the decisions made at Yalta which were ratified at Potsdam. There were references to the need to occupy and control Germany by the creation of zones but there was often confusion when candidates described the creation of the two Germanies. The better prepared dealt with denazification and demilitarization of Germany but the need to punish war criminals did not feature often.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources was set at Level 1. The majority of candidates were able to access Level 2 by identifying the military and sometimes the territorial clauses of the Treaty of Versailles and to Hitler's later policies of rearmament and conscription. Level 3 responses were characterized by a deeper understanding of the reasons for Germany's changing military strength between 1919 and 1939. Here there was sound reference to the punitive measures imposed after the First World War and to Hitler's dismantling of the Treaty of Versailles as a means of increasing Germany's military power and his plan to restore national pride and to adopt an aggressive and expansive foreign policy. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and requires candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter argument as part of a two-sided response.

This question did not perform particularly well.

Candidates at Level 2 often found it difficult to sustain discussion of the Russian campaign and drifted into narrative making obvious reference to the Russian winter as a crucial factor which led to ultimate defeat. Some were able to explain how Germany was now effectively fighting a war on three fronts and how huge casualties and losses contributed to defeat by the Allies. Reference was made to the battles at Stalingrad and Leningrad which gained Level 3 but surprisingly few candidates mentioned Stalin's 'scorched-earth' policy by name although there were references to the Russians destroying and sabotaging anything that could be used by the advancing German army. More sophisticated responses which offered sharper analysis of the issue gained Level 4. Candidates were able to arrive at a substantiated judgement which concluded that Hitler's tactical blunder and subsequent defeats in Russia contributed significantly to Germany's ultimate defeat.

SECTION B

Candidates must focus more sharply on the thrust of the question in terms of change, improvement, development or significance. A chronological dash through the period is not enough.

Many candidates offered very detailed and reasoned responses in the time available. The scaffold provides a useful structuring tool for the less able and allows access to Level 2 where responses often tended to be patchy offering only partial coverage of the period. Level 3 candidates offered a greater sense of chronology with supporting detail and those who discussed the extent of change/development/significance gained up to 9 marks. More sophisticated responses that offered an effective chronological overview while recognizing the varying impact of the issue, gained Level 4.

There was very little variance in performance across the three questions.

Question 4

Some 20% of candidates attempted this question which showed an increase of 6% from last year.

There was an appreciation of the need to cover the whole period but there was often imbalance. The need to avoid reference to social change as previously reported was still apparent. Many responses would have sat better in Question 5. The Weimar era was well known as was Stresemann's role in achieving political and economic stability and the reversal of fortunes after the crash in the USA and the resultant depression. As expected most candidates were informed about the Nazi era and how Hitler developed Germany and there was some description of developments in post-war East and West Germany. Surprisingly, there was little mention of economic developments during the Second World War and predictably little on the later policies which led to reunification. Many candidates just skipped from the 1950s to the Berlin Wall coming down in 1989.

Candidates failed to access top Level 3 or Level 4 because they did not specifically focus on the question and explain how far Germany developed politically and economically. Too many candidates merely offered routine accounts of Germany over the period. The more able however were able to identify variations and shifts in political and economic systems with relevant supporting detail.

Question 5

This was by far the most popular essay and was attempted by 75% of candidates.

In dealing with the 1920s, many still tend to note political and economic events rather than deal with their impact on groups in society though there was some appreciation of the varying impact of hyper-inflation. The Nazi era yielded sound examples of contrasting experiences and discontinuities for groups of people. Descriptions of life in West Germany were better supported than in the East and there was some focus of events during the Cold War period and to later reconciliation and reunification. The better prepared candidates were able to differentiate between different groups in society such as women, Jews and workers across the eras. Again the broad sweep approach was favoured by many and so the focus was not always on the impact of change.

Question 6

This remains the least popular question with just over 2% attempting it but it was generally well answered.

Developments in the 1920s were touched on as Germany went from being a pariah nation to being welcomed back into the international community and Stresemann's achievement was known as were Hitler's aims and infringements of the Treaty of Versailles along with the more obvious features of the Second World War. Accounts often faltered after 1945 and candidates still have difficulties finding an appropriate approach to discussing the position of the two Germanies in international relations after 1949. Better responses appreciated the shifts in foreign policy and to varying attempts to promote its importance across the period.

**4373/02 – DEVELOPMENTS IN PALESTINE, ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST,
1919-2000**

SECTION A

Question 1

This remains the most popular question with 92% attempting it which was down by 8% from last year and performance was higher than questions 2 and 3.

- (a) At Level 2, candidates focused on increased violence and acts of terrorism leading to the British government's decision to hand the mandate over to the UN whose plan to partition exacerbated the situation leading to Britain's withdrawal and the creation of the state of Israel. Candidates at Level 3 were able to sharpen the focus on how Palestine had become ungovernable and to Britain's withdrawal as an act of political and economic expediency.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources was set at Level 1. The majority of candidates were able to access Level 2 by beginning to focus on the reasons for tension which spilled over into violence in the 1920s and 1930s with reference to reaction at Britain's failure to control Jewish immigration and monitor the purchase of Arab land. At Level 3, candidates used the information from sources and their own knowledge to explain why tension escalated in the period by offering specifics about the General Strike and Arab revolt. Responses here sharpened the focus on heightened tensions caused by Jews fleeing from Germany and other anti-Semitic countries and Arab reaction to the recommendations of the Peel Commission. Very few candidates picked up on the roles of the Jewish Agency and the Supreme Muslim Council in adding to the tension. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and required candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response. Many candidates were able to recognize that attempts to create peace were hindered by the ongoing situation in the refugee camps and to unrest and acts of terrorism and limited attempts at analysis were usually awarded Level 2 and up to 4 marks. Level 3 responses were able to discuss the attempts by moderates to pursue a path to peace and candidates were knowledgeable about the roles of Sadat and Arafat and to progress made at Camp David along with how it was scuppered by extremists. Those achieving Level 4 offered a more substantiated explanation of the issue by analyzing the roles of individuals and outside powers and there was sound reference to attempts at peacemaking in Madrid and Oslo together with barriers to the process.

Question 2

As previously, this was the least popular of the questions in section A and attempted by 24% of the candidates but represents a significant increase of 14% on last year. Performance was lower than questions 1 and 3.

- (a) A significant number of candidates struggled with this question and were unable to recall the event. Those who offered some reference to the atrocities gained Level 2 but there were some well focused responses worthy of Level 3 though few could put the event in the wider context of Plan Dalet.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources was set at Level 1. The majority of candidates were able to access Level 2 by beginning to focus on continuing problems in the Occupied Territories by referring to the frustration and anger that festered in the refugee camps especially among young people and how it manifested into uprisings such as the Intifada and to the attraction of extremist groups. At Level 3, candidates used the information from the sources and their own knowledge to explain why conditions remained difficult in the Occupied Territories while hinting at the failure of attempts to secure a solution to the problems. The need here was to consider the factors which aggravated the situation such as increased confiscation of Arab land and the building of Jewish settlements. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and required candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.
Many candidates struggled here. Largely descriptive accounts of the kibbutz system were limited to Level 2. Some focus on Israeli economic and social development gained Level 3 and there was reference to the importance of US financial support and to the imperative of survival through political and economic growth. Many were unable to access Level 4 because of a lack of a judgement on the issue.

Question 3

This question was attempted by 81% of the candidates, 9% less than last year.

- (a) The majority of candidates at Level 2 showed some appreciation of events but often wedged between reasons for and results of the war.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. Although a number of candidates only paraphrased the sources, and so were limited to Level 1. Most candidates were able to access Level 2 by beginning to focus on changing relations between the superpowers as a result of the Cold War and how the USSR aligned itself to the Arab cause. At Level 3 candidates offered more explanation about how the USSR made arms deals with Egypt and Syria as a means of counter-balancing US influence in the Middle East. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.

- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and required candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.

Many candidates were able to show knowledge of the victory in terms the planning and organization of the Israeli army in contrast to the shortcomings of the Arab forces and so achieved Level 2. Better answers were able to explain the importance and impact of the war for both sides with reference to the magnitude of victory for the Israelis and `Catastrophe` for Palestinian Arabs. More detailed analysis leading to a judgement gained Level 4. Here there was reference to immediate, psychological impact of victory for the Israelis coupled with the longer term political and economic results in contrast to territorial losses and the enduring refugee problem.

SECTION B

Candidates must focus more sharply on the thrust of the question in terms of change, improvement, development or significance. A chronological dash through the period is not enough.

Many candidates offered very detailed and reasoned responses in the time available. The scaffold provides a useful structuring tool for the less able and allows access to Level 2 where responses often tended to be patchy offering only partial coverage of the period. Level 3 candidates offered a greater sense of chronology with supporting detail and those who discussed the extent of change/improvement gained up to 9 marks. More sophisticated responses that offered an effective chronological overview while recognizing the varying impact of the issue, gained Level 4.

Question 4

This question was attempted by just 2% of candidates who in the main were unsuccessful as they swept through events with little appreciation of the shifting emphases and relative importance of political developments.

Question 5

Performance here was significantly lower than questions 4 and 6. Responses were descriptive in the main and more akin to question 4. The better prepared considered how both groups were affected by various events between 1919-2000 but there was only thin reference to unequal development.

Question 6

The vast majority - 98% - of candidates attempted this question and performance was higher than questions 4 and 5.

Most candidates offered a decent chronological outline with reference to the factors making for conflict. Nearly all candidates made reference to the difficulties of British rule and its results, and the impact of the major wars in making for conflict. Many also covered the growth of extremism. Only a minority of candidates managed to make reference also to the on-going situation in the Occupied Territories and to the difficulties in achieving peace, often writing well over half their answer on the period of the Mandate. Stronger candidates offered a considered judgement about the relative importance of the reasons for conflict as part of their conclusion.

SECTION A

Question 1

The number of candidates attempting this question increased by 11% to 54% which restored the 11% drop witnessed last year.

- (a) A significant number of candidates gained Level 2 and 3 marks by discussing 'Reaganomics' as the President's recipe to fix the economic mess of the time. More detailed accounts at Level 3 dealt with the mechanics of Reagan's programme in terms of widespread tax cuts and decreased social spending along with mention of 'supply-side economics' and the 'trickle down theory' as a means of stimulating the economy. Some of the well informed candidates referred to specifics such as budget deficits and massive increases in the national debt.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' or largely generalized responses which just paraphrased the sources were set at Level 1. Candidates were able to access Level 2 by describing changing trends and patterns in the lifestyles of young people between the 1930s and 1960s while beginning to focus on the reasons for change. At Level 3, candidates used the information from the sources and their own knowledge to explain the conformity of many young people in the 1930s coupled with the austerity of the time with post-war affluence and the emergence and development of teenage sub-cultures and to how they defined themselves with music, film and literature. The more astute picked up on the gender issue and discussed the liberalization of groups of women by the 1960s. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and requires candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response. Candidates at Level 2 were able to offer narrative accounts of the main features of the New Deal and sometimes to the president as a war leader but with little attempt to explain Roosevelt's importance to the nation. At Level 3, candidates provided excellent description, but the focus was on Roosevelt's personal qualities in steering the nation through depression and war. The better prepared at Level 4 provided reasoned analysis and reached a more convincing judgement about Roosevelt's importance.

Question 2

This is by far the most popular question in the section with just under 98% of candidates attempting it and performance was predictably higher than questions 1 and 3.

- (a) Many were able to access Level 2 by referring to the Topeka case and to events at Little Rock High while those at Level 3 dealt with the changing face of education in terms of the unconstitutionality of segregation and to how events achieved presidential interest and nationwide attention.

- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources was set at Level 1. Candidates at Level 2 identified the segregated 'Jim Crow' regiment in Source A and to the different climate of 1947 when Truman announced his intention to end segregation in all branches of the military largely owing to the contribution of black Americans on war and home fronts. Candidates who developed the issue further by offering specifics about the skill and bravery of black combatants, the contribution of factory workers and to how the experience of war changed the outlook and stance of many black and white Americans gained Level 3. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.
- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and requires candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response. This question performed well. Most candidates achieved Level 2 by offering narrative accounts of King's role in the campaign for equal rights some of which were very detailed, but none the less were descriptions only. Attempts to evaluate the significance in terms of his importance secured Level 3 and, with more sophistication, Level 4. Here the focus was on his personal qualities and spiritual lead and to how he broadened the appeal of the Civil Rights Movement and universalised it. There were a number of two-sided responses which spoke in detail on the contribution of Malcolm X as a way of countering the question. Such an approach is to be discouraged.

Question 3

46% of candidates attempted this question which shows a decrease of 11% on last year.

- (a) This was a new question but the topic area is mentioned in the Specification and forms an important aspect of the USA's contribution to the war. A number of candidates struggled and produced either an incorrect response or failed to attempt the question. Other candidates confined themselves to a mention of the attack on Pearl Harbor and the dropping of the two atomic bombs but with little development. Despite this there were some excellent and fully developed responses that covered the nature of naval warfare in the Pacific and mentioned specific sea and land battles.
- (b) The question demands that candidates make explicit reference to the sources supported by contextual detail with a sharp focus on the concept of change or continuity. The 'face value' account which just paraphrased the sources was set at Level 1. The majority of candidates were able to access Level 2 by discussing the reasons for changing relations from wartime allies to bitter Cold War enemies. There was a tendency here to dwell too much on the shift from isolationism to involvement in the Second World War. Candidates at Level 3 explored the breakdown in relations by discussing ideological differences and post-war superpower rivalry. At Level 4 there was more focus on the reasons for tension in terms of the arms race and events in Berlin along with US alarm at the growth of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe leading to the announcement of the Truman Doctrine and the need to contain communism. It is again to be emphasized that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources.

- (c) This remains the most demanding question on the paper and required candidates to provide a well supported explanation in order to arrive at a reasoned judgement. The aim is to focus sharply on the main issue of the question and avoid the temptation to introduce other factors as part of multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.
- Descriptive accounts at Level 2 dealt with events and results of the Vietnam War and to the realization that Vietnam was a defeat and the aim of halting the spread of communism in South East Asia had failed. Some candidates saw importance in terms of the nature of warfare and to how the war was reported. At Level 3 candidates were able to discuss the importance of the war at the outbreak of hostilities as a means of combating communism in the region and how the reality of defeat led the USA to re-think its foreign policy. Those who were able to recognize the war as a watershed, while taking a more long-term perspective, gained Level 4. Responses here reached a judgement about how the war lessened the USA's role in foreign affairs leading to détente and the imperative of pursuing different diplomatic strategies.

SECTION B

Candidates must focus more sharply on the thrust of the question in terms of change, improvement, development or significance. A chronological dash through the period is not enough.

Many candidates offered very detailed and reasoned responses in the time available. The scaffold provides a useful structuring tool for the less able and allows access to Level 2 where responses often tended to be patchy offering only partial coverage of the period. Level 3 candidates offered a greater sense of chronology with supporting detail and those who discussed the extent of change/improvement/importance gained up to 9 marks. More sophisticated responses that offered an effective chronological overview while recognizing the varying impact of the issue, gained Level 4.

However, there remains an issue around the 'prepared answer' with a focus on 'turning point' or 'importance' rather than the key word in this instance i.e. 'change'

Question 4

The number of candidates attempting this question increased by 5% to over 12%. Performance however was slightly lower than questions 5 and 6.

Most candidates covered the period of the Depression in depth and cited the New Deal and the Second World War as important factors in the USA's changing social and economic fortunes. There were mixed responses to the period of affluence in the 1950s but there was some awareness of changes in popular culture and youth rebellion. The better prepared candidates were able to appreciate how presidential policy changed society but for many the trend to offer little beyond the 1970s continues.

Question 5

The number of candidates attempting this question dropped slightly to 75%.

Coverage of the period remains an on-going issue with most candidates' responses tailing off after the 1960s. However, there were some excellent responses that showed splendid period coverage together with an appreciation of the varied experiences of different groups of black Americans. Most candidates were secure on the 1930s, 1950s and 1960s.

There were some excellent responses to this question where candidates displayed sound knowledge and understanding across the period. These were well informed responses which were focused and developed in depth evenly across the period. Most responses covered the 1930s and 1940s reasonably well but some became uneven after that time. Some discussed the 1950s with regard to education and transport whilst others skimmed over these key areas. The legislation of the 1960s was covered in decent depth but some candidates failed to explore the nature and impact of change on different sections of the black community. A common shortcoming was a failure to develop the material in sufficient depth beyond the 1960s and many resorted to list/name drop successful black actors, musicians or personalities. The `bolt-on` evaluation remains a strategy to act as a catch all for a response to the question. Very few candidates make judgements or differentiate throughout their response. Indeed, differentiation remains a key weakness in this section.

Question 6

The number of candidates attempting this question dropped by 4% to 11% but performance was slightly higher than question 5.

The period of isolation was dealt with well by better candidates while coverage of the Second World War was generally sound as was the need for post-war intervention and the imperative of containing communism. Some candidates still find it difficult to go beyond Cuba and detente was dealt with superficially. The better prepared offered a sound sweep of the whole period while recognizing trends and shifts in foreign policy.

There were a number of excellent responses to this question which really honed in on the issue of `change` not just in relation to policy but also with relationships with other nations, particularly the Soviet Union, China and other pro-communist powers. A significant number of candidates appreciated the shifts in policy and covered isolation, intervention, containment and détente. Some answers covered the ground extremely well and discussed relationships and events in the Middle East during the last decade of the century whilst other responses became thin after the 1980s and the collapse of communism and the break up of the Soviet Union. Nevertheless, coverage was good enough to achieve top Level 3 accreditation. Weaker candidates tended to describe events, particularly in relation to the Second World War, Cuba and Vietnam.

SECTION A

Question 1

- (a) There were some good answers to this question with reasonable detail and description of Gwynfor Evans's contribution to Plaid Cymru. However there was a tendency to list Evans's 'achievements' without showing clearly how it contributed to Plaid Cymru's cause. A number of candidates confused Evans with Saunders Lewis.
- (b) Unfortunately too many candidates made very little use of the sources to explain why the Labour Party became the most popular political party in Wales by the 1920s. Again, listing of reasons was common but with too much emphasis on the decline of the Liberal party at the expense of the appeal of the Labour Party. Too many candidates wrote at length on the reasons for the Liberals popularity at the beginning of the twentieth century which was not required.
- (c) Most candidates recognised the unpopularity, in Wales, of Mrs Thatcher and the Conservative governments of 1979-97 by reference to non- Welsh MPs as Secretary of State for Wales and a general lack of support in Wales historically. Many answers provided a number of reasons for the change in attitude in Wales towards devolution. Though mentioned by most there was not enough emphasis on the effect of the miners' strike and destruction of Welsh coal and steel industries in bringing about this change.

Question 2

This was by far the least popular question in Section A.

- (a) Very poorly answered with 'light industry' not understood and very little knowledge demonstrated.
- (b) Many answers for this question either lacked focus, or were generalised and descriptive. Only a few candidates managed to address both the sources, and use their own contextual knowledge to explain the concept of change.
- (c) Disappointingly answered; very few candidates that attempted this question understood the term 'service industries'. Those that did understand the term failed to demonstrate why its development has been so important to Wales in the second half of the twentieth century. There were very few references to the decline of Welsh heavy industry and job opportunities in farming.

Question 3

This was by far the most popular question in Section A.

- (a) This was a well answered question with well-prepared candidates answering with good detailed knowledge of the effect of the Second World War on Welsh culture. Most candidates concentrated on the impact of evacuees but were also able to comment on the effect of the radio, cinema and English medium newspapers during the war.

- (b) Many candidates found this question challenging. This was because they failed to focus on changes in rural Wales and to focus on the second half of the twentieth century. Too many addressed this as a question asking, 'Why the Welsh way of life declined in the twentieth century'. Candidates must start their answers with the date of Source A; in this instance the 1960s and then address the reasons for the change shown in Source B. Very few candidates recognised that Llŷn was the last region in Wales to change and allow public houses to open on Sundays.
- (c) Many candidates were able to tackle this question with relative success. Though there was a tendency to be descriptive many candidates were able to provide a more detailed and accurate analysis of the key issue to access Level 3. Candidates provided good knowledge of Welsh medium and bilingual education provision in pre-school and the secondary sectors in particular. However very few were able to expand and consider the contribution of local authorities and central government.

SECTION B

Candidates must focus more sharply on the thrust of the question in terms of change, development or significance. Many candidates offered very detailed and reasoned responses in the time available. More sophisticated responses that offered an effective chronological overview while recognising the varying impact of the concept in the question, gained Level 4.

Question 4

This question was attempted by very few candidates. Of those that did very few accessed Level 2.

Question 5

This question was slightly more popular than Question 4 and was slightly better answered. However most answers were restricted to Level 2 and below.

Question 6

This was the best answer in Section B with most candidates providing a good chronological grasp of the whole period with good supporting detail. Many provided an effective overview and would go beyond the scaffold to gain high Level 3 and Level 4 answers.

4383/01 – CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN WALES AND ENGLAND, c. 1530 TO THE PRESENT DAY

SECTION A

Question 1

- (a) This was very well answered. Heresy was clearly understood by the majority of candidates as a religious crime, with a range of supporting detail given from the sixteenth century.
- (b) Many candidates referred to both sources explicitly and were able to use the sources to discuss the impact of the growth of industrial towns on crime. There was generally some imbalance in discussion and the highway robbery source tended to be more vague in its links to industrial towns.
- (c) This question led some students into a more descriptive outcome, with very few focusing on the idea of computers creating “new crime”. Better answers were able to conclude that the computer allowed old crime to be committed in a different way. The majority of students were able to give a list of the crimes you could commit with a computer and begin evaluation, but usually this was more generic. In some cases there was evaluation with little factual support that was again limited. Very few students achieved a Level 4 on this question.

Question 2

- (a) This question caused some problems, with some candidates not making the link between a Charlie and a Watchman. This led to some confused answers with candidates not being able to differentiate between Charlies and Constables. The information could also be variable with not all candidates focusing on the role of the Charlie.
- (b) The majority of candidates understood the thrust of the question, although the finer points about change and the pace of change over the course of the twentieth century were rarely developed. The stronger candidates tied the question very closely to question looking at methods in detail and why they changed. Most candidates were more focused on how they changed.
- (c) Most candidates could make the link between the Fielding brothers and the changes in policing in the second half of the 18th century. Many candidates were able to access the top level by evaluating the overall impact of the BSR and their influence over Peel and the creation of the Metropolitan Police in 1829. However, many candidates failed to analyse the variety of methods introduced by the BSR and their importance

Question 3

- (a) This question was not well-answered, with very few Level 3 answers. Many answers tended to only focus on imprisonment and others only on the later part of the twentieth century. Very few were able to give a detailed and accurate answer which covered the treatment of young offenders throughout the twentieth century.
- (b) This question was often misunderstood with students thinking that they were expected to comment on why there was a difference between punishments in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, rather than why they differed to each other. Some students went into a discussion of the Bloody Code although most were able to give basic reasons for difference such as serious and minor crime and the need for deterrence and humiliation.

- (c) This question led to some generalized answers with very few effectively separating the two systems and providing detailed analysis of their success. Some candidates attempted to argue for their success although most candidates were able to bring out the point about them driving inmates insane. Very few were able to develop their answers past this point to look at their cost, difficulty to enforce or lack of progress in reforming inmates.

SECTION B

Question 4

For some candidates the question led to a very narrative approach, rather than a discussion of change and continuity. Many candidates were able to give a chronological account of the causes of crime, but lacking the focus of a given factor in the question the evaluation of how far these factors had changed was generally weaker.

Question 5

This was a popular question. Candidates had a clear understanding of the chronological period. Some students however were still over-reliant on the scaffold, which held them back. The “How far” part of the question was less well done, bar a few candidates who were able to consider the varying impact of the improvements across the timeframes. Many students are completely positive about the 'improvements' of the twentieth century.

Question 6

Most candidates who attempted this were well prepared and knew how to address the 'attitudes' question. There was generally a stronger discussion of chronology and less reliance on the scaffold than in other questions. Change and continuity was still an issue for many candidates.

4383/02 – CHANGES IN HEALTH AND MEDICINE, c.1345 to the present day

SECTION A

Question 1

This section generally was not done as well as it has been in previous years. Candidates tended to write everything they knew about the individual, or development, rather than addressing the set question. This inhibited the marks that could be awarded with many candidates not being able to access the higher level marks.

- (a) Most candidates were able to describe the work of Ambroise Paré in some detail and develop at least two accurate points. Candidates tended to focus on the use of ligatures and the ointment. Many candidates mentioned the importance of publishing his work but were unable to name his book or when this was published. Candidates need to recognise that this question is now worth 5 marks and so more than two developed points are required. Higher level candidates were able to write about a number of developments by Paré e.g. prosthetic limbs, Bezoar Stone, Crow's beak and so were able to access the highest marks.
- (b) Most candidates were able to offer some own knowledge regarding why medical knowledge changed in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and so were able to achieve at least Level 2 for this question. Many were able to write about X rays and describe their impact particularly in relation to World War One but were not able to link this to the development of scans and beyond. This may have been because a number of candidates had clearly been expecting X rays to appear as a significance / turning point question. This meant most were not able to access the higher level marks available as they did not consider other changes in the time period e.g. DNA that were required for Level 3 marks.
- (c) Many candidates were able to describe in some detail the work of William Harvey explaining his experiments regarding circulation of the blood and how the publication of his book helped spread this knowledge. Many were able to achieve low Level 3 by giving a detailed account of his work and assessing how this was an improvement on the work of Galen. Higher level answers were fewer in number but those that did achieve high Level 3 or Level 4 were able to clearly explain in detail the work of William Harvey and how his adoption of a modern scientific approach signalled a turning point for medical knowledge, and that his book helped increase people's understanding over time. As with the other answers in this section the best ones were those where candidates were answering the set question rather than just writing everything they knew about William Harvey.

Question 2

- (a) A number of candidates did not answer this question well because they focused on those who delivered the treatments or remedies rather than what the treatments or remedies were. The best answers were able to describe how the 4 humours provided treatment through bleeding or purging; the use of herbal remedies with examples of treatments that were proven to work e.g. Plantain and a number of candidates wrote about religious treatments e.g. flagellants and praying.
- (b) Candidates were very knowledgeable about the changes in surgical methods in the nineteenth century. Answers were in the main able to explain how developments to surgery came about as a result of the work of Simpson and Lister and so achieve high Level 2 answers. Higher level candidates were able to build effectively on the sources with their own knowledge to show how surgical methods changed. A small, but significant number of candidates were confused by Source B and did not see this as a development on source A. Instead candidates wrote about patients being held down through a lack of anaesthetics.

- (c) Candidates were very knowledgeable about Jenner and his work. Most were able to describe in depth his discovery of vaccination and his experiment on James Phibbs, but their focus on this detail meant that many did not address the question of why his work was a turning point for the prevention of disease. This meant many candidates did not get above Level 2. Only a small number of candidates achieved the higher levels by explaining what Jenner's work led onto in both the short and long term and considered any detail beyond the experiment carried out on James Phibbs.

Question 3

As in previous years only a small number of candidates chose to answer this question, and those that did tended to answer the questions poorly.

- (a) Most of the candidates that decided to answer question 3 were able to identify a number of methods used to combat the Black Death. A significant number were confused about which were methods for the fourteenth century and which were used in the seventeenth century. This meant some candidates wrote about a significant number of methods but were unable to achieve any marks as they were writing about the wrong century
- (b) This was very poorly executed with candidates not knowing much beyond the sources. Many candidates wrote about the nineteenth century rather than the twentieth and it is clear that candidates are not being well prepared for this section beyond the nineteenth century which seriously hinders their chances of being successful in question 3.
- (c) Of the three sub-questions in question 3 candidates were able to answer this one in the most detail. Most were able to describe the impact of Chadwick's work and how public health changed in the nineteenth century but very few moved beyond this and answered the question how successful were attempts to improve public health in industrial towns.

SECTION B

Question 4

A large number of candidates were able to describe key features of four time periods but failed to address the set question of whether medical knowledge led to better health. This prevented candidates from achieving the higher marks available for this question. As with previous years candidates were more knowledgeable about the Renaissance period than any other. A significant number of candidates wrote beyond the scaffold and so were able to progress beyond Level 2. Written communication was generally good.

Question 5

Candidates who attempted this question were very knowledgeable about prevention and treatment of disease and were able to write extensively around the four time periods. They did not always deal with the crux of the question of whether methods used to prevent and treat disease always helped patients and so were not able to achieve Level 4. As with previous year's candidate's knowledge of prevention and treatment in the Renaissance was weak, but explanation of the nineteenth and twentieth century was good and many were able to write beyond the scaffold. A significant number of candidates provided a summing up at the end of their answer which directly answered the set question. Written communication was generally good.

Question 6

As in previous years only a very small number of candidates answered this question. Knowledge tended to focus on regurgitating the knowledge used to answer question 3 although many did write with some knowledge about Florence Nightingale. Knowledge around the twentieth century and the NHS was very weak. Written communication was generally poor.

CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

Centres will have received their moderator reports detailing the outcome of their 2015 Controlled Assessment submission on results day. Teachers need to pay particular attention to any specific recommendations made by their moderator.

It is clear that Controlled Assessment is a much appreciated unit by candidates and teachers. This year, again, the work presented was generally of a good standard. Most of the work was handwritten and of a reasonable and sensible length. It was clear that centres that restricted the time available for the 'write up' succeeded in producing more focused and relevant answers. The majority of centres are using the Controlled Assessment exercises produced by the Board, with exercises on the two world wars and Jack the Ripper proving very popular. Most centres are using the marking checklist produced by the Board.

Part (a)

Some centres are still adopting a source led approach to part (a). Candidates should be encouraged to produce coherent pieces of prose with the source evaluation integrated within the answer. Candidates should select a range of sources to fully demonstrate their evaluation skills. Candidates are adept at evaluating utility and reliability but there has been a trend in recent years for markers to accept illogical and erroneous comments.

Part (b)

Despite numerous warnings, unfortunately some centres did not update this part of the exercise. The exercise now reads, '**Some historians argue that'** **How valid is this interpretation of ?** This year we exercised leniency but in 2016 it will affect candidates' marks. Also, please be aware that there is a new mark scheme and marking checklist to accompany the changes and they must be used in 2016.

Some centres still address part (b) as another source evaluation exercise, which it is not. In part (b) candidates should be encouraged to offer a clear explanation and analysis of the set issue and reach a judgement with good support. The current marking check list clearly identifies the need for candidates to consider the purpose and intended audience as well as the accuracy of the sources. Effective answers begin with the view of an historian and then examine the sources the historian might have used to come to that interpretation. What is required is a consideration of why a particular author or source should have a particular view.

Marking and annotation

Most centres are using the Board's 'marking checklist' and as a result are 'cutting down' on the need to repeat comments on script after script. It also contributes in securing more consistency in marking within centres and between centres.

Most markers provide annotation on the scripts by highlighting what is credited, and this greatly assists the moderating exercise. We recommend that it is best to award a level at the end of a piece of work rather than on numerous occasions in the body of the script. Identifying the Assessment Objective (AO) in the margin is sufficient with no reference to level. For example, a single clear Level 4 comment does not merit the award of Level 4 overall; it has to be sustained throughout the piece of work. Internal moderation is a requirement and is essential in the moderating exercise.

Administration

The majority of centres follow the Board's instructions to the letter. However there are still some issues:

- Late arrival of the sample without prior agreement with the Board;
- Some centres still present candidates' work in plastic wallets and not in manila folders as stipulated;
- Please use the plastic sacks provided by the Board when forwarding your centre's sample to the moderator.
- H1 and H2 forms were not forwarded or incomplete. These forms are still required and are essential to the moderation process. The H1 form should only include the details of the candidates in the sample and signed by the Head of Department. The H2 form must be signed by the candidate in order to authenticate the work.

For 2016 and 2017

- It is essential that centres are using the current exercises, mark schemes and marking checklist. Part (b) must read 'Some historians argue' How valid is this interpretation of?
- Some centres have not received approval for 2016. If you have not yet submitted a proposal form for the 2016 Controlled Assessment entry you need to do so as soon as possible.
- All centres are required to submit a new proposal form for 2017. This form is available on the WJEC website.
- I draw your attention to the **Teachers Guide to Unit 4 Controlled Assessment, Revised for strengthened qualifications 2015-2016**. This guide provides support and guidance to teachers in preparing and administering the Controlled Assessment unit.
- Also available on the WJEC website are the Controlled Assessment exemplars, 2014 CPD slides as well as all the forms related to Controlled Assessment.



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