Grade boundary information for this subject is available on the WJEC public website at: https://www.wjecservices.co.uk/MarkToUMS/default.aspx?l=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.
Question 1

(a) This was reasonably well answered with the majority of candidates being able to access Level 2 by referring to the range of causes given in Source A as well as making passing references to Source B. Balanced use of the sources, set in their historical context, was required for full marks however and this meant that comments upon the number of turnpike roads shown in Source B and its impact upon rural communities could have been developed further.

(b) Responses to this question were mixed with the majority of candidates failing to develop their answer beyond what was contained in the source. Stronger candidates were able to contextualise the issue by referring to factors such as disillusionment with the increasing violence of the riots, the harsh punishments and troop presence in West Wales. Candidates achieving Level 3 were relatively few and far between which was somewhat disappointing given the well-established nature of the topic.

(c) This question was reasonably answered, with candidates being able to follow the usual evaluation of the origin and purpose of the sources. However, as in previous years it was 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. Very few candidates commented upon the fact that Source E referred to the Reverend Hurlock thus implying dissatisfaction with tithes. Greater evaluation of the content is required, as well as consideration of the historical context in order for an answer to move beyond mechanical responses. 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 problem that was facing post-Napoleonic war Britain. Given the range of factors that were available, many achieved full marks by referring to the economic, social and political problems that were prevalent at the time.

(b) This question continued to see an improvement in terms of candidate responses as many understood what was required of them in terms of considering what the source depicts, the historical context under which it was produced and the possible reasons for its production. As a result the majority were able to access Level 2 by referring to the restrictions on people’s lives depicted 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 fact that the cartoon was a response to the passing of the Six Acts post-Peterloo. Candidates are reminded that the date determines the historical context and the source reflects a particular perspective on an issue.
(c) The interpretation question again elicited mechanical responses that failed to see candidates achieve Level 4. The majority once again achieved high Level 2, low Level 3 by offering a basic judgement with limited support. Candidates tend to trawl 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. Therefore greater development of the authorship of the sources is needed.

Question 3

This well-established ‘essay’ question saw the majority of candidates provide the required two-sided account. Candidates overwhelmingly referred to the execution of Dic Penderyn as a sign of failure and the eventual granting of five of the six points of the People’s Charter as a success. However, stronger candidates were able to explain how in the short term both the Merthyr Rising and Chartist activities would have been considered by contemporaries to be failures but that in the longer term and in the context of subsequent events, they achieved a degree of success or at least impacted in a positive way. Future candidates should aim for a balanced response that displays accurate and relevant contextual support.

The majority of candidates achieved intermediate performance in terms of their spelling, punctuation and grammar with the accurate use of specific terminology being a feature of responses achieving high performance. Centres need to remind candidates that answers that are not focused at all on the main issue will not be rewarded in terms of spelling, punctuation and grammar.
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. Both sources must be dealt with equally in order to gain full 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 by referring to the source and making a clear explanation as to why rationing was introduced. 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.

(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 a conscientious objector, who was able to give his reasons for not joining the army. Some referred to the fact that because he was writing a letter to his wife he had no reason to exaggerate or lie. As it was a personal letter he has no reason to believe that anyone else would ever see the letter. They could see that Source E was by an army officer, so would be biased against conscientious objectors, and would not understand their reasons for not joining the army. Most candidates were able to achieve 6/8, 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 is not what is required and scores fairly low marks.

Question 2

(a) The majority of candidates were able to describe the role of O. M. Edwards briefly. Some centres had obviously been taught this extremely well, and were able to give a very full description of his work. Some centres had obviously not taught this at all, as candidates had no idea who he was even though it is mentioned on the specification.

(b) This was answered successfully by most candidates. Many very impressive answers were seen, with the majority of candidates scoring between 4 and 6/6. Most candidates were familiar with the poster and could clearly see why it was produced in 1911. However, many candidates only described the National Insurance Act which is not what the question was asking. Overall a very well answered question.
This question was done very successfully by the majority of candidates. 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. Many candidates gave a generalised view that Evidence 1 was by a historian who had the benefit of hindsight and had carried out research in order to write his book. This is very mechanical and simply shows that they are offloading class notes, and does not show a true understanding of how interpretations are formed.

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 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 high Level 3 answers, with some good support on both sides, although lacking some specific information. Level 4 answers were very intelligent and very detailed. Candidate’s knowledge of this period was excellent. Some centres have obviously prepared their candidates very well, however, some are also obviously supplying candidates with sample, pre-prepared answers. This can be detrimental as candidates just offload what they have learnt rather than focussing on specifically answering the question. This should be avoided, and rather candidates encouraged to use the information in their own way.
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 but may not have achieved full marks as they did not make full use of both sources. Some candidates only used a small section of Source A or Source B, thus not including some vital information in their answers. Others misinterpreted Source B by suggesting that because the cinema was empty, then it was not popular.

(b) This question proved accessible to the vast majority of pupils. Lower level answers tended to use the information in the source, or describe the changes in American society and not concentrate enough on sport. Better answers referred to the growing number of icons and stadia which attracted Americans, and would develop their explanation of the economic and technological conditions that allowed travel to the games. There were some references to participation in sport which was beyond the scope of the question. However, there were some excellent responses to this question, and most pupils were able to offer a coherent and substantiated answer.

(c) As in previous years, there were a variety of responses to this question, with very few achieving the highest level. Lower ability candidates took the sources at face-value or did not evaluate the evidence at all. At Level 1-2, there were many who merely paraphrased the sources, rather than trying to develop the content of the sources or evaluate them. Some also failed to address the utility of the sources at all, despite very good knowledge of the content, context and authorship of the sources. The utility of the sources must be considered. Many of the answers tended to be in the Level 3 range. Level 3 candidates considered the content and speculated on why the sources were probably biased, but only the very best answers considered the purpose of the sources and made clear reference to the fact that Source D was from a sermon and was designed to persuade his audience, whilst also providing historical context. Better candidates commented that Source E was like a form of advertising for Jazz music from the Jazz performer, in a newspaper, and would develop these as reasons for utility to an historian.

Question 2

(a) This question was answered very well indeed by the vast majority of candidates. Most pupils achieved full marks on this question because the topic clearly interested them. Many made reference to white supremacy; lynching; tar and feathering; violence; burning crosses; marches; gatherings in hooded outfits; and ‘friends in high places’. The weaker answers tended to lack detail.

(b) This question was answered reasonably well by most candidates, but some tended to describe the cartoon or outline the ‘Teapot Dome’ scandal, rather than focusing on reasons for the production of the cartoon. The best answers considered the historical context of the source and, crucially, the intention of the cartoonist. There were some very sophisticated answers which explained both the ‘Teapot Dome’ scandal, and why this particular source was produced including exposing the government’s hypocrisy and suggesting that the Republican government could not escape from the repercussions of the scandal.
Again this year, too many candidates would only consider the content of the given evidence instead of correctly addressing the question. 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 some of the benefits of immigration, and to the Immigration Acts of the period. 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 achieving high Level 3 marks (7-8 marks). There were very few who achieved 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. The better candidates mentioned the fact that the historian was more likely to provide a balanced interpretation because he had the benefit of hindsight, whilst the Republican Senator might have been justifying the ‘Closed Door’ policies of the Republican governments during the 1920s, as shown in Evidence 3.

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 Americans enjoyed the economic boom of the period or not. Most candidates knew a great deal about the topic and were able to provide specific examples for those Americans who benefitted during this time, such as Ford, industrialists, speculators, bankers, those in the advertising industry and consumers, and about those who did not do so well such as black Americans, farmers and those in traditional industries like textiles, coal mining and those working on railroads.

Sadly, some answers, lacked enough depth, or enough focus on the question, and some brought in irrelevant information from other sections of the syllabus, such as the Wall Street Crash in too much detail, 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 a good answer to this question.

SPaG

The standard of SPaG was good on the whole. Many candidates managed to achieve 3 marks. However, a few candidates failed to score any marks at all as their answers were too weak.
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 opposition by some young people to the Nazis during the war. The focus was on the war years and therefore no merit was given to answers discussing opposition pre 1939. Most candidates were able to use a combination of the source and their own knowledge to discuss youth opposition, focusing on the Edelweiss Pirates, the Swing Youth and White Rose. A minority provided a fair amount of narrative information about these groups whilst losing focus on the main thrust of the question which was to explain why there was opposition. The best answers also considered the motivation of these groups.

(c) Candidates are well versed in this style of question with the majority gaining Level 2 and higher. 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 focussing on one source. The focus has to be the utility of the sources for an historian.

Many answers very very mechanical and as such were unable to reach Level 4.

Question 2

(a) This question was answered well by many candidates. They were able to provide relevant details on the role of the SA, focusing on violence against opposition. Those candidates that discussed the events surrounding the Night of the Long Knives were not credited. Too many responses were too vague or underdeveloped to reach Level 2. Many candidates mixed up the SA and SS, whilst many focused on the events of the Night of the Long Knives.

(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. 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. Many candidates were able to comment effectively on the source, the attribution and put them into historical context, focusing on the Great Depression, propaganda and the 1932 elections earning a Level 3 response. Some candidates only focused on one issue, limiting them to a Level 2 response. Weaker candidates wrote at length on the poster and failed to make the link with the internal situation in Germany.
(c) In answering this question candidates were required to use the content and attribution of 3 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 3 sources in order to make a judgement on the validity of the interpretation. Many also answered using the content of the 3 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 attributions. 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.

Many candidates showed good understanding of the Reichstag Fire and the Night of the Long Knives but lapsed into narrative on these events. Other factors could also have been introduced in the consolidation of power.

There needs to be an engagement with the attribution to develop the answers.

Question 3

The extended answer was generally well done. Candidates were able to provide a range of factors on life in Germany between 1933 and 1939. A balanced and reasoned response was required with a sound judgement.

This question is a familiar one and it was anticipated that candidates would give details of those Germans that did benefit, and those that certainly did not. Many Germans did benefit from Nazi rule; unemployment fell in a short space of time and millions of Germans found jobs in public works and RAD. The DAF controlled conditions for workers and loyal party members and workers were rewarded with benefits through the Kdf including cheap holidays and cruises. However, not all Germans benefited from Nazi rule especially the Jews; the SA organised a boycott of Jewish shops in 1933; after the Nuremberg Laws of 1935 Jews lost their German citizenship. Kristallnacht (1938) led to the death of many Jews. Other groups were also targeted such as coloured people, gypsies, homosexuals, Jehovah witnesses, the mentally ill and physically disabled. Many women resented having to give up their jobs and becoming housewives. Workers lost any representation and the working day increased. There was great loss of personal freedom and fear of the SS and Gestapo.

In order to reach Level 3 and above, answers need to be reasoned, balanced and have sound factual support.
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) The majority of candidates were able to identify the relevant information in the source and provided additional own knowledge to explain why relations were poor between China and Taiwan gaining high Level 2 marks. Answers that used the content of the source and provided accurate additional knowledge gained Level 3 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 studying the Sino-Soviet split. 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 an understanding of the Sino-Soviet split gained Level 2 marks. Level 4 marks were awarded to candidates who engaged in 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.

Question 2

(a) The majority of candidates were able to present relevant factors to describe the People’s Communes and gained Level 2 marks. Answers that presented general points and lacked accuracy gained Level 1 marks.

(b) This question was answered very 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 Land Reform and Speak Bitterness Campaigns of the 1950s. Level 2 responses offered knowledge of the source in its historical context and suggested some reasons for its production. General points focused on describing the content of the source with little focus on why it was produced at the time gained Level 1 marks.
(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 offered 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 aspects of the Cultural Revolution for communist China. The wording of the question invited an evaluative response and the majority of candidates achieved this by following the guidance given in italics. 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 positive and negative aspects of the Cultural Revolution but lacked some detail or balance achieved 8-9 marks. Level 4 marks were gained by presenting a reasoned and convincingly supported two-sided answer using accurate and relevant historical detail; the higher marks were awarded for the degree of accurate and relevant contextual support.
Question 1

(a) On the whole, this question was well answered. Most candidates used the content of both sources, in their historical context, to get into Level 2. A few did not refer to content and skipped straight to context, which limited these answers to Level 1. Very few candidates this year ignored the sources completely and answered from their own knowledge.

(b) Answers to this question were, on the whole, disappointing. Most candidates made use of the content and provided some own knowledge about Sitting Bull’s role in the Battle of the Little Big Horn, with the result that Level 2 was the best that most candidates achieved. Level 3 responses also referred to Sitting Bull’s refusal to enter a reservation in a bid to preserve tribal culture and to his role as a spiritual leader, but these were few in number.

(c) This question was not quite as well-answered as last year, with most responses falling into a Level 2 or low Level 3. The majority of candidates made good use of the source content, taking them to Level 2/4, while others provided, at least, basic comments on authorship as well, taking them into a low Level 3. Candidates relied heavily on the content and authorship of Source D to consider the reasons for war but seemed less confident in their evaluation of Source E, with many candidates merely stating that it was a photograph of the expedition into the Black Hills taken at the time and therefore must be “accurate/reliable”. Some candidates also provided contextual support to aid discussion of both sources e.g. observing that the expedition shown in Source E was breaking the treaty referred to in Source D. In most cases, however, the evaluation of usefulness was not strong enough to take candidates into a level 4. There were some candidates who also insisted on discussing the reliability, rather than the utility, of the sources.

Question 2

(a) The majority of candidates produced Level 2/3 and 4 answers, by providing a range of reasons for the importance of the horse. They explained the importance in terms of the nomadic lifestyle, hunting and wealth that horses demonstrated. Many candidates were able to develop this importance by explaining how the horse was a form of currency, or offered in times of marriage and these more developed answers secured the full range of marks.

(b) Generally this question was answered well. Most candidates produced Level 2 answers by reference to the content and also, briefly, to the attribution, to consider the reasons for the poster. They were able to explain the significance of the Gold Rush and the eagerness to reach California – with many candidates being able to identify how the poster offered people steamship transportation. The best responses focused more clearly on the ‘why’, often with contextual support, stating that people would have wanted to use the steamship instead of the slow and dangerous journey across the Plains to make their fortune in California, as well as analysing how the advertising company were able to exploit this desire to reach California safely and quickly.
(c) The majority of candidates achieved a Level 2/4 or 5. 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, (though it was worrying that some candidates did not know if squaws were male or female.) However, to reach a Level 3 candidates also needed to refer to the attributions to explain why the individual writers came to their different interpretations. Those who did often commented on the attributions only briefly and tended to discuss reliability, instead of their use to an historian. The better Level 3 answers, and the occasional Level 4 answers, analysed the attributions in some detail and explained more clearly why these may have influenced the different interpretations e.g. the US Army officer may have reached his view of the Apaches because he only fought against them and had probably not seen them in a domestic setting, unlike the writers of evidence 1 and 3 (who were also writing about a different tribe).

Question 3

This question was not as well answered as in previous years. A significant minority completely misinterpreted the word “communications”. Some candidates thought that it meant that the government and Indian tribes were now speaking to each other, while others explained how communication encouraged settlement through letters and newspaper articles. Some developed this further by referring to the pony express and its replacement by the telegraph, but went on to write about the railway as a separate factor. These answers also tended to be weak in terms of supporting evidence and largely remained in Level 2, with most achieving a Level 2/5 or 6.

Many candidates did produce better answers covering a range of factors, taking them into Level 3. They discussed improvements in communications e.g. the telegraph and railway systems, and also considered how other reasons e.g. government acts, the end of the civil war, the development of the cattle industry and the role of the army in controlling the Indians made people more willing to travel. However, even for those who understood the meaning of “communications”, the range of factors considered was often limited or lacking in supporting detail. As a result there were few top Level 3 or Level 4 responses, though some candidates did demonstrate an excellent knowledge of the factors which helped settle the West.

SPG

The vast majority of candidates were awarded 2 or 3 marks, with only a small minority rated 1 mark. In general written communication was good across all centres.
4272/01 – THE ELIZABETHAN AGE, 1558-1603

Question 1

(a) The three marks on offer were available for giving a detailed description of the source and own knowledge. Many candidates did achieve this but there were too many who ignored the operative word ‘tactics’ and wrote in general as to why the Armada was defeated.

(b) To access Level 3 a full explanation was required on the importance of Sir John Hawkins. Very few candidates included a full description of the slave trade set up by Hawkins and its benefits to the Queen and other investors. There was also some confusion with Drake and Raleigh.

(c) This question was reasonably well answered with the majority of candidates familiar with the COP approach. However very few accessed Level 4 where a balanced and developed explanation of the differences in the sources and some contextual knowledge was required.

Question 2

(a) All candidates were able to write about the Elizabethan theatre. Far too many candidates wasted valuable time in addressing why the theatre was popular and often at the expense of describing the physical features of the theatre.

(b) This question on the reasons for poverty in the reign of Elizabeth was on the whole very well answered. There was a tendency towards listing the main reasons. A Level 3 answer should show how a long term cause (such as dissolution of monasteries or debasement of coinage) and Elizabethan reasons (change in farming practice, etc) resulted in ‘so much poverty in Elizabethan times’.

(c) Most candidates found this question on the importance of the issue of ‘freedom of speech’ in determining Elizabeth’s relationship with her Parliament difficult. Even candidates that understood the issue could only explain its importance in general terms as they lacked contextual support. Reference to MPs such as Peter Wentworth and the Puritan demands for church reform were required to show how Parliament came to ‘challenge’ the Queen.

Question 3

(a) Most candidates were able to link the translation of the Bible into Welsh with increased support to the Queen and Protestantism from Wales. Some candidates realised its importance to Wales and to the preservation of the Welsh language in the long term.

(b) There were many very good answers on whether Elizabeth ‘always’ dealt successfully with the religious problems of her reign. Most candidates succeeded in producing two sided responses with impressive detail and accurate knowledge provided. Clearly teachers and students had prepared well for the question. But a word of caution; answers must address the key words or phrases in the question – in this particular question, ‘always’, ‘successfully’ and to identify ‘religious problems’ in order to access the higher levels.

SPaG

This year again it was pleasing to see the ongoing improvement in spelling, punctuation and grammar on the whole paper and in question 3 (b) in particular.
Question 1

(a) The majority of the candidates achieved Level 2 by making reference to the source and providing some relevant background knowledge. Answers which discussed the service indicated in the source, plus additional ones (e.g. dentistry, GP cover) could achieve up to full marks. However, numerous answers were generalised and despite the low tariff, it is to be noted that accurate additional contextual support of and specific use of the source were needed to discuss the various services offered by the NHS and thus achieve full marks.

(b) Many candidates achieved Level 2 by displaying reasonably good knowledge of the reasons behind nationalisation. The vast majority were able to offer at least one reason, although it should be noted that there was an element of confusion with the causes of the National Health Service. Candidates who were able to accurately discuss two or more reasons were able to progress to Level 2 or higher. Candidates who were able to combine the proposed wider economic benefits and the intended advantages for the workers while also making specific references to the Labour Party’s rationale were able to progress 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 suitable reference to the authors. However, it was clearly noticeable that a number of centres still appear to have 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 various forms of popular entertainment available, supported by specific references to examples in Wales and England. As is always the case, the best answers displayed good contextual knowledge, although some tended to drift off into a discussion about the different forms of entertainment without an adequate discussion of the actual role this played during the Depression years. Candidates needed to illustrate an understanding of roles, including escapism, community spirit and the impact on morale. There was a tendency for candidates to hint at one or two of these roles, but without an appropriate level of discussion.

(b) Most candidates were able to provide a reasonably good explanation here, although too many focused just upon the internal weaknesses of the traditional industries, including their lack of modernisation. Many identified the growth of external competitors and their expansion in addition to the worldwide slump in trade. Answers that achieved Level 3 were able to contextualise these contributory factors, coupled with references to Britain’s traditional export markets, for example, Australia, New Zealand and Canada no longer being prepared to solely buy British products, or the failure to invest in new industries.
(c) Overall, this question was reasonably answered with most candidates clearly displaying knowledge and understanding. The majority of candidates achieved at least Level 2 by describing the challenges the Depression offered and making generalised references to its impact on morale and community spirit, mass unemployment and the importance of the protest marches. However, in relative terms, a smaller number of candidates were able to develop their response further and there were only a minority of candidates that were able to achieve Level 4 by offering a reasoned evaluation of the degree of success and failure. The best responses provided a summative evaluation of the key issue. Noticeably, there was a tendency for candidates to require a greater level of discussion of the key issue, namely how well the people of the depressed areas actually dealt with the challenges of the Depression years. There was occasional irrelevance with some candidates discussing geographical areas which were not significantly affected by the economic downturn.

Question 3

(a) This question was well answered with the majority of candidates being able to provide a minimum of two methods of how Britain prepared for war, mainly by referring to the evacuation process, air raid sirens, the use of radar and Britain utilising conscription. However, it was noticeable that weaker candidates concentrated heavily on the military preparations for the war or showed confusion by focusing on the foreign policy which led to the outbreak of war.

(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 balanced approach of the positive and negative experiences of war 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 how well the people coped with the changes brought about by total war and consider issues such as censorship, morale and community spirit. However, some candidates provided purely descriptive accounts of key issues including evacuation, the contribution females made, the impact of bombing and rationing, or merely described the impact the war had on UK citizens. Such answers tended to require a greater evaluation of how well British citizens coped with these pressures. Centres are reminded that a degree of evaluation is needed, supported by relevant contextual support.
Question 1

(a) This question performed very well with most candidates getting into Level 2. There was some irrelevance with some responses confusing CND protests with the 1968 anti-Vietnam disturbances.

(b) There were three distinct types of answer to this question. The best linked striker miners, power industry problems, inflation and the oil crisis to explain why electricity had to be rationed. Weaker answers often confused the Three Day Week with the Winter of Discontent. And many irrelevant answers argued that the Three Day Week was introduced because there were not enough jobs to go around. There were also a noticeable number of candidates who did not attempt this question at all.

(c) Many candidates are not seeing beyond the literal in response to this question. Many answers were variations on “the reasons why B and C have different views is because B, who is this person, said this, while C, who is this person, said that”. Higher level marks were awarded to candidates who recognised that the passage of time between the two sources may explain why Heath has a different view to Powell. The best answers used the source attributions to focus on the purpose of the sources, one to persuade Conservative MPs to support a particular view, one trying to justify to posterity why a course of action was taken.

Question 2

(a) Candidates either knew a lot of detail about the Festival or were very vague in their responses, most referring to boosting morale. There was some irrelevance here with comments on celebrating the end of the war or the end of rationing, one of which had finished six years earlier, the other would not finish for another three years. A small number of candidates saw the word “festival” and assumed it was about bands and popular music.

(b) There was a very impressive array of specific factual knowledge and a wide range of reasons deployed to support answers to this question and most candidates were scoring top Level 2 or Level 3 answers. It was also pleasing to see that candidates responded to both “housing” and “town planning” rather than just focusing on one or the other.

(c) There were many good responses to this question which started with explaining about the problems identified in the Beveridge Report and then going through what actions were taken to address these problems. Top level responses also made judgements based on the consequences of this – the number of houses built, the impact of changes to educational opportunities in terms of class and gender, demand pressures on the NHS and the impact on poverty. A number of candidates did not attempt this question at all and some responded with a general trawl through the content of the whole Topic Area, including the Beeching Axe and motorways.
Question 3

(a) Most candidates answered this question very well, many writing much more than was necessary to get full marks. Some irrelevant responses did not focus on musical styles but looked instead at teenage subcultures. Marks were awarded if the music these groups listened to was mentioned, but often these responses focused on attitudes and fashion rather than the music.

(b) There were a wide range of responses to this question, in particular a range of alternatives to the “cultural change” brought about by the increased use of television. Weaker answers said very little or nothing about television at all and if they did they tended to be about hire purchase and people’s ability to buy or rent one, rather than what was shown and why it became such a popular form of entertainment. The best answers looked at changes in music as an alternative, not just in terms of what was listened to but linking it to social change, teenage rebellion and the generation gap. A good case was also made for the cultural change in terms of attitudes towards women, as well as the multicultural impact of immigration. Less acceptable were responses that argued that consumerism was a major cultural change as they tended to be learned responses that related more to the 2015 question 3(b) on the post 1951 economy than to this year’s question about cultural change. Many candidates wrote their answers to this question in one continuous block of text instead of breaking it down into paragraphs which could affect the SPaG mark they were awarded.
Question 1

(a) Most students were able to get full marks for this question. Some however did not use the source but gave good knowledge to get Level 2 /2 marks. It was important to use both source and own knowledge to get 3 marks. The most popular answers were that markets allowed people to buy and sell goods whilst Nepmen and Kulaks were mentioned a lot in gaining profit.

(b) There were a number of Level 3s given as students presented a range of valid reasons. Most got into Level 2 as they gave more than one reason. The most common fault here was that there were a number who concentrated on what the communists did, not on why. Many were aware of the wealth and property the church possessed as this went against communist ideology. There were excellent answers that addressed this type of question correctly.

(c) Again the same problem arose with this question where perhaps students have been taught to answer this question in a mechanical way (COP). There were Level 4 answers but these were few in number. Students need to use both the content and authorship of both sources and need some explanation or some work on the authorship in particular to get into Level 3. Benefit of hindsight and research were mentioned by many without further explanation or development. The audience to whom the sources were addressed could also be encouraged.

Question 2

(a) Generally answered really well. With some the decrees were named without any description. Most got Level 2 in this question. There were some who concentrated on the life of women in the communist state without specific reference to the decree on marriage.

(b) This question was one we felt would be done extremely well and perhaps would prove the most popular. That did prove to be the case. Many were able to write about Lenin and Trotsky but were not specific in the part they played in the success of the October Revolution. Many pointed out the weakness of the PG but did not relate /link it to the storming of the Winter Palace. The average level given was Level 2 with students able to give more than one reason getting in the main 4 marks.

(c) Most answers tended to be descriptive with issues facing the Tsar due to war and issues with the Tsarina and the influence of Rasputin being the most popular. Students have improved during the years with this type of question and there were many who were able to formulate judgements with good analysis. Candidates should be encouraged to link back to the question throughout showing why each factor was important. Most marks for this question averaged between a top Level 2 /4 marks and lower Level 3 /5 marks.

Question 3

(a) Most students knew the terms well and were specific in using them giving accurate percentages in their answers. Those that were not so specific tended to be general and got Level 1 /2 marks.
(b) Many candidates were able to write something accurate for this question. There were excellent detailed sophisticated answers to those who wrote limited answers but were able to give some reasons backing up the main issue and include something on other factors. Getting a balanced answer was important and many were able to do this.

SPaG

Most candidates got 2 or 3 marks. Spelling and punctuation was generally good.
Question 1

(a) The need was to make reference to the visual source while providing contextual knowledge to describe the opposition to the new constitution of 1983 in order to gain the 3 marks. Candidates were often unable to gain full marks because of either a lack of source reference or limited knowledge of the backlash to Botha’s constitutional “reforms”. There was reference to the establishment of the UDF but little about its role in coordinating opposition culminating in the successful boycott of the 1984 elections. Some candidates confused the events of 1983/84 with the constitution agreed by de Klerk and Mandela in 1993 a decade later.

(b) Most candidates offered accurate explanation about why the release of Mandela was important in ending apartheid and so accessed Level 2. At Level 3 there were many sophisticated accounts of the role of Mandela in rallying the ANC while calming rival factions, his collaboration with de Klerk in pushing for reform and to the euphoria of the time and how his release represented a defining moment in the ending of apartheid.

(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, often with a weak reference to authorship to show how they differed but there was a surprising lack of contextual knowledge which was highlighted in last year’s report. Candidates at Level 3 made an attempt to recognise Botha’s motives in discrediting the ANC and to how hindsight would affect the BBC’s take on the issue. 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 time and circumstances in which they were produced by analysing Source B in the context of the Cold War and the link with Botha’s Total Strategy in contrast to Source C which was produced after the fall of communism and the dismantling of apartheid. Only a small minority were able to access full Level 4 marks on this question.

Question 2

(a) Many candidates gave impressive detail on the Pass Laws and so reached Level 2, 4 marks. Some candidates confused the Pass Laws with the apartheid laws in general and the Separate Amenities Act in particular.

(b) Most candidates were able to explain that the increase in police powers was as a result of increased opposition and subsequent protest. Many candidates focused on the need to enforce the newly passed apartheid laws and some gave impressive detail about the ANC’s Day of Defiance and the signing of the Freedom Charter by many anti-apartheid groups which gained Level 3. Some candidates were prone to slip out of context of the 1950s and referenced the No Trial Act and the brutal treatment of Steve Biko.
(c) Most candidates were able to offer some detail about conditions in the Bantustans and how inhabitants were denied rights and so gained Level 2. At Level 3, candidates focused on the importance of the Bantustans in maintaining apartheid while considering a range of supporting factors leading to a judgement that the establishment of these separate homelands was never fully successful. More sophisticated responses at Level 4 provided a more reasoned evaluation of the issue discussing the lack of economic and political power and how the creation of the Bantustans created division and stymied opposition which was key to Verwoerd’s vision of an all-white South Africa. Some candidates confused Bantustans with townships and therefore included detail on the violence of the 1970s and 1980s which was not rewarded.

Question 3

(a) The performance on this question was disappointing with only a minority of candidates scoring full marks. Most candidates at Level 1 were able to ascertain that Church leaders would have been against apartheid and would have protested peacefully gaining respect both internally and internationally. There were detailed accounts of the contribution of individuals such as Tutu, Huddleston and Boesak and these were elevated to Level 2.

(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. All candidates could comment on international (usually economic) opposition. Most candidates reached a judgement with justification. Many were also able to reference the role of sporting boycotts, the Commonwealth and the AAM worldwide. The better responses gave detailed and balanced consideration to the full range of international opposition to apartheid and discussed a wide range of internal forms of opposition before reaching a final judgement. Most candidates referenced the work of the ANC and Mandela, the impact of the Sharpeville and Soweto protests, the PAC, the role of church leaders, the Black Sash and increased violence in South Africa.

An encouraging number of candidates included a clear concluding paragraph with a strong judgement.

SPaG marks were awarded in line with the essay question with most candidates achieving 2/3 marks.
Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to identify women protesting for equal pay and how this led to the Equal Pay Act of 1975.

(b) This question was not well done. Very few candidates could give any specific details in relation to women in political life in modern Wales. The majority suggested that Margaret Thatcher, as a female Prime Minister, was a role model to women in Wales. Some candidates did state that the Welsh Assembly had an equal gender split in 2003, but very few referred to ‘twinning’ or gave examples of Welsh members of the Assembly such as Leanne Wood.

(c) Most candidates were able to discuss the two sources and better candidates were able to explain why the authors had different viewpoints. Comments on the authorship of the sources were more developed than in previous years with the majority of candidates achieving a Level 3 answer. Many were able to use the difference in time to give reasons why the viewpoints would be different. However these answers still lacked the developed explanation needed to achieve a Level 4.

Question 2

(a) As in previous years some candidates failed to read this question properly and a number of answers focused on domestic technology. However, most candidates were able to describe the improvements in post war housing such as indoor toilets and central heating, with some candidates also being able to describe the prefab housing of the 1950s.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to give some reasons why the depression was a difficult time for women. The most common answers included the women putting their husbands and children first at meal times, so that she had very little to eat and making clothes out of flour sacks. Although this topic was well known, answers tended to be rather narrow, with few candidates giving a range of reasons that would have allowed them to access to Level 4.

(c) This question was not well answered. The majority of candidates wrote about the Acts of the 1970s such as the Equal Pay Act, rather than focusing on post war legislation. When candidates did write about the NHS and the Family Allowance Act they were able to explain the importance of this legislation for women. However fewer candidates wrote about the National Insurance Act, and how this kept women dependant on their husbands as they could not claim benefits in their own right.

Question 3

(a) The majority of candidates were able to give the examples of domestic service or work in textile factories here. Very few candidates mentioned other forms of employment such as shop work, teaching or nursing. Many candidates also suggested that women’s main form of employment was being a wife and mother.
Candidates seemed more focused on the factor in the question than in previous years. Many answers were still very one sided suggesting that women had always taken advantage of employment opportunities, however the majority of candidates were able to offer an alternative viewpoint, the most common being that women had to return to their previous lives after both world wars. The majority of candidates had good knowledge of the first half on the twentieth century and were able to describe domestic service and the work of women during the wars, but answers then tended to jump to the end of the century and female role models. Very few candidates were able to discuss the growth of the service sector and light industry in the 1950s and 1960s and how this had changed women’s employment. Some candidates also succeeded in discussing the impact of changing education opportunities and how this has given greater employment opportunities to women with the better candidates pointing out that despite this equality in education that female students still tend to study the Arts and Humanities subjects whilst boys go on to study Science and Maths.

SPaG

Candidates were producing lengthy pieces of extended writing, which on the whole showed good use of SPaG. Many fell into the trap of not using paragraphs, but very few were given 1 mark for SPaG.
Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to make considered and accurate inferences from the source and use accurate knowledge such as “Most resorts had Piers and a promenade”; “There were many activities for children such as Punch and Judy”. However a significant number of students did not refer to Source A.

(b) Some centres were unclear on the time period they were to address in the question and gave an explanation based purely on the developments of air travel in the 1960s. Many weaker responses lacked explanations with supportive development and some narratives lacked contextual understanding. Good Level 3 responses concisely focused on a range of factors including post war desire for a family holiday, the “relief” at the end of conflict, growth of national parks and car ownership and caravanning, full employment, rising incomes. Some candidates offered an extended explanation of the role of holiday camps at the expense of other factors.

(c) Despite this question being one with which centres are familiar 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 long term effects of air travel and recognised that Source A would probably have been a child when undertaking air travel. 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 hardly any candidates were able to access the highest level because they did not submit supportive contextual knowledge which is required to access the highest level.

Question 2

(a) This question may have been misinterpreted by candidates. This question was attempted badly by a significant number of centres. Some generalised and inaccurate narratives were in evidence. Surprisingly some candidates offered two controversies despite the question clearly stating “a sporting controversy”. The controversies were varied and included the Jesse Owens Olympics, the Munich Olympics, Mexican Olympics, drug scandals, the 1980 and 1984 Olympic Boycotts. Centres may be advised to concentrate on just those specified in the specification.

(b) Most candidates coped well with this question. Simple generalisations were in abundance such as people “had more radios and more railways” which limited the answer to Level 1 or 2. However a significant number of centres could accurately explain a range of factors including the paid holiday act of 1938, improved railway systems and special trains the back pages of newspapers focusing on sport and interestingly Pathe newsreels.

Some candidates as in previous exam series lacked an understanding of time periods and went beyond “the early 20th century” and discussed instead developments in Television, and growing car ownership.
This was a question which should have elicited good responses from candidates given the modern time period. Some candidates could only submit short paragraphs describing sponsorship and could only describe how it benefitted the sponsor. Few sophisticated narratives were in evidence and only a minority of candidates could explain the impact on amateur and grass roots sporting developments as opposed to professional sport, the examples of which were heavily biased towards Football at the expense of a range of sponsorship developments in a range of sports.

Question 3

(a) This question required a concise overview of developments in entertainment within a prescribed time period. Many candidates went beyond 1945 and some candidates described developments before 1945. Excellent references to Television developments including references to specific programmes such as Dr. Who and Radio developments including Radio 1 in 1967. Popular music developments referenced the Beatles, the Who and the hippy movement.

(b) Some centres could offer an impressive awareness of the developments in and growth of entertainment since 1900. Sophisticated responses identified continuity and development as two areas to discuss, and consequently gave a balanced two sided response which looked at a range of factors from Radio/ TV /Cinema/Pop Music/Entertainment technology in the late 20th century 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 continuity and change in entertainment developments and referenced the most recent changes in entertainment technology and saw many developments as simply a continuation of older well established forms of entertainment eg The Sony walkman was a natural successor to the early transistor radio. 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.

SPaG was good on the whole, as many candidates wrote in clear paragraphs and with accurate spellings of key words.
SECTION A

Question 1

Just over 90% of candidates attempted this question which virtually mirrored last year’s figure. Performance was slightly below question 2 and on a par with question 3.

(a) This question was answered reasonably well. Many candidates however included antecedents, tracing events back to the post-war division of Germany, Cold War hostilities and to the building of the Berlin Wall which was not really required. At Level 2, candidates offered some detail about the weakening of Soviet control in Europe culminating with the fall of the Berlin Wall and moves to reunification. More detailed responses at Level 3 focused on the weakening and eventual collapse of Soviet control over Europe, the opening of Hungary’s border with Austria, the refugee crisis, demands for reforms and the dismantling of the Wall. The role of Kohl was considered in calling for the two Germanies to cooperate and his plans for reunification.

(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 and explain change gained Level 2. Here there was reference to the lack of support for the Nazis at a time of economic and political stability under Stresemann in contrast to the widening appeal of the Nazis as a result of the impact of the Depression together with Hitler’s electoral promises. Candidates at Level 3 made good use of both sources together with contextual knowledge to explain more fully how economic regeneration and political stability in the Weimar period made for a lack of support for extremist parties in contrast to the huge increase in the popularity of the Nazis as a result of the economic crisis and the weak response of the government. There was reference to Hitler’s orating skills and the use of propaganda and to his sectoral and national appeal. 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 of opposition to the Treaty of Versailles gained Level 1. Largely descriptive accounts of opposition to the punitive terms of the Treaty of Versailles and to the inability of the government to deal with the economic crisis leading to protests got to Level 2. Candidates at Level 3 were able to focus on the political and economic instability of the period and to right and left wing attempts to overthrow the government while underlining its fragility. The Spartacist and Kapp Putsches were cited though, for some, the Munich Putsch was almost incidental. More sophisticated explanation and analysis secured Level 4. Candidates here were able to reach a judgement by arguing that opposition was significant during times of political uncertainty and how the loyalty of the Freikorps was vital in extinguishing attempts to topple the government. Some candidates made specific
reference to the Red Rising on the Ruhr and to political assassinations. Many concluded that though attempts to overthrow the government failed the Munich Putsch was significant because it gained Hitler widespread publicity and the realization that he needed to use legal means to achieve power.

**Question 2**

This question was attempted by 97% of the candidates which represented an increase of 5% from last year and performance was expectedly higher.

(a) Many candidates were able to describe some features of Adenauer`s economic miracle and gained Level 2. At Level 3 there were some excellent, fully supported accounts of the economic transformation of West Germany and to the collaborative efforts of Adenauer and Erhard. There was reference to the effective use of Marshall Aid to regenerate industry, the reduction of unemployment and to increased living standards. Some candidates mentioned Germany`s improved trading links citing the ECSC and the EEC which gained credit. There were a significant number of candidates who confused Adenauer`s economic miracle with Stresemann`s `Golden Age`.

(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 utilize information from the two sources and explain how high unemployment rates were linked to the Wall Street Crash and the resultant Depression and that unemployment had decreased by 1933 because of Hitler`s policies. Most made reference to the introduction of the RAD and the building of motorways and other public works schemes together with conscription and rearmament.

Candidates who used both sources and their own knowledge to contrast the changing conditions while offering reasons gained Level 3. There was reference to how unemployment had virtually been eradicated by the end of the 1930s as a result of Hitler`s electoral promises of 1933. As part of a judgement candidates mentioned `invisible unemployment` as a result of Jews, other `undesirables` and women not being included in the figures.

There were many mentions of Strength through Joy and Beauty of Labour which were intended to create the illusion of better working conditions rather than reduce unemployment. 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 a multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.
The majority of candidates at Level 2 were able to describe the treatment of Jews in the Nazi and war periods although the focus was often on why the Jews were persecuted rather than how and why their treatment changed. At Level 3 many candidates were able to describe how and begin to explain why the treatment of Jews intensified between 1933 and 1945 from humiliation, the denial of opportunities and rights through to persecution and extermination with reference to key events. Level 4 candidates focused on the gradual erosion of rights after 1933 with reference to the impact of the Nuremberg Laws and to Kristallnacht as a prelude to wartime atrocities culminating in the Holocaust. Candidates here referred to the war as a turning point and a catalyst in the treatment of Jews.

Question 3

This question was attempted by just under 10% of candidates and represents a drop of 3% from last year. Performance was slightly lower than question 2 and on a par with question 1.

(a) This question was not generally answered well and a significant number of candidates failed to attempt it. Some confused the Anschluss with the Czech Crisis. The better prepared dealt with the situation in the Sudetenland and the need to restore it to Germany, the issue of appeasement and the Munich Agreement and to the annexation of Czechoslovakia in March, 1939.

(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 how Germany went from being an outcast nation after the First World War to becoming a full member of the League of Nations in 1926 as a result of the diplomatic successes of Stresemann in improving Germany’s international reputation. There was sometimes too much consideration given to economic recovery under Stresemann.

Level 3 responses were characterized by a deeper understanding of the reasons for Germany’s changing fortunes where candidates considered more fully Stresemann’s policy of fulfillment and to his pivotal role in transforming Germany from a pariah nation to an important player in foreign affairs and the restoration of great power status. There was reference to the Rapallo Treaty and the Locarno Pact and to the changing mood in Europe that Germany had been dealt with harshly at the Paris Peace Conference. 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 a multi-causal response or a counter argument as part of a two-sided response.
Candidates at Level 2 often found it difficult to sustain discussion about Berlin throughout the Cold War period and confined themselves to descriptions of the Berlin Blockade and Airlift and the building of the Wall. Those who were able to explain the reasons for post-war tension and how Berlin came to symbolize the Cold War and how key events intensified the situation gained Level 3. 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 East Berlin was an embarrassment to the USSR and how Berlin represented an island of capitalism in a sea of communism with reference to the building of the Wall at the height of tension and how its fall symbolized the end of the Cold War. As one candidate concluded Khrushchev once said that “When I want to choke the West, I squeeze on Berlin” which is either an adaptation or an attempt to clean up the original quote.

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 has been a trend of late to offer “ready made” answers which deal for example with “change” when the question may be on improvement or development which is not the correct focus. There was again very little variance in performance across the three questions.

Question 4

Some 25% of candidates attempted this question which showed an increase of 5% 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 is still apparent.

Many responses would have sat better in Question 5. The Weimar era was well known as was Stresseman’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 changed Germany and there was some description of change in post-war East and West Germany. There was little mention of economic change during the Second World War and again 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 changed 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 69% of candidates and represents a drop of 6% from last year.

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. At times the response might have gained more marks if the candidate had changed the number of the question from 5 to 4. 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 development.

Question 6

This remains the least popular question by far 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 opposition of the two Germanies in international relations after 1949. Better responses appreciated the shifts in foreign policy and to varying attempts to consider developments across the period.
SECTION A

Question 1

This is no longer the most popular question in this section with 83% attempting it which was down by 9% from last year.

(a) This question was answered reasonably well but too often candidates included antecedents at the expense of an actual description of the events of the Arab Rebellion. At Level 2, candidates focused on the difficulties faced by Britain in ruling Palestine and to Arab demands for independence with reference to acts of violence. Candidates at Level 3 were able to refer to the reasons for growing Arab tension and outbreaks of organized rebellion and sabotage towards specific British and Jewish targets and the Jewish reaction together with the brutal response by the British authorities.

(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 why British policy in Palestine changed between 1939 and 1947 because of the failure to satisfy the demands of both Jews and Palestinian Arabs and quash uprisings together with the imperative of maintaining oil supplies in 1939. At Level 3, candidates used the information from the sources and their own knowledge to explain fully the change in policy with more specific reference to the rejection of the Peel Commission and the White Paper compounded by international pressure to create a Jewish homeland in the wake of the Holocaust and post-war privations which forced the hand over of the mandate to the UN leading to plans to partition Palestine.

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 a multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.

Most candidates were able to describe the reasons for tension and resultant acts of terrorism but largely descriptive accounts with limited analysis were capped at Level 2 and up to 4 marks. Level 3 responses were able to discuss the reasons for the growth of extremism and how acts of terror hindered the peace process. A significant number of candidates cited antecedents such as Munich Olympics and Dawson’s Field which were outside the bounds of the question. Those achieving Level 4 offered a more substantiated explanation of the issue by analyzing the issue of terrorism and the damaging effect on the peace process. Here there was reference to attempts to create peace at the Madrid Conference and to the Oslo Accords and to the sense of frustration that saw many Palestinians switching support to militant organizations and the use of terror tactics.
Question 2

As previously, this is the least popular of the questions in section A and was attempted by 25% of the candidates which mirrored the figure for last year. Performance was lower than questions 1 and 3.

(a) There were many generalized responses to agricultural settlements and communal living which crept into Level 2. Those who offered some reference to the fundamental principles and intrinsic nature of the kibbutz system gained Level 3.

(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 why Arafat’s methods changed from belligerence to conciliation as a result of defeats in war. At Level 3, candidates used the information from the sources and their own knowledge to explain why Arafat’s methods changed to more peaceful means in the hope of securing a Palestinian homeland together with the realization that the rise of extremism was an obstacle.

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 a multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.

Largely descriptive accounts of the claims for land and increased tension resulting in war and the consequences were limited to Level 2. Some focus on the contrasting political, economic and social progress of both groups gained Level 3. Many failed to access Level 4 because of a lack of a judgement on the issue.

Question 3

This question was attempted by 89% of the candidates, 8% more than last year and performance was higher than questions 1 and 2.

(a) There were lapses into discussion of the causes of the Suez Crisis but the majority of candidates at Level 2 showed good knowledge of results. At Level 3 there was excellent reference to the consequences on Britain and France as spent powers in the Middle East, increased involvement from the USA and USSR and to the increased prestige of Nasser.
(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. Candidates who only paraphrased the sources were limited to Level 1. Most candidates were able to access Level 2 by beginning to focus on the experience of defeat in war for the Arab states and the change in direction by leaders like Sadat. At Level 3 candidates offered more explanation about the reversal in approach and to Sadat as peacemaker and to improved relations with Begin which culminated in the Camp David meeting.

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 a multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response. Many candidates were able to show knowledge of events and to Israeli gains but with little attempt at analysis and so achieved Level 2. Better answers were able to explain the importance of the war in terms of the impact of defeat together with an appreciation of the human cost of defeat and to the situation in the Occupied Territories.

More detailed analysis leading to a judgement with a clear focus on the war as a turning point gained Level 4. Here there was reference to Israeli gains and the consequences for the Arab states and the realization that terrorism, not war, was the answer.

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.

There has been a trend of late to offer “ready made” answers which deal for example with “change” when the question may be on improvement or development which is not the correct focus

Question 4

This question was attempted by almost 16% of candidates and represents a significant increase of 13% from last year. Many trawled through the period listing events with little appreciation of the shifting emphases and relative importance of political developments.
Question 5

This remains the least popular question with just 2% attempting it and performance here was, as usual, lower than questions 4 and 6. Responses were descriptive in the main and, as previously, more akin to question 4. At times the response might have gained more marks if the candidate had changed the number of the question from 5 to 4. The better prepared considered how both groups were affected by various events between 1919-2000 with some reference to the extent of change.

Question 6

The vast majority - 79% of candidates attempted this question, down by 19% but performance was considerably higher than questions 4 and 5.

Most candidates offered a decent chronological outline with reference to the reasons making for conflict. Reference was made 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 to the on-going situation in the Occupied Territories and to the difficulties in achieving peace, often offering too much on historical background and 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

This question was attempted by 54% of candidates which mirrors exactly the figure for last year. Performance was lower than questions 2 and 3.

(a) A significant number of candidates gained Level 2 and 3 marks by discussing opposition from named individuals arguing that the New Deal did not do enough for some sectors of American society and from some wealthy Americans who felt that too much was being done for the unemployed. More detailed accounts at Level 3 referred to Republican opposition which claimed that the New Deal was un-American and went against “rugged individualism” and infringed on personal liberty and to opposition from the Supreme Court which claimed that aspects of the New Deal were un-constitutional while citing examples.

More well informed candidates referred to opposition from Conservative Democrats mainly in the south.

Some candidates focused on the shortcomings or failures of the New Deal with inferred reference to opposition and such responses were set at Level 2.

(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 referring to Nixon’s successful first term in office and how his involvement in the Watergate scandal left him facing impeachment leading to his resignation. At Level 3, candidates used the information from the sources and their own knowledge to explain Nixon’s fall. Some candidates considered his popularity during his first term in office and the surety of his re-election and offered contextual reference to his promise to end the war in Vietnam and foreign diplomatic ties with the USSR and China. Here there was detailed discussion of the investigation and attempts at a cover up along with the Senate hearings and the controversial tapes which led to moves to impeach the president and his forced resignation.

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 a 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 changing lifestyle of women often spending too much time on the contribution to the war effort and with little analysis of the issue. At Level 3, candidates focused on the changing role of women in the period. There was reference to how war changed attitudes towards women and how many took a backwards step after 1945 and returned to a traditional domestic role. There was consideration of life in suburbia and to why some women began to seek better educational opportunities in the pursuit of careers. Candidates were knowledgeable about the feminist movement and the rejection of the traditional view of womanhood.

The better prepared at Level 4 provided reasoned analysis and reached a more convincing judgement about the extent of political, economic and social change and its impact on some women.

Question 2

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

(a) Many were able to access Level 2 by referring to the Jim Crow Laws with the usual misconception that segregation was prevalent across the USA, race-hate crime, the denial of political rights and the lack of educational opportunities. The lack of specific reference to the 1930s characterized Level 2 responses. Those at Level 3 referred to the impact of the Depression and to the efforts of the New Deal, the experience of sharecroppers and to migration from the south. Some candidates offered positives such as the work of the NAACP and the emergence of a black middle class.

(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 discussed why the buses in Alabama were desegregated as a result of the part played by Parks and King and the success of the bus boycott. Candidates who developed the issue more fully gained Level 3. There was reference to the involvement of the NAACP and the efforts of the MIA in putting economic pressure on the bus companies along with media attention leading to the Supreme Court declaring that segregation on transport was unconstitutional.

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 a 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 the case of Brown vs. Topeka, events at Little Rock High and the case of James Meredith in highlighting the injustice of the education system and to the need for change. Attempts to evaluate the importance of the issue in raising national and global awareness and the gaining of presidential support, although there was often confusion about which president was actually involved, secured Level 3 and, with more sophistication, Level 4. Here the focus was on how the issue of education provided a catalyst for change and an appreciation that education was the means of improving economic and political status.

**Question 3**

46% of candidates attempted this question which mirrors the figure for last year.

(a) Responses were mixed. There were some highly generalized references to jungle warfare and the use of chemicals. The better prepared however made reference to Operation Rolling Thunder and the use of B52 bombers and helicopters, the use of napalm and defoliants and to Search and Destroy tactics. Encouragingly, there was little reference to guerrilla tactics.

(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 improved relations between the USA and the USSR as a result of the showdown and standoff during the missile crisis. An appreciation of the term "brinkmanship" was key.

There was often confusion about the treaties related to nuclear warfare where candidates cited the SALT treaties.

Candidates at Level 3 explored the actions of both superpowers in the crisis and the imperative of forging better relations by correctly citing the Test Ban Treaty with mention also of reciprocal agreements to remove nuclear missiles.

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 a multi-causal response or a counter-argument as part of a two-sided response.
Largely descriptive accounts with limited analysis at Level 2 dealt with the need for the USA to become more involved in world affairs after 1945 in order to combat communism rather than reverting to an isolationist policy. At Level 3 candidates were able to discuss more directly the reversal of policy with reference to the Truman Doctrine and the use of Marshall Aid to contain communism in Europe and S. East Asia thereby taking a more long-term perspective. At Level 4, responses reached a judgement about how the Truman Doctrine became the cornerstone of US policy in the Cold War era and how, fearing the domino effect, the US became more prepared to use its economic and military power to police the world.

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.

There has been a trend of late to offer “ready made” answers which deal for example with “change” when the question may be on improvement or development which is not the correct focus.

Question 4

The number of candidates attempting this question decreased by 2% to under 10%. Performance was as in previous years, 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 again mixed responses to the period of affluence in the 1950s but there was decent 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 remains.

Question 5

This question was attempted by 80% of candidates showing an increase of 5% from last year. Performance was higher than question 4 but lower than question 6.

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 sound 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 excellent knowledge and understanding 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 mentioned but some candidates failed to explore the issue of improvement 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.

**Question 6**

The number of candidates attempting this question dropped by 2% to 9% and performance was higher than questions 4 and 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 détente was again 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 homed in on the issue of “significance” 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 and 9 marks. Weaker candidates tended to describe events, particularly in relation to the Second World War, Cuba and Vietnam.
SECTION A

Question 1

(a) Many candidates were familiar with the Liberal reforms of the early twentieth century, especially regarding free school meals and the Old Age pension provision. However too many candidates discussed why the Liberals lost favour and became unpopular rather than address the question set.

(b) Unfortunately too many candidates made very little use of the sources to explain why Wales rejected devolution in 1979. Source A shows strong support for devolution and Source B shows a clear lack of interest in the referendum with 41% not bothering to vote. Some candidates drew comparison with this year’s referendum on EU membership and cited the lack of information available in order to make a decision as a major reason for the apathy.

(c) Unfortunately this was a very poorly answered question. Far too many candidates ignored the question of Plaid Cymru’s importance after 1980 and discussed its early years which of course was irrelevant.

Question 2

(a) All candidates that attempted this question addressed the Penrhyn Lockout. Again the question set was often ignored with too many answers addressing the cause of the conflict and not describing the conflict as required.

(b) Many answers to 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. Nearly all the answers attempted mistook Source B as referring to light industry and not service industry as it clearly does.

(c) On the whole it was poorly answered with many candidates mistaking mechanisation for technology and more worryingly not understanding the term ‘rural’ and not focusing on ‘the second half of the twentieth century’.

Question 3

(a) This was a reasonably well answered question with many candidates able to describe the style of campaigning adopted by Cymdeithas yr Iaith. If only they would have matched the campaign with the specific aim, that is, for example, the daubing of English only road signs to be replaced with bilingual signs in order to gain equality for the Welsh language.

(b) On the whole this was a well understood question and candidates did address change. However answers tended to be descriptive and did not fully address the appeal of the cinema, and other new forms of entertainment, such as, the radio and the threat they posed to the traditional Welsh way of life. Again some candidates failed to keep within the perimeter of the question by discussing the effect of television.
(c) This question was accessible to most candidates, with many able to discuss either the positive and/or negative impact of pop music on Wales after the 1960s. Pop music is an example of an ‘outside’ influence which was eagerly accepted by the youth of Wales, just like elsewhere, and also of Wales adapting positively to change.

SECTION B

Candidates need to focus more sharply on the thrust of the question in terms of change, development and 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

The majority of answers were Level 2 or 3 with most candidates able to discuss some factors but not in sufficient detail.

Question 5

Here again the answers were too generalised and did not provide specific contextual knowledge in support.

Question 6

A relatively successful question that showed good knowledge though there was a tendency to be descriptive. To achieve the higher levels answers needed to consider whether Welsh-medium and bilingual education was the most significant factor in the survival of the Welsh language and culture against other factors such as Welsh medium radio and television, the Urdd and the campaigning of Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg.

SPaG

The standard of SPaG was good on the whole.
SECTION A

Question 1

(a) This was very well answered. Smuggling and the reasons for it were clearly understood by the majority of candidates, with a range of supporting detail.

(b) Many candidates referred to both sources explicitly and were able to use the sources to discuss why violent crime had increased. Many answers stayed within Level 2, with few candidates referring to technology as a reason why violent crime is now easier to organise. However, there was little specific support with these reasons which meant that Level 4 was rarely achieved. Some students did refer to hooliganism being fuelled by alcohol and the growth in gun and knife crime.

(c) This question was well answered on the whole with many students being able to give a range of reasons why vagrancy had increased and begin to evaluate. However, very few students achieved Level 4 on this question.

Question 2

(a) This question caused some problems, with some candidates describing a Watchman rather than a Constable. However, most candidates were able to focus on the role of a Constable and produced a detailed answer.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to explain change in relation to the specific examples given in the sources; transport and equipment. As with 1b), most candidates stayed within the Level 2 range, with few developing their own knowledge to link with the sources to explain that policing has developed to stay ahead of the criminals and combat many diverse crimes.

(c) Not all candidates were aware of the importance of the 1856 County and Borough Police Act, and some argued that it was not a turning point at all. The majority were aware that it made policing compulsory nationwide, but few could analyse the impact of having a national standard of policing and sharing information. Due to this there were very few Level 3 or Level 4 answers seen.

Question 3

(a) This question was not well answered, with very few Level 3 answers. Many answers tended to only focus on imprisonment in general terms and the poor conditions, rather than specifically on Tudor imprisonment. Some students were able to make reference to debtor's prisons and stronger answers mentioned Bridewells and Houses of Correction.

(b) The majority of students understood the thrust of the question, although many described the changes rather than focusing on why they had changed. The stronger candidates discussed the role of other reformers as well as Fry with the best answers emphasizing the move to reform prisoners through work, education and religion, and how this was still used in our prisons today.
(d) This question led to some generalised answers with some candidates tending to give the moral arguments against capital punishment rather than focusing on the question set. Many candidates were able to give detailed and accurate analysis with reference to miscarriages of justice and the need for different types of punishment needing to be introduced. However, these answers tended to be reasonably narrow, and therefore they did not reach Level 4.

SECTION B

Q.4 This question was better answered than in previous years. Many students were able to give a chronological account of the causes of crime with many being able to reach an evaluation on the changing causes of crime. However, few candidates were able to consider the varying impact of change across the timeframes.

Q.5 This is a popular question. Candidates had a clear understanding of the chronological period, with many being well focused on success. Candidates are very positive about the “successes” of the police on the whole, with very little discussion of any lack of change or failures mentioned.

Q.6 This was by far the weakest of the essay questions. Candidates who attempted this question were more reliant on the scaffold that with the others. The focus on “alternatives to prison” meant that some students produced answers which they had practised for another question. There was also a tendency to discuss the alternative to prison, and not discuss prison as a punishment at all. Most students had a sound chronological grasp of the question, but many lacked the necessary detail to go beyond the bottom of Level 3.

SPaG

Candidates were producing lengthy pieces of extended writing, which on the whole showed good use of SPaG. Many fell into the trap of not using paragraphs, but very few were given 1 mark for SPaG. There was some evidence of candidates going back and checking their SPaG, with paragraphing and spelling being checked.
SECTION A

Question 1

(a) Most candidates were able to write extensively about Andreas Vesalius and so able to access Level 2 easily. A significant number wrote specifically on the discoveries Vesalius had made and the books he had written (for most this was Fabrica / The Fabric of the Human Body rather than Tabulae Sex). Weaker candidates made general comments that Vesalius challenged Galen but weren’t able to offer specific information so remained in low Level 2.

(b) More candidates have been taught how to address this question this year but a significant number still do not understand the thrust of the question. Many candidates either paraphrase the sources and offer very little own knowledge; or they write a generalised account of change in the nineteenth century but fail to use the sources, or give any additional knowledge about Koch or Pasteur; or they describe in detail the work of Pasteur and / or Koch but don’t deal with the concept of change. As a result most candidates achieved only Level 2 answers, and most of these were low Level 2. Only a small number managed to achieve Level 3 answers by using the sources and developing these with their own knowledge to address the concept of change over the century. Candidates who did offer additional knowledge about Pasteur and Koch tended to be able to give more detail on the work of Pasteur rather than Koch. A small number of candidates still consider vaccinations to be cures rather than prevention.

(c) Many candidates described in detail the discovery of DNA and the work of Rosalind Franklin as well as Crick and Watson. Unfortunately many did not go on to deal with the demands of the question and explain how this was a turning point so remained in Level 2. A number of candidates did attempt to show medical change as a result of DNA by acknowledging the impact it has had for treatment of diabetes and diagnosing genetic illnesses but this was largely not developed and so did not move beyond low Level 3.

Question 2

(a) Most candidates were able to describe the work of Alexander Fleming and so were able to access Level 2 easily. A significant number of candidates gave too much emphasis to Florey and Chain and described in detail the experiments they conducted and the impact their work had without linking it to the work of Fleming and so were not credited with any marks.

(b) As with 1b many candidates just paraphrased the sources. Many candidates ignored the picture source (although some did talk about trepanning). A significant number added in the use of ligatures by Pare but very few candidates linked evidence to answer the question why surgical methods changed. A number of candidates went on to give evidence from the nineteenth century when the question clearly stated sixteenth century. Only a handful of candidates managed to get into Level 3 for this question.
(c) Large numbers of candidates were able to describe the work of Christian Barnard in great detail. A significant number wrongly credited him with the development of cyclosporine, but there was a greater awareness amongst candidates of the immediate impact of Barnard’s work with this question. Disappointingly very few went on to talk in detail about the development of transplants since Barnard’s work in anything other than a generic way and so weren’t able to explore the idea of a turning point for treatment. Many candidates did access low Level 3 for this question and the on the whole it was answered better than 1c.

**Question 3**

(a) Most candidates recognised that the NHS was free for all and offered a range of services. Some candidates were able to give details about Bevan and the idea of ‘cradle to grave’ care.

(b) Those candidates that answered question 3 answered this question well and went beyond just paraphrasing the sources. They could talk in depth about laissez-faire attitudes and the work of Chadwick to improve public health in the nineteenth century. Candidates were able to deal with the crux of this question and provide evidence to show development and improvement in the century.

(c) Most candidates were aware of the impact of the Black Death in terms of human life. They were aware of the different types of plague and different methods employed to try and prevent / cure the plague. Few linked lack of public health/medical knowledge with the spread of the plague. Those candidates that did answer this question tended to achieve high Level 2/ low Level 3 answers.

**SECTION B**

**Question 4**

Candidates answering question 4 were more likely to deal with all four time periods but in doing so many failed to address the question and instead described the developments/individual’s work. There was a tendency with a number of candidates answering this question to focus on the Renaissance period and describe in detail the work of Vesalius, Pare and Harvey. Those candidates that did this limited their marks no matter how developed their writing as they failed to deal with the whole time period. Some candidates still write about treatments/prevention even though the question is specifically asking about knowledge but there appeared to be less of this this year with this particular question. Some candidates did deal with the idea of varying impact and were able to show that not all developments were beneficial straight away, particularly around surgical developments. This meant more candidates accessed Level 4 marks than with question 4. There were still some candidates who wrote about medical knowledge developments in this question especially when it came to the Renaissance period which received no credit.
Question 6

Only a small number of candidates chose to answer this question, even if they had answered question 3. Those that did relied on the scaffold or the sources / answers provided in question 3. As a result very few candidates progressed beyond Level 2 which was disappointing.

SPaG

Most candidates wrote in a structured way and had a clear understanding of how to spell key words e.g. anaesthetics, antibiotics, dissection as well as individual’s names. This meant many candidates achieved at least 2 out of the 3 marks awarded for SPAG and significant numbers achieve 3 out of 3.
CONTROLLED ASSESSMENT

Unit 4 Controlled Assessment Report 2016

Centres will have received their moderator reports detailing the outcome of their 2016 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 alike. This year, again, the work presented was 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 focussed 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 and it has proved to be a useful tool and we recommend its use.

Part (a)

This year the moderating team reported fewer ‘trawls’ and an increase in integrated answers. Candidates should be encouraged to produce coherent pieces of prose with the source evaluation integrated within the answer. Part (a) does require a clear conclusion answering the set question and based on the evidence presented. However there was a tendency for some candidates to expect sources to provide everything they needed about the topic, even when the sources concerned were never meant to do so. A good example of this was the picture source of the Jewish boot-seller in Whitechapel being judged as “useless because it does not tell us about the other races who came to live in Britain”. Candidates are, also, expected to have background knowledge and to be able to provide context to the sources.

Part (b)

There was a marked improvement in the quality and focus of the interpretation analysis in part (b). What is required is for candidates 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. Candidates need to consider 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. However there were too many instances of simplistic evaluation being over rewarded. 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 2017

- All centres are required to submit a new proposal form for 2017. This form is available on the WJEC website. The completed form should be Emailed to Greg Lewis [Greg.Lewis@wjec.co.uk].
- 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 administrating the Controlled Assessment unit.
- The deadline for submission of Controlled Assessment to moderators in 2017 is 1st May