GCSE EXAMINERS’ REPORTS

HISTORY (LEGACY)

SUMMER 2018
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271/01</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271/02</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271/03</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271/04</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271/05</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4271/06</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272/01</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272/02</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272/03</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272/04</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4272/05</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4282/01</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4282/02</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373/01</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373/02</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373/03</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4373/04</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4383/01</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4383/02</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4286</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. (a) This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates being able to access Level 2 by using both sources with appropriate reference to the historical context. Balanced use of the sources with historical context was required for full marks. Candidates in general used Source A well but were limited in their comments on Source B.

(b) Many candidates were able to identify relevant information from the source and deploy their own knowledge and were rewarded with Level 2 marks. Candidates who were able to elicit the full range of reasons from the source and present a more detailed and accurate explanation from their own knowledge attained Level 3.

(c) The majority of candidates were able to offer reasonably sound responses with appropriate evaluative comments with reference to the content and attributions. Many candidates were able to achieve Level 3 marks with a clear attempt to place the sources in context with appropriate evaluative comments. Candidates who offered a full evaluation of both content and authorship of the sources with accurate reference to the historical context leading to a clearly reasoned and supported judgement were worthy of Level 4 marks.

2. (a) A very well answered question with the vast majority of candidates gaining Level 2 marks with an appropriate degree of detail and accuracy in their response. Candidates who were too general in their description achieved Level 1 marks.

(b) Level 2 responses were common on this question as candidates showed competency in their ability to analyse the content of the source in relation to its historical context and suggest reasons for its production. The better answers worthy of Level 3 marks dealt directly with the reasons for the production of Source F with a clear focus on using the attribution to support their understanding within the wider historical context. Many of the higher quality responses stressed the importance of considering the likely audience in explaining the purpose of the source.

(c) Again high Level 2 / low Level 3 were the typical responses. The majority of candidates made reference to the three sources and accurately identified the different interpretations. The candidates who offered a clear judgement with limited support were given low Level 3 marks. The best answers at Level 4 marks made a considered attempt to explain how and why the interpretations differed with a discussion of the attributions and historical context before offering a valid supported judgement. Some answers were imbalanced with too great an emphasis on one interpretation without offering a fair consideration of others.
3. The majority of candidates were able to display good contextual knowledge and an understanding of the question to gain Level 3 marks. Clear two-sided responses were generally well supported with accurate factual support and presented a judgement. Many candidates however failed to achieve higher marks due to an imbalance in their response and/or a weak conclusion not entirely focused on the question set. Many answers gave far more support to the failures of radicalism with little consideration of its relevant success. Some candidates were guilty of ignoring the dates in the question and consequently provided some irrelevant responses.

The majority of candidates achieved intermediate performance in terms of spelling, punctuation and grammar with the accurate use of specific terminology being a feature of responses achieving high performance.
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WALES AND ENGLAND IN THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY, c.1890-1919

1. (a) Overall answered very well. The majority of candidates focused on the actual two sources and did not include their own knowledge. A few candidates are still not giving a balance between both sources, with some making a strong reference to Source A, but only briefly discussing Source B.

(b) Very few candidates answered this well. Most gave a long description of the Penrhyn Lockout without actually explaining why there was a decline in the slate industry. As a whole many candidates only achieved Level 2 – 3 marks.

(c) Most candidates focused on showing how both sources were different by discussing some of the issues mentioned in the content. Very few candidates were able to actually show why they were different by analysing the attribution. Most gave a basic response to the fact that D. A. Thomas would want to make himself look good, and Noah Ablett was a Union leader and against Thomas. Very few candidates went beyond this limited response.

2. (a) The majority of candidates achieved full marks on this question. There were plenty of facts shown to describe life in the trenches.

(b) Many good answers on this question this year. Most candidates were able to give two to three reasons why this poster was produced in 1915.

(c) This question continues to be poorly answered by many candidates. It is clear that they have not been prepared adequately to answer it. Most focus on describing how Evidence 1 and Evidence 2 are different. Many ignore Evidence 3 entirely. Some candidates mention the attribution by simply saying who wrote them, but do not go beyond this. It was disappointing that most of the discussion on the attribution of Evidence 1 was the simple, basic and usual response that the author was an historian, therefore, would have carried out research. Candidates really need to move on from this basic, mechanistic approach. More needed to be made of the fact that the author was writing in an article and the limitations of this, the date and the nature of the article. Some candidates mentioned the fact that the author of Evidence 2 was using his family’s personal experience of war to form his interpretation, but again, went no further. More was needed on the limitations of this, the date, the title of the source etc. Candidates are obviously taught to answer this in a very simplistic style and as a result hardly any candidates were able to get into Level 4 which is highly disappointing.
3. Most candidates were able to give a two sided response, and discuss both social and political problems. Some schools are still giving pupils pre-prepared essays to learn and this is actually holding candidates back rather than helping them succeed. Offloading essays that they have learnt off by heart does not allow them the freedom to address the actual question asked, and as a result, many candidates simply reeled off a list of things that the Liberal Government actually did, rather than focus on showing how they were successful/not successful.
1. (a) Most candidates were able to use the sources to select relevant information, but some candidates provided too much own knowledge without sufficient use of the sources. 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 pupils neglected to provide enough details from the source or even state that not all Americans prospered economically during the period.

(b) This question proved accessible to the vast majority of pupils. Lower level answers tended to develop the information in the source, giving some details on the car industry. Better answers used the source and discussed many more factors in detail in order to explain why the economy boomed during the period. There were many references to Henry Ford’s mass production techniques and the best candidates provided other detailed reasons as an explanation.

(c) As usual, there were a variety of responses to this question, with only a few achieving the highest level. Many candidates managed to give a good attempt at the question, discussing that both sources were biased against each other as they were from different political parties. Some however 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/or authorship of the sources. Others tended to drift into narrative or a description of the effects of the Wall St Crash. 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 both sources were trying to prove a point. A balance of content, authorship, context and engagement with the question was needed for Level 4.

2. (a) This question was answered well on the whole by those candidates who understood the question. Too many answers sadly focused on a description of the Jazz Age or flappers which was not part of the question. There were clear references to flagpole sitting and dance marathons, and candidates provided good detail in order to achieve Level 2. Other candidates described other fads and crazes which were also rewarded.
(b) This question was answered reasonably well by most candidates. Most were able to identify the main reasons for the source including the growing importance of advertising for attracting the public to go to the cinemas. Answers also focused on the importance of the *flapper* lifestyle as a means of drawing young men and women to the cinema. Many candidates also dealt with the importance of the date of the source and that it was Gloria Swanson’s first talkie, though there was some confusion at times. This was generally a well answered question with many pupils achieving Level 3. However, a few candidates failed to address the ‘why’ part of the question and just described the cinema culture.

(c) 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 paraphrase the evidence or just provide their own knowledge of the Wall Street Crash changing the lives of women. Level 2 answers referred to the traditional roles of women in America and to the work done by women during the First World War and the 19th Amendment to the constitution. These pupils showed that there was an alternative interpretation as illustrated by Evidence 2 and 3. 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, with better references to the attribution with judgements achieving high Level 3 marks. The better candidates mentioned the fact that the historian was more likely to provide a balanced interpretation because he has the benefit of hindsight, whilst the author of Evidence 2 was likely to be exaggerating the point as she was a feminist. Many candidates were able to provide some judgement on the interpretation, but lacked the detail and explanation for higher marks. There were very few who achieved a Level 4 because of the sophistication of the response required. These excellent candidates provided substantiated comments and gave a clear judgement considering the given interpretation in the historical context.

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 immigration was the greatest problem facing America during this period. Most candidates knew a great deal about immigration, particularly about the effect on organised crime or the Red Scare.

A great number of pupils also mentioned other problems facing American society. The most popular alternative problem was the role of the KKK and the treatment of African-Americans or to organised crime, particularly the activities of Al Capone. They referred in detail to gang rivalry and violence, corruption, racketeering, speakeasies, bootlegging and prostitution. Many also knew about other gangsters in a variety of American cities. Many excellent answers also included details about the Teapot Dome Scandal. Excellent answers also had a good focus on the question with a clear judgement throughout.
Sadly, some answers however, lacked enough depth, or enough focus on the question, and some brought in irrelevant detail from other sections of the specification, such as the Wall Street Crash or even the Jazz Age. Some also lacked enough balance, or provided generalised answers, or would merely list the factors without explanation.

On the whole, however, many candidates managed to write at length a good answer to this question.

**SPaG**
The standard of SPaG was good on the whole. Many candidates managed to achieve the full 3 marks. However, a few candidates failed to score any marks at all as their answers were too weak.
1. (a) This question was accessible to virtually all candidates. Generally, this question was answered very well by the majority of candidates who were able to achieve a Level 2 response by gathering relevant information from both Sources A and B about Hitler’s policy towards women. Some candidates supplemented their responses effectively with their own knowledge to put the 2 sources in context. A small number of weaker candidates failed to mention the sources or only dealt with the first source, scoring Level 1. It is still frustrating when a minority of able candidates provide a wealth of information but don’t use the sources.

(b) This question was answered quite well by the vast majority of candidates. Most candidates were able to use a combination of the source and their own knowledge to discuss the factors responsible for the lowering of unemployment in Germany. Those candidates that were able to use the source and their own knowledge reached Level 2. In order to develop the response and reach Level 3, candidates needed to use the source, and their own knowledge in detail and many were able to do this successfully. Some candidates either focused fully on the source or their own knowledge, and were therefore unable to reach beyond a low Level 2 response.

(c) Candidates are well versed in this style of question and are, on the whole well prepared by centres. When candidates addressed the utility of the content of the source only, these answers were capped at Level 2. Conversely when candidates addressed the attribution of the sources only these answers were also capped at Level 2. In order to reach Level 3, candidates need to discuss the utility of the source based on its content and attribution. A judgement needs to be reached. A small minority were able to reach Level 4 by placing the sources in their historical context, using the attribution and context in a developed and reasoned way, reaching a balanced conclusion as to the utility of both sources. On the whole the majority of candidates did reach a conclusion about the utility of both sources. A relatively small number of candidates reached Level 4 as most answers lacked the sophistication necessary to do so.
2. (a) This question was well answered by those that had a knowledge of the Nuremberg Trials. Many were able to discuss the specific details of the trials along with the links to de-Nazification, leading Nazis executed and the specific war crimes that were punished. A significant number of candidates wrote in a vague manner, mixing the Nuremberg Trials with the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. It must be noted that the whole of the period 1919-47 must be taught when looking at Germany in Transition.

(b) This question was well answered by a majority of candidates. The clear visual source with relevant attribution enabled most candidates to obtain Level 2. Stronger candidates provided accurate and factual support, considering Volkssturm, Total War, the last months of the war and the fear of Russian soldiers. Some candidates focused only on the source and its content / attribution. This limited these responses to a Level 2. Many were able to comment effectively on the source, the attribution and put them into historical context, earning a Level 3 response.

(c) The sources this year were relatively straightforward and clear with relevant attributions. However many candidates appear to be ill prepared and are not fully able to come to terms with the requirements of the question regarding interpretations. In order to reach Level 3 candidates need to discuss the content of the sources as well as the authors, in context. Far too many answers considered the content of the 3 sources or the authors only. These answers were capped at Level 2/5 at best. There was however little in the way of looking at the origins of the interpretations. Candidates were able to reach an overall judgement and were able to reach the top of Level 3 – 8 marks. The number of candidates that reached Level 4 were very few and far between. Candidates find it a challenge to place the interpretations in enough historical context whilst reaching a balanced conclusion. The very best candidates were able to judge each piece of evidence on its own merits and provide a considered judgement. Centres are obviously preparing their candidates to treat this question as a source style question examining utility and reliability rather than genuinely looking at the validity of the interpretations. As a result very few candidates were able to access Level 4.

3. Centres and consequently candidates are well versed in this style of question. The majority of candidates gave two sided answers covering the range of factors leading to Hitler’s consolidation of power with only a small number providing answers from outside the period specified. Inevitably there were many imbalanced answers with a number of answers featuring a narrative on the events of 1933 to 1934. Candidates on the whole were knowledgeable and referred in depth to the importance of the Night of the Long Knives, The Reichstag Fire, Enabling Act and Hitler as Fuhrer. A well balanced answer full of appropriate detail reached Levels 3 and 4 and there were many of these.
1. (a) Candidates were able to use information from both sources to answer the question. Answers that described the relevant content gained Level 1 marks. The majority of candidates achieved Level 2 marks with appropriate reference to both sources and the relevant historical context.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to identify the relevant information in the source and provided additional own knowledge to explain why the Gang of Four failed to gain power after Mao’s death and gained Level 2 marks. Full relevant use of the source and additional accurate contextual support gained Level 3 marks.

(c) The majority of candidates were able to present answers worthy of Level 3 marks by offering a clear attempt to discuss both content and authorship together with a clear judgement. Candidates who focused on the content only with no consideration of the authorship, or general consideration of the content and authorship with no evaluative comments gained Level 2 marks. Level 4 responses included a full evaluation of both sources in their specific historical context, together with a reasoned and substantiated judgement why an historian would find the sources useful.

2. (a) This was a very well answered question for the vast majority of candidates. Level 2 responses were common as accurate and detailed descriptions of China’s relationship with Tibet were deployed. Answers that offered generalised comments achieved Level 1 marks.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to engage with the question successfully with high Level 2 and low Level 3 responses common. Level 2 responses offered clear consideration of the source and the historical context to suggest reasons for its production. Candidates who were able to make full use of the source and particularly the attribution to explain why it was produced together with a sound appreciation of the wider historical context achieved Level 3 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. Candidates who clearly identified the different ways in which the issue
has been interpreted and offered a basic judgement supported by some of the
evidence and/or knowledge achieved Level 2 marks. The candidates who
dealt with the content well but neglected to discuss the attributions achieved
high Level 2 marks. Answers that made a clear attempt to discuss how and
why the issue has been interpreted in different ways supported by the
evidence provided with reference to the attributions gained Level 3 marks.
Top Level 3 marks were awarded to candidates who additionally offered a
valid judgement on the issue set. The candidates who achieved Level 4
marks displayed a sound understanding of how and why the different
interpretations were formed while offering a valid judgement with
consideration of the historical context.

3. This was a well-answered question with the majority of candidates presenting
answers worthy of Level 3 marks. Answers were generally well-supported with
accurate examples to show the relative success and failure associated with the first
period of communist rule in China together with an appropriate summation.
Generalised answers with limited support gained Level 1 marks. Candidates
achieved Level 2 marks by offering a one sided answer with some support or a very
weak two sided answer gaining four marks. The award of 5-6 marks was given to
answers that presented a reasoned one-sided answer or a weak two-sided answer
with some contextual support. Candidates who presented a very well supported one-
sided answer reached Level 3/7 marks, as did unbalanced two sided answers with
contextual support. Answers that presented a reasoned analysis of the relative
success in establishing a communist state but lacked some detail or balance
achieved 8-9 marks. Level 4 marks were awarded to pupils who engaged fully in
presenting a reasoned and convincingly supported two-sided answer using accurate
and relevant detail across the whole period in the question; higher marks were
awarded to the degree of accurate and relevant contextual support.

The majority of marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar were 2 or 3 for fully
answered responses with accurate use of terminology.
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WESTWARD MIGRATION: THE AMERICAN WEST 1840-1895

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.

(b) The majority of candidates accessed Levels 2 or 3. They made good use of the content and provided a range of own knowledge to explain why the West was so lawless.

(c) This question was not quite as well-answered as in previous years, 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. However, in general, discussion of authorship and its impact on the usefulness of the sources was limited. Some candidates also overlooked the fact the question was focused on homesteader women and lost marks as a result.

2. (a) This question was generally well-answered. The majority of candidates produced Level 2/3 and 4 answers by providing a range of reasons for the impact of reservations on the Indian way of life.

(b) This question was answered reasonably well. Most candidates produced Level 2 answers by reference to the wording of the content and also, briefly, to the attribution, to consider the reasons for the production of the newspaper. The best responses focused more clearly on the ‘why’, often with contextual support, bringing out the sense of shock felt by many Americans as the first news of the defeat was made public.

(c) The majority of pupils achieved a top Level 2 or low Level 3. 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 elements of their own knowledge in support. However, discussion of the attributions was generally weak and rather mechanical with little focus on why the individual writers came to their different interpretations. 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 fact that Evidence 1 was from a modern U.S. government history website but critical of the actions of past governments only adds weight to the statements made.
3. This question was reasonably well answered with the majority of candidates reaching top Level 2 or Level 3. In most cases, answers covered a range of factors, from the opening of new routes by traders and trappers to the California gold rush, religious persecution, push factors in the East and the idea of Manifest Destiny. The level and mark given tended to be dictated by the degree of contextual support. Pleasingly the vast majority of candidates also confined their answers to the early pioneers, and there were relatively few references to later developments such as the railways and the Homestead Act (for which no credit could be given). There were a few Level 4 responses, with some candidates demonstrating an excellent knowledge of the factors which encouraged the early pioneers to head West.

**SPaG**
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.
1. (a) The three marks on offer were available for giving a detailed description of the source and some own knowledge. The source showed William Morgan who translated the first complete Welsh Bible in 1588. It was hoped that the candidates would then develop their answers by reference to the process of translating the Bible, such as, how long it took, who else was involved or that it was ordered by the Queen. Unfortunately, too many candidates wrote answers that referenced why the Bible was translated and the impact of the translation.

(b) To access Level 3 a full explanation of the Puritan threat was needed. Many candidates described a Puritan and gave a description of Puritan beliefs. A large number of candidates were able to provide an explanation of the threat, giving reference to the threat in Parliament and the circulation of pamphlets. Some candidates correctly noted that the threat became greater in the latter years of her reign.

(c) There was some improvement in the candidates' answers this series; this question was reasonably well done. Most candidates realised that Source C was produced in Rome but often neglected the fact that it was created after Elizabeth's excommunication and during the period of Catholic plots. Many candidates made bland reference to the reliability of the sources; for example, the author of Source B was an historian and therefore had hindsight; the author of Source C was a Catholic and therefore was biased. The better answers considered the reason why these sources were produced and referenced the difference in dates.

2. (a) Candidates were required to address Elizabeth's relations with both France and Spain on her accession. Reference to the threat of the Franco-Scottish alliance and the factors that contributed to Spain and Elizabeth trying to keep a positive relationship accessed Level 2.

(b) This question was answered well by the majority of candidates. However, some candidates had the tendency to explain how the Armada started which wasted valuable time. Many concentrated on the fire ships and the weather. A Level 3 answer needed to show how other factors, such as better tactics and fighting methods or the superiority of the English fleet and commanders were responsible for the Armada's defeat.

(c) Most candidates answered this question on the importance of Francis Drake's 'voyage' well. Even candidates that found the focus on importance difficult were able to provide sound understanding of the increase of trade and discovery in their answers. However very few accessed Level 4 where a detailed analysis within the historical concept was required. Reference to the role Drake took in improving discipline on board and how the journey impacted later developments were required to show the importance.
3.  (a) Most candidates were able to identify the role of the Justices of Peace and some of the responsibilities. Many Level 2 answers explored how the role helped Elizabeth to control the counties far from London and focused on the numerous responsibilities held. The majority of candidates discussed a range of factors and were well rewarded.

(b) There were many very good answers on ‘how’ successful Elizabeth was in ‘controlling’ her ‘government’. Those candidates, who focused on ‘government’ and produced fully reasoned and well supported two sided responses with clear judgements were well rewarded. The work of the Privy Council was well known and understood as was how local and national government worked during Elizabeth’s reign. 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 instance, ‘successful’, ‘controlling’ and ‘government’. Some candidates wrote lengthy answers on Poor Relief, the translation of the Bible and the Catholic threat and did not focus on government.

SPaG
It was pleasing to see the continuing improvement in spelling, punctuation and grammar on the whole paper and in question 3 (b) in particular. There were very few spelling mistakes and paragraphing was a feature on most scripts.
DEPRESSION, WAR AND RECOVERY IN WALES AND ENGLAND, 1930-1951

1. (a) The majority of candidates dealt with this question very well and showed sound knowledge of the effects of the Blitz. A minority did not make use of the source.

(b) Good answers seen here – most candidates were able to explain Churchill’s importance. Some candidates were able to give a full explanation, and many candidates achieved top Level 2 or went into Level 3. A minority of candidates tend to just list reasons without developing the explanation.

(c) Most candidates gained Level 3 on this question by making some use of the content, and a generalised analysis of the attribution. It was disappointing to see candidates making mechanical use of the attribution, and not developing aspects of both. Most gave very generalised comments about the leaflet being propaganda, but failed to really address the date, while others tended to stick to the fact that Source C was by an actual evacuee who had personal experience of evacuation and could have forgotten what conditions were really like over the years. More was needed regarding the fact that her evidence was based on a diary written during the war, and that she was discussing her own experience only, and not considering others who may have actually enjoyed evacuation. Very few candidates have achieved Level 4 on this question.

2. (a) This was answered extremely well, and most candidates were able to show a sound knowledge of the new educational opportunities.

(b) Most candidates were able to give good reasons why the Labour Party lost the election in 1951. Many different reasons were given, and good intelligence shown by candidates. However, some candidates misunderstood the period, and believed that Winston Churchill was the Labour Prime Minister and therefore answered the question incorrectly.

(c) The majority of candidates showed a good knowledge of the importance of Aneurin Bevan. There were a few exceptions whereby centres had obviously not taught students about him at all. Most candidates were able to show his importance within the Health Service, but did not also consider his work as Housing Minister. Those who had been taught this well produced excellent details regarding his work within the NHS and Housing and achieved Level 4.
3.  (a) Most candidates were able to provide ample reasons for the decline of traditional industries.

4.  b) This year many good essays have been seen, with the majority of candidates reaching Level 3, and some achieving Level 4. Not many are getting into the highest level, as they are not providing a balanced answer or one with specific details relevant to the period. Most tend to be fairly generalised essays, pre taught in the classroom, with very little deviation within centres. This is disappointing as it has been pointed out many times over the years that providing candidates with pre prepared essays actually holds them back instead of letting them show what they can do themselves.
1. (a) There were many excellent responses to this question that could have scored a lot more than the three marks available. However some responses were very vague eg. “they wore skirts” or talked about teenage fashion beyond the 1960s such as punk.

(b) Again, some excellent fully detailed responses, while others were let down by being too vague. A significant number of responses focused more on the decline of cinema rather than increasing ownership of television.

(c) One of the best answered of this type of question as most students could see that Source B was writing with a particular bias for a particular audience, while Source C was written in an age when the legal changes of the 1970s had resulted in complete re-evaluation of attitudes about women. A number of students still restricted the marks they could get by describing the different views without engaging with the specifics of the attributions in trying to explain why the sources views were different. There were some responses who tried to explain the views of Source B using speculation, for example by saying that the writing was being forced to say women should be wives and mothers by the government. There was also a lot of source evaluation focused on utility and reliability which is not what the question is asking for.

2. (a) Some excellent detail in support of responses to this question. Some responses were very vague and some were focused more on the reasons for immigration rather than on the experiences of immigrants.

(b) This question was not attempted at all by a large number of candidates, and many of those who did answer it tended to focus more on explaining the rise in support for nationalist parties in Wales and Scotland, rather than on why the devolution referendums were held. Only a very small number of candidates considered how the political expediency of a Labour minority government dependent on nationalist support had led to the referendums.

(c) Another question that was not attempted by a number of candidates and answered very poorly by a number of others who wrote about strikes and the Welfare State rather than the benefits of the relaxing of government control over a number of aspects of people’s lives. There was also some confusion over some of the details, including legalising gay marriage rather than homosexuality and drugs being legalised rather than criminalised.
3. (a) A very well answered question with a lot of excellent supporting detail. Some responses focused more on the problems of housing rather than the solutions to the problems.

(b) A number of detailed and well-supported evaluations about economic recovery. However there were a number of responses which made a number of unsupported points, and others that were not focused on the evaluation required by the question – what was the most important factor in the UK’s economic recovery? There were excellent descriptions of the expansion of motorways, the impact of the Beeching cuts, consumerism and building houses that were not linked to their role in economic recovery.
RUSSIA IN TRANSITION, 1905-1924

1. (a) Most did well in this question achieving Level 2 (3 marks). Detailed description of source and own knowledge was mainly used. There were some who ignored the source and used only their own knowledge or only the source really well which was Level 2 (2 marks).

(b) Most got into Level 2 giving more than one reason. There were some that gave one developed reason and got Level 2 (3 marks). There were excellent answers that produced a range of reasons and were fully explained and focused attaining Level 3. Some tended to drift away from why and talked about the Reds success but these were limited. Overall a popular question done well.

(c) A lot of Level 2 and Level 3 marks were given for this question. For most Level 3 (5 marks) seemed to be the average mark given. Students made clear references in most cases to both content and authorship with some analysis. More exploration of the authorship of each source would help. Students were able to distinguish the differences by making references to phrases in the content of the sources. There were this year again some mechanical answers which only got into Level 2. There were few Level 4s; these students produced developed answers and good analysis of the authorship of sources with reference to intended audience.

2. (a) Students did well in this question and were able to write something on the subject matter. Most achieved Level 2 (3 or 4 marks). Accurate understanding was shown using mainly the two key figures Trotsky and Stalin.

(b) There were a number of candidates who wrote on the main features of the NEP and failed to explain why it was introduced. Those who knew the topic well gave at least one reason, most more than one. Again as in question 1 (b) a developed reason was given Level 2 (3 marks). There were a number who gave a full range of reasons with clear explanations. There were mixed responses to this question.

(c) There were good responses for this question. Most concentrated on women, education and religion. There were others that involved only the NEP, for the ones who did, Level 2 (3 marks) was the highest they could get. Most were able to grasp the word significant and used contextual support in making judgements. There was evidence that in some cases the changes in life got better whilst for others it did not using factual support to back up their deductions. The average Level and mark seemed to lie between top Level 2 and bottom Level 3. There were some students who knew this topic extremely well and produced Level 4 answers with a reasoned evaluation on the extent of change.
3. (a) Students were able to write accurate answers and were focused with a list of relevant factors. In fact there were a lot who wrote far too much but it was good to see that these students really knew their work. Most got into Level 2 and got full marks.

(b) A number were able to produce relevant developed and reasoned answers with well-substantiated analysis of the key issue in the question. These achieved Level 4. The average Level was Level 3 perhaps lacking some detail or balance. More discussion on the key issue would improve the answer. Overall the question presented the students with enough contextual support to formulate a good answer. The students were familiar with this topic which had been taught well in most centres.

**SPaG**
Most achieved high performance 3 marks with accurate relevant information writing between 1 and 2 sides. Some candidates achieved intermediate 2 marks showing some accurate and relevant information.
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CHANGES IN SOUTH AFRICA, 1948-1994

1. (a) This was a very well answered question with the majority of candidates achieving Level 2 marks. Candidates own knowledge of events at Sharpeville were detailed and accurate. Some candidates however were too brief in their description of the source and therefore gained Level 2 marks.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to present more than one reason to explain why members broke away from the ANC and joined the PAC and gained Level 2 marks. Answers that presented a range of reasons that offered a full explanation why people were beginning to doubt the ANC and the attraction of the PAC gained Level 3 marks.

(c) In general candidates made a clear attempt to use both sources in support of their answer however many responses were mechanistic and neglected to explain fully the key feature in the question about the impact of economic sanctions on South Africa. Candidates who paraphrased the sources and copied the attribution gained Level 1 marks. Level 2 marks were awarded to candidates who were able to identify the different views presented in the sources with weak reference to authorship. Many candidates were able to achieve Level 3 marks with a clear attempt to explain how and why the sources offer differing views. Mechanistic COP style approaches were common and were awarded marks at the bottom of Level 3. The more successful answers showed a greater understanding of the authorship and purpose with an appreciation of the historical context to offer an explanation for the different views. Candidates who were able to access Level 4 marks did so by analysing fully both sources with contextual knowledge and focusing on how and why the different views were expressed regarding specifically the impact of economic sanctions on South Africa.

2. (a) Most candidates were able to present sufficient detail and accuracy to gain Level 2 marks. Lack of detail and statements that were too general gained Level 1 marks.

(b) The main feature that emerged from candidates’ response to this question was the lack of focus on offering a full explanation. Too many answers were heavily focused on describing Botha’s reforms without explaining fully how they increased opposition. The majority of candidates succeeded in gaining Level 2 marks by linking Botha’s reforms to more than one reason for opposition. Level 3 responses were clearly focused on explaining a range of reasons why opposition increased as a result of Botha’s reforms. A number of very good answers offered a full explanation with reference to both black and white opposition to Botha’s reforms.
(c) Most candidates were able to offer accurate answers that focused on the changes that happened following the release of political prisoners linked to the ending of apartheid. Answers that predominantly described the release of prisoners achieved Level 2 marks. Level 3 responses showed clearly the relationship between the release of political prisoners and the ending of apartheid. Answers that focused almost entirely on the release of Nelson Mandela were awarded low Level 3 marks. Candidates who were able to provide detailed analysis of the range of political prisoners released and how they influenced the future steps towards the ending of apartheid gained Level 4 marks.

3. (a) A very well answered question with the majority of candidates gaining Level 2-4 marks by displaying knowledge of a range of apartheid laws created between 1949 and 1956. General descriptions of relevant laws gained Level 1 marks only.

(b) The vast majority of candidates successfully presented the required two-sided response with reference to a range of factors. Generalised answers with a limited response gained Level 1 marks. Candidates achieved Level 2 marks by offering a one sided answer with some contextual support or a very weak two-sided answer. 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. Level 3 7 marks were awarded for well supported one-sided answers or unbalanced two sided answers with contextual support. Some candidates were unable to progress beyond bottom Level 3 marks as they confused the formation of Bantustans with townships. The majority of candidates were able to discuss the key feature in the question in relation to a range of other factors that affected the lives of black South Africans offering a bolt-on judgement and achieved Level 3 8/9 marks. Typically Level 4 responses provided a fully reasoned and well supported two-sided response with a valid and supported judgement.

Accurate answers achieved 2 or 3 marks for spelling, punctuation and grammar. Good terminology and structure achieved the full marks.
The changing role and status of women 1900 – the present day'

1. (a) A surprisingly large amount of candidates did not make the connection between the supermarket and women working in the supermarket. Many candidates described either office/ banking employment opportunities and the ‘white blouse’ revolution or employment opportunities in catering/ tourism.

(b) Most candidates were able to give some reasons why attitudes changed towards the employment of women by explaining how women took over men’s jobs whilst they were away fighting. Many also mentioned women working in munitions factories and the Land Army as well as women returning to their traditional roles at the end of the war.

(c) Most candidates were able to discuss the two sources and better candidates were able to explain why the authors had different viewpoints. Most candidates noted that the main difference in the viewpoints of the sources were that Source B was the experience of an individual, whilst Source C reflected the experience of the majority of women. However these answers still lacked the developed explanation needed to achieve a Level 4.

2. (a) The majority of candidates knew that Fawcett was the leader of the Suffragists who were a peaceful movement. Most also mentioned at least one of their methods of protest though only a minority could mention numerous methods of protest and very few mentioned the fact they had their own newspaper.

(b) The vast majority of pupils gave role models as an important reason for the increase in numbers of female politicians, most giving Theresa May and/ or Margaret Thatcher as an example. Some candidates also mentioned the Welsh Assembly Government as a reason. There were very few Level 3 answers, but those who did achieve this gave Cameron’s policies, ‘Blair’s Babes’, twinning and all female shortlists as other reasons.

(c) This question was not well answered. The majority of candidates gave The Equal Pay Act and the Sex Discrimination Act as reasons for greater equality since the 1970s. Some candidates also mentioned that these laws had not resulted in equality in the workplace. Very few candidates discussed other relevant pieces of legislation or the work of the Equal Opportunities Commission to ensure these Acts were being adhered to. As a result very few reached Level 4.
3.  (a) The majority of candidates were able to explain the role of women in the depressed areas and were able to give examples such as a lack of money, 'making ends meet' and going without in order to provide for their children and husbands. The best answers also discussed the 'Means Test' and the impact this would have on the family.

(b) Generally candidates seemed more focused on the factor in the question, although some still discussed employment opportunities and legislation such as the Representation of the People Act and the Equal Pay Act. Many answers were still very one sided suggesting that women had benefited due to changes in home and family life. The majority of candidates were able approach the question chronologically and discuss a number of changes that had occurred across the period. Many were able to offer an alternative viewpoint, the most common being that women now have a double burden of housework and having to go out to work as well. The majority of candidates could discuss changes in housing, birth control and labour saving devices benefitting women with the better candidates also discussing how these changes also meant greater difficulties for women. There were very few answers that were balanced and reasoned, so again very few candidates reached Level 4.

SPaG
Candidates were producing lengthy pieces of extended writing, which on the whole showed good use of SPaG. Some fell into the trap of not using paragraphs, but very few were given 1 mark for SPaG.
DEVELOPMENTS IN SPORT, LEISURE AND TOURISM IN WALES AND ENGLAND, 1900 TO THE PRESENT DAY

Question 1

(a) This was generally well answered with the majority of candidates being able to access Level 2 by engaging with the source and adding their own knowledge to outline developments in new entertainment technology. More specific knowledge would have helped some candidates.

(b) This question was done well by almost all candidates. Many of them hit Level 3 due to the depth and quality of their points. Even weaker candidates offered sound reasons for the popularity of radio in the period, with references to the Second World War and the mass production and relative cheapness of radios abounding.

(c) The balanced use of the sources, set in their historical context, was required for full marks. Candidates were often stuck at Level 2 due to the lack of a balanced assessment of content and authorship, with very little own knowledge evident in candidate’s work. There was a lot of paraphrase and comments on authorship were very hackneyed. Overall this question was done poorly.

Question 2

(a) This question was answered well, on the whole. A lot of candidates got into Level 2 with good knowledge and specific detail about the location of the Parks, activities to do there and also the time frame for their introduction. The worst answers, of which there were less this year, were just generic examples of things one might do in a park or open space.

(b) This question was answered well in the main, with many candidates getting to Level 3. It was pleasing to see comments on the impact of the Holidays With Pay Act, and references to the end of the War and full employment. Perhaps less frequently commented on was the rise of the motor car, which remains an undiscovered country for some centres, it seems.

(c) Candidates seemed prepared for this question and were able to cite key content with some ease. However, coverage in many answers was too limited in scope, with some good points offered on the low-cost revolution in the 1990s and not much else. Others recalled Skytrain and the rise of the Costas in Spain, but missed detail such as the growth of long-haul flights.

Question 3

(a) Overall this question was answered fairly well by a lot of candidates. Lots of developments were referred to and credit was given to brief concise details, such as the rise of disability and women’s sports, and the development of the UK sports infrastructure. A lack of specific examples dogged some candidates, and a significant minority of candidates appeared to have no real knowledge of this topic – proof positive that the whole specification ought to be taught.
(b) Some students could offer an impressive awareness of the growth and development of sports and were able to discuss developments in sponsorship, the role of significant individuals and television. There was less on transport and the rise in living standards. There were many candidates who were not able to exceed Level 2 because of a lack of chronological awareness of the developments they were discussing. Often this was evident in a lack of structure in the narrative shifting from the late 20th century in one paragraph, to the early 20th century in the next. Too many of these responses lacked specialist terminology and were characterised by generalised statements. There were lost opportunities to gain a Level 4 response because the conclusion would simply offer a summative, rather than an analytical conclusion which should have referenced the fact controversy worked in tandem with other developments such as the advent of television and the role of the media. A significant number of answers just focused on controversy. Centres are reminded that there are sporting stars apart from David Beckham who can be used as examples.

**SPaG**

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

1. (a) Generally very well answered, with some candidates not achieving the highest level because their responses were not specific enough – for example, the phrase ‘golden age’ was used a lot without being explained, while some responses elaborated on this talking about housing and welfare reforms. There were some answers that confused Stresemann with Ebert.

(b) A lot of responses focused too much on the building of the Wall rather than why it came down. There were two common misunderstandings in a number of responses – confusing the 1961 Berlin Wall with the Airlift crisis of 1948/9, and that Stalin ordered the Berlin Wall to be built. Ostpolitik and Kohl’s support for reunification were given as reasons for the Wall coming down far more frequently than Gorbachev withdrawing military support from the communist regimes of eastern Europe.

(c) Very common confusion between the Depression and the hyperinflation crisis on 1923-4. Many responses tended to be answering the question “Explain why Hitler rose to power” rather than focusing on the importance of the Depression. There were also a number of responses that tried to use events after Hitler was selected as Chancellor, like the Reichstag Fire, to explain why Hitler was selected as Chancellor.

2. (a) Many candidates did not attempt this sub-question or misunderstood it and wrote about the Home Front in Germany in more general terms. There were a number of high level and very specific responses as well.

(b) The best answered of the part (b) questions on this paper with very detailed references to the impact of the Marshall Plan and Adenauer’s ‘economic miracle’. Some responses did not get the highest marks as they described the changes between 1945 and 1960 but did not link them to what was shown in Source B.

(c) A lot of confusion with the Depression and occasionally with the Streseemann years. A significant number of responses described the hyperinflation crisis but did not focus on the impact it had on people’s lives as required by the question.
3.  
(a) Most responses to this question were very detailed, even though it was attempted by far fewer candidates than question 1 or 2.
(b) Responses to this question tended to focus more on Berlin as a cause of tension rather than Germany as a whole.
(c) Very few candidates attempted this question and most of those that did showed little understanding of the importance of the invasion of the USSR in blunting the effectiveness of blitzkrieg in the short term and fatally diverting German resources in the long term.

Section B

4. Most responses to this question were limited to the scaffold only and did not fully focus on the most significant political and economic developments as required by the question.

5. The vast majority of candidates attempted this question. Some responses did not get past the 1930s and others were limited by focusing on generic 'change' rather than on the extent to which people’s lives improved, as required by the question. There were also a lot of responses which fully differentiated between the differing experiences of different groups of people in different parts of Germany.

6. As with question 4 most responses to this question followed the scaffold only and tended to be purely descriptive, rather than focusing on the success of Germany’s attempts to improve its international position.
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DEVELOPING RELATIONS IN PALESTINE, ISRAEL AND THE MIDDLE EAST 1919-2000

Section A

1.  (a) Many excellent responses to this question but some focused too much on the reasons for the Arabs and the Jews making claims rather than the claims themselves, for example when writing that The Holocaust was the reason why the Jews wanted to move to Palestine, rather than talking about their historical or religious claims to it.

(b) Some excellent answers that explained clearly how ruling Palestine became increasingly difficult for the British until they withdrew from the mandate in 1948. A significant number of responses explained in general terms about how the Arabs and Jews made ruling Palestine difficult for the British without specifically linking to withdrawal in 1948, and some spent too long talking about what happened in Palestine before the date of the first source, missing the focus of the question.

(c) This question was answered very well by a number of candidates who correctly argued that Sadat was crucial in bringing Israel and the USA into peace negotiations through use of the ‘oil card’, and that he made a significant contribution to peace by recognising Israel and agreeing to the Camp David Accords. Some responses listed these achievements and the events of the Yom Kippur War without linking them to Sadat and attempts to bring peace, while others confused Sadat with Nasser, or with Yasser Arafat.

2.  (a) Responses to this question tended to be vague, relying mostly on general descriptions or a desire for a Jewish homeland.

(b) For the few candidates that attempted this question it was mostly misunderstood as responses tended to be more about war than the changes in the lives of the Israelis.

(c) As with question 1(c) a number of candidates confused Arafat and Sadat. Responses tended to focus either on the violent campaigns of the PLO, or the attempts of Arafat to bring about peace, but no candidates covered both.

Very few candidates attempted question 2.
3. (a) Responses to this question tended to be about the role of the USA in the 1970s or the 1990s, but very few managed both.

(b) As with question 1(b) there was too much focus on before 1922 which was the date of the first source. Common misconceptions were to confuse the League of Nations and the United Nations, as well as focusing on the Jewish homeland part of the first source, rather than focusing on the British aim to protect the rights of all inhabitants of Palestine. Some responses included a lot of detail but stopped short of explaining why the British were considering partitioning Palestine.

(c) Overall this question was very well answered using a wide range of issues of importance. A few candidates confused the 1948 war with the 1956 Suez Crisis. Some responses were limited by making relevant points that were not supported by specific details.

Section B

4. There were hardly any responses to this question. Candidates who did attempt this question produced responses that were vague and did not focus on 'significant political developments'.

5. There were hardly any responses to this question. Candidates who did attempt this question produced responses that were vague and did not focus on the extent to which life changed for the people of Palestine and Israel.

6. The vast majority of candidates attempted this question. There were a lot of candidates who wrote very detailed responses who did not make it beyond Level 3 7 marks as their answers described the sequence of important events in the Middle East but did not focus on the evaluation required by the question – 'the most significant developments in the conflict'.
1. (a) Many candidates were able to access Level 2 by referring in some detail to some of the changes in popular culture in the 1950s and 1960s including the introduction of Rock ‘n’ Roll, music by Elvis Presley or to films such as ‘Rebel Without a Cause’. Those at Level 3 referred in greater detail to the wider influence of television and to drive-in cinemas and to youth rebellions inspired by teenagers. Some candidates were confused by the question and brought in irrelevant detail such as the changes in the 1920s or 1930s or to changes in the lives of black Americans.

(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 generalised responses which just paraphrased the sources were set at Level 1. Candidates were able to access Level 2 by identifying reasons for the changes in the lives of Americans between the early 1930s and the mid-1940s but time was often spent unprofitably referring to the Great Depression in detail. Too many candidates focused on this instead of the reasons for bringing the USA out of the Depression. At Level 3, candidates used information from the sources and their own knowledge to explain why life changed for many Americans with detailed reference to the New Deal and to the economic benefits of the Second World War.

It is again to be emphasised that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources. Even referring to the source as being from a school text book is a waste of both time and space.

(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 principles of the New Frontier and the Great Society with reference to the Civil Rights Movement or to the tax cuts and spending increases by both Presidents. At Level 3, candidates made a more direct attempt to analyse the importance of the policies of both Presidents in improving the lives of Americans. At Level 4 there was more reasoned and sophisticated analysis of the social, economic and political impact of the New Frontier and Great Society. Candidates were able to arrive at a judgement about the importance of the policies of the Presidents in making the USA a fairer and more affluent country.
2. (a) Many were able to access Level 2 by referring in some detail to the laws passed by the USA during the 1960s, in particular to the increased rights of black Americans in terms of segregation and voting. Those at Level 3 referred in greater detail to the specific acts during the 1960s and brought in other improvements in terms of housing and marriage. Some even mentioned the criticisms of the Acts and were rewarded with marks for this too. Some candidates however focused too heavily on the Civil Rights Movement and described the protests of the 1950s instead of focusing on the issue at hand.

(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 used the sources to identify the early improvements to the position of black Americans by referring to the part played by black Americans during the Second World War. Candidates who developed the issue more fully by arguing that the New Deal had some impact on the position of black Americans too were rewarded with Level 3. Here there was specific reference to some of the alphabet agencies and to the 'Double V' campaign along with the increased membership of the NAACP. There was mention of presidential support by Truman and support from General Eisenhower. It is again to be emphasised that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources. Even referring to the source as being from a school text book is a waste of both time and space.

(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, but was mostly answered with good detail and some good explanation. 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 achieved Level 2 by offering narrative accounts of the significance of Malcolm X in the struggle for civil rights. Most candidates were able to identify the importance of his speeches and to his calls for violence. At Level 3 candidates would expand on these themes and begin to explain why his actions were noteworthy, in particular to the Black Power Movement and to the Nation of Islam. Level 4 answers showed a great level of sophistication and would discuss the wider impact on the lives of young black Americans. A few candidates gave a weak answer here and failed to expand on their knowledge.
3.  

(a) This was answered quite well, with many candidates identifying that the USA wanted to improve relations with the USSR and China. Many candidates secured Level 2 with reference to discussions about arms reduction, trade or sporting ties without giving enough detail to reach the highest level. Level 3 responses offered more understanding of the policy of detente and giving more specifics or by discussing the end of detente in 1979 after the invasion of Afghanistan by the USSR. There were however many blank responses with some candidates not even attempting the question.

(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 the shift from entering the conflict in Vietnam to a change by 1969. The question was answered quite well, although some candidates focused too heavily on the Domino Theory instead of concentrating on the matter at hand. At Level 3 there was specific reference to the tactics used by the Vietcong, the protests at home due to the televised nature of the war and to the economic and human cost of the conflict. It is again to be emphasised that this is not a source evaluation question and there is nothing to be gained by discussing the origin and purpose of the sources. Even referring to the source as being from a school text book is a waste of both time and space.

(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. A number of candidates managed to offer some analysis on the issue and could see that the USA’s foreign policy was drastically affected by the Second World War. Many were able to identify the shift from Isolation to Intervention and finally to Containment and they were able to explain why the Second World War initiated this change. At Level 3 candidates were able to discuss more directly the significance of these changes but many of the responses were not sustained. It was disappointing that many obviously able candidates were unable to focus fully on the issue. They were stronger on the shift from Isolationism but less secure on the changing nature of the US’s foreign policy at the end of the war. At Level 4, responses offered some focus on both factors while attempting a judgement.
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. This was less evident this year.

4. 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 developing social and economic fortunes. There were as usual 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.

5. 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 but responses became uneven after that time. The legislation of the 1960s was mentioned but some candidates failed to explore the issue of improvement for different sections of the black community. There was the usual failure to develop the material in sufficient depth beyond the 1960s and many resorted to list/name drop successful black actors, musicians or sporting 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. There were some excellent responses to this question however where candidates displayed sound understanding across the whole period while writing extensively with authority and maturity.
6. Weaker candidates tended to offer narratives that covered most of the period up to the 70s but did not explicitly address change or the extent of it. The period of isolation was dealt with well by better candidates while coverage of the Second World War was generally sound as was the need for post-war intervention and the imperative of containing communism. Some candidates still find it difficult to go beyond Cuba and detente was dealt with superficially. The better prepared offered a sound sweep of the whole period while recognising trends and shifts in foreign policy.
There were a number of excellent responses to this question which really honed in on the issue of importance not just in terms of policy but also with relations with other nations. 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.
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THE DEVELOPMENT OF WALES, 1900 - 2000

SECTION A

1. (a) Most candidates were able to provide information on Saunders Lewis but too many failed to focus on his contribution to Plaid Cymru as was required.

(b) Candidates made good use of the sources provided. There was too much focus on why Wales rejected devolution in 1979 at the expense of why the attitude of Wales towards devolution had changed by the end of the century as was required.

(c) Overall this question was poorly answered with ‘creating a Welsh national identity’ not that well understood. Very few candidates were able to refer to both symbols associated with nationhood and the creation of national institutions that helped distinguish Wales from other parts of the UK.

2. (a) Most candidates were able to outline the decline of heavy industry in the 1930s. But beyond increased unemployment very little was offered on how it affected people’s lives.

(b) The question was reasonably well answered. Most candidates were able to use the information provided in the sources and draw on some own knowledge. There was a tendency to go beyond the time scale of the sources and write at length on women’s contribution in the workplace during the Second World War. Knowledge of increased job opportunities for women between the 1950s and 1970s was patchy.

(c) On the whole it was poorly answered. Candidates’ answers focused on tourism providing jobs but lacked specific knowledge and detail by reference to National Parks, coastal resorts and the Welsh government’s effort to advertise Wales’s attractions. However many candidates realised that tourism provided more job opportunities for women but not that it was seasonal, poorly paid and often involved unsociable working hours.

3. (a) On the whole this was well answered with accurate knowledge to support the popularity of the cinema in Wales in the 1930s provided.

(b) This was reasonably well answered with candidates aware of Gwynfor Evans’s role in establishing S4C. The better answers made reference to the campaign of Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg in the 1970s and early 1980s.
This question was surprisingly poorly answered. Candidates’ knowledge of the development of Welsh medium and bilingual schools and education was very limited. Only a few were able to engage with the focus of the question, that is, why there was a change in attitude towards Welsh-medium education by both parents and local authorities in particular.

SECTION B

Candidates needed to focus more sharply on the thrust of the questions 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.

4. The majority of answers were Level 2 or 3 with most candidates able to discuss some factors but not in sufficient detail. Beyond the Plaid Cymru’s parliamentary ‘success’ of the 1970s very few discussed successes in Welsh Assembly and local elections. Surprisingly very few considered devolution to be a most significant development in Welsh politics.

5. Candidates were able to discuss the decline of heavy industries in the 1930s without showing that coal and steel’s fortunes fluctuated during most of the first eighty years of the twentieth century. A more detailed understanding of the economic developments of the last two decades of the twentieth century was required.

6. Some very good answers were seen. The threat posed by the Second World War was well explained as were other ‘threats’ in particular, the new forms of entertainment over the century. The better answers addressed how Wales adapted to these threats.

SPaG
The standard of SPaG was very good on the whole.
Sgriptiau cyfrwng Cymraeg
Roedd canran uchel o’r sgriptiau drwy gyfrwng y Gymraeg. Braf ydy adrodd ar safon uchel y mynegiant.
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, C. 1530 TO THE PRESENT DAY

Section A

1. (a) This was well answered. The majority of candidates were able to describe the crime of highway robbery including references to robbing stage coaches, the availability of cheap horses and guns and the lack of banks.

(b) Most candidates referred to both sources and were able to use the sources to describe different causes of different crimes. Many candidates could not give any other causes of poverty other than those that were mentioned in Source A. The better candidates did refer to differences such as the dissolution of the monasteries and enclosures for sheep farming. Many answers stayed within Level 2, with few candidates explaining why there were different causes.

(c) This question was well answered on the whole with many students being able to give a range of crimes that have been caused by the development of the computer. However, fewer candidates were able to analyse the key issue and explain that computers allow criminals to commit crimes remotely and that mass ownership of the computer means that there are more opportunities to commit crimes such as downloading digital media. Some candidates did state that the computer allowed old crimes such as theft to be carried out in a different way.

2. (a) This question was well answered, with the majority of the candidates knowing the role of the Tudor watchman. However, there was some confusion amongst some candidates as they described the role of a constable rather than a watchman.

(b) The majority of candidates were able to explain developments in the police during the early nineteenth century by using the sources. Many were able to explain the development of the Metropolitan police following the Bow Street Runners, and the spread of the police throughout the country. However, there were few Level 4 answers as candidates did not always explain clearly why these developments took place, such as the need for an organised system with the coming of the Industrial Revolution and the related problems.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates did not seem to know what police specialisation was, whilst other candidates gave many examples of specialisation and how specialisation gave the police more in-depth knowledge and resources to combat complex crimes.
3. (a) This question was well answered with the majority of candidates being able to describe the use of the stocks and pillory clearly.

(b) The majority of students were able to use both sources to describe transportation and the Separate System and many candidates were able to reach Level 3 as they explained why there was a need for the methods of punishment to change.

(d) Many candidates were able to describe alternative methods of punishment to imprisonment, and also explained that the punishment should fit the crime, changing attitudes towards punishment and the need to look at different methods of punishment as after the abolition of the death penalty there were more ‘lifers’ in prison. Candidates at Level 4 questioned how effective and therefore significant these new punishments had been.

Section B

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 main cause of crime. However, few candidates were able to consider the varying impact of change across the timeframes.

5. This is a popular question. Candidates had a clear understanding of the chronological period, with many focusing on the development of the police rather than change.

6. This was by far the weakest of the essay questions. As in previous years, candidates who attempted this question were more reliant on the scaffold that with the others. Answers tended to focus on the Tudor period and the modern era, with much less written about the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the end of the Bloody Code and prison reform. Few candidates went beyond the bottom of Level 3 as answers lacked detail and very few candidates were able to consider the varying impact of change across the timeframes.

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

1. (a) Most candidates were able to write well about William Harvey and therefore there were many answers that reached Level 2. Significant numbers achieved low Level 3 marks. A significant number wrote in detail about Harvey’s work on the heart, and it was good to see detail on arteries and veins, as well as Harvey’s experiments with animals. It was disappointing to see so few references to Harvey’s On the Motion of the Heart and Blood from 1628.

(b) The trend for answers addressing the concept of change continued this year, with many candidates able to consider the idea of change even if their supporting detail and analysis was not developed. Only a small number of candidates just paraphrased the sources as they tended to have some knowledge of scanners and X-rays. However, far fewer candidates were able to explain in detail about Rontgen’s work and even less were able to add specific detail on scanners, such as MRI, ECG, ultrasound and so on. Very few answers reached Level 3 as a result.

(c) This question was generally answered well. Candidates were usually knowledgeable about Pasteur and germs in general. Many were able to describe in detail how he discovered germs and the impact this had on medical knowledge. However, candidates missed opportunities to link Pasteur’s work to the work of Koch, and often those who mentioned Koch did so in very general terms with no mention of his work with TB and cholera. Curiously there was very little reference to Pasteur’s swan neck flask.

2. (a) Most candidates were able to describe the work of James Young Simpson and so were able to access Level 2 easily. Some candidates explained in detail the experiment Simpson carried out and almost all got the idea that he had created an effective anaesthetic, which was pleasing. Many pointed out it was an improvement on ether and the like. However, as is often the case, the lack of discussion of the next steps, such as Queen Victoria’s use of chloroform, prevented them accessing Level 3.

(b) This question was bedevilled by paraphrasing. Source A proved a rich seam to be mined in this respect. Many candidates showed sound knowledge about the development of the smallpox vaccine. Some made good points about the work of Lady Wortley Montague on inoculation. However, it would have been of great benefit to many candidates to have a greater balance of coverage between the two sources and their own knowledge. Very few answers hit the top mark as a result, but many were scored at a good Level 2.
(c) Large numbers of candidates were able to describe the work of Fleming in good detail. Some were more specific about his work and the dates involved, as well as making reference to his work with lysozyme. The best answers referenced the problems of infection and the epoch-making role of penicillin in treatment. Most candidates made reference to the limits of Fleming’s work, and the link to Florey and Chain, and the Second World War. Sometimes this was quite limited in detail, but overall some very good Level 3 answers were more frequent on this question than its counterparts.

3. As appears to be standard practice, this question was attempted less frequently than the previous two questions.

(a) Most candidates had sound knowledge of the role of the Church, and there were a good number of answers that explained the Church’s conception of care and treatment as well as some of its practices. Most were able to access Level 2 but only a small number achieved Level 3 answers for this question, chiefly due to the amount of detail offered.

(b) Candidate’s knowledge of patient care in the nineteenth century was quite good, although for many there was an over-reliance on the sources as prompts. Consequently marks awarded for this question were often in Level 2. Candidates were comfortable in discussing Florence Nightingale’s contribution and there were also mentions for Besti Cadwaladr and Mary Seacole. Source B was underutilised by many candidates who were good on the fact that nursing improved and hence patient care improved as well, but did not link this to better training and the Notes on Nursing guidance.

(c) This answer produced mostly bland answers that did not really show much historical knowledge. Instead, many candidates relied on a general understanding of the NHS as a care provider, and most mentioned free prescriptions. Overall there were too many missed opportunities in terms of areas such as operations, preventative work, and the role of hospitals, GPs, dentists and opticians as component parts of care. Some mentioned mental health services, but again this was in a generalised way rather than historicised as the question invites.

SECTION B

This section was answered very well this year. Even candidates that did not do well in Section A were able to provide a detailed answer for Section B. Question 6 was the exception.

4. There were a significant number of very good answers to this question. Candidates tended to clearly address all four time periods and were able to describe the developments in these time periods in great detail. The work of Vesalius and Harvey tended to over dominate for some candidates but many continued last year’s trend and moved beyond the Renaissance to consider more fully the other time periods. There was a sense of centre’s ‘training’ candidates to answer this question with answers being very similar for centres, although there was less reliance on the scaffold and so fewer answers marooned at Level 2. More candidates this year dealt with the idea of varying impact and were able to access Level 4 marks. Low Level 3 marks predominated due to the quality of the detail; many candidates began to address the question well without fully sustaining their points.
5. Similar 'trained' responses were found for this question. However, they were supported by good detail and some good analysis. A frequent problem with this question is the incursion of medical knowledge content, and this was evident again this year, usually in the Renaissance section. Missed opportunities were also noticeable in the section on the modern period, with a surprising lack of detail about heart transplant, or indeed transplants in general. On the whole candidates dealt well with the thrust of the question and were able to achieve high Level 3 marks. As with question 4 there were more attempts to deal with the issue of varying impact and this was reflected in the awarding of more Level 4 marks.

6. This was hardly answered, and when it was, it appeared to have been by accident rather than design. The best answers scored less than their counterparts in Questions 4 & 5 due to a lack of specific detail and almost no discussion of the varying impact of change. Use of time periods was reasonably good, but very few answers went beyond a series of facts on what happened in a few of the periods. The responses remain a disappointment.

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 achieved 3 out of 3.
Centres will have received their moderator reports detailing the outcome of their 2018 Controlled Assessment submission on results day. This year’s was the final Legacy Controlled Assessment submission. The 2019 submission will be the new Non Examination Assessment (NEA) exercises.

This year, again, the work presented was of a good standard. Most of the work was handwritten and of a reasonable and sensible length. Centres that adhere to the recommended time limit for the ‘write up’ succeeded in producing more focused and relevant answers. The vast majority of Centres are using the Controlled Assessment exercises produced by the Board, with exercises on the two world wars proving most popular. Nearly all Centres used the marking checklist produced by the Board and it has proved to be a useful tool and we recommend its use.

Part (a)

As required more candidates are producing coherent pieces of prose with the source evaluation integrated within the answer. Part (a) does require a clear conclusion answering the set question with reference to the evidence they presented. As in previous years 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. This led to mechanical source evaluation, with candidates attempting to comment on why a source was useful, and then why it was not useful and repeating the process for reliability. Candidates are, however, expected to have background knowledge and to be able to provide context to the sources.

Part (b)

Part (b) is not another source evaluation exercise. What is required is for candidates to offer a clear explanation and analysis of the set issue and reach a judgement with good support. 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. The current marking checklist clearly identifies the need for candidates to consider the purpose and intended audience as well as the accuracy of the sources.
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. This year, again, there were instances of simplistic evaluation being over rewarded. 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 also 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 which include:

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. Candidates work should be stapled or bound with their name and exam number clearly stated.

The Centre’s sample should be forwarded to the moderator in plastic sacks provided by the Board. In some instances the H1 and/or 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 2019

All Centres are required to submit a new proposal form for the 2019-21 cycle. This form is available on the WJEC website and the completed form should be Emailed to Greg Lewis [Greg.Lewis@wjec.co.uk].

The existing WJEC Exemplars have been modified and several new exercises have been produced. These are available on the WJEC website.

Other useful resources available on the WJEC website are:

- GCSE History Guidance for Teaching: Unit 4 Non Examination Assessment.
- The Unit 4 Non Examination Assessment for 2017 slides used at the February 2017 CPD events.

Both provide support and guidance to teachers in preparing and administering the NEA unit and clearly identify the changes involved.

The deadline for submission of Non Examination Assessment to moderators in 2019 is May 1st.