

GCSE Examiners' Report

History

GCSE

Summer 2025

© WJEC CBAC Ltd.2025



Introduction

Our Principal Examiners' report provides valuable feedback on the recent assessment series. It has been written by our Principal Examiners and Principal Moderators after the completion of marking and moderation, and details how candidates have performed in each component.

This report opens with a summary of candidates' performance, including the assessment objectives/skills/topics/themes being tested, and highlights the characteristics of successful performance and where performance could be improved. It then looks in detail at each unit, pinpointing aspects that proved challenging to some candidates and suggesting some reasons as to why that might be.¹

The information found in this report provides valuable insight for practitioners to support their teaching and learning activity. We would also encourage practitioners to share this document – in its entirety or in part – with their learners to help with exam preparation, to understand how to avoid pitfalls and to add to their revision toolbox.

Further support

Document	Description	Link
Professional Learning / CPD	Eduqas offers an extensive programme of online and face-to-face Professional Learning events. Access interactive feedback, review example candidate responses, gain practical ideas for the classroom and put questions to our dedicated team by registering for one of our events here.	https://www.eduqas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/
Past papers	Access the bank of past papers for this qualification, including the most recent assessments. Please note that we do not make past papers available on the public website until 12 months after the examination.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page
Grade boundary information	Grade boundaries are the minimum number of marks needed to achieve each grade. For unitised specifications grade boundaries are expressed on a Uniform Mark Scale (UMS). UMS grade boundaries remain the same every year as the range of UMS mark percentages allocated to a particular grade does not change. UMS grade boundaries are published at overall subject and component level. For linear specifications, a single grade is awarded for the subject, rather than for each component that contributes towards the overall grade. Grade boundaries are published on results day.	For unitised specifications click here: Results and Grade Boundaries and PRS (eduqas.co.uk)

¹ Please note that where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

Exam Results Analysis	Eduqas provides information to examination centres via the WJEC Portal. This is restricted to centre staff only. Access is granted to centre staff by the Examinations Officer at the centre.	Portal by WJEC
Classroom Resources	Access our extensive range of FREE classroom resources, including blended learning materials, exam walk-throughs and knowledge organisers to support teaching and learning.	https://resources.eduqas.co.uk/
Bank of Professional Learning materials	Access our bank of Professional Learning materials from previous events from our secure website and additional pre-recorded materials available in the public domain.	Portal by WJEC or on the Eduqas subject page.
Become an examiner with WJEC.	We are always looking to recruit new examiners or moderators. These opportunities can provide you with valuable insight into the assessment process, enhance your skill set, increase your understanding of your subject and inform your teaching.	Become an Examiner Eduqas

Contents	Page
Executive summary	5
Component 1 British	6
Component 1 non-British	9
Component 2 Period Study	12
Component 2 Thematic Study	15
Supporting you – useful contacts and links	18

Executive Summary

Candidate performance was broadly in line with previous years. Many produced strong responses with secure knowledge and growing awareness of exam requirements, though challenges remain in applying second-order concepts and interpreting historical viewpoints.

AO1 continues to be the strongest area across all components. In Component 2 (Period Study), many candidates recalled accurate, detailed knowledge to support well-structured arguments. In the Thematic Study (Q6a), responses frequently demonstrated strong contextual understanding. In Component 1 (British and non-British Depth Studies), secure factual knowledge often underpinned more developed answers, although for Q3 and Q4 (non-British), candidates need to supplement the provided material with relevant contextual knowledge to access higher AO1 marks. Across all components, some responses still included inaccurate or irrelevant detail, reducing clarity and coherence.

Performance in AO2 remains mixed. While some candidates are increasingly confident in applying historical concepts such as causation and significance, many continue to describe rather than analyse. In Component 2, (Thematic Studies) responses to Q1 often contained generalised description rather than precise identification of similarity and difference, and Q6b responses typically described the site's history without explaining its significance. In Component 2 (Period Studies) Q3 responses frequently lacked explanation of significance or relative comparison between factors. In Q5, many candidates lost focus on the named factor, structuring their answer around other issues; stronger responses analysed the importance of the named factor and used other factors; stronger responses evaluated the importance of the named factor using other factors for comparison rather than as standalone points. In Component 1 (British Studies in Depth) responses to Q4 often treated issues discretely; more successful answers used comparative language to explore the links between them.

AO3 performance continued to improve across Component 1 (British and non-British Depth Studies), with candidates generally approaching source tasks more confidently. Question 1 was accessible, though many responses still relied on paraphrasing rather than supported inference. In Question 2, there was stronger engagement with purpose and authorship, though contextual support was often limited. In Component 2 (Thematic Studies), responses to Question 2 showed some attention to authorship, but confusion between reliability and utility remained a common issue. Greater precision in evaluating sources using contextual knowledge is needed to strengthen AO3 performance further.

AO4 continues to be an area with scope for development. In Component 1 (British and Non-British Depth Studies), many candidates relied on pre-learned, generic phrases and did not engage fully with how and why interpretations are formed. Consideration of authorship, audience, or purpose was often limited, with few responses showing contextual understanding. Centres are encouraged to use model responses and mark schemes to teach how interpretations are shaped by factors beyond the content alone.

Key Areas for Improvement

- AO2: Focused practice on applying second-order concepts to strengthen analysis and reduce narrative.
- AO3: Stronger source responses need clearer inference, contextual support, and focused comparison of content, purpose, and value.
- AO4: Candidates must move beyond rote phrases to show real understanding of interpretation formation, referencing context, authorship, and audience.
- All questions to be attempted; even brief answers can earn marks for demonstrating understanding.

HISTORY

GCSE

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 1 STUDIES IN DEPTH – BRITISH STUDIES IN DEPTH OPTIONS C100A-D

Overview of the Component

- This component assesses AO1, AO2, AO3 and AO4 emphasising substantial and coherent short time scales; assessment is based on the use of wide range of historical sources and differing historical interpretations.
- Overall, candidate performance was comparable with previous series. Once again, there were many high-quality responses. There was a decrease in the entries for options 1C and 1D compared to previous series.
- Candidates were once again well-prepared in terms of the techniques required to answer specific questions, although, as in previous series, some responses included inaccuracies or irrelevant detail.
- Given that the format of these papers is well-established, candidates continued to display improving historical skills. Candidates with good subject knowledge were able to gain marks for AO1, so the regular reinforcement of historical knowledge is to be encouraged.
- Some candidates left questions unanswered, despite the opportunity to gain marks by demonstrating understanding of AOs 2–4. Candidates should be encouraged to attempt all questions and make basic judgements where required, even if detailed AO1 knowledge is lacking.
- The issue of how and why historical interpretations are formed remains challenging for many candidates. Candidates should specifically focus upon how and why historical interpretations are formed, focusing on the authorship, medium and audience and avoiding mechanical, generic responses. Sharing and explaining the banded mark schemes with candidates will enable them to gain a better understanding of the requirements of each question.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** As in previous series, the majority of candidates were able to achieve high Band 1 or low Band 2 for extracting at least two pieces of relevant information from the source material, demonstrating the accessibility of the question. Candidates should be reminded that full marks are not awarded for simply paraphrasing or describing the source material. Discussions over the authorship are not required for this question. In order to achieve the fourth mark, candidates need to make an inference from the source material that is relevant to the question asked.

On the Elizabethan paper, for example, candidates generally paraphrased the source material but could have inferred that the sources revealed there were differing attitudes towards the Elizabethan theatre. On the Conflict paper, candidates could have commented upon the variety of tactics used by the English, or the harsh nature of the use of chevauchees.

- Q.2** The majority of candidates made an appropriate judgement in their answers, as opposed to simply paraphrasing the source material, **which meant they immediately accessed the mark scheme**. The question therefore proved accessible to most candidates across the four papers. There remains a tendency for candidates to make a judgement without supporting it with specific references to the source material, which is a key requirement of the question.

Candidates mostly addressed the authorship of the sources across the four options, which is key to understanding its 'strengths' or more probably, its 'weaknesses', as **the authorship will reflect a certain perspective**. Candidates also need to consider the prospective audience and contextualise the response by providing a counter-argument to what has been provided in the source. **Many candidates provided a good counter-view on the Elizabethan paper, demonstrating good knowledge of the reasons for poverty in Elizabethan times. Similarly, on the Conflict paper, many candidates dealt well with the attribution and showed good understanding of the broader reasons for the Peasants' Revolt.**

- Q.3** The ongoing improvement in the quality of responses provided for this question continued. Candidates are **generally continuing to focus** upon the issue of 'significance' and are therefore attempting to provide an explanation, **which accounts for the 8 marks awarded for AO2**, as opposed to simply providing a narrative. However, many candidates once again 'topped and tailed' their responses, with candidates referring to the significance of the issue at the start and end of the answer, as opposed to providing a consistent explanation. Answers of this kind will, in general, only be able to access low Band 2 for AO2, since they tend to be **descriptive in nature**.

Stronger candidates were able to fully contextualise their responses. **For example, on the Elizabethan paper, whilst the majority of candidates were knowledgeable about the Religious Settlement, the best responses were able to briefly contextualise their response by alluding to the religious turmoil that preceded its introduction.**

- Q.4** The majority of candidates were once again able to achieve Band 2 AO1 by demonstrating awareness of their chosen issues; however, many tended to simply describe these issues discretely rather than linking them. This was particularly the case on the Conflict paper. Good quality responses were ones where candidates regularly used terminology such as ‘connected to’, ‘linked to’ or ‘led to’, thereby accessing the higher Bands for AO2.

The majority of candidates on the Elizabethan paper, for example, were able to make connections between the chosen issues. **It should be noted that candidates do not necessarily have to write in depth for this question and some very good answers were elicited that were to the point, since the candidates focused specifically on use of the terminology referred to above, as a means of accessing AO2 on the mark scheme.**

- Q.5** The majority of candidates were able to achieve at least Band 2 for both AOs by demonstrating understanding of the key feature for AO1 and by referring in general terms to the authorship for AO4. It was again pleasing to see candidates attempt to provide a two-sided response, which is a key requirement of this question. However, as noted in previous reports, candidates often make mechanical and irrelevant comments about authorship. Some candidates continue to use terms such as the ‘benefit of hindsight’, which demonstrates a limited understanding of how and why historical interpretations are formed and is not relevant to the question. Candidates need to address the authorship, the title and date of the publication, its medium and more importantly, the prospective audience.

There were also many references to the interpretation being ‘peer-reviewed’ and ‘proof-read’ and so on, which is do not directly relate to the issue of how and why the interpretation was formed. Additionally, some candidates questioned the interpretation based on it being written ‘many years after the event’ or ‘published on a website,’ which are not relevant considerations for this question.

There remains a tendency to over-focus on whether the author is an experienced historian, which is not central to how and why the interpretation was formed. Centres are reminded that the interpretation provided will not necessarily be one provided by an historian. This will continue to be the guiding principle for this question.

It **is also** evident that an increasing number of candidates refer to the views of ‘economic’, ‘social’ or ‘military’ historians. However, such references are most effective when supported with relevant contextual support; without this, responses can become mechanical and fail to engage meaningfully with the nature of historical interpretations.

HISTORY

GCSE

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 1 STUDIES IN DEPTH – NON-BRITISH STUDIES IN DEPTH OPTIONS C100E-H

Overview of the Component

- This part of the component assesses AO1, AO3 and AO4
- The component focuses upon substantial and coherent short time scales; assessment is based on the use of a wide range of historical sources and differing historical interpretations.
- The papers for the Non-British Studies in Depth performed at a comparable level to previous series.
- Many excellent responses were again evidenced, however, Questions 3 and 5 continue to require development in terms of the candidates explaining how and why historical interpretations are formed. This is particularly the case for Question 3.
- Candidates should avoid using rote-learned or irrelevant comments, such as 'peer-reviewed', 'benefit of hindsight' and instead focus specifically upon the authorship, the publication, its medium and audience.
- As with the British Studies in Depth, the majority of candidates completed the questions in the time provided. The advice given relating to candidates failing to attempt questions remains the same, particularly since the preponderance of marks on these papers are for the skills elements of the assessment objectives.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** This question was generally accessible to the vast majority of candidates across the four papers. However, it is once again to be stated that simply copying or paraphrasing the information provided with comments such 'Source A says/shows' will not enable candidates to achieve two marks for AO3. For the second mark, candidates need to make an inference from the material. **For example, on the Germany paper, candidates could have inferred that the Nazis were using the reputation and respectability of Hindenburg as a way of furthering Hitler's electoral appeal.**

Candidates' responses across the four papers were rather mixed. On the Voyages of Discovery paper, **candidates tended to narrowly focus on the issue of sacrifice when describing features of Aztec civilisation. On the USA paper, many responses developed little further than referring to lynching as an activity of the KKK. Overall, however, performance on the Germany and USA papers was solid.**

- Q.2** Candidate performance in this question continues to **improve, in terms of candidates addressing the issue of purpose.** The majority were able to achieve at least Band 2 for AO3 by providing a judgement as to the purpose of the source. Once again, stronger candidates were able to access Band 3 by providing a good discussion of the authorship of the source and the very best ones, its prospective audience, which is the key to answering this question effectively.

However, as noted in previous reports, candidates should be reminded that half the overall marks are awarded for AO1 and therefore they need to provide knowledge and understanding of the issue beyond what is provided in the source material. For example, on the **USA** paper, many candidates provided excellent support by **demonstrating good understanding of the Red Scare and were therefore able to effectively contextualise their response.** On the **Germany** paper, there was an over-focus upon the 3Ks and the Nazis' attitude towards women, as opposed to focusing on the key feature, which was the Hitler Youth.

- Q.3** Of all the questions across the entire Component, this question remains one of the least well addressed, with average marks typically ranging between 3 and 4 out of 10. Issues highlighted in previous reports continue to be relevant. While many candidates are able to make appropriate judgements, they also **need to develop the AO1** aspect of the question by providing understanding of the key feature, that goes beyond what they have already been provided with in the two interpretations.

Candidates are also not addressing the issue of how and why interpretations are formed. Answers tend to be limited to merely stating which one supports the view, with token references to the authorship and why the author may have that view. This question should be **treated in a similar fashion to Question 5**, where candidates need to discuss the attribution in detail, considering the authorship, title and date of the interpretation, its medium and most pertinently, the audience. By doing this, they will support their judgement and be able to access the higher bands for AO4, which at present, not many do.

- Q.4** The majority of candidates accessed the question by demonstrating understanding of the source material and by providing a relative judgement as to which of the sources is more useful to an historian studying whatever the key feature is. Candidates need to provide AO1 beyond what they have been provided with in the source material. They should be encouraged to provide a brief overview of the key feature so that they can be rewarded for AO1. There were good examples provided on the **Germany paper, with good knowledge demonstrated regarding hyperinflation, but knowledge was variable on the other papers.**

In assessing the usefulness of the sources, candidates should be encouraged to consider the issue in terms of the content, authorship and audience. The sources will provide certain perspectives on the key feature, and these should be developed in candidates' discussion. In terms of providing a relative judgement, comments along the lines of 'Source...is more useful, because it provides more information', are not sufficiently developed enough to achieve Band 4 for AO3. Once again, it must be impressed upon candidates that utility and reliability are not the same thing, **so candidates who focus solely upon reliability are not accessing the mark scheme. Unfortunately, this continues to be widely evidenced and centres should be aware of this deficiency in candidates' responses.**

- Q.5** The majority of candidates achieved at least Band 2 for both AOs by demonstrating some understanding of the key feature for AO1 and by referring to the authorship for AO4. However, candidates generally did not fully engage with the authorship, medium and audience which limited their ability to access Bands 3 to 4 for AO4. Many responses included similar generalised comments to those seen in the British papers, with frequent references to terms such as 'benefit of hindsight' and 'peer-reviewed' as well as discussions regarding the reliability of websites that were not relevant to the question. It should be noted however, that there were some very good responses, both in terms of AO1 and AO4, where candidates displayed excellent subject knowledge and attempted to engage with the process of how and why the interpretation was formed. On the Germany paper, for example, many candidates pertinently commented that Lord Halifax may have been attempting to improve his own reputation and on the USA paper, candidates generally displayed good knowledge about the impact of film as well as other forms of entertainment.

As a general guide, candidates should agree with the interpretation, explaining what it says and back their response up with AO1. A counter-argument should then be provided, followed by a full discussion of how and why the author arrived at the interpretation and why other interpretations may differ, depending upon the predilections of the author, the focus of the interpretation, the medium and the prospective audience. Many candidates provided irrelevant comments on reliability, which is not the focus of the question. An interpretation may be highly unreliable, but the issue is how and why was it formed.

SPaG – Candidates generally achieved 2 out of 3.

HISTORY

GCSE

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 2 STUDIES IN BREADTH – PERIOD STUDIES C100U1-4

Overview of the Component

- This component assesses only AO1 and AO2.
- This component assesses substantial and coherent medium and long timescales.
- The focus of this component is on broad periods of history, therefore there is an emphasis on explaining changes and impact over time. Candidates are required to make judgements and to evaluate events/people/policies and to demonstrate an understanding of second order historical concepts in particular, including continuity, change, cause, consequence, significance and similarity and difference.
- Candidate performance in the Period study papers appears to be largely comparable to previous series.
- Candidates have shown good knowledge of the periods studied. They are often able to recall quite detailed facts and information, and some candidates are able to use this knowledge to support their judgements and construct coherent arguments.
- There were, as in previous years, some very sophisticated responses demonstrating an excellent knowledge of the examined content and the relevant exam techniques. Performance on the USSR paper was particularly notable in this regard.
- Candidates tend to struggle more with the AO2 element of this component, particularly explaining the importance or significance of events. Candidates will also occasionally describe or narrate when asked to explain.
- This paper relies on candidate knowledge and preparation, as there are no sources to support student recall. Where students did not have the required knowledge, they were often unable to answer, leading to a number of questions not attempted, especially on the larger entry papers, Germany and USA.
- The majority of candidates were able to access the paper well, and as a result there were many high-quality responses. Candidates who had prepared well for the exam were able to score highly on AO1 in particular however some candidates focused too strongly on providing specific details at the expense of developing their arguments, and whilst this meant they were able to access band 3 or 4 for AO1, they often failed to move past band 1 for AO2.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** This question examines AO1 and requires candidates to describe a key feature of the time period. Candidates are often confident with this question and in general scored quite highly, often reaching band 3. This was the case across all of the papers set. The best responses described a range of features and gave accurate, detailed responses written in full sentences. The best responses included some specific detail. There were very few who failed to attempt the question.
- Q.2** This question examines AO1 and AO2 and requires candidates to judge the extent of change. It should be remembered that there are only 2 marks available for AO1 on this question, so the majority of the response should focus on analysing the nature and extent of change within the context of the question. Responses that focus on describing the detail of the feature in the question rather than analysing the change rarely scored more than half marks. Candidates' responses to this question were sometimes disappointing in this series, many responses, particularly on the USA paper focused on a narrow view of the period and did not consider changes over the time period given in the question. Similarly on the Germany paper, candidates struggled to consider changes over time. Candidates often scored below half marks despite showing some knowledge of the key issue named in the question. In the UK paper in particular, candidates struggled with their knowledge of the welfare state in the 1920s and often strayed into discussions of later periods.
- Q.3** This question examines AO1 and AO2 and requires candidates to explain the significance of three factors and place them in order. Candidates again tended to write extensively on this question, and were often able to show good knowledge, providing pages of factual detail on the factors provided. However similarly to previous years this did not always result in high marks as candidates were often unable to explain why factors were significant and rarely considered that significance relative to the other factors. This limited many responses on AO2. It should be remembered that this component is a breadth study and therefore there is a greater focus on the broad strokes of history than on the specific forensic detail. In each of the Germany and USA papers, candidates often wrote more extensively about one or two factors rather than all three. In the Germany paper candidates lacked knowledge of the home front, and in the USA paper candidates generally knew much less about Republican attempts to deal with the depression.
- Q.4** This question examines AO1 and AO2 and requires candidates to explain a key issue. Many candidates performed well on this question and were often able to reach band 2 or higher. The most effective responses recalled a range of points about the key issue and explained each one in context. This was particularly evident on the USSR paper where candidates were often able to show detailed knowledge and understanding. Some candidates were unable to explain and instead listed events or recounted a narrative, in those cases, candidates were generally unable to access band 2 for AO2. This was particularly evident in the Germany paper where many candidates listed opposition to the Weimar Republic but failed to develop those responses into an explanation of why. On the USA paper, candidates sometimes made a point about containment but repeated it once or twice rather than also considering other reasons, this restricted their AO2 marks.

Q.5 This question examines AO1 and AO2 and requires candidates to evaluate the importance of a named issue within the appropriate historical context. This question continues to cause candidates some difficulty. Many candidates still attempt to give a two-sided response to the question along the lines of “X was important, but Y and Z were more important because”. In many cases they tend to follow the structure of some of the questions on the other component papers. This approach led many candidates to focus more on other things than the named factor in the question and therefore limited their performance. The most effective responses analysed the importance of the named factor and then evaluated specifically that factor against other factors. This did not involve lengthy paragraphs analysing and explaining the other factors and did not lead to judgements about the importance of other factors in comparison to the named factor. Instead, the best responses would compare the named factor to other factors and *evaluate the named factor in comparison to those*. (i.e., not evaluating the other factors, but using them as a comparative marker to make judgements about the named factor) The purpose of having the "other factors" phrase in the mark scheme, is that it's extremely hard to evaluate something in isolation. So really what the question is looking for is for the candidate to explain why the key issue was more or less important than other relevant factors.

A candidate might take the following approach:

- Explain what the named factor was.
- Analyse why it was important.
- Evaluate the importance of the named factor when it is compared to other factors.
- Make a judgment on "how important" the named factor was.

On the USA paper for example, some effective responses were able to discuss the importance of leaders like MLK and Malcolm X through a comparative lens of other factors, such as MLKs influence on the Civil Rights Act, in comparison to legal changes brought about by challenges in education. Or the publicity raised by the March on Washington in comparison to the publicity raised by events such as the Sit-ins.

HISTORY

GCSE

Summer 2025

COMPONENT 2 STUDIES IN BREADTH – THEMATIC STUDIES 3100U5-8

Overview of the Component

This component assesses AO1, AO2, AO3 over broad periods of history, therefore there is an emphasis on explaining changes and impact over time. There is a need for candidates to examine the relationship between a key historic site and historical events and developments.

- There continues to be an impressive level of detailed knowledge in responses to the questions about the historic environments across all the options.
- Over the last few series, there has been a steady improvement in the use of contextual knowledge in answer to Question 2 as well as supporting detail in Question 4.
- In Question 1 candidates need to avoid just describing the sources, making the similarities and differences they identify clearer.
- Responses to Questions 4 and 5 can sometimes deviate from the period of time set in the question, although there are fewer instances when candidates are focusing on the wrong topic in their responses
- Question 5 responses could benefit from making change and continuity between eras clearer.
- As has been identified in previous series, responses to Question 6b need to be more emphasis on explain the significance of change than describing it.

Comments on individual questions/sections

- Q.1** Candidates must consider one similarity and one difference between the three sources provided. Many responses to this question score highly, but there are still a significant number that just describe what is in each source, without linking them to a similarity or difference. As it is the similarity and difference (AO2) that is the focus of this question, descriptions alone cannot be credited. Observations “in all of the sources” tend to be too general or inaccurate to credit as well, for example in Option E (Crime and Punishment) when candidates said all of the sources showed people stealing money were not accurate as Source A showed a beggar not a thief. The most successful responses to this question make the similarity and difference they are describing clear. They also link them to named sources.
- Q.2** Candidates must analyse and evaluate the content and authorship of two sources from different eras and make a judgement about their relative reliability. The trend continues to be that comments on authorship are seen more than paraphrases of the content of the sources. Contextual knowledge is increasing in its use to support points, like those candidates who were able to elaborate on the background of Edwin Chadwick in Option F (Health and Medicine), or linked Source E in Option E (Crime and Punishment) to the founding of the Metropolitan Police. However, most AO1 marks awarded are for 1 mark for some knowledge rather than 2 marks for detailed knowledge. Utility and reliability continue to be confused, with a significant number of responses focusing on use to a historian rather than relative reliability as in the question set. The most effective responses to this question base their judgement on issues of reliability around the authorship of the sources. These responses will be supported by specific references to knowledge that illustrates points made in the context of the sources, or relating to their authorship.
- Q.3** This question requires several historical details about a feature of a particular historical era. Impressive levels of knowledge on display in answer to this question across all of the options. Many points were backed up with specific and accurate knowledge and there were much fewer instances of the wrong topic or period in responses.
- Q.4** Candidates need to give a reasoned explanation of a specific issue set in an historical context, supported by specific factual knowledge. For many candidates now this has become a much higher scoring question. In particular, there increasing numbers of responses that include specific details to get both of the AO1 marks. There was also a noticeable trend away from description, more towards explanation. While the vast majority of responses across all options were in the correct part of the specification, there were a considerable minority that focused on the wrong period of time. In Option E, for some the Metropolitan Police were founded in the twentieth century, while in Option F Ambroise Paré was improving surgery in the nineteenth century. Where candidates write several focused explanations supported by contextual knowledge they score well on this question.

- Q.5** The question requires candidates to provide a structured narrative about an issue of change across all three historical eras. There were impressive levels of knowledge of the earlier periods of time, whether it was leper, royal or endowed hospitals in Option F or the role of women in medieval warfare in Option G. There was also a continuation of the trend of sticking to the focus in the question set. Degrees of period coverage varied between options and in particular the distinctions between medieval and early modern once again caused candidates issues in every option. In most options, a noticeable amount of the material for the modern era was taken from the nineteenth century and little was said about the twentieth or twenty first centuries. The best responses are still those that focus on the question throughout, give roughly equal time to each of the historical eras and support points with specific contextual knowledge, highlighting aspects of both continuity and change.
- Q.6 (a)** This question requires students to use their knowledge to describe two features of the historic environment. The level of relevant detail in these responses overall is very impressive. The trend of moving away from listing features to more developed descriptions has also continued across all options in their series. Responses need to be focused on the question set. For example, in Entertainment and Leisure there were a number of candidates for whom some of their answer was about the nineteenth century when the question was asking about the twentieth century. Candidates who do the best on this question support their responses with specific detail from the historic environment.
- (b)** This question requires students to make and explain a judgement about the significance of the historic environment. As observed in previous series, although a lot of specific detail is used in responses to this question across all of the options, these tend to be in the form of descriptions of events that happened rather than explanations of the significance of the historic site. There are also sometimes long preambles, for example in Option F where more than half of a number of responses was given over to describing the problems for people living in Ancoats, while the solutions, which were the focus of the question, are tagged on briefly at the end. The best responses to these questions identify and explain the significance of a number of changes across a wide period of time and support the points made with specific contextual knowledge.

Supporting you

Useful contacts and links

Our friendly subject team is on hand to support you between 8.30am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday.

Tel: 02922404278

Email: GCSEHistory@edugas.co.uk

Qualification webpage: [GCSE History | Eduqas](#)

See other useful contacts here: [Useful Contacts | Eduqas](#)

CPD Training / Professional Learning

Access our popular, free online CPD/PL courses to receive exam feedback and put questions to our subject team, and attend one of our face-to-face events, focused on enhancing teaching and learning, providing practical classroom ideas and developing understanding of marking and assessment.

Please find details for all our courses here: <https://www.edugas.co.uk/home/professional-learning/>

Regional Rep Team

Our regional team covers all areas of England and can provide face-to-face and online advice at a time which is convenient to you.

Get in contact today and discover how our team can support you and your students.

[Regional Support Team | Eduqas](#)

Eduqas Qualifications

We are one of the largest providers of qualifications for schools, academies, sixth form and further education colleges across England, offering valued qualifications to suit a range of abilities. Each and every one of our qualifications is carefully designed to engage students and to equip them for the next stage of their lives.

We support our education communities by providing trusted qualifications and specialist support, to allow our students the opportunity to reach their full potential.



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