

## Issues of breadth and depth in Unit 1

Several centres have asked for further clarification on matters concerning breadth and depth of material required for Unit 1. This document tries to address these concerns.

### 1. A reminder from the specification

Students undertake studies exploring aspects of the past in breadth through periods or themes

The unit addresses breadth of study, requiring students to address two linked themes with a range of perspectives, for example social, religious, political and cultural

### 2. Breadth of study

Breadth of study can be achieved in two ways:

- Chronological breadth across the period studied
- Considering a range of factors which influenced a particular situation or outcome.

The chronological range of Unit 1 papers ranges from 23 years for D6: the USA in Asia to 107 years for A1: Alfred the Great and the Vikings. Thus breadth is achieved through *chronological range of the two Unit 1 papers taken together*, but also through *considering a range of different factors which influenced situations or outcomes*.

For example, the question for January 2009, B1, Question 1 was:

*How far was support from the Princes responsible for the spread of Lutheranism within Germany in the years 1517-55?*

The question focuses on the third bullet point, and has a chronological range of 38 years. It invites candidates to consider the given factor and other relevant factors contributing to the spread of Lutheranism over these years. These might include:

- Luther's message and its power
- The printing press
- The role of the towns and the trade routes
- The distractions faced by Charles V.

Questions such as these allow candidates to consider a range of factors operating over time.

January 2009, E6/F6, Question 1:

*How far do you agree that terrorism in Palestine in the years 1945-48 was the most important factor in the creation of an independent state of Israel?*

The question focuses on the first bullet point, and, unlike the previous example, has a chronological range of just four years. It invites candidates to consider the given factor and other relevant factors contributing to the creation of Israel, which might include:

- Jewish migration
- The role of Britain and the end of the mandate
- The role of the UN
- Arab and Zionist groups

Although the chronological range is much smaller than in the previous example, the same process is at work. The stem 'how far' is inviting candidates to consider a range of relevant factors which led to the outcome of an independent state of Israel.

January 2009, D3, Question 6:

*How far was the Provisional Government responsible for its own downfall?*

This question has a very limited chronological range of just eight months. However, it does cover the whole of the third bullet point in the specification and, once again, asks candidates to consider a range of relevant factors.

### **3. How many factors are required in an answer?**

It is, of course, impossible to be prescriptive about this. However, operational experience in January 2009 suggested that many candidates can, in the time allowed, deal effectively with the given factor in the question and three further factors to produce a successful answer.

### **4. Progression through the five levels of attainment**

The following scripts are intended to highlight the sort of response which might appear at the different levels of attainment, and to illustrate matters of breadth and depth.

Script 1  
B4 - The European Witchcraze, c1580-c1650  
Question 8

Why Did The Persecution Of Witches Vary In Intensity From One Region To Another?

Attainment: Level 1

During the witchcraze the persecution of witches varied from one region to another. This is because of many different factors that influenced the regions in question.

The first believed reason for variations in intensity of witchcraft persecution was religion and how the population saw witchcraft. Although members of Christian and protestant churches put fear of witches out it was mainly catholics that were fired up.

The superstition of the religious rulers played a key part in the variation of intensity. Many religious rulers found out it was important to persecute people.

Urban and rural factors are also important in the variation of intensity. Witchcraft was very common among the rural villages but not in towns.

*No significant point is made here.*

*Simple statement on religion.*

*Simple statement on (unnamed) rulers of states.*

*Simple statement on rural and urban factors.*

*This is an example of the sort of answer which is placed in the 1-6 mark range, ie simple limited factual information: a few statements on the question. Any answer which has some development is more suited to the 7-12 mark range.*

*This answer was awarded mid-Level 1: 4 marks.*

## Script 2

D4 - Stalin's Russia, 1924-53

### Question 7

How far were economic failures responsible for Stalin's decision to replace the New Economic Policy in 1928 with the first Five-Year Plan?

Attainment: Level 2

In 1928 Stalin came into power, after the death of Lenin, and the economy was following the NEP (New Economic Policy). The NEP was not a very successful policy and therefore had to be replaced, by a new policy that would change the country's economy.

The NEP's aim was to build up the country's economy, in the shortest amount of time possible so that Russia could compete with the West, e.g. in the industry standard of living etc. The NEP did little for the economy, and especially for the country as it was having so many different difficulties e.g. financial problems.

The aim of the five year plans, it was to bring the economy to that of which the west was. Stalin's said that they had to do in five years what the west did in 100. The aim was to bring back up the economy which Lenin's NEP failed to do during his time as leader of Russia.

The New Economic Policy was not as successful a policy as they had hoped for so this gave Stalin the power and excuse to change the policy and go along with his own policy, of the Five-Year Plans which in the end were very successful. The NEP did not do what it was supposed to and that was build up the economy. So it gave Stalin a reason to change them as they were not successful in doing what they were supposed to so. It gave and played a key part in being able to bring the Five-Year plans in.

The NEP was a policy that had a successful start, but it was not

*Simple suggestion that NEP was not working and would have to be replaced.*

*Aim of the NEP is suggested here, though the candidate appears to be confusing this aim with that of the Five Year Plans. There is no indication of why NEP was failing.*

*Simple statement on one of Stalin's motives for introducing the Five Year Plans.*

*This is a repetitive paragraph, both within itself and within the overall answer. There is no effective development of material.*

*Some hints that NEP had been successful in part, but not supported in any way.*

increasing the economy enough, it did not resolve any of the problems in Russia e.g. unemployment, the industry and agriculture, how much was being produced, where it was not enough to build up the economy. This supported Stalin enough so that he could bring in the five year plans and boost the economy.

The problem with the NEP were, quite a big influence on Stalin to bring the five year plans, and try and build back up the economy as fast as possible so that Russia could compete with the west and show that communism is capable of having a strong economy and competing with the west and this was down to the NEP failing and giving Stalin the power to bring in his own policy, that would be a lot stronger and also bring back Russia's economy.

*Once again, mentions the failures of NEP.*

*This is an example of an answer which gets beyond Level 1 but is not within striking distance of Level 3. The generic level descriptor for Level 2 fits this response: Simple statements supported by some mostly accurate and relevant factual material. Only limited links between the statements. Material is not developed very far. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing are likely to be present.*

*This answer was given a mark of mid-Level 2: 9 marks.*

### SCRIPT 3

#### D3: Russia in Revolution, 1881-1924: From Autocracy to Dictatorship.

How far were divisions among its opponents responsible for the survival of Tsarist rule in the years 1881-1905?

Attainment level: 3

The divisions among the opponents of Tsarist rule were slightly responsible for the survival of Tsarist rule in 1881-1905. This is so due to the obedience of the imperial army and the alliance with the church during these years. The divisions among the opponents was a small contributing factor due to the size of the opposition and their reluctance to act at this time.

Firstly, during these years two out of the three columns of support for the tsar, the obedience of the Imperial army and the Alliance with the church remained solid and true to the tsar, however small fractures began appearing within the peoples of Russia. This was due to factors such as rapid industrialisation causing harsh working/ living conditions for the people, starvation was also a pressing issue. The new growing proletariat within the cities meant a growing base of discontent within the people and therefore culminating in the 1905 revolution. This, however, was subdued by the presence and obedience of the army.

Opposing groups at the time had to work underground, the Bolsheviks, Mensheviks etc. These both relatively small parties at the time did not have the immense backing as in 1917 revolution so had no means of overthrowing the Tsarist regime. As the Mensheviks believed in the Marxist views of revolution occurring as a natural process and would only work after a certain chain of events, felt it was not time by 1905 to push for a revolution, Trotsky would not as a key Menshevik assist the Bolshevik attempt at overthrowing the tsar. This therefore aided the survival of

*The opening paragraph is attempting an analytical approach, suggesting that divisions among revolutionary groups were not as important as the support given to Tsarism by the army and the Church.*

*Mentions the support of army and church, but without much development. However, links the army to the suppression of the workers during the 1905 revolution. Some causes of the revolution are suggested.*

*Considers the opposition to Tsarism, but sees it only in terms of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. Some understanding of the divisions between these two groups, but by no means extensive.*

Tsarist Regime however was only an attributing aspect.

The country between 1881-1905 was in great economic turmoil of mass discontent within its peoples meant a diversion tactic from current affairs was needed. This came in the form of the Russo-Japanese war 1903. This was an attempt for land expansion and ports which would not ice over during winter, therefore year round trade could be established. However due to the failing on Russia's behalf in this war, it only created humiliation within the country.

Overall, divisions among its opponents was a small factor in the survival of the Tsarist Regime 1881-1905. The continued obedience of the Imperial Army to put down the 1905 revolution, in which hundreds of discontent prolaterians stormed The Winter Palace due to the increasingly inhumane living conditions. Diversion tactics were used also to keep the survival of the Regime, even for a small period aided it. The fact that the opponents themselves were divided in their decision to attack the regime made little difference as the Tsar's two most important collumns of support remained strong and true to him.

*The significance of the Russo-Japanese war is not entirely clear, though the candidate does suggest that a 'short, victorious war' would rally its opponents to the Tsarist system.*

*A factual error here on the storming of the Winter Palace, wrongly attributed to the 1905 Revolution. However, the answer concludes as it started, by downplaying the role of opposition groups while mentioning the essential resilience of Tsarism itself.*

*The answer is clearly better than the Stalin answer. It is focused on the question and considers two relevant factors: Tsarist strengths and the weaknesses of its opponents.*

*The Level 3 descriptor indicates that*

- *candidates will attempt analysis (done)*
- *factual material will be accurate but may lack depth (correct)*
- *writing is coherent but some passages lack clarity (correct)*

*Thus a high level 3 response, at 17-18. Taken to 18 for quality of written communication.*

SCRIPT 4

D7: Politics, Presidency and Society in the USA, 1968-2001

Why was the Republican Party so successful in Presidential elections in the years 1968-88?

Attainment: Level 4

Throughout the years 1968-88 the Republican Presidents dominated the White House with four out of five terms being served by a Republican President in this period. This is because of several main factors: good campaigning; Cold War context; Democrat weaknesses and record.

Nixon used strategies of focus in order to win the 1968 presidential election. His Southern Strategy focused on 'the silent majority'. This is in the context of the Vietnam War, when students would protest over issues of drafts and the violence and war occurring. Nixon believed that 'the silent majority' was middle America who were deprived of a 'voice' and who were tired of these 'campus bums', and he would therefore focus on the 'sun belt' states in the south, who were traditionally republican, as this was able to support him with the majority of votes, in theory.

Nixon was also seen as a conservative Republican to end the era of permissiveness through law and order. Conservative Republicans and middle America favoured this, as it was felt that law and order needed to be restored in the community. Nixon showed this well in his campaign by contrasting his peaceful Republican Convention to the Democratic Convention in Chicago, where riots broke out, suggesting there was a lack of order.

The failures of the Democratic Party also helped Nixon to win the 1968 election as Bobby Kennedy's challenge to the incumbent President

*Focused opening paragraph which mentions three factors which are likely to be discussed in the body of the answer.*

*Nixon's strategies in 1968 are described in this paragraph. Good development, but links to the question are not being strongly made.*

*Again, Nixon's conservatism is well developed, though not in a very analytical way.*

*A better focus and analysis here, explaining the link between Kennedy and Nixon's success.*



Johnson caused divisions within the party, which were exacerbated by Kennedy's assassination and the withdrawal of Johnson.

Cold war context is also important as to why Nixon won the 1968 election, as his 'peace with honour' suggested he had a solution to the Vietnam War, and republicans were traditionally cold war warriors, in contrast to the Democrats who were 'soft on communism'. With the Vietnam War growing increasingly unpopular and the domino theory present in the minds of Americans, the silent majority wanted a success and didn't want another achievement for Communism, thus adding to the Republican's victory.

The Republicans also succeeded in the 1972 election due to Nixon's good campaigning skills. CREEP agents were used to aid Nixon's re-election, and would go to Democratic Conventions such as with Wallace supporters, and handed out cards saying 'If you liked Hitler, then you'll love Wallace', on the back it said 'Vote Muskie'. The CREEP agents eliminated stronger democratic candidates so that Nixon had the weaker competition of McGovern. CREEP agents spread rumours that Muskie's wife, a catholic, had had an abortion.

McGovern's poor campaign and running mate choice also led to the Republican success of the 1972 election. McGovern asked several people as running mate who declined, until he teamed up with Eagleton. However it was rumoured that Eagleton was a manic depressive who received electric shock therapy, which made the American people question whether they'd want Eagleton to be a heartbeat away from the presidency. McGovern backed Eagleton and publicly said 'I back Eagleton by 1000%'. A few days later

*The answer is now sharpening its explanatory focus, showing the importance of Cold War concerns and the electorate's fear of the spread of Communism.*

*Reasons for Republican success in 1972 are highlighted here, through the role of CREEP*

*There is an implied comparison here between Nixon's assured 1972 campaign and the falling apart of the Democratic campaign, focused on the Eagleton issue.*

he dropped Eagleton as his running mate and asked Shriver to be his running mate instead, which made McGovern look indecisive and weak, therefore adding to Nixon success. In addition to this McGovern's campaign funds were only \$38million in contrast to Nixon's \$60million.

Nixon's economic policies of wage and prices freeze also helped to boost the economy for the 1972 presidential election, so was permanently in the minds of voters, helping to secure Republican success.

Although the Republicans didn't have a success in the 1976 election, they did in the 1980 election. This was for several reasons. Carter (the Democrat opposition) was the incumbent president, and his main focus was on decreasing the dependency of America on foreign oil, which he was successful in reducing from 48% to 40%. However, the plan was too complex for the public to understand. All they understood of his policy was that inflation and tax prices were increasing and so didn't favour particularly well to the Democratic nominee, thus helping support the Republican nominee, Reagan. Carter's policy also made Americans question 'Can Carter Cope?', while 40% of people who voted for Reagan felt there was a need for change.

Reagan was known as 'the great communicator' and was well known across America as a film celebrity, so also had a good public image. The American people were familiar with him. He also had a purpose and had his aims clearly drawn out in front of him, whereas Carter didn't seem to have any policy other than the issue of oil, and Reagan had ideas and solutions to the economic problems.

The Religious Right was also an important factor in the Republican success as they approved of Reagan,

*This point is not very strongly made, but it is relevant and linked to Republican success.*

*For 1980, the candidate is targeting Carter's real and perceived weaknesses, linked to Republican success in 1980.*

*Reagan's sunny personality is contrasted well with Carter's.*

*The significance of the rising power of the Religious Right is a point which is well made here.*

and 70% of those who wouldn't normally vote, voted for Reagan. The Religious Right was also an important political influence who would work for you or against you, and in this case worked in favour of Reagan and the Republican Party and their views on traditional family than Carter.

As a conclusion, there were many important factors as to why the Republican party was so successful in election years 1968-88. Perhaps the most important reason was strategy, as this allowed Nixon to have an effective campaign for two elections, and provided Reagan with direction. However, Democrat party weaknesses were also very important due to divisions in the 1968 election, disorganization in 1972 election and the President seen to be incompetent in the 1980 election. Therefore these two reasons coupled together are the most important reasons for why the Republicans were so successful in the election years 1968 to 88.

*The conclusion suggests that electoral strategies, coupled with the manifest weaknesses of the Democrats, both in party organisation and in their choice of candidates, are prominent factors in explaining the Republican dominance in these years.*

*The answer displays a wide range of accurate and well-deployed material.*

*It is focused on the question.*

*It follows the outline set in the opening paragraph.*

*The quality of communication is high.*

*Some delegates might be persuaded to place this answer into Level 5. However, it is in fact High Level 4, 24 marks.*

*The answer shows a good understanding of key issues, and is well directed. However, there is some lack of balance in places, notably in the opening two or three paragraphs, which are driven by information. Also the answer lacks balance overall. It focuses on Nixon's two elections very strongly, and thus misses out the elections of 1984 and 1988. For these reasons, the answer cannot reach Level 5.*

## SCRIPT 5

How far do you agree that economic development in West Germany was significantly greater than in East Germany in the years 1949-91?

*There is no need to provide a commentary for this script. It is an example of a candidate thinking about the question and framing an outstanding answer, which is awarded the top of Level 5, 30 marks.*

Following Germany's defeat in the Second World War the country became split into two – a West German State, the FRG controlled by western allies, and an East German State, the GDR controlled by the USSR. Due to the allies in control of them, the states developed in completely contrasting ways, but the FRG seemed attractive amongst its boom of consumer goods and increase in living standards, to the members of the GDR, however it is arguable that the economic development in West Germany 1949-91 was not necessarily greater than in East Germany.

In the post war period of the 1950s, in the FRG, an economic miracle was experienced, and all details of this period in the economy suggest an unbeatably strong economy. Firstly, in 1949-55, the average real wages increased by 80 %, and in 1950-70, the average income increased by 400%, suggesting their extremely strong living standards, and explaining the increase in public expenditure on consumer goods. Workers were undoubtedly happy and working harder to maintain the prosperity as production growth rate in the 1950s was 25%, and was 250 % of that by the 1960s. Unemployment was reduced to 1.2% mid 1960, and by the end of the 1980s there was a labour shortage. This affluence seemed unrivalled by the dull, unvaried and monotonous economy of the GDR in 1949-91.

The focus seemed to be, as in the USSR, on quantity of production rather than quality, and furthermore, the economy was geared towards heavy industry rather than consumer goods as in the FRG. Living standards and wages of workers were not made as much a priority as production, and this resulted in a declining wages in 1950 for GDR workers. These factors, combined with the lack of colour and variety in industry as could be seen in the economy of the FRG led to much discontent of workers in the GDR, though this was not displayed initially due to fear of the oppressive communist regime. The levels of migration from the east to the west state in 1949-91 strongly suggest that the economic development was greater in the West German State as those experiencing the GDR economy were greatly dissatisfied yet drawn to the economy of the FRG. This was displayed in the strikes and revolts of 1953 and 1989. In desperation to escape from the never-growing economy of the GDR, in 1989 the border with the GDR and Hungary was dismantled to allow escape to the West.

However it must be acknowledged that the economic development of the GDR had some strengths. The East German economy grew 12% in 1957-58. Firstly, in the 1980s it had become the 12<sup>th</sup> most important trading nation in the world, and developed in the period 1949-91 to become the largest and richest economy within the eastern bloc of the USSR's satellite, COMECON states. It is also important to consider the production rates in heavy industry were always high, and to consider that in the late 1950s full employment was achieved. The workers in the GDR were

kept satisfied enough to allow the GDR a level of stability and contentment amongst the society, however, the economic development and development in technology lagged far behind the west.

It is clear that the West German State enjoyed the affluence and the economic growth for the other western countries achieved. By the 1980s, the FRG was the third largest economy in the world, and because of this, any success for economic growth in the GDR paled into insignificance next to such a successful recovery and development. This is proven by the levels of discontent and migration to the west by members of the GDR. However it is crucial to acknowledge the economic developments of the GDR as successful when its weakening factors are considered, such as the fact that 25% of goods were taken as reparations from the GDR in the period 1949-91 by the USSR. The economic development was stunted by the GDR's cut off from western economy by the Brezhnev doctrine, and by the communist regime in enforcing collectivisation. For this reason, although both economies recovered and grew to greatest possible levels, the economic development in West Germany was significantly greater than in East Germany in 1949-91.