GCSE

History A

General Certificate of Secondary Education   **GCSE 1935**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)   **GCSE 1035**

Report on the Components

June 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 870 6622
Facsimile: 0870 870 6621
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
History A (1935)**

**General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)
History A (1035)**

REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS

1035/01 Short Course

NB The general comments, the comments on the source-based questions common to the long and short courses, and the comments on the essay questions on Medicine and Crime and Punishment for 1935 all also apply to 1035 (the short course). Below are comments on the source-based questions that appear only in the short-course paper.

Medicine Through Time

Q1(a) This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates knew little about the Aborigines and had to rely on what source told them. However, there were a reasonable number of better candidates who used their knowledge to explain that benefits to public health may have been unintentional because the Aborigines had other (such as religious) reasons for carrying out the practices described.

Q1(d) Many candidates were able to interpret Source F in a valid way and this led to some interesting comparisons with Source E. The best candidates were aware that Source E can be read in two different ways while the cartoon can either be taken as evidence that conditions were appalling or as evidence of the fact that the dangers were understood at the time. Such sophistication was not expected for marks in the middle range and many good candidates scored at least reasonable marks.

Q1(f) Most candidates have been well prepared for this question and knew exactly what to do. For some the marks for this question led to a dramatic improvement in their overall mark. However, as reported in last year's report, there is still a significant minority of candidates who appear to be taken by surprise by this question. They either ignored the sources or failed to target their answers on the statement about people understanding the importance of public health.

Crime and Punishment Through Time

Q1(d) Most candidates took Source E at face value and explained why they thought the punishments mentioned for cutting a twig were harsh. Some candidates did attempt to answer the question by commenting on the reliability of the source. The weaker candidates either simply dismissed it because it was from a novel, or accepted it because it was written by a magistrate, while the better candidates used their knowledge of crime and punishment in the eighteenth century to evaluate the content of the source properly. These candidates used their knowledge of the Bloody Code to good purpose

Q1(e) The weaker candidates thought that the pamphlet had been published as a warning to criminals, but most understood that it was trying to draw attention to the appalling conditions in prisons with the aim of improving them. Better candidates developed their answers by referring to their knowledge of prisons or prison reformers at the time.

Q1(f) This question was generally well answered with most candidates aware of what is required. However, as reported in the section of this Report on Medicine 1(f), a minority of candidates had not been prepared for this type of question. They ignored the sources and simply wrote about cruelty in general.

1935/11-15 and 1035/01 – Schools History Project

General Comments

The performance of this year's candidates was very similar to that of last year's candidates. Most candidates had obviously worked hard during the two years of the course and had made progress in developing their historical knowledge, understanding and skills. There were a number of outstanding scripts, but even more pleasing was the fact that even the weakest candidates appeared to have enjoyed the course of study, and to have benefited from it.

It was encouraging to see the number of candidates entered for Elizabeth England and Britain, 1815-1851, remain stable. The American West remains by far the most popular of the Depth Studies, while Medicine remains far more popular than Crime and Punishment.

There were fewer rubric errors than in previous years and nearly all candidates had time to complete the paper - even those that wrote at great length. The choice made by candidates between the various optional questions was more even than in past years and no optional question stood out as being easier or harder than other questions.

Last year's report concentrated in some detail on the failure of some candidates to answer the questions set. A tendency to simply write all that they knew about the topic was reported. It is pleasing to report that there was a clear improvement this year. Candidates were making more effort to focus their efforts on the specific requirements of questions. For example, in response to Medicine 1(c) they did not just write about factors such as the work of Snow, Chadwick and Pasteur, but in addition explained how this meant that they were, or were not, surprised by the building of sewers. However, despite this improvement, a failure to focus answers on what a question is asking remains the single most important reason why some candidates do not do as well as they should. Two examples of this will suffice: when asked about the reasons Vesalius was able to make discoveries in medicine, some candidates spent most of their time explaining how he managed to communicate his discoveries to others; when asked a straightforward question about how the Indians used the buffalo, some candidates decided to explain the impact the buffalo had on their lives by explaining about their nomadic habits.

It is important that candidates are given practice in thinking about what a question is specifically asking for. One useful practice is to give candidates a list of questions and a list of brief plans for these questions. Ask them to match up the correct questions with the correct plans. Another useful activity is to ask them to point out the strengths and weaknesses of plans for answers. Too much time can be spent in class writing out full answers to past examination questions when the time would be more profitably spent writing brief plans and encouraging discussion of the different plans produced.

It is important to emphasise this is not simply about training candidates to answer examination questions. The crucial point is to encourage them to develop their thinking skills and problem solving abilities. Examination questions are problems to be solved. If candidates have been encouraged to think, to solve problems and to be mentally agile, they will analyse the requirements of a question more effectively. They will also be better equipped to choose from their knowledge the relevant examples for a given question and deploy these examples in such a way that the requirements of the question are met. Too much time can be spent on covering content in detail. If candidates have not made progress in these other areas, they will not be able to rise to the challenges set by the question no matter how much knowledge they have.

It is possible to cover the content of the Development Studies in particular in too much detail. This can result in candidates not being able to see the wood for the trees. Past reports have identified the fact that some candidates do not have a clear overview of the content. This can

lead to weaknesses in chronological understanding and an inability to make connections. There is still evidence in candidates' answers that many would benefit from more work concentrating on overviews of, for example, the history of medicine. Previous reports to centres have made suggestions of ways in which this can be achieved. It is just as important that candidates have overviews of the Depth Studies. These need not be chronologically based but should make clear for candidates the main groups in, for example, the American West, differences and similarities between them, and their relationships with each other.

It is apparent to markers that many candidates perform very differently on the source-based questions compared to the structured essays. These differences are far more significant than differences in performance between Development Study and Depth Study questions. Some candidates would benefit if a weakness with either the source-based questions or the structured essays were identified at an early stage of the course and extra help given.

Some candidates struggling with the source-based questions often fail to recognise the main message of a cartoon. For example, it was common to see candidates avoid the main feature of medicine Source C (the burning of tar as a way of fighting cholera) and concentrate instead on the dog. Candidates would benefit from more practice in differentiating between the main feature or message of pictorial sources and the less significant features and messages. Cartoons often include a main message and subsidiary messages. Candidates need to be able to distinguish between these especially in questions asking about the message or purpose of a source.

Other source questions focus more on testing sources for reliability. For example, Sources C and D in the American West paper both gave impressions of what life was like on the Plains. While it is still important to recognise the overall impression given by such sources, it is also crucial to use relevant knowledge to check particular points a source is making. Many candidates do this in a very vague way without referring to specific points in the source or to specific and relevant contextual knowledge. The impression of a homestead given by Source D could be challenged by questioning details in the advertisement. These details need to be confirmed or questioned through reference to specific knowledge. It is, of course, just as legitimate to evaluate sources by referring to their provenance. However, evaluation should never rest purely on source type. Contextual knowledge needs to be used to raise questions about the possible purpose of a source.

Candidates who do less well in the structured essay questions often struggle with parts (b) and (c). Often plenty of relevant knowledge is demonstrated in answers to part (b) without the question being answered. Such answers lack explanations. For example, when asked why bloodletting was widely used in the Middle Ages, it is not enough to write down everything a candidate knows about the Theory of the Four Humours. A factor such as the support the medieval Church gave to Galen's teachings needs to be identified. An explanation then has to be provided of how this factor led to bloodletting being widely used.

Part (c) questions in the structured essays nearly always ask candidates to reach a judgement. Often even the better candidates fall at the last hurdle in answering these questions. They can explain, for example, why smugglers were a problem for the authorities and they can also explain why highwaymen were a problem. But they struggle when they come to their conclusion about who was the more serious problem. It is not enough to simply reassert the case for one group. A reason must be given and explanation for why one group was more of a problem than the other. In this case, the revenue lost to the government, or the complicity of whole communities (including people holding major positions of authority) in smuggling could be used as the starting point for arguing that smuggling was more of a problem. The resulting answer needs a reason and then a comparison of the consequences of the two crimes.

Topics that candidates knew and understood well included: Medicine - Roman public health, John Snow, Pasteur and germ theory, Edwin Chadwick, the Great Stink, Egyptian and Greek

medicine, the work of Vesalius, Pare and Harvey, opposition to smallpox vaccination; Crime and Punishment - trial by ordeal, smuggling, Peterloo, the suffragettes; Elizabethan England - Puritans, the Catholic threat, the Spanish Armada; Britain - the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, the electoral system; American West - reservations, the importance of the buffalo, Young's decision to go west and the organisation of the journey; Germany - the importance of the family, the unpopularity of Weimar, the Munich Putsch, the Hitler Youth; South Africa - the Pass Laws, reasons for supporting and for opposing apartheid.

Areas not known or understood so well included: Medicine - medicine in the Middle Ages, Pasteur and vaccination; Crime and Punishment - vagrancy, crime prevention in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; Elizabethan England - progresses, specific candidates for marriage with Elizabeth; Britain - railway mania and Hudson, poor law reform; American West - the role of the railways, women on the Plains, Young's work at Salt Lake; Germany - Kristallnacht, the two economic depressions; South Africa - de Klerk and the changes he introduced.

Comments on Specific Questions

Medicine Through Time

Q1(a) This question was generally answered well. Only a few candidates ignored the sources and instead wrote general accounts of public health. Most were able to compare what the two sources tell us about public health of the two periods and a good number used relevant knowledge to explain their answers. The best candidates, after comparing the details of the two sources, went on to explain that monasteries were far from typical of medieval public health whereas Roman public health facilities were more generally available. Knowledge of Roman public health was generally stronger than knowledge of medieval public health. Accounts of the latter often descended into general descriptions of muck, filth and squalor that could have been about almost any period. One worrying feature of a number of answers was the frequency with which aqueducts were described as carrying sewage out of the city.

Q1(b) Some candidates found it impossible to focus on the central feature of the source - the burning of tar. They instead concentrated on the dog, the open windows, the lamps and any other insignificant detail they could find. However, this question was generally well answered with many candidates explaining about belief in miasma or bad air. Some concentrated more on what they did not know at this time, for example, germ theory. While this is a reasonable approach and will score marks, it is worth noting that in questions such as this one it is always better to explain what they did believe rather than merely noting what they did not know.

Q1(c) It was good to see so many candidates making sure that they clearly expressed surprise or a lack of surprise. There were many excellent answers based on the work of John Snow or Edwin Chadwick. The latter has rarely figured in answers in past years but was a common part of answers this year. Pasteur, germ theory, and the Great Stink were also used by candidates to express no surprise. (It is worth noting that last year's report mentioned a general ignorance of these factors - an excellent example of centres reading and acting on the report.) Some candidates got as far as identifying one or more of these factors but failed to explain why they would lead one to not being surprised by the building of water pipes. A small minority concentrated more on the underground railway while others were worried by the proximity of the gas and water pipes. However, overall it was good to see so many candidates selecting relevant factors from their knowledge and deploying this knowledge to construct an effective answer to the question.

Q2 Part (a) was well answered. Many candidates knew about specialist doctors, learning about the body as a result of mummification, and the theory of blockages and the River Nile. A minority failed to read the question carefully and wrote down everything they could remember about Egyptian medicine. The pages they wrote about medical practices based on religious beliefs gained no marks. Others described the process of mummification in great detail but failed to relate it to progress in medicine. Part (b) was surprisingly badly answered. It was clear from the answers of the same candidates that they knew about the Four Humours but they failed to realise that such knowledge was relevant to this question. Many showed a worrying lack of understanding of bloodletting. Their answers included references to transfusions and to letting evil spirits out of the body. However, good candidates scored high marks with many explaining at least two valid reasons, for example, the Theory of the Four Humours, the revival of Galen's ideas, the support of the Church for Galen, and astrology. Answers to (c) often demonstrated much knowledge but too often answers got little further than description. To achieve high marks candidates needed to use such knowledge to explain why more progress was made in Greek times than in the Middle Ages. Good candidates produced some excellent explanations of why the Greeks progressed. Knowledge and understanding of the Middle Ages was less good with answers lacking specific reasons although many did explain about dissection being banned (this is not true for the whole of the Middle Ages but is allowed). As has already been noted in this report the fact that some medieval people could read and that they were not all stupid would come as a complete surprise to many candidates.

Q3 Many candidates wrote good answers to part (a) with knowledge of anatomy, human dissection, correcting Galen and the 'Fabric of the Human Body' all well known. In response to (b) some candidates spent much time writing about areas that failed to explain why Vesalius was able to make discoveries. As has already been mentioned, writing down everything one can remember about Vesalius will not gain high marks. There were, however, some excellent answers about the Renaissance and how it produced a climate in which Vesalius could prosper. Much knowledge was demonstrated in response to (c) but it was not always deployed effectively. Simply describing the work of Pare and/or Harvey will not gain good marks (a maximum of 4). To reach higher levels in the mark scheme candidates needed to explain the importance of their work in the history of medicine. The easiest way of doing this is to explain either how they improved on what had gone before, or how they made future developments possible. In the case of Pare it is important, for example, to explain how his methods were an improvement on the use of boiling oil, while good marks could be scored on Harvey by explaining how he improved on Galen's ideas about blood or how his work made future developments such as blood transfusions possible. Some candidates produced excellent answers by arguing that Pare's work brought about immediate practical improvements while Harvey had no immediate impact on treatment but is clearly more important in the long term.

Q4 Average and good candidates answered part (a) well. They knew and understood the story well, they could tell it accurately, and they scored five marks! However, weaker candidates' answers were very confused. Cows were injected, chickens were experimented on, while Pasteur, Koch and Fleming all played crucial roles. Part (b) was answered well. It was encouraging to see many candidates going beyond the usual examples of fear of turning into cows, and exploring other reasons for opposition. Resistance by inoculators and opposition to compulsory vaccination later in the century were both well explained. This shows a clear advance on answers to similar questions in previous years. However, similar progress in knowledge and understanding was noticeably lacking in many answers to (c). Past reports have noted a general ignorance of Pasteur's role on the development of vaccinations. Many candidates clearly believe that an individual can only be important for one thing and have Pasteur identified as the germ theory man. The better candidates did know about Pasteur's work with, for example, chicken cholera but surprisingly few were able to come up with a convincing reason why Jenner or Pasteur contributed more. They tended to simply repeat in their conclusions what they had already written instead of explicitly comparing their importance.

Crime and Punishment Through Time

Q1(a) This question produced a wide range of answers. The weakest candidates refused to believe that the sources were about trials and wrote answers based on the idea that the people shown were being punished. However, a majority of candidates were able to explain what was happening – trial by ordeal and trial by battle were both explained. The top level in the mark scheme was reserved for the surprisingly few candidates who were able to explain that in both trials God was being asked to reach a verdict.

Q1(b) Some candidates simply compared the surface features of the three sources while others concentrated on the role of the king in Source C. Better candidates, however, did realise the crucial difference between A/B and C – the former look to God for a verdict whereas in C evidence is considered and a rational decision is made.

Q1(c) Most candidates were able to compare the use of torture unfavourably with the methods used in Source C. An encouraging number of candidates used their contextual knowledge to question how representative Source D is. They based this line of argument on the fact that Guy Fawkes was suspected of treason - the most serious of crimes.

Q2 A few candidates failed to read (a) carefully and described how suspected witches were punished. However, most candidates were able to make at least a few valid points. The use of tests, visible symptoms such as the Devil's marks on the body, and social factors were covered. A number of candidates explained a foolproof way of identifying witches – throwing suspects off a cliff and those that flew back to safety were the guilty ones. Part (b) was not answered well. Too many of the answers were vague, general, and could have applied to almost any period. There were worryingly frequent references to the poor making streets look untidy. The topic of vagrancy clearly needs to be studied with a firmer contextual base. Features specific to the sixteenth century need to be emphasised more. Part (c) produced a wide range of answers. Weaker candidates seemed to be describing smugglers today and there were even some references to illegal immigrants. An uncertain grasp of highwaymen was demonstrated by the candidate who explained that, to avoid being caught, some highwaymen operated on abandoned roads. Generally, however, reasons for smuggling being a problem were well explained. Reasons covered included the involvement of local communities and worthies, the concept of a social crime, the isolation of many of the coasts, the understaffing of the revenue service, and the loss of income for the government. Highwaymen were written about with less confidence. Even the better candidates struggled when they attempted to compare the two; final judgements rested on little more than assertions.

Q3 Part (a) was answered well by a few centres but other candidates left examiners wondering why they had opted for this question. The best candidates mentioned factors such as watchmen, the Bow Street Runners, the hue and cry, and even the River Thames Police. A number of candidates took a slightly different tack and focused on deterrents such as the Bloody Code. This approach was allowed. However, many other candidates wrote general answers that could have applied to almost anywhere at any time. Answers to part (b) followed a similar pattern – a few well informed candidates, and a larger number who could not go beyond general claims that the crime rate was going up. Part (c) was answered rather better. A reasonable number of candidates were able to explain the growing effectiveness and popularity of the police force during the nineteenth century. Some benefited from recent practice on a past Paper 2 about the police in the nineteenth century. However, there was a significant minority of candidates who showed a weak chronological grasp and based their answers on topics such as DNA, flying squads and anti-terrorist operations.

Q4 There were many good, detailed answers to (a), while in (b) centres seemed to have responded to comments in past reports about the general level of total ignorance regarding the Rebecca Riots. Answers this year were much better with good knowledge of turnpikes demonstrated. However, other factors such as high rents for farmers, the poor law, English

landowners, and tithes were not known so well. There were some excellent answers to part (c) with both sides of the argument being carefully considered. Of all the part (c) questions in Crime Punishment this was the best answered with some telling points being made both in support of, and in criticism of, the suffragettes.

Elizabethan England

Q1(a) Most candidates wrote well on Source A. They recognised the portrait as The Armada Portrait and wrote in detail about the symbolism. Source B proved to be more of a struggle with many candidates appearing to think that Elizabeth was still alive at the time of the painting of the portrait. A few, however, were able to explain that Elizabeth was no longer there to control how she would be depicted.

Q1(b) A small minority of candidates clearly had no idea what a progress was, but even these candidates were able to use the information in Source C to gain some marks. Better candidates were able not only to explain the general political purpose of progresses, but they also set their answers in context by explaining why Elizabeth in particular needed to win the loyalty of her subjects.

Q1(c) Most candidates wrote long answers but a sizeable proportion of these failed to get beyond general points, for example, she did not want to upset people by marrying an English nobleman or a foreign or a Catholic prince. The top levels of the mark scheme were reserved for candidates who were able to set their answers in the particular context of the time, for example, by mentioning particular suitors and their disadvantages as far as Elizabeth was concerned.

Q2 This question was not quite as popular as Question 3 but was answered just as well. Part (a) produced many good answers with candidates showing a detailed knowledge of Puritan ideas. A small minority thought they were Catholics. Part (b) was the least well answered part of Question 2. It divided candidates into two clear groups. A number of candidates focused on Elizabeth's debts and suggested that this meant she had no money left to help the poor. However, there was a significant minority of candidates who scored full or nearly full marks by explaining the role of factors such as inflation, debasement of the coinage, collapse of the cloth trade, enclosures and the rising population. It was good to see these candidates explaining how these factors contributed to causing poverty, rather than just describing them. There were many good answers to (c) with candidates making meaningful and interesting comparisons between the threats posed by the two groups. Some candidates got carried away when writing about Catholics and wrote far too much but at least they were mostly assessing the threat they posed and not just writing everything they could remember. There were some well argued and fascinating answers claiming that vagrants were more of a danger. The very best candidates differentiated in their answers between different periods of Elizabeth's reign.

Q3 Part (a) was answered reasonably well by most candidates, although a few failed to read the question carefully and wrote about the problems fighting the Armada. Apart from a few general answers that displayed no contextual knowledge, part (b) produced many good answers. Most candidates knew the story of the Armada in detail and while a few merely told the story, most wrote analytical answers explaining the different reasons why the Armada failed. Part (c) produced a good number of interesting answers. The best candidates argued that the two were connected, for example, the sea power of England confirmed by the defeat of the Armada helped the voyages of discovery, or the skills acquired through the voyages of discovery made the English sailors superior to their Spanish counterparts and this helped them in their struggle against the Armada. One puzzling feature of even the better answers was the concentration of most candidates on the glory and reputation gained by the defeat of the Armada, but a general failure to explain the political and religious importance of the defeat.

Britain, 1815–51

Q1(a) This question was answered well. This was in contrast to the last time that a question was asked about the Liverpool and Manchester Railway. Then many of the answers were general and were not specific to this railway. This year's answers were a great improvement with candidates knowing about the difficulties posed by features such as the Sankey Viaduct, Chat Moss and the Olive Mount cutting. The building of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway is identified as a Case Study in the specification and was obviously taught with care by centres.

Q1(b) Candidates were more successful with Source C than with Source B. The latter was misinterpreted by weaker candidates who thought that it showed a train that had broken down. This led them to think that the painting was suggesting that railways had no future. Most candidates were able to interpret Source C as a warning about the safety of railways and better candidates were able to compare this with the message of Source B. Source B can be seen as anti-railway or as pro-railway, but whichever interpretation is taken, it is definitely predicting a bright future for the railways.

Q1(c) Some candidates clearly had no idea who George Hudson was. Some confused him with William Huskisson and wrote about Huskisson being killed by a railway engine. The mark scheme was amended to give some credit to answers that claimed the cartoon was published to criticise railway travel or investment in railways. However, there were many candidates who did know about Hudson, railway mania, and what Hudson got up to and his financial disasters. These candidates wrote some excellent answers.

Q2 Over the last few years, candidates' knowledge and understanding of the early nineteenth-century electoral system has improved. This was clear in answers to part (a) which demonstrated detailed knowledge. A few candidates misread part (b) as being about those who supported electoral reform, while weak candidates wrote about electricians. The remaining answers explained a range of arguments that were used at the time to oppose reform. In response to (c) most candidates were able to write about the activities of the Chartists but explanations of the limited impact of the 1832 Act were rather thin. A number of candidates thought that the Act had solved all problems, while even the best candidates found it difficult to explain both sides of the argument.

Q3 Part (a) divided candidates into two groups. The first were able to explain in detail about Speenhamland, the Roundsmen system, and outdoor relief, while the second group wrote in very general terms and demonstrated little specific knowledge. There were a number of candidates who failed to recognise the significance of 1834 and appeared to think that poor relief remained unchanged throughout the nineteenth century. These candidates also struggled with part (b) and some of them seemed to think the reforms were designed to make things easier for the poor. Part (c) produced many good answers with an encouraging number of candidates reaching the top level of the mark scheme by explaining both sides of the argument and then reaching an informed conclusion. Knowledge was often displayed of the different reaction to the reforms in the north and the south.

The American West, 1845–95

Q1(a) A significant number of candidates ignored the fact that the advertisement was published by a railroad company. Some wrote answers that were based on the assumption that the advertisement was published by the government to encourage people to move west. These candidates did use their knowledge to check some of the claims made by the advertisement and did score some marks. Better candidates showed a sound knowledge of the fact that the railroad companies owned land alongside the railways and had sound commercial reasons for encouraging more people to move west. The question could be tackled by either testing the claims made in the advertisement, or by investigating the possible motives of the railroad company. The best candidates did both.

Q1(b) This question was not answered well. Many candidates appeared to know little about the contribution of women in settling the Plains. They either agreed with the source or wrote general answers about women doing the cooking, cleaning and washing-up. The disappointing feature of these answers was the fact that they were not set in the relevant place or time. References to specific jobs carried out by women, their contribution to farming, or to the difficulties they faced such as loneliness and living in sod houses, were few and far between. There were a few good answers that concentrated on analysing the tone of the source.

Q1(c) Some candidates got no further than making general claims that cartoons cannot be trusted because their purpose is to make people laugh, while advertisements cannot be trusted because they are trying to sell something. A disappointingly small number of candidates used their knowledge to check either the overall impressions given by the sources or the details contained in them.

Q2 Part (a) was answered well with many detailed answers. There were also many good answers about reservations in response to (b). Answers covered a wide range of valid reasons why the Plains Indians disliked the reservations. Part (c) was answered less well. This was not because of a lack of knowledge - there were many detailed accounts of the events before, during, and after the battle. However, many candidates wrote narrative accounts that failed to answer the question. Even some of those that did attempt to answer the question argued that the battle solved all the Plains Indians' problems. The better candidates wrote answers that did explain both sides of the argument but there were fewer such answers than expected.

Q3 This question was slightly less popular than Question 2 but was generally well answered. In response to (a) much detailed and relevant knowledge was demonstrated. There were also many good answers to (b) with factors like polygamy, collapse of the Mormon bank, the raid growth of the Mormons, and Smith's decision to run for President all being common elements of answers. In (c) the importance of Young's decision to go west and his planning and organising of the journey was explained well, but candidates were far less sure about what he did once the Mormons had reached Salt Lake.

Germany, 1919–1945

Q1(a) A significant minority of candidates missed the clues in the cartoon and in the caption and explained that it was a Nazi cartoon showing people that they would clean-up Germany. Many of these answers went on to explain how this would persuade many people to vote for the Nazi Party. However, most candidates did understand that the cartoon was mocking the Nazis and placed it the context of Nazi policies against their opponents.

Q1(b) This question was generally well answered. Many candidates were able to explain the significance of the large family, the appearance of the mother, the closeness of the family or even the importance of classical music (as opposed to jazz). Contextual knowledge was used relevantly to explain the importance to the Nazis of these features. There were a few misunderstandings, for example, the family are having a miserable time, the Nazis would not want people to enjoy themselves, and every family had a resident Nazi living with them to make sure they behaved properly.

Q1(c) Nearly all candidates were able to understand that both sources show mixed attitudes towards the Nazis. The doctor sympathises with some Nazi aims but dislikes their methods, while the workers, while not being won over, were not ready to show more than passive resistance. Better candidates tested the evidence in the sources either by investigating their provenance or by referring to their knowledge of resistance or lack of resistance within Germany. There were some very interesting answers about the extent of private grumbling about the Nazis, but little overt opposition.

Q2 Part (a) was answered well with most candidates knowing at least part of the story of the Munich Putsch. High marks were scored by many candidates although a significant minority wrote about either the events in the Beer Hall, or the events on the following day, but not both. There was a tendency for good candidates to waste time by writing about events after the Putsch – Hitler's time in prison, the writing of 'Mein Kampf' and the changes in Nazi tactics. There were many good answers to (b). Candidates knew this well and explained about the unpopularity of the Treaty of Versailles, hyperinflation, and the occupation of the Ruhr. The main weakness of some of these detailed answers was a failure to explicitly link the factors mentioned to the unpopularity of the Weimar Republic. Part (c) produced a wide range of responses. There are still candidates who confuse the two economic crises and write about hyperinflation at the beginning of the 1930s. Weaker candidates would benefit from exercises focused on making clear the differences between the two economic crises. There were some excellent answers about Hitler's contribution, but also some general ones or ones that concentrated on the Nazis generally rather than on Hitler in particular. The better candidates compared the two factors in interesting and informed ways. Some excellent points were made while arguing whether one factor was more important than the other.

Q3 Part (a) was generally well answered although some well informed candidates did wander off into aims and purposes rather than just activities. Kristallnacht was not known by more than a few candidates – the Night of the Long Knives, the Reichstag Fire and the Holocaust were all written about in answer to (b). There were some good answers to (c) with good candidates managing detailed explanations of how women and young people fared under the Nazis. However, few of these candidates produced a genuine comparison. More average candidates tended to produce general answers lacking specific period detail.

South Africa, 1948–1995

Q1(a) Part (a) was answered well with most candidates having some knowledge of the Pass Laws and the reasons for their unpopularity. There was a tendency on the part of some candidates to simply write about the Pass Laws as if the reasons for their unpopularity were self-evident.

Q1(b) Most candidates were able to identify differences of detail. Having done this, few bothered to go on and find similarities or make judgements about 'how far'.

Q1(c) A reasonable number of candidates realised the significance of the date but could relate this to only a limited reading of the cartoon. They recognised the symbolism in the cartoon as it related to the abolition of the Pass Laws but failed to understand the overall message of the cartoon – that Black South Africans still did not have freedom.

Q2 This question was more popular and better answered than Question 3. Bantustans were reasonably well known, while most candidates could suggest some valid reasons for apartheid collapsing even if they could not explain them very well. The same point has to be made about most answers to part (c) – candidates could identify valid reasons but struggled to explain them.

Q3 The few candidates that answered this question were not sure about the changes introduced by de Klerk. Answers tended to be either wrong or lacking in specific detail. This lack of knowledge about de Klerk led to general answers to parts (b) and (c) as well.

1935/21 – Paper 2
Medicine Through Time

John Snow and the Causes of Cholera

General Comments

It is clear that candidates now have sufficient time for a careful consideration of the sources and to give full and detailed responses to the questions set. Some centres instruct their candidates to read the paper thoroughly before setting pen to paper and such an approach has many benefits in encouraging cross-referencing and allowing candidates to see 'the big picture'.

None of the questions this year appeared to cause undue difficulties, though each saw some candidates failing to score as highly as they should have through technical deficiencies. These deficiencies are addressed in comments on the individual questions, but it is worth emphasising several of them here.

- In comparison questions, such as Q2, candidates sometimes tell you what each source says and then conclude 'so you can see that they are similar'. This is not a correct approach. What examiners are looking for is a direct point of comparison (in this case, about the causes of cholera).

- Where statistics are provided (as in Q3), candidates should always be aware that an evaluation of their reliability is likely to prove of value. On this question, higher reward went to those candidates who considered exactly what these statistics were showing, rather than taking them at face value.

- On the final question candidates continue to ignore the reliability of the sources they are using and so miss the extra marks awarded for this.

Individual Questions

Question 1

For most candidates, this question posed few difficulties. The majority of answers concentrated on what the source told us about the spread of cholera. So it was common to read answers along the lines of: '*This source is useful because it tells us that cholera was caused by sewage soaking through the ground and getting into wells or by running along channels and sewers into the rivers from which drinking water is taken'.* Higher reward was given to those candidates who could also explain that the source was not comprehensive in what it told us about cholera. ('*It helps us to understand the causes of cholera but does not tell us how it might be treated or what the effects were.')*

Level Three was awarded to candidates who could put Snow's work in the context of the development of understanding of the disease. A typical such response was:

'This source is very useful. It tells me that at last people were beginning to grasp what really caused cholera. Snow says that they 'have been considering' different ways of how cholera spread. Now it seems that he has worked out how it was really spread. So I can see progress in the understanding of its causes.'

Highest marks went to those candidates who explained how the source was, or was not, useful and then went on to consider its validity as a piece of evidence. Could we, for example, draw conclusions about cholera in the nineteenth century by looking at a source which is describing

one outbreak, in one year, in one area of London? Others sought to prove the reliability of the source by cross-reference to the Background Information where we are told that '*one man who did understand that cholera spread through drinking contaminated water was John Snow'.*

In their desire to give a full answer, many candidates gave extra detail about Snow and his decision to remove the pump handle, thus reducing cholera. Only where this was used to prove that Source A was, therefore, providing reliable evidence was it possible to reward this contextual knowledge.

Question 2

This was a very straightforward question and those candidates who approached it by providing a direct answer scored well. A large number of candidates, however, did not. Surely it was not beyond the capabilities of the vast majority of candidates to explain how the sources are different because one blames contaminated water for cholera and the other blames something in the air. Yet at the same time, they both acknowledge that water is involved in bringing about cholera, so they have similarities.

A direct and focused answer like the one below, which quoted the sources to support the argument, scored full marks.

The sources are different because they give different reasons for the outbreak of cholera. Source A says the disease is spread by sewage mixing with drinking water. So it thinks the disease is water-borne. Source B thinks the impure waters infected the air and so the disease is air-borne. However, there is a similarity in that both sources think impure water is involved in spreading the disease.

What is impressive about this example is that it makes direct comparisons. It provides support from the sources and it addresses the issue of 'how' different the sources are. The answer is also concise, containing no irrelevant information.

It was very disappointing to see some able students address only one of the sources and merely imply that the other source did something different. It was also surprising to read a large number of answers where the candidate felt the need to explain why Snow and the committee had different explanations of the causes of cholera. This was not required in response to the question set.

Question 3

Although the examiners had some reservations about the complexity of the wording of the question, it was apparent that candidates had no difficulty understanding what was required.

Almost all candidates explained in detail that Source A says that cholera is caused by drinking water contaminated with sewage and Source C supported it by showing more deaths where water was drawn from close to the sewage outlet. More reward was given if the candidates also used the statistics showing fewer deaths upriver to discredit Source B.

However, things were not necessarily as straightforward as such responses suggested. It was disappointing to see that many candidates who had noted in Question 2 that Source B suggested that the impure water may have infected the air, could not carry that argument forward to this question. One answer which did argue: *'…of course, this doesn't mean that Source B is necessarily wrong. There were more deaths where the sewage outlet was, but these deaths could have been caused by the sewage infecting the air. So Source B could still be correct. Up-river the air might be less infected because of the lack of sewage in the system.'* Such an answer, considering how both Source A and Source B could be supported, received high reward.

Candidates should be aware that when statistics are presented on a paper, there is often an opportunity to evaluate those statistics as evidence. This was such an opportunity. The figures appeared to show cholera being caused by contaminated water, but as more perceptive candidates pointed out, '*these statistics don't actually tell us that the people died of cholera and they don't give us an indication of what each place was like. For all I know Lambeth could be a wealthy area where people are living in spacious houses and eating well. Southwark might be an economically deprived area with slums and poor living conditions. If that were so, then the different death rates would not be surprising – and would have nothing to do with what Source A or Source B say.*'

Answers which, in addition to making the comparison between the sources, also evaluated Source C as evidence in this way were rewarded at the highest level.

Question 4

This question produced a good spread of marks and was an example of where contextual knowledge can be used effectively.

Weaker answers asserted that the cartoon was drawn '*because there was a cholera epidemic at this time*', but failed to develop their answers to consider the message or purpose of the source.

Many answers concentrated on the detail in the source to explain what might be called 'everyday explanations' of the reasons for it being drawn. These tended to focus on the desire to stop people drinking water, or to show the poor conditions in which they lived. Such answers were valid, but failed to note the nineteenth century context of the cartoon and so received only moderate reward.

Better answers were those which appreciated that the cartoon was part of the Public Health debate of the mid-nineteenth century. Despite the work of Snow some ten years earlier and the increasing evidence that poor living conditions increased the spread of disease, the government was still allowing people to take their water from contaminated water pumps. That was the message of the cartoon.

Best answers were those which identified the message and then went on to provide a valid purpose, for example, '*…So by showing the government in a poor light, the cartoonist is obviously trying to create public outcry and force the government into introducing public health measures which prevent the poor being treated in this way*'.

Such answers showed a clear understanding of the difference between the message of the cartoon (what it is saying) and its purpose (what it hopes to make happen as a result of the message).

Question 5

This question produced a surprisingly large number of responses which suggested that candidates had forgotten all they had been taught about the development of medicine since ancient times! The standard answer to this question for the majority of candidates was, 'I am not surprised by what this source says as I know that at that time people thought that illness was caused by God. So they would go to church in large numbers.' This was a disappointing response in two ways. Firstly, it ignored all the progress that had been made in understanding the causes of disease and, secondly, it actually contradicted Source E which tells us that in the years immediately prior to 1832 church attendance was poor.

It was, therefore, pleasing to read answers which expressed surprise because they knew that there had been developments which provided other explanations (rightly or wrongly) for disease

or which argued that the sources were not surprising because religion has always influenced medical developments. Whilst a discussion of the Egyptians may have been tenuous, it did at least show candidates trying to use their contextual knowledge to answer the question. Indeed the response to a question asking if a candidate is surprised by what a source says can only be answered by explaining that the candidate knows something which causes surprise (or not) or has read something on the paper which produces the same response. The following response used this approach and received full marks.

I am not surprised to see the link being made between religion and the spread of cholera. Although there had been new ideas such as miasma and an understanding of the importance of cleanliness, in dire times people often return to superstition or religious explanations. During the time of the Black Death flagellants thought that purging themselves of their sins would bring God's forgiveness and end the outbreaks of plague, so that's quite similar. We also shouldn't forget that this is 1832, before the work of Snow and Pasteur had established the impact of contaminated water and the presence of germs.

But having said that, it is quite surprising because as long ago as the Roman period people knew that lack of cleanliness was linked to disease and at the time of the Black Death there were attempts to clean up the streets. Also in Source A Snow talks about ways of spreading disease that people have been considering. So some people at least knew better than to blame it on God. Perhaps news had not travelled north!

Question 6

Performance on this final 'over-arching' question continues to improve, with only a tiny minority ignoring the sources and writing answers based on their own knowledge. Centres are obviously getting the message across that the instruction 'use the sources and your own knowledge' does not mean 'write what you know', but 'use your knowledge to interpret the sources and construct an argument using them'.

As in previous years, the majority of candidates were able to consider the sources individually to explain how they showed an understanding of the cause of cholera or did not do so. Where reference to individual sources was clear and support was given from the source, this approach resulted in high marks. Many candidates took the question to mean cholera was spread by drinking contaminated water, rather than whether people knew this and examiners accepted this interpretation.

There is a worrying tendency in some centres for candidates to band the sources together and make a general comment about whether that collection of sources supports or opposes the hypothesis. This is not good practice. Centres should be aware that examiners are looking for individual source reference and for evidence from that source to support the argument being put forward. The suggestion that a collection of sources supports the hypothesis (or not) is valid only if those sources are then considered individually.

Candidates should also be aware that marks are allocated for valid source evaluation in this question and that from next year, it is likely that reward will also be given for a conclusion indicating the degree to which the collection of sources supports the hypothesis, rather than whether it does or not.

For the guidance of centres, the example below scored full marks. It contains annotations showing the marking. Where a source is proven to support the hypothesis, this is indicated with a 'y'; where it is shown to oppose, this is indicated with an 'n'. Source evaluation is indicated with +1.

Source A shows that people did accept that cholera was spread by drinking contaminated water as Snow shows that it was caused by drinking water contaminated with sewage (y). I think this

source is particularly reliable as the Background Information tells me that Snow was someone who did understand how cholera was spread (+1). Source C supports it also as it shows that deaths were much higher around the area where water was taken from near a sewer outlet (y). However, I don't know whether the deaths in the source are from cholera, so the evidence is limited (+1). Source D backs it up too by suggesting that the water from the pump is associated with death (y).

However Source B does not show that it was contaminated water which caused death and instead blames it on some form of infection in the air (n). Source E doesn't support it either, suggesting that it is a punishment from God (n). Similar to this is Source F which says the churches are now full. Presumably all these people think God is causing the disease and will stop it if they pray (n).

3y +3n = Level 4, 8 marks +2 = 10 marks.

**1935/22 – Paper 2
Crime and Punishment Through Time**

Who or What was to Blame for 'Peterloo'?

General Comments

This year's paper proved accessible to candidates of all levels of ability. Sources and questions were readily comprehensible, and it was a rarity to see an incomplete script. Moreover, the paper discriminated more effectively between weaker and stronger candidates than has sometimes been the case – whilst fair and manageable for the former, it also encouraged the latter to demonstrate higher levels of skill and understanding. Indeed, the most obvious difference between this year's paper and last year's was that more candidates used relevant factual knowledge to enhance more of their answers, and, as one would expect, the stronger candidates did this more effectively and consistently than the weaker.

A recurrent theme in these reports has been that the best answers are invariably those that adopt a direct and straightforward approach to the questions. There really is no need to repeat what the source says or shows, nor do all questions require the sources to be evaluated. The best advice to give candidates is simply to answer the question. If this asks '*How useful is this source?*', then you will only get a good mark if you deal with its utility. If the question wants to know '*Why did the artist draw this cartoon?*', then you will only get a good mark if you give reasons. If you are asked '*How similar are these sources?*', then you will only get a good mark if you make comparisons (similarities or differences). Although less common than it used to be, there is still some evidence of candidates in some schools using a formulaic, over-prepared approach which, more often than not, deflects them from giving direct and focused answers.

One last introductory point, and although it concerns a specific question, it is so important that it deserves particular mention. It is astonishing how many candidates still fail to score well on **Q6**. The reasons for this are discussed later in the report, but here it is sufficient to say that the final question remains the single, most obvious opportunity for teachers to improve the performance of almost all their candidates.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

The first question is always designed to offer candidates a straightforward entry into the paper, and this was no exception. There was plenty of material both in Source A and in the Background Information which could be used on the basis of simple comprehension/inference, and up to three marks were available simply for identifying reasons. These included *the town was in danger, people were alarmed, there was a large crowd*, and so on, but slightly higher marks were given if answers included reasons which related to the broader background of social unrest, such as *there was an economic depression/fear of revolution/campaign for reform*. The better candidates went on from this, however, and, as the question demanded, explained the reasons they had previously identified. The best explanations of all used additional contextual knowledge not contained within the question paper, perhaps mentioning the ruling classes' fear of a repeat of the French Revolution, or of the Luddites' campaign.

As indicated in the General Comments above, marks were only awarded to answers that actually answered the question. This meant giving reasons why Hunt was arrested. However, many candidates knew a lot about Peterloo and were determined to write it all down, regardless of what they were asked. This may be based on miscomprehension of what the prompt *'Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer'* really means. It signifies that both the

source and contextual knowledge may be used to help answer the question, and not, for example, that candidates should use the source to answer the question, and then (separately) write everything they know about the topic.

Question 2

This was another question where the majority of what was written by candidates was not focused directly on the question. They were asked for reasons why the artist drew the cartoon (Source B). The first step most candidates took was to describe what the cartoon showed. This could be quite a lengthy process, encompassing maybe a side or more of writing, and, in itself, it earned nothing. Marks were available for using details of the cartoon, but only to support candidates' analysis of the reasons for drawing it.

Central to this analysis should have been the idea of the *message* the artist wished to transmit to his *audience*, i.e. he drew the cartoon because he wanted to say something about what happened at Peterloo. Some less able candidates, though, were not aware that cartoonists comment upon, or represent, events for their own reasons, and took the cartoon as an objective record of what happened. This was the lowest level answer – that is, he drew the cartoon to show what happened at Peterloo. Others misinterpreted the cartoon, seeing it as a celebration of the victory of the forces of law and order over the unruly mob. This was indeed a message, but unfortunately the wrong one. However, the majority of candidates did (eventually) successfully interpret the cartoon, thereby inferring messages hostile to the authorities, and scored a respectable mark, particularly if details of the cartoon were used in support.

Nonetheless, this still left unanswered the issue of *why* the cartoonist would wish to pass on his message to the audience. The cartoonist's true purpose was the intended *impact* of the message on the audience, and the best answers showed awareness of this. Such impacts included, for example, stirring up opposition against the government, winning support for the reform movement, or trying to ensure that those responsible for the massacre would be held to account.

Question 3

The skill of comparison – the direct matching of content from two sources for similarity and/or difference – is not one that many candidates find easy to master. Much of the time comparison is implicit in what candidates write, rather than directly spelled out. At its weakest, this can produce answers which merely summarise the two sources in turn, and then assert that the sources are therefore similar or different. Certainly there are similarities and differences in there somewhere, but the candidate never actually identifies them. Slightly better are answers which, though still failing to make the comparison explicit, by a process of selection of extracts from each of the sources strongly suggest a comparison. The first of these two types of answer would receive a very low mark, whilst the second would (just) be regarded as achieving a valid comparison.

Ideally, though, answers should be constructed around specific comparisons, explicitly demonstrating similarity/difference. Sources C and D contained several points of similarity and difference, yet relatively few answers identified more than one or two differences. As the question asked '*How different?*', those answers which could deal with both similarity and difference scored more highly. The following example shows how easily this could have been done:

Sources C and D are very different, but not totally. For example, both suggest that the Yeomanry were in some confusion and that swords were used to cut through the crowd (two similarities). *However, Source C says that the soldiers acted with restraint, but Source D shows that they attacked the crowd without mercy* (one difference).

However, candidates should always look for opportunities to make more than simple content comparisons. The content of these two sources, evaluated in the light of their provenance, strongly suggested that the authors were both representing the events in a certain way for their own purposes. Many answers showed some awareness that the provenance might offer a route to higher level comparisons, but got stuck in unexplained assertions of 'bias'. As with those answers that simply compared the provenance, they were placed in the lowest level. However, those answers that saw the two sources as contrasting attempts to shift blame for the events at Peterloo onto the other side achieved the highest marks. Unfortunately, whilst many answers successfully interpreted Source C as trying to place responsibility onto the crowd, most failed to complete the comparison, and therefore took Bamford's account (Source D) as fact rather than as a representation of the facts.

Question 4

This was the one question on which a significant (though still small) number of candidates failed to score. These candidates simply did not see what the question was asking, so, if they answered at all, they would simply agree or disagree that something in the source was/was not surprising, with no reason given. Another weakness, which even better answers could contain, was a failure to make it clear exactly what it was in the source that was/was not surprising. This was a matter of significance, given the ambiguity of what Liverpool had written – in fact it was this very ambiguity that made the source surprising! Thus he supports the magistrates, but in a less than wholehearted manner. The fact that he gives his support is *not* surprising (given that he is the Prime Minister and his little alternative but to support the forces of law and order), so in each level answers which could explain why the source *was* surprising were awarded a slightly higher mark.

Reasons for surprised/not surprised all had to relate in some way or another to the context. The more effectively the context was used, the higher the mark. In practice, the lowest level answers were little more than commonsensical responses based on the fact that Liverpool was the Prime Minister:

No, of course I'm not surprised that he supports the magistrates. He has to support them or nobody would ever want to be a magistrate in the future.

Better than this were answers based on the specific context of the Peterloo massacre:

Yes, I am a bit surprised that he says not everything the magistrates did was sensible, because they had a huge crowd that had started throwing bricks and stones to deal with, so obviously they had to take firm action.

But the best answers showed a broader contextual grasp of the background of unrest and 'revolutionary' activity of which Peterloo was a part:

Well, I am surprised that Liverpool was so half-hearted in his support. You would think he would be pleased with the magistrates for putting down an unruly mob at a time when the ruling classes were still scared that there might be a revolution in England. His government were certainly scared enough to pass the Six Acts after Peterloo, so we know he was worried.

Question 5

This was another question that caught out those candidates who love to describe the source, without ever answering the question. Of course, candidates do not have to use the word 'useful' in their answers – synonyms such as 'good evidence', 'tells us', and so on are equally acceptable, but it must be clear that the answer somehow relates to the issue of utility, and if it does not, then it cannot earn any marks. The only exception to this rule is when answers deal with reliability rather than utility. Although, strictly speaking, these are not answering the

question, the idea that a source is/is not useful if it is/is not reliable is so strongly implicit that it would be too harsh to give no reward.

The levels of response to all utility questions are almost bound to be based on a common set of approaches. First, and most basic, are answers which assume that the utility of a source is determined by its provenance:

I think Source F is very useful because it is a picture about Peterloo, and it was drawn near the time of the events.

Next come answers that, taking the source at face value, assume that its utility is determined by the information that it does/does not provide. Generally, because of the wording of the question ('*How useful?*'), higher marks are given to answers which deal both with what the source does and does not tell you:

Source F is quite useful. It shows how the Yeomanry attacked the crowd at Peterloo, and that the victims were women and children. However, it is limited because it does not say anything about why the crowd were demonstrating, or why the magistrates decided to arrest Hunt.

It follows that answers that do not take the source at face value, and go on to explain (i.e. not merely assert) the source's utility in relation to its reliability, must represent a further step up the levels. In this question, it was possible to evaluate the source using the biased nature of the source content, or by cross-referencing what the source showed to other sources or contextual knowledge:

Source F cannot really be useful evidence because it is so one-sided. You can tell that whoever drew it was on the side of the protesters because it depicts the soldiers as ruthless murderers. We know that there are some people who think the soldiers tried to avoid bloodshed (Source C) so we cannot trust what Source F shows.

Finally, the best candidates will appreciate that the un/reliability of a source does not determine *whether or not* a source is useful, but merely establishes the *way(s)* in which it can be used as evidence. Demonstrably, Source F was drawn by a critic of the actions of the authorities, but the fact that it was drawn two years after the event is evidence of the enduring importance of Peterloo as a symbol of the brutal and repressive response of government to the people's campaign for reform:

I think Source F is very useful as evidence about Peterloo. By showing the soldier brutally murdering members of the crowd, including women and children, the artist is making the point that the government was wrong in how it dealt with the demonstration, and this backs up the idea that reform of the country is needed. The fact that this is still going on two years after the massacre tells us how strong feelings still were, and how Peterloo could still be used to stir people's feelings up against the government.

Question 6

As mentioned in the General Comments at the beginning of this report, Question 6, rather perplexingly given its predictable nature, remains a largely untaken opportunity for most candidates to improve their performance. On the face of it, the task is simple. Here's a hypothesis (*the actions of the crowd caused the violence at Peterloo*), now show us whether each of the sources supports it or not. Despite the apparent simplicity, candidates find problems. Generally these amount to a failure to *use* the source content effectively. They must show *how* the content of the source leads them to conclude that it either supports or opposes the hypothesis, for example as follows:

I think Source A shows that the crowd caused the violence <u>because it states that they threw bricks and stones at the Yeomanry</u>.

Use one source to support the hypothesis and one source to oppose it, and on the mark scheme as used at present, you score seven marks (out of 10). Many candidates (though not as many as one would think), can of course do this, but very few go on to score the maximum. They probably believe that they have used more sources, but in practice what they have written has not counted – they have merely asserted that sources support/oppose, and not demonstrated it. Another source of lost marks is the bonus that exists for source evaluation. The bonus (up to two extra marks) seeks to reward candidates who do more than simply accept the sources at face value. Again, many candidates obviously believe that they are evaluating the sources, but what they write about reliability is almost always limited to comments about source provenance, or undeveloped assertions about bias, rather than demonstrating *how* the source's content leads one to a judgement on whether or not it can be believed.

This year's hypothesis was very straightforward, and did not, in itself, cause problems for candidates. There were a few who insisted that, whilst the sources showed the violence, they did not generally deal with the issue of what started it, but most candidates took the simpler line of seeking to demonstrate who was to blame – the crowd or the magistrates/soldiers. One specific point about marking does, however, need to be made. The use of sources to show that the crowd was to blame because (e.g. Source D) they did not get out of the way fast enough, i.e. a 'self-harm' argument, was not permitted.

1035/02, 1935/03
Coursework

The component showed a slight improvement on previous years, with an uneven spread between centres. The strongest candidates continue to produce assignments that match and, indeed, often surpass the standards laid down for the objectives. The work produced is clearly capable of stirring a considerable level of interest and pride in the students. Centres who have achieved a high degree of focus on the objectives allow their candidates to achieve these standards without going too far beyond word limits. At the same time, the students manage to write really investigative history.

The vast majority of centres were very thorough in meeting the administrative requirements of the course. For those that had problems, these usually revolved around the provision of Centre Authentication Forms or the Coursework Consultant's approval. Both can easily be provided, assuming that the necessary steps are taken early enough. It is also important that the copies of results that go to the moderator are clearly legible, with teaching groups and mark breakdowns available. All this makes the selection of a sample much simpler. The advent of non teachers in the role of exams officers has also caused a few problems when History Departments fail to follow the instructions. They are not always familiar with the key issues when moderators contact the centre. Fortunately, this is a tiny minority, but it does involve the greatest loss of time. Greater use of card wallets to transport candidates' work has been a welcome development that is to be further encouraged.

The History Around Us assignment continues to encourage a huge range of topics with many students showing a range of strong historical skills. The assessment of evaluation and interpretation have been targeted more directly by some centres, allowing an increasing number of candidates to avoid writing too much and slipping into long stretches of narrative. Many centres have now developed assignments that feature two tasks, one aimed at interpretation and one at evaluation. Through the combination of site, sources and challenging hypothesis, many candidates have really prospered, producing work that naturally covers the skills. Unfortunately, some centres have continued with assignments that are indirect, or deal with each aspect of the evidence separately. This places far greater pressure on the student and usually involves longer answers.

The Modern World Study continues to rely heavily on the situation in Ireland but there have been interesting developments around Terrorism and specifically 9/11. Other centres continue to use China and Racism in the USA, but the challenge here is to keep the work related to the present day. Again, questions that naturally explore the impact of the past on the present are very successful. Many centres are now making very sensible use of the internet to help students cover the present situation. Many centres have managed to reduce the necessary period of history for their assignment which has made the work more manageable. It has been increasingly obvious that tasks that do manage to contain the scale allow students to tackle the tasks along the lines of the objectives, rather than falling into simple narrative.

Centres who feel that their assignments are dated, poorly focussed or asking too much of their students should be encouraged to speak to their coursework consultant to improve this aspect of their studies.

Coursework (Short Course)

This year saw a reduced entry with few centres looking beyond long-standing exemplar material. The prospect of covering all the objectives within one assignment may help to explain why they are less confident in producing their own materials and tasks. Some of the exemplars are rather challenging with a great many tasks, and many of the points relating to the full GCSE can be applied to the short course assignment. Realistically, three well directed tasks should enable students to cover the three objectives with tasks aimed directly at them.

Grade Thresholds

History A (Short Course) 1035
June 2006

Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01 (Paper 1)	60	41	34	28	22	17	12	7
02 (Coursework)	25	21	18	15	12	10	8	6

Overall (weighted marks)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	100	81	70	59	49	40	31	23	15
Percentage in Grade		3.0	5.7	15.0	18.3	16.0	11.7	10.0	9.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		3.0	8.7	23.7	42.0	58.0	69.7	79.7	89.0

The entry for the examination was 319.

Grade Thresholds

History A 1935
June 2006

Component Thresholds (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	57	48	40	32	25	18	11
12	75	61	52	43	35	26	17	9
13	75	58	48	38	31	24	18	12
14	75	56	47	39	32	26	20	14
15	75	56	47	39	32	25	18	11
21	50	31	28	25	23	20	17	15
22	50	32	28	24	21	17	13	10
03	50	41	35	29	23	18	13	8

Option Thresholds (weighted marks)

Option A (Medicine and Elizabethan England)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	160	142	124	107	89	72	55	38
Percentage in Grade		7.5	14.2	18.0	18.3	17.3	10.7	7.6	4.2
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.5	21.7	39.7	58.0	75.3	86.0	93.6	97.8

The total entry for the examination was 997.

Option B (Medicine and Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	165	147	129	111	92	73	54	35
Percentage in Grade		12.0	15.4	15.4	18.2	15.0	10.9	7.4	3.8
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		12.0	27.4	42.7	61.0	75.9	86.8	94.2	97.9

The total entry for the examination was 1257.

Option C (Medicine and American West)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	161	142	123	105	88	71	55	39
Percentage in Grade		7.8	15.3	19.2	19.1	15.0	11.1	6.5	3.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.8	23.1	42.3	61.4	76.4	87.5	94.0	97.3

The total entry for the examination was 16582.

Option D (Medicine with Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	159	141	123	106	89	73	57	41
Percentage in Grade		9.4	16.7	18.6	18.7	14.5	9.6	6.2	3.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		9.4	26.1	44.7	63.4	77.9	87.5	93.7	96.9

The total entry for the examination was 10355.

Option E (Medicine with S Africa)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	135	124	113	103	87	71	55	39
Percentage in Grade		4.2	4.2	8.3	8.3	29.2	25.0	8.3	8.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.2	8.3	16.7	25.0	54.2	79.2	87.5	95.8

The total entry for the examination was 24.

Option F (Crime with Elizabethan England)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	162	143	124	106	87	68	50	32
Percentage in Grade		7.5	19.2	29.9	18.5	9.3	8.9	3.9	2.1
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.5	26.7	56.6	75.1	84.3	93.2	97.2	99.3

The total entry for the examination was 282.

Option G (Crime with Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	171	150	129	109	89	69	49	29
Percentage in Grade		11.4	37.4	21.5	12.8	9.6	4.1	2.7	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		11.4	48.9	70.3	83.1	92.7	96.8	99.5	99.5

The total entry for the examination was 219.

Option H (Crime with American West)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	163	142	121	101	84	67	50	33
Percentage in Grade		4.2	10.2	19.0	17.4	16.4	14.3	9.6	5.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.2	14.4	33.3	50.8	67.1	81.4	91.0	96.5

The total entry for the examination was 857.

Option J (Crime with Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	162	143	124	105	87	70	53	36
Percentage in Grade		7.3	19.5	19.5	18.1	13.8	10.1	5.9	3.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.3	26.8	46.2	64.3	78.1	88.2	94.1	97.4

The total entry for the examination was 2051.

Option K (Crime with South Africa)

There were no entries for this option.

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	8.3	16.0	19.0	18.8	14.8	10.6	6.4	3.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	8.3	24.4	43.3	62.1	76.9	87.4	93.9	97.2

The total entry for the examination was 32635.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance
programme your call may be recorded or monitored