

**History A**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1935**

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

**Report on the Components**

---

**June 2007**

**1935/1035/MS/R/07**

OCR (Oxford, Cambridge and RSA Examinations) is a unitary awarding body, established by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate and the RSA Examinations Board in January 1998. OCR provides a full range of GCSE, A level, GNVQ, Key Skills and other qualifications for schools and colleges in the United Kingdom, including those previously provided by MEG and OCEAC. It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the syllabus content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this Report.

© OCR 2007

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

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

<b>Component</b>	<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
*	Chief Examiner's Report	
1035/01	Paper 1 (Short Course)	1
1935 11-15	Paper 1	1
1935/21	Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time	14
1935/22	Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time	18
1035/02, 1935/03	Coursework	21
*	Grade Thresholds	23



## **GCSE HISTORY A**

### **PAPER 1 (1935/11-15 and 1035/01)**

#### **General comments**

The entry for this specification went up slightly this year but the entry for the Short Course fell a little. The entry for Crime went up by about 300 but Medicine continues to be far more popular. American West continues to be the most popular Depth Study by some distance although the entry for Germany, which is the second most popular option, continues to grow each year. Elizabethan England and Britain 1815–1851 each had just over a thousand candidates with the entry for Britain slipping a little. The entry for South Africa doubled but there are still well under a hundred candidates.

Candidates found most of the questions rather more accessible than last year and the mean mark on most of the options went up. The paper stretched the most able candidates but even the weakest candidates mostly produced answers that showed they had benefited from following the course and which were worthy of some credit. The full mark range 0–75 was used and there was a very good spread of marks. The overall standard was very close to that of last year. Overall, the cohort entered for the Britain 1815–51 option was the strongest. There was little overall difference between the cohorts entered for American West and Germany.

There were many strengths in the candidates' responses but the rest of these general comments focus on areas where there is room for significant improvement to help centres improve future performance.

The number of rubric errors was small but it was worrying to find high numbers of such errors in a small number of centres. In some centres well over half the candidates were guilty of this. Most either answered both Development Studies or answered different parts of different optional questions, for example, 2(a), 3(b) and 4(c). In the latter case candidates are awarded the highest mark only – for (a) or (b) or (c).

Some common terms at the heart of this specification are still causing candidates problems, for example, some candidates think that 'chance' in Medicine means 'taking a chance' and there is much misunderstanding of the term public health (not a few candidates thought this meant surgery). There are also some areas of content that are causing problems for candidates: public health in the nineteenth century; confusion between Lister and Simpson and antiseptics and chloroform; the details of transportation, especially conditions in Australia; the significance of the Robin Hood story; prisons in the nineteenth century; the exploits of Drake and voyages of exploration; the importance of the navvies; the importance of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway; the Mormons at Salt Lake; the chronology of German history 1919–1945, for example, timing and nature of events such as the two economic crises, the Munich Putsch, the Reichstag Fire, the Night of the Long Knives and Kristallnacht; the main events in South Africa from 1948 and through the '50s.

Candidates' knowledge and understanding of the content has improved over the last few years and several examiners commented on the impressive knowledge of this year's candidates. However, candidates around the C/D borderline still suffer from weaknesses in the skills of selection and deployment of knowledge. Their answers are often not relevant to the question set: dates mentioned in the question are ignored; when an area of content is identified in the question candidates fail to limit their answers to the relevant area and try and impress the examiner with how much they know about a broader topic; when asked to interpret a source they evaluate it, when asked to evaluate a source they describe it; when asked to describe they explain. The first step to writing relevant answers is to think carefully about what a question is asking them to do. Candidates should be given practice in looking for key words in terms of the

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

content area being asked about, for example, a question about the impact of religion on medicine in Egyptian times is not asking candidates to write down everything they know about Egyptian medicine, and in terms of what they are being asked to do with the content, for example, describe, explain, evaluate or compare. When instructed to use a source in their answer candidates must do this – there will be a limit to the number of marks they can achieve if they ignore the source. A golden rule for source questions is to use both the source and relevant knowledge in answering the question.

Candidates should be reminded that examiners award marks for one thing only – attempting to answer the question. Candidates sometimes use their answers instead to show off their knowledge and the range of their historical skills and understanding. No matter how impressive this display is, marks will not be awarded unless the answer contains moves towards answering the question.

After thinking about what the question is asking them to do, candidates need to select the relevant knowledge for that particular question from everything they know about that topic. This will mean leaving out of their answer more than they put in. Candidates find this a very difficult discipline and need practice through short sharp exercises in class. Having selected the relevant knowledge, candidates need to think about how to use it to answer the question. In other words, they need to deploy their knowledge. For example, if they have been asked whether they are surprised by a source they need to use their knowledge to explain why they are surprised or not surprised. Some candidates simply write a lot of relevant material without saying whether they are surprised. A good way of starting answers is to try and provide a direct answer to the question in the first line and then use the rest of the answer to support this.

There was a tendency this year for candidates to evaluate sources as a matter of course whether it was required or not. Again, a careful think about the question will help, for example, if a question asks how far a source proves something then it is legitimate to evaluate the source, but if a question asks candidates to compare two sources then issues of reliability are not relevant. Instead, candidates should be asking themselves about the message, purpose and audience of each source. In evaluation questions candidates can go a long way by testing the claims of a source against their own knowledge of the topic. It is surprising how many candidates do not do this.

Sometimes candidates are asked to base an answer on two areas of content they may not have used together before, for example, public health and Fleming or the homesteaders and Mormons. Candidates often have the required knowledge to answer these questions satisfactorily but because they are not used to comparing different topics they can become confused in their answers. Again, practice with challenging comparisons could be provided in the classroom.

A number of candidates appear not to be clear about what they are being asked to do in the (b) part of the structured essay questions. These questions always require explanation, usually causal explanation. Candidates should avoid simply identifying a list of reasons – they need to explain them. This involves more than just telling the story, describing the reasons or writing in a general way about them. Candidates need to explain how a particular reason contributed to a particular outcome, for example, in Germany 2(b) it was not enough to describe the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. What was required was an explanation of why people in Germany disliked particular parts of the treaty – why they were so upset by the war guilt clause. Of course, anybody would be upset if they were accused of being responsible for starting a war so candidates have to go beyond that and explain why Germans in that particular context were upset about having to admit responsibility. When asked about why reforms were introduced it is not enough to simply describe the conditions that the reforms were designed to do something about. What is required is an explanation of why at that particular time people decided that something had to be done.

The big hurdle for the best candidates is to achieve the eighth mark in the (c) part of the structured essay questions. To do this a conclusion is required. This needs to consist of a reasoned and supported argument. In trying to write a conclusion candidates too often simply repeat an earlier part of the answer or make an assertion. When asked, for example, who was more important in medicine, the Greeks or the Romans, candidates need to argue a reason why one of them was more important or why they were equally important. This cannot be done by simply saying what the Greeks or Romans did. There needs to be an element of comparison in the conclusion and an argument, for example, explaining how the Romans relied on Greek medicine. Good candidates need practice in writing such a conclusion.

## **Comments on specific questions**

### **Medicine Through Time**

**Q1(a)** The responses to this question were rather polarised – if candidates knew about Pare they did well, if they knew nothing about Pare they did badly. There is little excuse for knowing nothing about Pare but a minority of candidates claimed he lived in the eleventh century and was responsible for anything from developing vaccinations to constructing the germ theory. However, overall the question was answered well. A good number of candidates used their knowledge of the story of Pare and his use of ligatures and/or his soothing ointment to explain that he would not have approved of the method described in Source A. Some candidates lost marks unnecessarily either because they failed to say whether Pare would have approved or they merely identified ligatures or the soothing ointment without explaining why these would have led to disapproval from him.

**Q1(b)** This question was generally answered very well, although some candidates failed to reach the top levels of the mark scheme because they failed to follow the instruction in the question to use the source as well as their knowledge. Most candidates knew the main dangers of infection, bleeding and pain and wrote about them at some length.

**Q1(c)** This question produced the full range of answers. Weaker candidates simply accepted the claims made in the source and used the content of the source to argue that Lister contributed little to the development of surgery. Better candidates used their knowledge of Lister's work to challenge the claims made. Sound knowledge was demonstrated about what the spray did, the resulting fall in mortality rates and Lister's contribution to further developments in aseptic surgery. The best candidates carefully qualified their claims about Lister's significance by pointing out the limitations of his work. Again, a number of candidates failed to achieve marks because they wrote lots about Lister but failed to deploy their knowledge to provide an answer to the precise question set.

**Q2** This question was the most popular choice of candidates. Part (a) was generally answered well with a good number of candidates scoring full marks. Most candidates knew about the combination of natural and supernatural methods that were used. However, knowledge that a range of natural methods such as bleeding were used should not be used to allow answers to degenerate into a full scale account of, for example, the Theory of the Four Humours. Answers still need to be to the point.

Part (b) produced many good answers with candidates able to explain the main features of Galen's work and why his influence lasted into the Middle Ages. Knowledge of Galen's work on anatomy and the use of opposites was sound. Some of the more recent textbooks correctly emphasise Galen's role in reviving Hippocratic methods. While knowledge of this enabled some candidates to write very good answers, weaker candidates confused Galen with Hippocrates and claimed that it was Galen who first came up with the Theory of the Four Humours. Care needs to be taken in class to clearly distinguish between the work of Hippocrates and Galen.

## *Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

Some candidates failed to score high marks because instead of explaining Galen's contribution (this need be based on no more than two examples) they identified six or seven ways in which he is important. One good explanation will always be awarded more marks than endless identifications.

Part (c) produced a good range of answers. Many candidates were able to explain the importance of at least one civilisation. Many concentrated on natural explanations, Hippocrates and the Four Humours for the Greeks, and on public health for the Romans. However, it was worrying to see a number of candidates dismiss the Greeks because they explained everything through supernatural beliefs. Another disappointment was how few of the best candidates went on to produce a comparison of the importance of the two civilisations based on argument. There were plenty of assertions but few argued reasons.

**Q3** This question was not quite as popular as Question 2. Part (a) was answered well with many candidates able to explain about embalming, mummification and priests and cleanliness. Some failed to score good marks because they did not connect these factors with religion while a few ignored religion completely and simply write about any aspect of Egyptian medicine. In the past, questions about factors such as chance have often resulted in general answers lacking specific examples.

Although there were some of these this year in response to (b) there were also many more answers based on examples such as Pare, Jenner, Simpson, Pasteur and Fleming. It is important to remember that candidates will not get high marks by simply telling the story – they need to explain the part that chance played in the discovery or development. Some candidates misunderstood what is meant by chance in this context and wrote about 'taking a chance' while a number identified examples but made no attempt to explain them.

In (c) a number of candidates ignored the instruction to write about 'since' the Romans and spent much time producing detailed answers about prehistoric times, the Egyptians, the Greeks and the Romans. However, there were plenty of candidates who wrote about the Church's disapproval of dissection, its support of Galen, the contribution of monasteries and of Islamic medicine and finally opposition to the use of chloroform in childbirth. The key to gaining a good mark was not simply to write about these examples but to explain how they show religion as a factor in either helping or hindering development in medicine. Good candidates had no trouble explaining examples on both sides but few reached the top level of the mark scheme by reaching an argued and supported conclusion.

**Q4** This question was not popular and it tended to be choice of the weakest candidates. In response to (a) there were many general answers that could have referred to any period in history and lacked details that were specific to the nineteenth century. Chronology was a problem for these candidates with plenty of references to rats and the Black Death, although they did score marks by general references to sewage and overcrowding. Some candidates clearly had no understanding of the term 'public health' and wrote about various aspects of medicine with surgery being the favourite.

In (b) there were many general answers lacking specific detail. Other candidates ignored the 'why' in the question and described the improvements rather than explaining the reasons why they were taking place. Weak candidates thought it was sufficient to describe the bad conditions and claim that these were the reasons why improvements were being made. A minority of candidates scored high marks by focusing on specific examples such as Snow, Chadwick and the Great Stink and explaining why these led to improvements.

There were some good answers to (c) from candidates who used their knowledge about the benefits brought by public health and the work of Fleming. Some even evaluated Fleming by comparing his importance with that of Florey and Chance. However, many candidates



answered this question very badly. Many appeared to have no idea what Fleming did and simply claimed he was involved in public health reforms. What they wrote about public health was general and lacked references to the nineteenth century. This question did require candidates to compare two aspects of medicine that they had probably not connected before and may have been too demanding. However, the fact that Question 4 was overwhelmingly the choice of the weakest candidates makes it difficult to be certain about this. In the past many candidates have risen to the challenge posed by such questions.

### **Crime and Punishment Through Time**

**Q1(a)** Answers were divided fairly evenly into three types: those that were surprised by such punishments for such minor crimes; those whose knowledge of the Bloody Code led them not to be surprised; and those who were able to explain that the crimes cited all related to property and the interests of the propertied. There were some misunderstandings, the most common being that the Normans and the forest laws were major factors in the eighteenth century. Some candidates missed out on marks that they should have gained by failing to explain whether their answers made them surprised.

**Q1(b)** produced the full range of answers. Some candidates effectively deployed detailed knowledge of smuggling as a social crime to question the impression given by the source and the best candidates went on to use more knowledge to confirm the seriousness or viciousness of smuggling. However, there were also a good number of candidates who simply based their answers on the information in the source. These answers could have been written without studying smuggling!

**Q1(c)** Probably because the source provided evidence for both sides many candidates failed to go beyond the source. They simply took one passage from the source that suggests transportation was a failure and one that suggests it was effective. It is important that candidates realise that when they are asked whether a source proves a certain point it will always be necessary to refer to, and use, knowledge of the topic. A few candidates used knowledge of factors such as tickets of leave, some ex-convicts making good, the dreadful conditions suffered by many on the ships and in places like Tasmania to reach reasoned judgements about transportation.

**Q2** This question was slightly more popular than the other two optional questions. The more able candidates tended to choose this question. Part (a) was generally answered well. Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of some of the unpleasant punishments used by the Romans such as crucifixion. There were some excellent answers that differentiated between different social groups but there were also answers from candidates who simply wrote down every punishment they could think of.

Answers to (b) fell into three clear groups. The first and weakest of these had little idea about the question and appeared to know virtually nothing about the context of the Robin Hood stories. The second group had some idea of what the question was getting at but lacked detailed knowledge. Answers in this group made general references to the story showing that people were unhappy with the law or the powers that be. The third group, (there were a fair number of candidates in this group) explained the social significance of the story, for example, the unpopularity of the forest laws, hatred of the Norman masters and corrupt officials, effectively emphasising its context and how aspects of the story represented the grievances and hopes of many people at the time.

Part (c) was answered well by many candidates. Most used various types of trial by ordeal as the basis of their answers and the better candidates were able to qualify their answers by reference to medieval use of juries, witnesses and evidence. Some candidates should have scored more marks than they did because they had the necessary knowledge but failed to explain the part played by religion.

**Q3** This question was slightly more popular than Question 4 but was not answered well. It tended to be the refuge of the weaker candidates. In previous years candidates have shown a lack of knowledge and understanding of the development of prisons in the nineteenth century and this year was no exception to this. In (a) answers were vague and general with details taken from early medieval prisons through to in the twentieth century. There are aspects that clearly characterise prisons during the later eighteenth century and early nineteenth century but few candidates were aware of them.

There were a few good answers to (b) using knowledge of the work of Elizabeth Fry, John Howard and demands to reform criminals but many of the answers were general and some seemed to be about debates current in the early 21st century.

The same pattern was found in answers to (c). There were some excellent answers but too many were confused about the timing of developments such as the silent system, the separate system, separate prisons for children and for women. Candidates seem to struggle with this topic and it may be that the available textbooks fail to provide a clear route through the main developments. Teachers could try and construct a clear and uncluttered timeline giving candidates an overview of the main developments.

**Q4** This question was not a popular choice but was answered much better than Question 3. Part (a) was answered well with sound knowledge of the main features of the story demonstrated. (b) produced some descriptions of the methods of the suffragettes but there were also many answers that tackled the question properly and explained how and why peaceful methods had not been effective. There were some good answers to (c) showing that candidates had only selected Question 4 if they knew something about it. Sound knowledge was demonstrated about both Peterloo and the Rebecca Riots (these were the best answers for years about the Rebecca Riots). Many candidates were able to make informed judgements about the success of each but only a few attempted the comparison. Those that did the comparison did it well with some interesting arguments based on factors such as the Six Acts, the 1832 Reform Act, the reduction in tolls and the transportation of the Rebecca leaders.

### **Elizabethan England**

**Q1** In response to part (a) nearly all candidates were able to compare the details in the two sources for both similarities and differences. Some candidates noted that not all the features described in Source A could be checked by reference to Source B but better candidates realised that some of the features described in Source A could never be shown in a portrait, for example, a lack of commonsense. The best candidates used their knowledge and focused on the fact that a portrait painted during Mary's captivity could not be trusted.

In (b) most candidates were able to suggest contextual and valid reasons why some people might agree with Elizabeth and others disagree. However, the weakness of these answers was that the reasons were not matched to particular groups such as Catholic and Protestant. Answers that did this were placed in higher levels – surprisingly only a small number of candidates reached these levels.

There was a full range of answers to (c). Weak candidates assumed the decision was an easy one for Elizabeth and often did not go beyond the information in Source D. Some candidates failed to read the question carefully and based their answers on events surrounding the Babington Plot and Mary's eventual execution. The question, however, asked about the situation in 1572. Better candidates were able to focus on issues that made Elizabeth's decision a difficult one such the potential threat from Catholic powers abroad and Catholics at home, and fears of going against a divinely appointed monarch.

**Q2** This question was rather more popular than Question 3 although not by an enormous margin. It was rather better answered. Candidates were able to identify many relevant features in (a) with the best candidates mentioning the unsettling effect on Elizabethan society of so many people simply moving around rather than keeping to their home parish.

There were many good answers to (b) although weaker candidates tended to produce very general answers that could have been about anywhere at any time, for example, general references to drunkenness and debauchery. Some answers thought that riots by women refusing acting parts in the plays were a major problem. Better candidates raised a range of contextual reasons including the siting of the theatres outside the City of London, the spread of disease and Puritan concerns. Some candidates tended to simply write about these factors rather than explain why they caused problems. They probably thought this was too obvious to mention.

There was a full range of answers to part (c) although some weaker candidates thought that it was another question just about vagrancy while others who had studied *Crime and Punishment* were distracted into writing about the 'horrible' and 'cruel' punishments of the time that made everyone behave. Better candidates made good use of the Elizabethan Poor Law but also ranged across other aspects such as the Elizabethan religious settlement and the defeat of attempted rebellions. The only disappointing feature of these answers was their failure to produce an argued conclusion rather than assertions.

**Q3** This question tended to attract many of the weaker candidates and this obviously had an effect on how well the question was answered. However, even the weaker candidates knew a little about the Armada campaign for part (a) and better candidates had little trouble in scoring full marks. There was a tendency to waste considerable time on the causes of the Armada. Marks were not awarded for this. Some of the better candidates seemed to think that the story ended with the use of fire ships and did not complete the story around the coast of Scotland and Ireland.

In (b) the weaker candidates either restricted themselves to Drake's exploits against the Armada or wrote very general answers. Better candidates demonstrated knowledge of, for example, Drake's exploits around the world and against Spanish treasure fleets and colonies but only the best put these reasons into context by explaining the fear and hatred in England of Spain and Catholicism.

Answers to (c) were rather polarised. There were some splendid answers from the better candidates and some interesting comparisons. Valid arguments were made about England as a rising world power and about the need to keep order, unity and stability at home if England was to become a major power. Excellent knowledge was demonstrated about expanding trade, settlements and the importance of Elizabeth's religious policies at home. Other candidates wrote vague and general answers full of assertions but with little relevant knowledge or reasoning.

### **Britain, 1815–51**

**Q1(a)** This question differentiated well with many candidates able to interpret the message of the cartoon. The better candidates used their contextual knowledge to produce excellent explanations while other candidates were able to make use of details in the cartoon. A small number of candidates misunderstood the cartoon and thought that it was criticising the farm labourers and supporting the farmers. An even smaller group thought that it was about working conditions in factories.

**Q1(b)** Almost all candidates demonstrated some knowledge of the Speenhamland system, although the weaker ones simply used the information in the source to claim that it was popular. A majority of candidates, however, went beyond the source and used their knowledge to produce good explanations of why some groups liked Speenhamland while others, such as ratepayers, did not. In past years the different systems of poor relief have caused confusion for some candidates. This year's answers showed a marked improvement in knowledge and understanding.

**Q1(c)** This question presented rather more of a challenge to candidates. Some candidates got no further than comparing the content of the two sources and expressing surprise at the differences between them. Others ignored Source C and simply used their knowledge of conditions in the workhouses to explain why the New Poor Law was unpopular with the poor. However, there were plenty of candidates who realised there was no reason why Source C should make us surprised by what is described in Source D because the two sources show the views of two very different groups. There were many good explanations along these lines supported by good contextual understanding. There were also a number of good evaluations of Source C through an informed use of the provenance.

**Q2** This question was not as popular as Question 3 although the latter was chosen by most of the weaker candidates and so the overall standard of answers was not as good as those for Question 2. Part (a) was answered well with plenty of accurate detail. A small number of candidates failed to read the question carefully and wrote about conditions in factories.

In response to (b) some candidates thought that it was sufficient to simply describe how bad working conditions were rather than explaining the reasons why Parliament decided that something had to be done about them. Most candidates were able to explain factors such as the work of individuals such as Shaftesbury, pressure from groups such as the Chartists and economic arguments. A number of candidates simply identified these factors and failed to explain how they contributed to reforms being introduced.

Part (c) produced many good answers with candidates able to go beyond the selfishness of factory owners and explain other reasons. Candidates were particularly strong on the idea that some of the workers (including the women) were against the reforms because it restricted their earning power and their rights. There were also some good explanations about Britain's economic competitiveness. It was, however, disappointing to see few candidates go on and compare the importance of the selfishness of the owners with that of other factors. Weaker candidates wasted considerable time by simply writing about how terrible working conditions were and why it was dreadful that anyone should oppose attempts at reform.

**Q3** Part (a) did not always produce good answers. A number of candidates ignored the fact that the question was about the contribution of the navvies to the development of the railways and spent their time describing in detail their drinking, violence and womanising. Some of the better candidates were able to score high marks by keeping to what the question was asking but even some of these appeared to have limited knowledge of this topic.

Answers to (b) fell into two groups: those about the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in particular and those that were about railways in general. The building of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway is a Case Study and candidates should have studied it. Answers to this question went by centre. In some centres most candidates were able to write about the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in particular and covered points such as the technical advances that were made, the importance to the economic development of Liverpool and Manchester and the way in which it acted as a stimulus for further railway building. In other centres nearly every candidate produced general answers that could have applied to almost any railway anywhere.

There were many good answers to (c) with most candidates aware that some people supported the railways while others opposed it. A small number of candidates were only able to identify groups such as stage coach owners and investors, but most produced good explanations and a good number went on to produce an argued and supported conclusion about 'how far'.

### **American West, 1840–1895**

**Q1(a)** This question was generally well answered with most candidates realising that they had to explain why there were these different attitudes towards the Plains rather than just compare the attitudes. A number only identified factors such as differences in time and manifest destiny, but a good number used factors such as these to explain why attitudes towards the Plains had changed. There were some really excellent answers showing an impressive grasp of the broader context. Weaker candidates used the sources for surface details and failed to infer attitudes. Their answers simply compared the surface details of the two sources.

**Q1(b)** This question required candidates to use their knowledge and understanding to make inferences from the painting. It produced a wide range of answers and differentiated well. The weaker candidates dismissed the source out of hand on the grounds that it tells us nothing about how the Indians managed to survive. The next group of candidates were able to identify details from the painting such as the horses, the dogs and the tepees but then only made vague references to hunting as a way of life. A good number of candidates went further and explained how details in the painting suggest that the Indians were nomadic and then explained how being nomadic helped the Indians survive. The best candidates added that the source has its limitations because it fails to show us other factors such as the importance of the buffalo to the Indians.

**Q1(c)** Many candidates knew a lot about why the Plains Indians disliked living on reservations but some ignored the instruction in the question to use the source. Answers needed to be based on what is shown in the source – the provision of free rations. Some candidates made no reference at all to this in their answers. There were, however, many good answers with candidates explaining why being given free rations would not have been popular. Candidates mentioned the dislike of being dependent and the impact on their culture and way of life. There were a few weaker candidates who thought the Indians would be delighted to be given free food. More credit was given to those candidates who placed this kind of answer into some kind of context by explaining that the buffalo herds had been destroyed and so the traditional food source of the Indians had gone.

**Q2** This question was rather more popular than Question 3 but not by an enormous margin. There was little difference in how well the two questions were answered. Many candidates scored full marks in (a) by mentioning factors such as Indians, the extreme weather, disease and the crossing of rivers. However, a small number of candidates lost marks by writing about the problems faced by homesteaders after they had settled on their homesteads. Taking a few moments to carefully read, and think about, the question would have avoided this.

There were many good answers to (b) with an encouraging number of candidates showing detailed knowledge of the problems faced by the Mormons in the East. However, a number of these candidates thought it was sufficient to simply describe these problems rather than explain why and how they led the Mormons to go west to the Great Salt Lake. Likewise, candidates were aware of the attractions of the Great Salt Lake, for example, it was outside the USA, but they failed to explain why this was an advantage for the Mormons.

Part (c) required candidates to compare two areas of the specification content that they may not have previously used together. Many rose to this challenge and produced some very interesting comparisons. The similarities were relatively straightforward, for example, difficulties in finding water, growing crops and finding building materials, but the differences posed rather more of a

challenge. Most candidates tackled this challenge by producing some interesting contrasts between the isolation of the homesteaders and the community approach of the Mormons. Other candidates contrasted threats to the homesteaders from Indians and ranchers to threats to the Mormons from the US government. There were also some misunderstandings, for instance, the Mormons continued to suffer the type of persecution they had faced in the East, the homesteaders were given free land while the Mormons had to buy their land.

**Q3** In previous years questions about law and order and conflict between cattlemen and homesteaders have been answered badly. This year's answers showed a marked improvement in candidates' knowledge and understanding of these topics. There were many good answers to (a) with candidates rightly concentrating on the special nature of mining towns, for example, the presence of gold, arguments over claims and the speed with which these towns appeared, as the key. There were still some general answers that could have applied to almost anywhere but overall this question was much better answered than similar questions have been in previous years.

In (b) most candidates were able to explain one reason – this was usually the argument over, or different views about, land. Candidates often used land in such a general and all-embracing way that they left themselves little scope to find a second reason. The issue of land can be broken down into several aspects each of which can be used as a reason for the conflict. Only the very best candidates did this.

### **Germany, 1919–1945**

**Q1(a)** In response to (a) weaker candidates got no further than suggesting that the poster was published to persuade girls to join the League of German Maidens. This information was given to candidates in the information about the provenance of the source. Examiners were looking for candidates to explain why the Nazis wanted girls like the one in the poster to join the League. Many candidates were able to do this and the question was, on the whole, answered well. The best answers focused on two aspects: the type of girl the Nazis wanted (the Aryan ideal depicted in the poster) and the type of roles that girls would be prepared for in the League. A small number of candidates went wrong by writing about boys and the Hitler Youth, describing in detail the activities undertaken by the girls in the League without explaining their purpose and by explaining that the girls were being prepared to work in the factories making armaments.

Part (b) produced a wide range of answers. The weaker candidates found it difficult to interpret the two illustrations, especially the first. These candidates often produced comparisons of surface details. Many candidates were able to work out the anti-Semitic nature of the sources but some struggled with their analysis of Source B. Most were able to explain Source C but the money, the Soviet Union, the map of Germany tucked under the arm and the whip in Source B were explained by only the better candidates.

Part (c) also produced a wide range of responses. The best answers (there were an encouraging number of these) realised that there was no reason to be surprised by the activities described in Source D because of their knowledge of groups like Swing and White Rose. However, these candidates also realised that their answers needed to be qualified by suggesting some surprise because of the control and indoctrination imposed by the Nazis. Slightly less good answers left out this qualification. Other candidates produced reasonable answers by explaining why it was not surprising that the Nazis were reporting these kinds of activities. Even weaker candidates were able to express their surprise by asserting that it was dangerous to do this kind of thing in Nazi Germany. Their answers, however, lacked contextual development.

**Q2** Part (a) was generally well answered. A few weaker candidates thought that the Ruhr was taken from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles and that it was Germany that was invading, but most were able to write about Germany's failure to keep up the reparation payments, the taking over of factories and materials, the passive resistance, inflation, and the action of Stresemann.

Answers to (b) on the other hand were a little disappointing. There were plenty of candidates who wrote good answers and scored high marks but a surprisingly large number simply listed the reasons for the Treaty being unpopular (in the weakest answers this consisted of listing some of the terms of the Treaty) without explaining why.

Part (c) produced the full range of answers. A worrying number of candidates are still confusing the two economic crises and a number simply used the Nazi coming to power as evidence that Weimar had not overcome its problems. However, there were plenty of more subtle answers. A large number of candidates achieved reasonable marks by explaining ways in which Weimar had appeared to overcome its problems (for instance, survival in 1923, involvement in international affairs and agreements and the work of Stresemann) but better candidates were able to add to this by explaining how Weimar foundations were always weak because of, for example, dependence on foreign loans.

**Q3** Answers to (a) showed that some candidates appeared never to have heard of the Reichstag Fire. They described various events such as the Munich Putsch, Kristallnacht and the Night of the Long Knives. It is clear that weaker candidates would benefit from a clear and simple chronology of the main events of this period and a short straightforward account of each event with practice in distinguishing one event from another. However, most candidates achieved high marks by telling the main features of the story including the clampdown on opponents, the winning of the election and the Enabling Law.

In (b) there were some excellent answers showing a good understanding of the situation in 1934 especially in relation to the relationship between Hitler, the army and the SA. However, as in some of the answers to (a) there were also a number of candidates who had no idea what the Night of the Long Knives was while others were content to simply assert that Rohm was plotting against Hitler.

There were some very general answers to (c) lacking specific contextual detail. These answers contained little more than vague references to Hitler's popularity, his ability as a speaker and economic problems. Some candidates again confused the two economic crises and wrote about Germany suffering hyperinflation in the early 1930s. The best answers distinguished the factors from one another, for example, unemployment, the political intrigues of Hindenburg and von Papen and Hitler's abilities, and examined how each one contributed to Hitler's success. There were some interesting arguments based on the fact that the Nazi vote had started to go down. However, even many of the best candidates failed to reach an argued and reasoned conclusion. There were many assertions about one factor being more important than another but little reasoning. There was a real opportunity here to show how these factors were closely linked and depended on each other but few candidates realised this.

### **South Africa, 1945–1995**

**Q1(a)** Some of the weaker candidates could get no further than stating that the cartoon is reporting de Klerk's departure. However, about half the candidates understood the mocking of de Klerk or the delight at his departure (many picked up the reference to the forced removals) but only a few placed their answers in the context of 1994 and the ANC victory in the elections. It is important that when asked about the message or purpose of a source that candidates make an inference, use the details in the source and place it in context.

**Q1(b)** This question produced a wide range of responses. Candidates had no trouble in interpreting the hope of Source B and most understood the mixed messages of Source C. However, a minority of candidates explicitly compared the two sources. There was a tendency to write about each source separately and at best to make a very general remark about agreement or disagreement between the sources.

**Q1(c)** Candidates struggled rather more with this source. There were many assertions that white rule did end or that black South Africans did get the vote but far fewer valid interpretations of the source. A few good candidates did understand the cartoon, for example, that white South Africans had little choice but to end minority rule and most used their contextual knowledge to explain why they agreed with this message.

**Q2** This question was rather less popular than Question 3. The weaker candidates tended to choose this question and as a result it was not answered very successfully. In (a) there were many general points made but often little mention of specific promises made in 1948. Answers to (b) were surprisingly weak. Candidates did mention claims of superiority but few other arguments were mentioned, for example, advantages of separate development and claims that it had divine support. In (c) candidates managed to identify relevant points on both sides of the argument but often failed to go on and fully explain them.

**Q3** (a) was generally answered well with references to specific events such as the Defiance Campaign, bus boycotts and anti-pass law demonstrations. There were many good answers to (b) with candidates particularly strong on the international reaction to Sharpeville. Many candidates were able also to explain other consequences such as the banning of the ANC, the turn to violence and investors withdrawing money from the country. In response to (c) many candidates were able to suggest and explain several factors other than the activities of the ANC. These usually included international sanctions and the spread of independence across other parts of southern Africa. A number of candidates also reached argued and reasoned conclusions.

### **Short course questions not appearing in the long course papers**

#### **Medicine Through Time**

**Q1(b)** This question was generally answered well. Only a few candidates assumed that the scene in the source meant that the problem of blood loss had been overcome. Most candidates understood that the blood transfusion shown would not work and many were able to explain why this was so. Mention was made of the lack of knowledge of blood groups at the time. Better candidates added that attempts at blood transfusion did indicate knowledge of circulation of the blood and that developments were going in the right direction.

**Q1(d)** This question was not answered as well. Too many candidates restricted themselves to the surface information in the two sources to explain that chloroform had its supporters and opponents. Better candidates evaluated the sources either by exploring the provenance of the sources or by bringing in their own knowledge of the development and use of chloroform to support, or show the limitations of, the sources.

**Q1(f)** Many candidates scored well on this question. They used the sources well to explain how some support the statement and some do not. There were very few answers that failed to use the sources but some candidates did identify correctly which sources support and which disagree with the statement but failed to explain their answers properly.

#### **Crime and Punishment Through Time**

**Q1(c)** The few candidates who answered the Crime and Punishment option did not get very far with this question. There were some general comments about how cruel and barbaric people were but little contextual understanding of the eighteenth century was shown and little attempt was made to explore the details in the source.



*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

**Q1(d)** The few attempts at this question were poor with candidates being restricted to simple inferences, for example, to catch criminals. Better inferences about the general state of law and order at the time were not made and little use was made of the mention of the Bow Street Runners in the provenance.

**Q1(f)** This question was answered reasonably well with candidates able to identify some sources on each side.

**PAPER 2: MEDICINE THROUGH TIME**  
**THE WORK OF ALEXANDER FLEMING**

**General Comments**

This year's paper seems to have caused few problems for candidates, who were obviously very comfortable with the chosen topic. Ironically, however, setting questions on a topic where candidates have a very sound knowledge of the detail created other difficulties. This was most apparent on Question 1, where some candidates wanted to tell the examiners things they knew about Fleming rather than make inferences from the source itself.

Other points which emerged from the performance of candidates were:

- when a question asks the candidates whether they are surprised by what a source says, candidates must somewhere in their answer tell the examiners whether they are surprised! Examiners read many analyses of Sources B and C but sometimes did not know which way the candidate was arguing
- in utility questions (such as Question 3), candidates must make sure that they consider the reliability of the source

In general, however, this year's performance was good and examiners were pleased to read many thoughtful and well developed answers.

**Comments on Individual Questions**

**Question 1**

Examiners saw many good responses to this question and most candidates were able to find valid inferences and support them. For example:

*'Fleming was obviously hard-working because the source says he was in his little laboratory as usual.'*

*'Fleming was an unusual scientist because he was teased for being untidy and scientists are thought to be tidy and methodical.'*

*'He was obviously a man of action as his assistant said that he didn't confine himself to observing, but took action at once.'*

Three supported inferences, such as above, were sufficient to score full marks on this question. Candidates should be aware of the need to make more than one inference; otherwise marks will be limited to the lower end of the top level.

Weaker candidates might benefit from further guidance on the meaning of 'inference'. An inference is making a judgement from the information which is provided, but which is not directly stated in the source. So it is not a valid inference to suggest that Fleming was 'untidy' (because the source actually says that) but it is valid to suggest that *'his behaviour was unusual because he was teased about his untidy habits'*.

As mentioned in the introduction, this question was made a little more challenging for candidates as their knowledge sometimes took them into areas which were not valid in explaining what could be learned about Fleming from this source. So examiners could not accept 'shy' or 'careless, because he left the window open' as inferences, because these could not be validly inferred from the source.

## Question 2

As stated in previous reports, the essence of questions such as this is that candidates should feel that what is being said in the source contradicts something they have learned about the history of medicine. In this example, they are asked to consider a criticism by Florey of all the publicity around Fleming's role in developing penicillin. This obviously contradicts what candidates have been taught about the importance of Fleming and ought to be surprising. However, deeper analysis should help candidates explain why Florey might be offended by the level of credit given to Fleming and, therefore, why the source might not be surprising. Many candidates did this.

Weaker candidates argued that they were surprised because '*Fleming was the one who started it all*' or because '*Source B says that Fleming does not get enough credit, so why should Florey be upset?*'

Better answers were those which drew on their knowledge to explain that Florey and Chain had played a significant part in the development and so were not happy that Fleming seemed to be receiving undue praise. Where this was supported by contextual knowledge ('*I cannot understand why Florey was bothered. I know he tried to avoid publicity himself, so why is he upset when others get it?*') or cross-reference ('*If you look at what Chain says in Source G, it looks like it all might have happened even without Fleming*'), reward was given in the top level.

## Question 3

This is a standard source evaluation question and most candidates were able to score well. Centres should note, however, that reliability is an essential part of evaluating utility and should be addressed in this type of question.

Lower marks were awarded to those candidates who simply explained what information could be gleaned from the source. ('*From this source we can learn that Fleming worked in a laboratory and used petri dishes*') with further marks awarded for details of what could not be found out ('*...but we cannot see that he immediately took action on discovering the mould*').

What examiners hoped to see, however, was a consideration of the reliability of the source and how it affected its utility. Candidates who did this tended either to argue that the church was close to the hospital where Fleming worked so he was a '*local hero*', or to use their knowledge or cross-reference to show how the detail in the source was accurate or inaccurate. Answers such as '*I have my suspicions about this source because the lab looks very neat and tidy and we were told in Source A that he was untidy. So I don't think it is reliable*' were common. More surprising were those which (invalidly) claimed the untidy state of the lab in the window showed the source to be reliable.

A minority of candidates were much exercised by the window in the picture and what might have flown in through it, but couldn't because the window appeared to be shut.

Regardless of reliability, however, the most compelling argument is as set out in the following candidate's response.

*'Whether the details are reliable or not, what really matters is the fact that the window exists. It is not an ordinary thing to appear in a stained-glass window. Normally, there are biblical scenes or pictures of God or Christ. So if Fleming appears in a window, this tells us that he must have been seen as a very important person in history – or, at least, in the history of medicine.'*

#### Question 4

This was a relatively straightforward question, but it was disappointing to see so few candidates reach the top level.

The most obvious response to the question was to argue that the source shows that Fleming does not deserve the credit because he himself says so and the doctor writing the letter obviously agreed (though some candidates did not understand the meaning of '*and I had to bite my lip not to agree with him*').

Some candidates then went on to argue that Fleming might have just been modest or that he is denying that he deserves the Nobel Prize, but that doesn't mean he didn't deserve credit for discovering penicillin. Further reward was given for this type of answer.

Most candidates took their answers a stage further and argued either that Fleming did deserve credit because of the importance of his work, or did not deserve credit because Florey and Chain '*did the important stuff*'. This was the correct approach, but answers were often too generalised. What was needed was reference to contextual knowledge about the work of Fleming, Florey or Chain – or a detailed use of the sources to support the argument. In most cases this was not forthcoming.

#### Question 5

The 'purple prose' of Source F obviously appealed to some candidates who were amused at the suggestion that Fleming had 'dreamy blue eyes' or a mind which 'moves like a cobra'. Indeed it must have come as a shock to those who had decided that he was an eccentric, slovenly, rather unclean and very lucky individual (as often suggested in Q1 or Q6).

Most candidates were able to explain in general terms that the context of the sources explained their different approach. This proved easier to develop for Source G than for Source F.

In discussing Source G candidates generally explained the role that Chain had played in developing penicillin, his links with Florey and suggested that Chain, most probably, felt undervalued for his role. Where this was supported by cross-reference or contextual knowledge, highest marks were awarded.

Source F proved a little trickier and most candidates limited their answers to the fact that it was a magazine and would therefore be 'bigging up Fleming'. A significant number of candidates argued that as the magazine was American, that explained the hyperbole. It is a pity that arguments were not developed to explain the impact that penicillin had in the USA and on the Second World War or the major investment made in the development programme by the American government. Such an approach, in conjunction with evaluating Source G by the same method, would have scored full marks.

#### Question 6

Examiners now see very few answers which do not use the sources in answering this final question, but there was, once again, a minority of candidates who banded the sources together and addressed them as one source. It is, therefore, worth repeating the advice given in last year's report:

'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.'

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

There was a variety of approaches which could be taken in considering whether Fleming's importance has been exaggerated. Some candidates chose to argue that the sources actually showed exaggeration (or not), whilst others argued that Fleming had or had not received due credit because of what the sources actually said. An example of these two different responses to Source G will help clarify these approaches.

*'His importance certainly has been exaggerated. He is described as having a mind like a cobra and being a scientist of similar standing to Galileo and Newton. Well, if it hadn't been for Florey and Chain his discovery would have been much less important.'*

or

*'No I don't think Fleming's importance has been exaggerated. As it says in Source G, he belongs to the list of great scientists which includes Galileo and Newton.'*

Examiners much preferred the first approach, as it involved using knowledge to consider the accuracy of the source. However, the second approach was valid and was rewarded.

Whichever approach was used, most candidates seemed to appreciate that the key to success was to consider the sources individually to explain how they showed an understanding of the importance given to Fleming – and to provide support from the source. Where this was done, high marks were awarded.

## GCSE HISTORY A

### PAPER 2: CRIME AND PUNISHMENT THROUGH TIME

#### General Comments

Candidates found the paper straightforward and accessible. All questions and sources were readily comprehensible, and there was little evidence of candidates experiencing problems in completing the paper in the time available.

However, despite the accessibility of the paper, the concerns that have surfaced in previous years about skill levels, and the approaches candidates take to the questions, did not disappear. There are two main issues. First, candidates often seem unaware of exactly what a question is demanding of them. For example, asked a simple comprehension/inference question like Question 1, they waste time by trying to evaluate the source and explaining why they do not find it reliable/useful, even cross-referencing it against other sources. Comparable problems occurred with other questions. Perhaps the most worrying thing about this is the suspicion that some candidates are being taught to answer in this manner on the basis that the scattergun approach is bound to hit the target somewhere.

The second problem relates to the poor quality of source evaluation that characterises many scripts. The top levels in Questions 3, 4 and 5 were rarely reached, with answers to Question 5 being particularly poor. Detailed comments on these questions are given below, but as a general point it is disappointing that most candidates seem unable to adopt a critical approach to the specific challenges of the sources given to them in the examination, and insofar as they attempt evaluation at all, rely on mechanical techniques such as cross-reference without questioning how plausible or persuasive their answers really are.

#### Comments on Individual Questions

##### Question 1

This was a very gentle opening to the paper. Candidates understand that a question asking for 'impressions' is actually inviting them to make inferences from the source. Given what the picture showed, almost all candidates were able to suggest that highwaymen were 'violent', 'ruthless' or 'aggressive', but in practice any plausible inference was accepted. Higher marks, as always, were given to those who could explain how the picture supported their inference(s). Interestingly, a significant minority of answers said that the source showed highwaymen were *not* violent, the justification generally being that they had not actually killed the coachman or passenger! This was not accepted.

##### Question 2

The underlying theme of the whole paper was whether there was any substance to the image of highwaymen as 'gentlemen of the road'. This question used two sharply contrasting sources, one portraying highwaymen as brutal criminals (Source C) and the other as the stereotypical gentleman highwayman (Source B), and asked about the extent of the similarity between them. Most candidates could make some valid comparisons. This was encouraging since in previous years questions requiring the skill of comparison – the direct matching of what one source says against another – have often caused problems. What separated the better answers from the weaker was an awareness of exactly what it was that was being compared. At the simplest level the sources contained similarities and differences of detail – they were both about a highway robbery taking place (similarity), or the highwayman in Source B only had a pistol whereas the robbers in Source C had a blunderbuss as well as a pistol (difference).

However, the accounts of the robberies differed sharply in the *impressions* they gave of the highwaymen – polite and considerate in Source B, violent and aggressive in Source C. Comparisons based on such inferences about the character of the highwaymen were more highly rewarded, as long as the source content was used to support the inferences. The very best answers, however, were not content merely to note the different impressions given by the sources, but were able to qualify these by spotting that Source B did not give an entirely positive view of highwaymen. In both sources, if passengers attempted to resist, violence would ensue.

The most common weakness was for candidates to make an inference about the character of highwaymen on one source, but then to compare this against content (with no inference about character) from the other source, as in this example:

*The sources are different because in Source B the highwayman is kind and considerate (inferences) because he begs to be excused for robbing and he leaves the passengers enough money to continue their journey (support from the source), but in Source C they thrust a pistol into the coach and demanded Mr Walpole's money (source content but no inference).*

It is easy to understand why candidates thought such answers were valid – in Source B the highwayman is nice, and in Source C they do something horrible – but this falls short of using inferences/impressions as the basis for comparison.

### Question 3

The question asked whether Source D could constitute proof of the highwaymen being sorry for nearly shooting the victim of their robbery described in Source C. The fact that Source D could be interpreted as an apology ('*Let us assure you that we did not intend to hurt or frighten you*') was enough to persuade weaker candidates of the highwaymen's sincerity, but did not earn many marks. More candidates were capable of seeing Source D as a ruse to get more money for the goods they had stolen, which at least had the merit of demonstrating a critical attitude to the source, even though the explanation of these answers, if limited to the content of Source D alone, owed more to commonsense than to technique in source evaluation.

To explain whether or not one believed the apology (as opposed to merely asserting whether or not one believed it, based on the content of Source D) required further reference to what one knew about highwaymen, and the obvious first point of reference was Source C, not least because the question itself pointed to it. Some candidates tried to use Source C as evidence of the highwaymen's bad faith by noting that a shot had been fired – but this made no real sense since Source D was attempting to explain that the shot was an accident. The more damning evidence from Source D was the way in which the highwaymen behaved *after* the shot was fired – threatening to shoot the coachman if he did not hand over his goods. If they were truly sorry, would they have continued to behave in such a brutal fashion?

Cross-references were also possible to other sources, or even to specific background knowledge of highwaymen's behaviour, but fewer marks were awarded to attempts to prove that they were sorry, and the highest marks went to those arguing that they were not. In terms of the skill demonstrated, all answers based on cross-reference are, of course, essentially the same, yet the sheer implausibility of Source D as a sincere apology counted against those candidates who fell for it.

### Question 4

On the evidence of this question, there has been a significant advance in candidates' understanding of the concept of source utility. A majority now do not automatically take the source at face value and assume its utility to be what it says or shows. To be sure, there are still many weaker candidates who do, but they earn low marks. For the rest, the route into utility is to

question the source's reliability, and although this is clearly insufficient in itself, it does represent a step forward. There were plenty of reasons for doubting the literal truth of what Source E showed about highwaymen, and concluding that it was not therefore a very useful source. The picture was implausible, showing a highwayman on horseback jumping over a cart. The provenance offered clues which, if developed and explained, provided further reasons for doubting the source.

Finally, contextual knowledge could be used, either specifically about Dick Turpin, or more generally about the unlikelihood of a highwayman attempting a robbery in the middle of a town in broad daylight, to question the source's reliability. As long as these reliability arguments were used to reach a conclusion about utility, they could earn good marks.

However, they still fell short of detecting the real utility of the source. A source does not have to be literally true in order to provide useful evidence. Source E's utility as evidence about highwaymen was to illustrate the enduring attraction (the source came from the 1860s) of the highwayman myth. The fact that storybooks about highwaymen were still being written long after their heyday tells us about what people at that time liked to believe about them, and how the image of the 'gentleman of the road', performing daring exploits, retained a powerful attraction. Very few candidates managed successfully to reach such a conclusion, though many tried to argue that the source was useful because it showed what people thought about highwaymen – this lacked the vital time dimension of placing the source's utility into the 1860s, rather than seeing it as contemporary with the highwaymen.

### **Question 5**

This question was not answered well. By this stage of the paper all candidates should have been awake to the issue of what was truth and what was myth about the highwaymen. Surprisingly, the great majority based their answers simply on what Source F said. That is, they merely asserted that there were aspects of Source F that they either did or did not believe, but gave no substantive explanation why. A typical answer is given below:

*I do agree that the highwayman's life must have had attractions. It must have been good to be free and ride your horse wherever you liked, and you could make good money by robbing people. However, I don't believe they would have rich friends because why would they want to rob their friends?*

Slightly better than this were answers that attempted to use their contextual knowledge to establish which bits of the source were in/accurate, though even these might conclude that, whilst individual details were unreliable, overall the source did give an accurate impression of what highwaymen were like. The real surprise was how only a tiny number detected that the source – *from a nineteenth-century novel* – was another example of mythmaking about highwaymen, and therefore utterly unreliable as literal truth.

### **Question 6**

The hypothesis to be tested against the sources was straightforward, and in the main candidates were able to answer this question more effectively than in some previous years. The only slight complication was that candidates had to decide whether or not the evidence pointed to highwaymen being *violent criminals*. Some focused on 'violent', some on 'criminals' and some on 'violent criminals'. In practice this made little difference as what counted was whether the manner in which the source was used was consistent with the conclusion reached. The most common approach was to focus on 'violent', as the sources themselves tended to split neatly on this issue. As always, the bonus marks for source evaluation were rarely awarded. This is generally because candidates simply use the sources at face value, but even where they show awareness of the need to evaluate the sources, this is invariably done on the basis of the provenance alone (*'You cannot believe Source F because it is a novel'*), which is not rewarded.



## **GCSE HISTORY A 1935/03, 1035/02**

### **COURSEWORK**

The completion of coursework for the SHP specification again achieved the main objectives. Results indicated that centres have applied the standards of last year very accurately, producing a clear measure of differentiation between the stronger and less able students. At the same time, the two assignments produced continue to be a key element that makes the SHP course different from others, in providing important skills and study options which benefit the candidates. The research and understanding shown by a large number of students for the History Around Us assignment must represent a high point in their GCSE thinking and performance. This pays a considerable compliment to many centres that inspire such an interest in local historical sites through their choice of site, together with the events and personalities they weave into the study.

Modern World Studies have also developed a strong purpose through the course of recent years, and those centres who have grasped the importance of linking the past in terms of the influence it has on current events will have noted the valuable understanding their students can acquire from it. As a tool to avoid simple narrative, this element of the assignment gains further value. Instead the best candidates are able to make telling analysis which displays a firm understanding of complex world issues. At a time when the use of coursework has been thrown into doubt, the manner in which SHP History is demanded and applied by the vast majority of centres means that those criticisms that are around have little validity when set against the criteria we use.

Dealing with the year in purely practical terms, the moderation process went relatively smoothly this year. The process can be carried out very easily when centres apply their part of the system in the right time frames and follow the guidelines. To this end, the large number of moderator reports show that they are greatly assisted by the huge majority of centres who apply these rules really carefully, with some centres sending marks off before time to help spread the work load. There are small issues over how the materials are presented with simple card folders being the most popular and over-use of plastic wallets and staples being frowned upon. When centres do fall out of the usual routine, for whatever reason, they do cause a number of problems well beyond the normal time frame allowed to deal with them. Moderators can only cope because the numbers involved remain thankfully so small.

Numbers of centres continue to improve their assignments and this should be encouraged for a number of reasons, not least because good habits now will make it easier to conform to any changes that await with GCSE alterations on the horizon. The HAU continues to demonstrate a high calibre of work, but concentration on the appropriate skills, an interesting hypothesis to challenge and careful selection of source material to go alongside the site will always bring about progress. The tasks set are also usually better if they directly encourage the students to apply the skills that are being tested. A few centres still comment on the lack of focus from their candidates when they have set unfocussed questions!

Keeping the MWS current has been a difficult issue for some centres, especially when a particular task relied on a particular event to keep the whole assignment up to date. These need changing at regular intervals, or a more general title needs to be adopted. Again stressing the impact on the present in the task is a good way of ensuring students do so. Terrorism has made an impressive large-scale debut but there has been a good variety of topics, and no reason why Ireland cannot continue to offer some interesting thoughts. The present encouraging peace can still be considered against the historical experience. The BBC are to be congratulated for providing such a useful historical and news section to allow students the chance to understand the position there. This also removes the constant thought that textbooks need updating.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

Finally on the subject of the MWS, there is a strong need to ensure that the 'taught course' is completed to a good standard. Whilst the majority of centres ensure that this is the case, a few seem to rely largely on a few sources, worse still, ones they use as part of the tasks. This sometimes results in candidates lacking confidence and being fed additional help that should not be necessary or allowed.

I would like, finally, to thank centres for making the work enjoyable by providing such a range and good standard of materials. It is always a pleasure to read interesting thoughts from students concerning a local site or complex issue. Based on my own experiences, the standard of historical thinking and certainly, ICT skills, continues to improve.

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

**June 2007 Assessment Session**

**Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
01 (Paper 1)	60	45	37	30	24	19	14	10
02 (Coursework)	25	21	18	15	12	10	8	6

**Specification Overall (weighted marks)**

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	86	75	63	51	42	34	26	18
Percentage in Grade	0.8	6.8	13.7	18.6	17.9	16.7	11.4	9.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	0.8	7.6	21.3	39.9	57.8	74.5	85.9	95.4

The total entry for the examination was 286.

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

**June 2007 Assessment Session**

**Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)**

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	56	47	38	30	22	15	8
12	75	62	54	46	38	29	21	13
13	75	61	51	42	34	27	20	13
14	75	60	51	42	34	27	20	13
15	75	57	49	41	33	25	17	10
21	50	33	30	27	24	20	16	13
22	50	31	28	25	23	19	16	13
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	164	144	124	105	86	68	50	32
Percentage in Grade		5.67	15.65	20.52	17.46	15.08	9.75	8.84	2.72
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		5.67	21.32	41.84	59.30	74.38	84.13	92.97	97.28

The total entry for the examination was 886.

**Option B (Medicine and Britain)**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	169	152	134	117	97	77	57	37
Percentage in Grade		12.79	16.40	17.75	17.39	13.51	10.63	5.77	3.15
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		12.79	29.19	46.94	64.32	77.84	88.47	94.23	97.39

The total entry for the examination was 1113.

**Option C (Medicine and American West)**

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	167	149	130	112	93	74	56	38
Percentage in Grade		6.47	17.63	19.84	18.56	14.01	10.74	6.43	3.66
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		6.47	24.10	43.94	62.50	76.51	87.26	93.69	97.35

The total entry for the examination was 16335.

**Option D (Medicine with Germany)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	165	148	130	112	93	74	56	38
Percentage in Grade		8.58	16.35	19.06	17.51	15.29	10.70	6.31	3.71
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		8.58	24.93	43.99	61.50	76.78	87.49	93.80	97.51

The total entry for the examination was 10583.

**Option E (Medicine with South Africa)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	163	145	127	110	90	70	50	30
Percentage in Grade		0	8.70	4.35	17.39	13.04	13.04	17.39	17.39
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		0	8.70	13.04	30.44	43.48	56.52	73.91	91.30

The total entry for the examination was 23.

**Option F (Crime with Elizabethan England)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	159	140	121	102	84	67	50	33
Percentage in Grade		1.15	15.38	24.62	20.38	16.92	10.38	6.54	3.08
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		1.15	16.54	41.15	61.54	78.46	88.85	95.39	98.46

The total entry for the examination was 260.

**Option G (Crime with Britain)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	174	153	132	111	93	75	57	39
Percentage in Grade		7.98	31.92	23.94	18.62	7.98	4.26	2.13	3.19
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.98	39.89	63.83	82.45	90.43	94.68	96.81	100

The total entry for the examination was 188.

**Option H (Crime with American West)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	167	148	128	109	91	73	56	39
Percentage in Grade		4.08	13.49	18.59	20.52	17.35	11.45	7.03	4.54
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.08	17.57	36.17	56.69	74.04	85.49	92.52	97.05

The total entry for the examination was 883.

*Report on the Components taken in June 2007*

**Option J (Crime with Germany)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	162	145	127	109	91	73	56	39
Percentage in Grade		6.44	16.91	20.34	20.89	13.94	10.89	6.06	2.84
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		6.44	23.35	43.69	64.58	78.52	89.41	95.47	98.31

The total entry for the examination was 2361.

**Option K (Crime with South Africa)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	166	147	127	108	89	71	53	35
Percentage in Grade		46.67	26.67	26.67	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		46.67	73.33	100	100	100	100	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 15.

**Specification Overall**

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Percentage in Grade	7.26	17.01	19.59	18.38	14.50	10.69	6.41	3.64
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	7.26	24.28	43.86	62.24	76.74	87.43	93.84	97.48

The total entry for the examination was 32656.



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

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**(General Qualifications)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: [general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://www.ocr.org.uk)**

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

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**

© OCR 2007