

History B (Modern World)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1937**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE 1037**

Report on the Components

June 2009

1937/1037/MS/R/09

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new syllabuses to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education History B (Modern World) (1937)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) History B (Modern World) (1037)

REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

Unit/Content	Page
1037/01 (Short Course) Paper 1	1
1937/11-14 Paper 1	3
1937/02 Paper 2	11
1937/03 1037/02 Coursework	19
Grade Thresholds	20

1037/01 (Short Course) Paper 1

Section A

Question 1

Question 1(a)

A significant majority of candidates were able to make at least one interpretation from the source such as 'Germany was building more aircraft than Britain'. Many then linked this statement to the idea that the increased building of aircraft suggested the possibility of war. However, fewer candidates took note of the 'how far' of the question to indicate other indicators of the threat of war from their own knowledge, such as the appeasement policy or Hitler re-introducing conscription. Where this did happen the factors were often unexplained and therefore remained in Level 4.

Question 1(b)

A significant number of candidates were able to infer correctly the main message of the cartoon which involved the idea of uncertainty, and good responses often stated the message in the first sentence of their answer. These answers were qualified by relevant use of aspects of the cartoon which included Chamberlain's depiction as an angel and thus the bringer of hope and peace. Often candidate's responses went on to cite the olive branch in his hand as further supporting evidence. Answers were less well supported contextually with many candidates unable to offer an appropriate context.

Question 1(c)

The vast majority of candidates were unable to do anything more than take the sources at face value, paraphrase them and thus make no comparison. Some did get as far as saying they both agreed about Munich being a disaster and using the sources to support this comparison. Disappointingly very few made any attempt to use their contextual knowledge to interrogate the sources to gain an understanding of what each source was saying and why that might be said so that 'agreement' or 'disagreement' could be fully explored.

Question 1(d)

Most candidates were content to interpret what the cartoon was showing in relation to the trust Hitler and Stalin displayed towards each other. This was supported by the guns behind their backs. Little was made of the arms around each other; the legs tied together and even 'Eastern Frontier' on the path. Contextual knowledge was limited to Stalin fearing an attack from Germany. Many candidates failed to state if 'surprised or not', thus invalidating their answer.

Question 1(e)

Generally candidates worked through the sources, taking each in turn but often the comments were limited to comprehension of the source without linking to the hypothesis of the question. This limited the marks available. Those who considered whether each was for or against the question hypothesis supported their judgement with evidence from the source. A number of candidates failed to identify the source they were working with.

Question 2

Question 2(a)

This question was attempted by a significant minority. Most used the provenance of the poster to express the message regarding USA's unwanted presence in Vietnam. Supporting evidence was given by realising, from the cartoon, that civilians of all ages and gender were prepared to resist. Candidates should realise the importance of the source attribution. In this instance the fact that the source was Chinese was significant but often ignored. Contextual knowledge was mainly focused on explaining guerrilla warfare as proof of Vietnamese resolve and resourcefulness in driving out the Americans.

Question 2(b)

This question produced a wide variety of responses. Better answers were based on the candidate realising that they were considering reliability and that the comments in the source had to be tested against knowledge. This resulted in a number of responses considering the source to be believable because of guerrilla warfare, inexperienced troops, wrong equipment and low morale. Others considered reliability in terms of provenance putting up a strong argument. The more limited answers took the source at face value and the 'they would say that' approach.

Question 2(c)

A number of candidates tended to take the sources at face value and describe what each showed without considering usefulness. This resulted in many responses failing to move beyond Level 2. Some answers moved beyond this by considering the purpose of the source and usefulness began to be developed in this context. This was particularly evident with Source C where candidates realised why the Vietcong had published the cartoon. In the best answers contextual knowledge was often related to usefulness in relation to the effectiveness of guerrilla warfare and the demonstration of indiscriminate American response.

Question 2(d)

Disappointingly few candidates took note of the source attribution and thus their answers were limited to general claims. Those who used their knowledge of the role of the American media fared better and often made progress to Level 4 by suggesting that they were not surprised that the General felt let down by the media, this interpretation being based on the media reporting the futility of war. A small number developed this further using their knowledge in relation to the Tet Offensive. Weaker answers made more general, supported claims about the media. Many candidates failed to state if 'surprised or not', thus invalidating their answer.

Question 2(e)

Comments for this question are as for 1(e).

1937/11-14 Paper 1

General Comments

As in previous years a significant majority of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. This knowledge was used to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments to their chosen questions. Additionally, there were many quality responses to the evidence based questions in question 1 and question 7.

These answers were characterised by the candidate remaining focused on the demands of the question and selecting and deploying material which directly provided an answer to the question asked. Selection of relevant information to use is important. Some candidates were less successful in this process resulting in over long answers which often resulted in answers which concentrated on the generalities of the period, missing the point of the question. Another area where candidates are less strong is in the final part of the (c) answers in Section B of the Core and in questions 8 and 9 of the Depth Study. Here some candidates were producing a summary almost as long as the original answer whilst not gaining any more marks. To gain the additional marks requires some comparative judgements based on the arguments presented in the response.

Whilst most candidates are now aware that an answer to a part (a) question from Section B and a part (a) question to 8 and 9 of the Depth Study should be relatively short and to the point, there remain some candidates who spend far too much time producing very lengthy responses which often have gained maximum credit in the first five or six lines. Parts (b) and (c) of these questions require understanding and explanation. Candidates should be encouraged to move away from telling the story and concentrate on explaining events. This is important if the higher levels of the mark scheme are to be achieved. Equally important is ensuring that the answer is based on historical fact. Explanation should avoid the 'I think...' approach.

Examiners were encouraged by the many high quality answers seen to Question 7 of the chosen Depth Study. Many candidates are well versed in the demands of this type of question. Here candidates quickly ascertained the focus of the question, used the material provided accordingly, producing an answer in which the elements of source use and contextual knowledge complimented each other. Generally candidates who produced weaker responses failed to recognise the focus of the question, e.g. purpose. Some candidates still use sources directly as information giving rather than as pieces of evidence from which deductions can be made.

Answers to 1(a) and 2(a) continue to improve. Increasingly candidates are realising that the important first step in an answer is to provide a 'main message' and that this has to be inferred from the source. Good answers then support this by using the evidence in the cartoon to support their inference and completing the answer with knowledge that is directly relevant to the main message.

There were relatively few rubric errors. Overall, candidates generally used the time allocated well, with the vast majority completing the paper. Where time was short it usually related to over long, unfocused answers.

Core Content – Section A

Question 1(a)

This was the most popular option. A significant number of candidates were able to infer correctly the main message of the cartoon which involved the idea of uncertainty, and good responses often stated the message in the first sentence of their answer. These answers were qualified by relevant use of aspects of the cartoon which included Chamberlain's depiction as an angel and thus the bringer of hope and peace. Often candidate's responses went on to cite the olive branch in his hand as further supporting evidence. Answers were well supported contextually with many making reference to appeasement, travelling to Munich or concern over the Sudetenland. This approach gained full credit.

Reference to the dark, foreboding sky as evidence that war was imminent or that Chamberlain was facing a difficult challenge sometimes were not linked to the idea of 'the hope to avoid war'. Other answers concentrated on the briefcase as an indication that Chamberlain meant business. However, far too many related the cartoon to the Treaty of Versailles and Britain's sympathy for the severity of the treaty, believing that Chamberlain was flying to help Germany. Some even considered the cartoon to be a reference to the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

Question 1 (b)

Many candidates answered this question well and offered many reasons for the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact. The most popular was an explanation that Germany did not want to fight a war on two fronts, highlighting the fact that Hitler was unperturbed about Britain's promise to protect Poland but Russia's possible intervention was a concern. The Pact negated this as they divided Poland between them. Other explanations included Stalin's fear of a future war with Germany after Hitler's pronouncements in Mein Kampf; the Pact thus giving him time to prepare and ready his armies. Stalin's disappointment at not being represented at Munich, viewing this as some kind of betrayal by the allies, was also a popular response. Clearly, the fact that Stalin was able to regain territory in the East was given as a more Russian response.

Weaker answers lacked contextual understanding, preferring to give general reasons like forming alliances and making peace. A surprising number thought that the Pact was one of mutual aid, where either side would come to the assistance of the other if attacked. Some wrote about appeasement but often thought this was a formal, signed agreement.

Question 2 (a)

This question was attempted by a significant minority. Most used the provenance of the poster to express the message regarding USA's unwanted presence in Vietnam. Supporting evidence was given by realising, from the cartoon, that civilians of all ages and gender were prepared to resist. Candidates should realise the importance of the source attribution. In this instance the fact that the source was Chinese was significant but often ignored. Contextual knowledge was mainly focused on explaining guerrilla warfare as proof of Vietnamese resolve and resourcefulness in driving out the Americans. Additionally, some introduced knowledge of Chinese support.

Question 2 (b)

There were many good answers to this question with candidates displaying a sound understanding of reasons for American involvement in Vietnam. Particularly well understood was American's fear of the Domino Theory. Many placed US involvement firmly in a Cold War context and with China's recent revolution being further evidence of the threat Communism. North Vietnam's attack on the USS Maddox was also specified as the American excuse to escalate their involvement.

Core Content – Section B

Question 3

Most candidates who attempted this question were, in part (a), able to recall a variety of military restrictions imposed by the Treaty gaining maximum credit. Popular answers included the regulation of the army to 100,000 troops; 6 battleships, 36 ships in total; no air force; no submarines; no armoured vehicles. However, a common mistake was the Rhineland with many believing the land was lost by Germany as well as being demilitarised. The old chestnut of confusion between the Rhineland and the Ruhr was also all too common. In answering part (b) a significant number ignored the question which required an explanation of why the 'Big Three' disagreed and were content with giving a statement of aims, thus scoring no more than Level 3/4. Most answers explained Clemenceau's attitude but failed to make any link to Wilson or Lloyd George. Wilson was often limited to the need to get his Fourteen Points, whilst Lloyd George 'came in the middle'. Weaker candidates often got Lloyd George and Wilson muddled up. Candidates in answer to Part (c) often resorted to considering 'harshness' rather than 'fairness' which limited the marks achievable. Where 'fairness' was considered, the 'fairness' aspects were less well-developed than the 'unfair'. Answers that developed Level 4 answers often reflected on the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and its severity compared to Versailles, making the point that the Germans would have imposed an even harsher treaty of the allies had Germany won. Others made the point that Germany had rejected peace talks both before and during the war, thus as the aggressors they deserved the punishments that were meted out.

Question 4

Most candidates who attempted this question could usually offer in part (a) 3 points to explain the peacekeeping methods of the League, with the idea of 'collective security' with condemnation, sanctions and then the use of force being the most common. Weaker answers tended to focus on the League as a talking shop to solve problems with little additional information. Part (b) brought better responses. Most were able to explain how the absence of the USA limited the effectiveness of the League, linking it in the main to the ineffectiveness of trade sanctions. Self-interest of the major powers was also given, more often developing into an explanation of the problems caused by the fact that the League did not have an army of its own. Meeting protocols were also mentioned, especially in relation to the Council and Assembly whose irregular meetings and unanimous voting causing delays in resolving crises. Surprisingly there were many disappointing responses to part (c). Most candidates could retell the story of the Japanese invasion without ever linking it to its effect on the League. However, the ones that did were generally sound, highlighting the effect of the League's incompetence on other aggressive nationalists like Mussolini and Hitler. Other answers reflected on the delay surrounding the Lytton Report and Japanese arrogance in leaving the League. Most answers tended to stop here without being able to develop a L4 response. Most could only identify other reasons for their failure, which tended to be a repeat of points made in 4 (b) i.e. lack of an army and delays within the League without ever citing an example of where it was a particular problem. The very few that did, used Abyssinia as an example of the impact of the absence of the USA, British self interest, reflected in their failure to close the Suez Canal, and the deplorable Hoare-Laval Pact which was made behind the League's back. Although it must be said that many had only a basic understanding of Hoare-Laval.

Question 5

In response to (a) the commonly stated decisions tended to revolve around the division of Germany and Berlin with additional marks available if the holding countries were named i.e. USA, USSR, UK and France. Some added that free elections were planned for liberated countries and the trial of Nazi War Criminals. Whilst candidates were able to describe details of the Plan in part (b) fewer were aware of the reasons why it was introduced. Most could offer that

the Marshall Plan was introduced to prevent the spread of Communism, with extreme ideologies tending to flourish in times of poverty and instability, like Europe after World War Two. Aid would help their economies recover and more easily withstand the threat of Communism. Very few were able to develop any reference to Greece and the Civil War which prompted the instigation of the aid package. Answers to part (c) varied significantly. The weaker candidates showed little contextual understanding of any of the events of the early Cold War. Many others missed the date cut off and issues like Cuba and Vietnam were included. Generally, in these answers, the individual points were sparse and subject knowledge was disappointing. Most could relate Stalin's takeover of Eastern Europe as evidence of success, although details of the events in individual countries were thin. Others commented on his success on denying the countries Marshall Aid and stamping out any insurgency and opposition, essentially through the use of the Secret Police. Failure seemed to hinge on the breakdown of the Blockade and the allied airlift to relieve Berlin, which was allowed. The better answers could develop the Greek Civil War and Western allies' success in preventing the collapse of the country to a Communist dictatorship. On a similar vein, Tito in Yugoslavia was given as an example of an independent Communist country, unlike the 'Puppet' states of Eastern Europe. Other common mistakes tended to relate to the date cut off, with many including Russia's successful suppression of both the Hungarian and Czechoslovakian revolution as evidence of Soviet success. Clearly, no credit was given for this.

Question 6

For the weaker ones, the term 'Warsaw Pact' in part (a) proved illusive. However some answers were well informed, highlighting the military nature of the Pact as a response to NATO; its control from Moscow; ideas of Collective Security and the mandatory nature of membership. Others were able to assert its use as a buffer zone to protect Russia in the event of invasion. Answers to (b) demonstrated a huge difference in quality. The weaker ones ranged from 'because they didn't like them' to 'because they were at war' clearly, neither scored particularly well. However, better candidates were able to offer some reasonable explanations. These tended to include the fragility of Russia's acceptance of the Prague Spring and continued fears of a repeat of Hungary. Others cited Moscow's worries that insurgency may spread to other Eastern European countries and subsequent fears over holes in the buffer zone, perhaps to be exploited by NATO. In part (c) 'Solidarity' was often dealt with descriptively. Even those who displayed some understanding were unable to explain how the movement contributed the collapse of Soviet control. Responses were often stronger in relation to Gorbachev with more advanced answers relating the collapse to the perilous state of the Russian economy and the need to focus more on domestic problems. The war in Afghanistan and the changing position of the USA under Reagan proved too much for many but could have been used as valid explanation.

Section C - Depth Studies

Germany, 1919-1945

Question 7

In response to (a) many candidates were able to use the source to suggest reasons for the popularity of the Hitler Youth. As this was a 'how far' question candidates were then expected to offer reasons not indicated in the source as to the reasons for popularity. Those who adopted this approach hit the top level of marks. Many evaluated the source for its reliability on the basis it was propaganda whilst others considered why some did not join, i.e. the unpopularity of the Youth. For those who followed these approaches there was no credit. There were numerous good responses to part (b) with many candidates identifying a valid purpose for the publication of

the painting early in their answer. Contextual knowledge was generally strong and used to good effect in supporting purpose and thus achieving the top level of the mark scheme. Often those who failed to identify the purpose early in an answer then forget all about it and concentrated just on contextual knowledge. This approach limited the marks available. Although some candidates noted the seriousness of the family this was often used to good advantage. In response to part (c) many expressed that they were 'not surprised' and used contextual knowledge to explain why certain groups would carry out this type of act. Those who went further explained 'surprise' in terms of the Nazis not tolerating active opposition. This approach developed both sides and gave the top mark. Some candidates failed to state that they were 'surprised' or 'not surprised'. It is important that answers are qualified in this way.

Question 8

In (a) many candidates were fully aware of the events of the Munich Putsch. Candidates were often unprepared to be selective in the detail used resulting in over-long responses. The length was exacerbated by the answer being taken beyond the Putsch itself, describing events in prison. Even better responses did not always get Hitler's sentence correct, or how many Nazis were killed. Although in (b) many were able to explain the significance of the publicity surrounding the trial and the opportunity taken to redefine policy whilst in gaol, there was little else. Many responses to part (c) were able to cover at least two of the factors effectively. Most wrote about the impact of the Great depression in terms of the rise of the Nazis but were less secure in linking it to Hitler being elevated to Chancellor. There were some detailed accounts of Nazi propaganda which were more effectively linked although some did stray into post January 1933. Less well-known were the actions of von Papen and Hindenburg. Weaker responses were unable to link to the Chancellorship and were often confused over the type of election being held or the significance of seats in the Reichstag.

Question 9

In part (a) few were aware of much beyond the fact that it gave Hitler power to rule without the Reichstag. Some did mention the four year limit and the banning of opposition parties but there was barely a reference to state parliaments or unions. There was some confusion between the Enabling Act and the Emergency Decree. Some good answers were seen to part (b) with many candidates usually able to explain at least one reason often related to the poor image created by the SA. Some resorted to describing the Night of the Long Knives which was irrelevant. Answers to part (c) were often good with each of the three factors dealt with clearly and succinctly. In some answers propaganda was the weakest aspect. It is ironic that candidates who answered question 8 often used details of post 1933 propaganda, whereas those whose chose question 9 dealt mainly with election propaganda rather than propaganda related to control. Some answers tended to describe the three factors without linking to lack of opposition.

Russia, 1905-1941

Question 7

There were many very good answers to part (a). The vast majority of candidates were able to identify the main message of the cartoon and support this with material from the cartoon to gain five of the six marks available. In searching for contextual knowledge information relating to Rasputin during the Tsars absence at the war front was more readily used. This could not be contextual as the source attribution refers to 'The Russian Tsars at home'. In the responses to (b) most were able to infer purpose correctly and use contextual knowledge well in support, producing very good responses. Only a small number, however, were able to suggest why the source had been produced in 1916. A small number of candidates offered a message rather than purpose. It is important that candidates are able to recognise the difference between these two question targets. Many candidates in their answer to (c) used their knowledge and

understanding of the period to explain why the events in the source threatened the power of the Tsar. Some answers finished at this point. Others went on to identify other reasons for the abdication but failed to explain their significance.

Question 8

Candidates appeared well-versed in relation to (a) and produced detailed responses relating to the Petrograd Soviet and the Bolsheviks. Surprisingly fewer mentioned the more obvious points of land reform, food shortages or whether to stop the war. Most answers in (b) achieved the top level by explaining the return of Lenin and the April Thesis and the role of the Bolsheviks against Kornilov's troops. Other relevant points remained more elusive. All three factors given in (c) were known but answers tended to be more descriptive than explanatory in relation to the Communist victory. Comments about War Communism were related almost entirely to agriculture whilst Trotsky on his train predominated in (ii). Of the three the 'Red Terror' was the least well known.

Question 9

Many had difficulty coming up with four points in part (a) and so often resorted to writing about Stalin. However, responses to (b) were much stronger with many able to explain a number of reasons as to why Trotsky was defeated, particularly the trick played by Stalin with regard to Lenin's funeral. As with question 8(c) many candidates failed to develop explanation being content to describe the three factors without any link being made to 'almost total control'. Where explanation did happen then it was strongest in relation to the use of propaganda and the 'cult of Stalin'.

The USA, 1919-1941

Question 7

Most candidates could spot the irony and contradiction of the poster, thus scoring a mark of four. Terms from the poster were used as supporting evidence, especially 'World's highest standard of Living'. However, fewer then took this on to any contextual explanation of how blacks were treated during the Depression or New Deal, often being content with generalities, or even the 1920s, rather than relating to the specific date given in the source attribution. In answering (b) most recognised that the cartoon demonstrated the conflict between Roosevelt and the Supreme Court and in support mentioned the waving fist of the cartoon and sometimes the demanding tone of the caption. Those who went further often moved to Level 4 by using contextual knowledge to explain the conflict but without getting to purpose. Some candidates proved very knowledgeable when discussing the unconstitutional nature of the New Deal whilst others took a different route and focussed on the membership of the Supreme Court itself, relating their Republican bias, with its emphasis on rugged individualism, as reasons for their rejection of Roosevelt's action plan. Both approaches were acceptable. The removal of a certain amount of 'clutter' from the bottom of the cartoon did not affect candidates. If candidates gave the purpose and used contextual knowledge, as above, they had little difficulty in reaching six marks. Few went on to state why the cartoon was specifically published in 1937. Part (c) gave the opportunity for candidates to display their knowledge with many doing this to great effect in relation to the source and then as demanded by the 'how far' of the question in relation to other areas of success or failure of the New Deal.

Question 8

Most were able to give 4 features of discrimination for part (a). Often mentioned was the spectre of the KKK and their lynching, torture and beating of blacks. Others dealt with economic inequality, highlighting the fact that black people were often paid less than their white counterparts, did the menial tasks and were disallowed from serving in any profession, especially law enforcement and the justice system. Socially, candidates pointed out that many blacks lived in the worst housing, were denied a good education and were subject to verbal abuse on a daily basis. Part (b) proved to be challenging for many. Most answers gave a couple of weaker explanations, dealing with the issues of White Supremacy and a general dislike of blacks but there was too much description about the KKK and its activities. More sophisticated answers focussed on the fact that black people were often used as a scapegoat to explain the nation's woes, or to protect their jobs. Some highlighted the fear aspect, believing that non-membership was seen as sympathy for the black's plight and could thus illicit an angry response from the Klan. When answering part (c) too many candidates merely described the 3 factors rather than discussed their impact on the way of life. This was particularly evident when dealing with the changing role of women which predictably focussed on the flapper girls and their determination to buck the trend by going out without a chaperone, smoking, drinking, having pre-marital sex and wearing revealing clothes. Few could develop the idea of liberation, freedom and more independent roles as explanation. The entertainment industry fared little better in its treatment.

Question 9

There were many good answers to part (a) relating to the Wall Street Crash. Too many candidates wasted time by giving unnecessary causes of the Crash which, although perfectly correct, were beyond the remit of the question. Similarly, the effects of the Crash scored no credit, despite being well explained in some cases. The most popular explanation seen in response to (b) was the loss of demand for consumer goods after the massive sales seen in the boom. Others tended to feature on tariffs and reciprocal taxes on American goods abroad. The other popular option was the invention of new machinery, often related to the car and farming industries. Part (c) was often done well with candidates able to access the higher marks in Level 4. Knowledge of both the social and economic effects of the Depression was encouraging. Many were then able to relate this to Hoover's approach as the '*do nothing president*' with the '*prosperity is around the corner*' card falling on deaf ears. Most were able to highlight the irony of the *Hooverilles*, *Hooverblankets* and *Hooverstew* as evidence that he had lost public support and was thus unlikely to win the election. Few however, provided any evidence of the Bonus Marchers, despite the fact that it was possibly one of the biggest factors in Hoover's unpopularity. He was often unfavourably compared to Roosevelt's dynamic approach, either because of his energetic election tours or his inspiring promise of a New Deal to end the Depression. Do nothing was compared to '*action and action now*'.

China, 1945-c.1976

Question 7

Part (a) was generally well answered with most candidates getting the message of the poster with many going on to support the message with details from the poster. Most were also able to use knowledge putting the context of the cartoon firmly in the early part of the 1950s. A small number of candidates showed they were unaware of the difference between message and purpose offering answers as to why the poster was published. Part (b) produced a wide variety of answers with many accepting the source at face value or alternatively identifying other reasons for the campaign. Only the better candidates fully addressed the question and explained why Mao may have started the 'Hundred Flowers' campaign and how it might have got out of control, thus prompting Mao's punitive action. Answers to part (c) were the weakest of

the document answers in that a number of candidates completely misinterpreted the source by not even associating it with the Cultural Revolution. Better answers identified the purpose of the source and effectively used contextual knowledge to explain why it was published. A disappointing number of candidates failed to reach the top level by not explaining why the source was published in 1966. Additionally some did the opposite of what had happened in part (a) by trying to find a message rather than considering purpose.

Question 8

Most answers to part (a) were specific and relevant, although some candidates produced very vague responses either surveying the Civil War or the work of the CCP during the 1950s. Part (b) was not well answered. Explanation was often limited to differences in ideologies. The vast majority of candidates failed to progress beyond four marks as most produced general answers which in some instances went back to 1911 and the fall of the Manchu Empire. It was surprising how well informed they were of early twentieth century Chinese history despite the Depth Study content beginning in 1945. Candidates needed to be more specific in explaining why Civil War broke out in China. Part (c) produced a variety of responses. Weaker candidates misread the factor 'Nationalist military tactics' as CCP military tactics and therefore failed to address that particular statement. Some candidates failed to link the explanation of the three statements to why the Communists won the Civil War and thus stuck in Level 2. Better candidates explained the three statements and linked them to the Communist victory in the Civil War thus accessing Level 4 although many wrote about relations with the peasants and Mao's leadership as one item.

Question 9

Part (a) produced many good answers that were both precise and concise and which showed a good knowledge of agricultural changes during the early 1950s. It is important that candidates take note of dates in the question. In this instance they were limited to before 1953. Despite this limitation many wrote about communes at great length. In answering part (b) most candidates were able to produce at least one explained reason. The most popular explanations centred on China wanting to become an industrial superpower or wanting to copy what happened in Russia. Some candidates explained both of these reasons or alternatives to some depth and thus accessed the top level and maximum marks. Part (c) was generally well answered by most candidates who addressed all three factors linking them to the failure of the Great Leap Forward. The introduction of communes produced the most difficulties, but even here there were many good responses.

1937/02 Paper 2

First World War Recruitment

General Comments

Candidates did respond well to the topic and the sources, with the vast majority displaying an assured confidence about the period under examination. The nature of their answers was proof that all levels of ability had been prepared with appropriate skills and knowledge for the demands of the paper.

Although there is only one more year of examination under this specification, the new question papers (available for examination in January and June of 2010) maintain continuity in terms of knowledge and skills. Consequently, it is emphasised that the essence of Paper 2 is using and evaluating historical sources critically in their context. Testing the sources against historical knowledge, against other sources on the paper and against the internal evidence of the sources themselves gives access to the higher mark levels.

Paper 2 is a Depth Study and candidates are expected to have depth of understanding as well as depth of knowledge. For a high level answer the two are interdependent, together with detail from the source/s in question. It is also important that candidates read the questions so that they focus their efforts appropriately. All of the questions require the source/s to be placed in context, but not all require evaluation. For example, 'What is the message of this poster?' and 'Why was this poster published?' do not demand critical evaluation of their message or purpose, but they do need to be placed in their historical context.

A cause of disappointment for examiners is the able candidate with depth of knowledge and depth of contextual understanding who fails to cite information from sources. The continued absence of source detail from some answers makes one wonder if candidates simply respond to the provenance/description of sources with the neglect of studying the content of sources. Once again, Centres are reminded that this is a source-based paper and candidates must use information taken directly from the sources. Failure to root an answer in the source/s in question will compromise its quality by failing to support valid reasoning and inference. It is not enough to assert that a source 'shows' something, candidates need to demonstrate how the source agrees or disagrees with their point.

A tendency persists for a number of candidates to be rather perfunctory in the application of skills, knowledge and source detail. They knew what to do and how to do it, but they did not produce the developed answer they were capable of. Consequently, where a range of marks was available for a particular level poorly developed responses limited themselves to the bottom of the level. Time for completing the paper has long since ceased to be a problem for candidates, but too many are writing and explaining far too briefly to do full justice to themselves.

A high quality answer will contain, in varying combinations: specific source detail; comment about that detail in relation to the particular question being answered; clear contextual knowledge enabling a judgement to be made about the purpose or validity of the source in question.

Content – quote it.

Comment – on the content.

Context – relate to events.

On points of administration:

Attendance registers must be completed and enclosed with scripts.

Candidates must write on the front of their scripts the numbers of the questions they answer.

Supplementary answer sheets must be attached at the back of the answer booklet, not inserted.

Script envelopes must have the paper reference number and quantity of scripts enclosed clearly written.

If more than one packet of scripts is despatched this must be indicated on the outside of the packets.

Comments on individual questions

Where two marks are available for a level, award the higher mark unless the answer is a weak answer at that level.

Where a range of three marks is available for a level, award the middle mark unless the answer is a weak or strong answer at that level.

Q1 Source A

What is the message of this poster?

Use details of the poster and your knowledge to explain your answer.

6 marks

Level 1	Description of surface detail/general assertion.	1
Level 2	Valid inference from the poster about its message, unsupported by detail from it.	1-2
Level 3	Focus is main message of the poster, unsupported by detail from it.	3-4
Level 4	Focus is main message of the poster, supported by detail from it. OR from contextual knowledge.	4-5
Level 5	Focus is main message of the poster, supported by detail from it and put into context.	6

This question was answered rather well, with most candidates reaching Level 4 at least. Many reached Level 5 by writing about the recruitment campaign fronted by Lord Kitchener and/or the urgency to boost British army numbers because of the enormity of the task facing the BEF relative to the size of the German invasion of Belgium. Although the figure of John Bull was not commonly recognised, what the figure represented was understood. Many candidates thought the figure represented Lloyd George, with Asquith a popular choice. Too many candidates were anxious to unload their knowledge of conscription in 1916, sometimes to the exclusion of writing about 1914 and the content of the poster. This answer illustrates best practice by answering the question in the first sentence, then providing context and supporting detail from the poster.

Level 5 6 marks

The message of this poster is to encourage men to join the British army. When Great Britain declared war on Germany in August 1914, there was only 250,000 men in the army. Germany had over 1 million men in their army so Britain needed many more soldiers.

The poster is of a man wearing a waistcoat with the Union Jack on it, this suggests he is Great Britain. There are soldiers behind him and behind them is a fire, this suggests the poster is about war. The man is pointing a finger at you and is asking "Who's absent? Is it you?" This sends out a message to the men of Great Britain that they need to join the army because their country needs them. I think the overall message of this poster is to recruit men into the army.

Q2 Sources B and C

Is one source more useful than the other in helping you understand why men volunteered for the army when war began?

Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. **8 marks**

Level 1	Description of surface detail/general assertion.	1-2
Level 2	Comment limited to type of source/matching details of sources.	2-3
Level 3	Valid comment on usefulness of a source/s for understanding volunteers, supported by source detail OR from contextual knowledge.	4-5
Level 4	Evaluates usefulness of a source/s for understanding volunteers, based on tone/language supported by source detail.	5-6
Level 5	Evaluates usefulness of one source for understanding volunteers, based on purpose/contextual knowledge supported by source detail.	6-7
Level 6	Evaluates and compares the usefulness of both sources for understanding volunteers supported by detail from both sources.	7-8

This type of question, requiring candidates to address two sources, appears each year and the great majority of answers did use both sources in reaching Level 3. Progression to Level 4 or Level 5 was common, but it was uncommon for candidates to reach Level 6, evaluating both sources. Source B was most often evaluated through tone/language, but candidates must comment on the nature of the tone or language used. It is not sufficient to quote part of a source without pointing out how the tone/language affects our judgement of the value of the source as historical evidence. It was reassuring how many candidates did evaluate Source C by using their knowledge of pre-1914 Liberal welfare reforms, as this answer illustrates:

Level 5 7 marks

Both sources are useful because they show different reasons why joining the army seemed appealing. It's clear from B that he was persuaded to join up by the huge amount of propaganda which emphasised everyone's moral duty to fight. He said that he knew he could no longer let others do the fighting. This propaganda also created naivety that the war was a big adventure that would soon be won by Britain. He said "The spirit of adventure was strong in me and I knew it would mean a terrific fight." It is clear that the realities of war were unknown to him and he saw it as an adventure.

Source C on the other hand shows men joined up believing it will improve their pay. It tells us East Lancashire had big economic problems in 1914 and so many were unemployed that 700 children were fed at the town hall every lunch time. If you joined the army you could earn £1.05 a week, only 20 pence less than the pay of a skilled worker. This factual content is more useful because I know it fits with the Liberal reforms before the war when free school meals were introduced in 1906 because so many people were below the poverty line of Rowntree.

Although source B is believable because the soldier has no purpose to persuade it is only his story and although it is useful it is not as useful as knowing why hundreds of men in Lancashire joined the army.

Q3 Source D

Are you surprised by this magazine cover?

Use details of the magazine cover and your knowledge to explain your answer. **8 marks**

Level 1	Description of surface detail/general assertion.	1-2
Level 2	Valid inference/s from the cover, unsupported by detail from it. OR Makes contextual reference without inference.	2-3
Level 3	Valid explanation for reaction to the cover, supported by detail from it.	4-5
Level 4	Valid explanation for the cover, supported from contextual knowledge or by cross-reference.	6-7
Level 5	Valid explanation for the cover, supported by detail from it and put into context.	7-8

A wide variety of responses was stimulated by this source, but they fell into three broad categories.

Answers focused on the female, commenting on her appearance and that she was smoking, to the exclusion of any reference to the text. Answers focused on the text to the exclusion of the image. Answers which responded to the image and the text. Candidates who commented on the text often put it into the context of censorship, with good knowledge of the 1914 DORA. This answer is typical of those who were aware of the massive campaign to portray Germans as savages.

Level 5 8 Marks

I am not surprised by this magazine cover for many reasons.

During the war the British government used many techniques to get support from families on the home front. They made propaganda posters to encourage them to support the war effort, and to encourage men to fight. They also made anti-German propaganda which gave the British public negative views towards the Germans and urged patriotism. This front cover shows a posh sophisticated young woman and is aimed at women readers. Its headline reads "Appalling Barbarities of the Germans", and tells us they are factual stories by a war correspondent at the front.

Stories about terrible things German soldiers were doing weren't true, they were made up. Stories such as Germans killing babies and boiling the bodies of soldiers to make soap were spread across Britain. People wanted to believe such stories as a reason for hating the Germans and allowed family members to fight. They gave comfort to people who believed Britain was doing the right thing in fighting Germany.

In conclusion, I am not surprised by the magazine cover because it was a well known tactic of the British government to get support from families on the home front and it appears in a normal magazine.

Q4 Sources E and F

How similar are these two sources?

Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

9 marks

Level 1	Description of surface detail/general assertion.	1-2
Level 2	Comment limited to type of source/matching details of sources.	3-4
Level 3	Valid comment on similarity/difference concerning motivation supported by source detail OR from contextual knowledge.	4-5
Level 4	Evaluates a source/s concerning motivation using tone/language supported by source detail.	6-7
Level 5	Evaluates one source concerning motivation using contextual knowledge supported by source detail.	7-8
Level 6	Evaluates and compares the similarity of both sources in context supported by detail from them.	8-9

As with Q2, the great majority of answers did use both sources in reaching Level 3. Progression to Level 4 or Level 5 was common, but it was uncommon for candidates to reach Level 6, evaluating both sources. It was surprising that more candidates did not comment on the nature of the tone/language of Source E and disappointing that so many thought it was the product of a radio broadcast or even television. This answer is typical of the very many candidates who used their knowledge effectively to evaluate Source E. Very many also reached Level 5 by using their knowledge of German atrocity stories to evaluate Source F.

Level 5 8 marks

The two sources, E and F, are similar because they both discuss how proud men were to go to war. However, the sources differ because source E was made by the government with the intent to manipulate emotions, whereas source F is a personal account of the reasons for joining up.

Source E is an extract from a recording made by the government in 1914. It is propaganda in a humorous way to show it is a manly thing to sign up for the war, "If you can guarantee me killing ten Germans...We'll even reserve the bloomin Kaiser for you!" It uses emotional blackmail by women to persuade men to show they are not afraid to join the army. This fits in with the Order of the White Feather which started at the beginning of the war and involved women giving a white feather of cowardice to men not in uniform. Joining the army made a man's wife feel proud and she says so in the recording. The government also used a poster which said The Women of Britain say Go!

Source F is an extract from the autobiography of the writer Robert Graves. He says he joined up because he was "outraged to read of Germany's attack on neutral Belgium" and believed some of the stories about German atrocities. Even though he saw through the propaganda he did believe the Germans were monsters and had to be stopped. Even his mother, born in Germany, "thought her people had gone mad." Consequently, his father said how proud he was that Graves had "done the right thing" by joining up.

In conclusion, although the sources are similar in mentioning family pride at men joining up, they are not similar due to their purposes. Source E aims to persuade men to join the war by using emotional blackmail, source F aims to share personal thoughts about the various reasons for joining up.

Q5 Source G

Why was this poster published?

Use details of the poster and your knowledge to explain your answer. **7 marks**

Level 1	Comprehension only/general assertion.	1-2
Level 2	Valid inference/s from the poster unsupported by detail from the poster. OR Makes contextual reference without inference unsupported by detail from the poster.	2-3 2-3
Level 3	Valid explanation why the government published the poster, supported by detail from the poster. OR from contextual knowledge.	4-6
Level 4	Valid explanation why the government published the poster, supported by detail from the poster and put into context.	6-7

Although most candidates reached Level 3, a surprising number used only minimal detail from the source and scored at the bottom of the level. There were too many examples of candidates who understood clearly what the nature of the poster was yet were disinclined to write a developed response. Few recognised the figure of Britannia, many thought the figure represented Germany and it was not uncommon for candidates to think that it was Germany burning in the background. The majority of candidates, however, knew about the attack on Scarborough and its significance. As with this answer, there were many who knew the details of the attack on the north-east coast and the propaganda opportunity it presented to the government.

Level 4 7 marks

The poster was published to encourage more men to enlist in the war. The poster shows a person dressed as a warrior carrying the British flag. This person represents Britannia. There are two men cheering Britannia and this shows they are proud of their country. The border of the poster has the symbols of Ireland, Wales, Scotland and England to try and encourage the whole nation to go to war.

The words on the poster 'Remember Scarborough! Enlist Now' appeals to every man's sense of duty, reminding them of the German navy attack on the east coast of England in December 1914. At Scarborough 119 people were killed and there were attacks on Whitby and Hartlepool. The government used the fear caused by the attacks to begin another propaganda campaign to get more recruits. By 1915 the number of recruits was falling and the number of deaths on the Western Front was rising, but the government did not want to introduce conscription and still relied on volunteers.

Q6 All the sources, A to G

'Men volunteered for the army in 1914 and 1915 because of propaganda.'

How far do the sources in this paper support this statement?

Use details of the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Remember to identify the sources you use.

12 marks

Level 1	General answers unsupported from the sources.	
Level 2	One-sided answer using relevant contextual knowledge unsupported from the sources.	2-3
	OR Uses the sources without addressing the question.	2-3
	OR One-sided answer based upon reference to the sources.	2-3
Level 3	Balanced answer, using relevant contextual knowledge unsupported from the sources.	4-5
	OR Balanced answer based upon reference to the sources.	4-5
Level 4	One-sided answer, with specified detailed support from the sources.	6-7
Level 5	Balanced answer, with specified detailed support from the sources.	8-10
Level 6	In addition to Level 5, addresses 'how far?'/evaluates sources based on specific reference to the sources used in their answer.	11-12

It is very evident that even the weakest candidate is trained to attempt a balanced answer and so the majority of candidates reached Level 5. A significant proportion, however, did not get further than Level 4 because they did not provide support from the sources for a balanced argument or became committed to presenting a yes or no response. The variety of source groupings which candidates used, clearly reasoned and supported in detail, was heartening. There is still, however, work to be done to ensure that they are able to reach Level 6 after investing so much effort in marshalling the sources for and against the statement in question. This answer is very typical of the many who were so near to moving up to the top level.

Level 5 10 marks

Source A shows men in the army waiting for help while the figure wearing the British flag demands why we aren't with them, "Who's Absent? Is it You?". This demonstrates how propaganda used guilt against men to make them enlist and therefore supports the statement somewhat. Likewise source B uses the mob psychology of patriotism to force young men to sign up to help "our brave boys confronting a massive German army", he knew "the time had come when I could not stand by and joined up to serve my King and Country."

Source D uses propaganda about "Appalling barbarities of the Germans" to make people angry and join up to protect the weak. This shows how feelings were shaped and people believed it was right to go to war and volunteer for the army. Source F similarly talks of the anger felt when reading of German atrocities, "I was outraged to read of Germany's attack on neutral Belgium and I decided to volunteer". Playing on the anger of people appears again in source G when the propaganda poster urges men to "Remember Scarborough! Enlist Now".

However, from source B we can also see that there was a sense of excitement and adventure and anticipation that caused men to enlist, "It would mean a terrific fight". But it was probably propaganda which produced those feelings to start with. Source C is clearly against the statement because it talks of how the economic difficulties made the army popular. "7000

Report on the Components taken in June 2009

workers were unemployed and joining the local Pals battalion was attractive because of army pay and allowances totalling £1.05 a week." Men enlisted simply because they needed the money, not because of propaganda.

Even though source E shows hatred of Germans, wanting to kill 10 of them, its main theme is that of a man's pride. A man would not want a woman to think he was weak, and therefore it would be in his nature to enlist. "Afraid! I'm not afraid." This reflects the moral pressure placed on men to join. Therefore source E gives other reasons apart from propaganda and does not support the statement.

Overall some of the sources do support the statement, as either they are strong examples of propaganda or an account of how propaganda influenced them. Yet some sources do not and portray other reasons why men enlisted in the army in 1914 and 1915, such as pride, patriotism and peer pressure.

1937/03 1037/02 Coursework

With only one more year to go of the present specification and with the forthcoming demise of coursework and the change to controlled assessment it is not surprising that there is little of note to report. The entry for this specification, the overall quality of work, and the nature of the assignments, were stable with no significant changes noted.

The moderation of this year's coursework was completed with few problems. This was due to the efficiency of the majority of centres. MS1s were often sent to moderators early and the requested work was usually despatched quickly with the authentication forms enclosed. There were few clerical errors on the mark sheets and it was easy to find one's way around most of the coursework schemes and materials. It would help if centres make sure that they send the sheet showing the breakdown of candidates' marks across the two assignments with the MS1s.

Nearly all centres continue to use OCR assignments and mark schemes. Although this is a little unadventurous, it is understandable that centres play safe in the present climate of pressure for ever-improving results and better placing in the league tables. It certainly makes the task of moderating more straightforward and is one of the factors that explain why few centres have their marks changed. Most the marking of work had clearly been carried out with care and there was much detailed and useful annotation of work explaining where and why levels and marks had been awarded. There was plenty of evidence of careful internal moderation being carried out. Some centres standardise the teachers who will mark the work before marking begins. This can make no more than a light touch internal moderation necessary at the end of the process.

There still appears to be some confusion over the requirements of the short course (1037/02). Candidates only need to complete a single piece of work on AO1. Centres are still submitting work for AOs 2 and 3. Nearly all centres fulfilled the regulations of the full course specification correctly.

The overall quality of the work is excellent. Most candidates clearly put a lot of hard work and careful thought into the completion of their work. They are to be congratulated.

Assignment 1

On the rare occasion when marks had to be adjusted by moderators the reason was usually found in the marking of this assignment. There is still a tendency in a few centres to reward detailed and accurate descriptions and narratives too highly. To achieve high marks for AO1 candidates must show that they can produce genuine historical explanations, can develop and support their own arguments, and can reach and support their own judgements and conclusions.

Assignment 2

There was much excellent use of historical material with candidates interpreting, evaluating and using sources in their historical context. Moderators rarely disagreed with the marking of this assignment.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
History B (Modern World) 1937
June 2009 Examination Series

Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	54	45	36	31	26	20	15
12	75	57	49	42	36	30	24	18
13	75	53	45	38	33	28	23	18
14	75	51	44	37	31	25	19	13
02	50	34	31	28	25	22	18	15
03	50	43	38	34	26	18	11	4

Options (weighted marks)

Option A (depth study Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	162	145	128	111	93	75	57	39
Percentage in Grade		14.4	21.6	21.1	16.8	11.6	7.2	4.2	2.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		14.4	36.0	57.1	73.8	85.5	92.7	96.9	98.9

The total entry for the examination was 30,697.

Option B (depth study Russia)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	166	150	134	118	99	80	61	42
Percentage in Grade		17.9	25.3	18.0	13.2	10.4	8.2	4.0	2.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		17.9	43.2	61.2	74.4	84.8	93.0	97.0	99.0

The total entry for the examination was 3,262.

Option C (depth study The USA)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	160	144	128	113	95	77	60	43
Percentage in Grade		11.7	20.0	21.3	17.3	14.1	7.8	4.0	2.1
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		11.7	31.6	52.7	69.9	84.0	92.0	96.2	98.4

The total entry for the examination was 16,380.

Option D (depth study China)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	159	143	127	111	92	73	55	37
Percentage in Grade		18.3	24.5	17.5	19.4	14.2	3.6	1.1	0.8
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		18.3	42.8	60.3	79.7	93.9	97.5	98.6	99.4

The total entry for the examination was 360.

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	13.8	21.3	20.9	16.8	12.4	7.5	4.1	2.1
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	13.8	35.1	56.0	72.7	85.1	92.6	96.7	98.8

The total entry for the examination was 50,699.

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)
History B (Modern World) 1037**

Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01	60	41	34	28	24	20	16	12
02	25	23	20	18	14	10	7	4

Overall (weighted marks)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	100	83	73	62	51	43	35	27	19
Percentage in Grade		5.4	12.0	17.0	18.5	14.8	11.2	9.3	6.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		5.4	17.5	34.4	52.9	67.6	78.8	88.1	94.4

The total entry for the examination was 614.

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@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

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 2009