

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 2006

1937/1037/MS/R/06

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.

The mark schemes are published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by Examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

The reports on the Examinations provide 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.

Mark schemes and Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this mark scheme or report.

© OCR 2006

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annersley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

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

**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

Component	Content	Page
1037/01	(Short Course) Paper 1	5
1937/11-14	Paper 1	7
1937/02	Paper 2	18
1937/03 1037/02	Coursework	23
*	Grade Thresholds	25

1037/01 - Paper 1 (Short Course)

Section A

Question 1

- (a) This was generally answered well, although relatively few candidates reached the top level. Most were able to reach Level 3 by using contextual knowledge to explain what was happening in Germany. Candidates appeared to be less confident in using material relating to Europe as directed by the question.
- (b) Most candidates were able to identify the message of the cartoon the most common of which was *'The world is heading towards war'* and *'Chamberlain is trying hard to achieve peace but is finding it difficult'*. This message was supported from the cartoon by reference to the breaking plank of wood, rocks, globe, Chamberlain without jacket and with his sleeves rolled-up and the 'peace side'. A substantial number of candidates were then able to relate this to the policy of appeasement and the Munich conference. Occasionally candidates wrote about the invasion of Czechoslovakia and an event that happened in the year after the cartoon was published.
- (c) This question saw a range of responses – some were excellent, but a substantial number of candidates simply did not answer the question. Many wrote learned responses about provenance and reliability without ever addressing the question of similarities and differences. Some candidates dismissed source C as being useless because only Hitler knew about his policy. Others just copied out the two sources. A number of candidates read the question as "Are these two sources similar to Hitler's foreign policy?" and then wrote a resume of Hitler's foreign policy with very little reference to the sources. A few candidates compared Sources A and B, when the question actually asked about Sources C and D.
- (d) Generally answered well with many candidates identifying the purpose of the cartoon. For many this was Britain and France protecting themselves to get Germany to attack the Soviet Union. This was often well supported by detail from the cartoon. Few took it to the stage of 'why 1939?' However, some candidates displayed very little knowledge of European geography and spoke about France and Britain being in Eastern Europe, which obviously led to misinterpretation of the cartoon.
- (e) Candidates are becoming more secure with what is required by this question and many were able to support the question hypothesis through direct reference to particular sources. The mark scheme allowed a maximum of six marks for this. It was relatively rare for candidates to reach Level 3. To do this, the answer needed to challenge the hypothesis using the given sources. In answering this question it is important that candidates make reference to the sources individually. There were a number of candidates who did not do this and a small number who did not use any of the sources. This approach limits the mark to a maximum of two.

Question 2

- (a)** This question was not very popular and those that attempted it offered a wide range of responses with some excellent answers and some very weak answers. Many simply did not understand the message of the cartoon and were thus unable to suggest a valid interpretation. A common misconception was that Glasnost and Perestroika were a response to the strikes, unrest and riots. Only a few candidates displayed any contextual knowledge in their answers.
- (b)** Generally responses to this question were weak. Few candidates addressed the agreement / disagreement aspect of the question with many copying out the sources with no additional comment.
- (c)** There were some good responses to this question, although it was relatively rare for candidates to reach Level 5. Many were able to access Level 3, using contextual knowledge of events in Poland.
- (d)** Candidates appeared to lack information about Gorbachev making the understanding of this source more difficult. Many did achieve Level 2 by identifying why the source was useful but few went on to explain the content of the source or give other information that might be useful to evaluate his career.
- (e)** There were some excellent answers to this question, but equally some candidates were unable to actually answer the question and simply copied out each source in turn without any comment. As with Question 1(e), there were candidates who made no reference whatsoever to the sources.

Section B

A comprehensive survey of candidates' strengths and weaknesses in answering the structured questions (numbers 3-6) is given later in this report. This will provide guidance for Centres and assist in the preparation of candidates for future examinations.

1937/11–14 - Paper 1

General Comments

The paper proved to be accessible to candidates of all abilities and examiners concluded it to be a fair test. There was much evidence of candidates being well prepared to meet the demands of the paper using both their historical knowledge and conceptual understanding effectively across the Core and their chosen Option. Where candidates took the time to think about a question they produced answers that were clear and concise and which remained firmly rooted in the question demands. Others were often less concise, producing rambling answers that told the examiner all they knew but never really got to grips with the demands of the question.

In Section A, Question 1 was by far the most popular with many responses combining successfully details from the source with contextual knowledge to form a supported interpretation of the cartoon message. Candidates should continue to be encouraged to produce concise answers which offer a valid interpretation clearly linked to relevant source support and contextual knowledge.

Question 3 was the most popular question in Section B, with Questions 5 and 6 being the least popular. Candidates are slowly beginning to realise that short answers containing factual detail are the best way of answering the (a) parts. Here, four correct pieces of information will gain full marks. Alternatively, two developed relevant points will also gain maximum credit. Answers to the (b) questions need to move from identification and/or description to explanation if they are to access the higher marks and here also it is expected that answers will be concise. There were many good answers to part (c) where candidates made a good attempt at 'how satisfied' and 'how successful'. Some answers made the judgement at the beginning of the answer and then either contradicted themselves or got into a muddle trying to justify their initial reaction. They might find it more advantageous to make the judgement after they have presented their arguments.

The quality of work in relation to the relatively new approach to Question 7 continues to improve with many candidates having confidence in their ability to deal with historical sources combined with their contextual knowledge. The responses to the structured questions in Section C were broadly comparable with those in Section B.

Some candidates ran short of time, and in the vast majority of cases this was due entirely to the writing of unnecessarily long answers which contained masses of irrelevant information. There were considerably fewer rubric infringements this year than previously but they are still occurring. This is particularly so in Section A where some candidates answered both questions.

Last year this Report drew Centres' attention to the presentation of the scripts and no apology is made for repeating those comments.

- Candidates should put the number of each question answered, in the order they are answered, on the front cover of the answer booklet. This should be the number only, i.e. 1, 3, 7, 8 and not (a), (b) etc.
- Candidates should ensure that single sheets are attached securely but loosely to enable the booklet to be opened by the examiner.
- Questions should be numbered within the body of the answer booklet.

Comments on Individual Questions

Section A

Question 1

- (a) Question 1 was by far the most popular. Most candidates were able to identify the message of the cartoon the most common of which was '*The world is heading towards war*' and '*Chamberlain is trying hard to achieve peace but is finding it difficult*'. This message was supported from the cartoon by reference to the breaking plank of wood, rocks, globe, Chamberlain without jacket and with his sleeves rolled up and the 'peace side'. A substantial number of candidates were then able to relate this to the policy of appeasement and the Munich conference. Occasionally candidates wrote about the invasion of Czechoslovakia and an event that happened in the year after the cartoon was published. Generally this question was well answered.
- (b) This was quite well answered, although some candidates offered four or five identifications without developing any kind of explanation. Some candidates clearly had very detailed knowledge of the reasons for Hitler's desire to take over Czechoslovakia. Most focused their answers on resources, living space and the unification of German speakers into a Greater Germany. A common misconception was that Germany lost the Sudetenland (or in some answers the whole of Czechoslovakia) at the Treaty of Versailles and that Hitler was righting this wrong. Some answers displayed a considerable lack of knowledge of European geography in the 1930s, with candidates claiming that Hitler would gain access to an array of countries that were actually nowhere near Czechoslovakia.

Question 2

- (a) This question was not very popular and those that attempted it offered a wide range of responses, with some excellent answers, but equally some very weak answers. Many simply did not understand the message of the cartoon and were thus unable to suggest a valid interpretation. A common misconception was that Glasnost and Perestroika were a response to the strikes, unrest and riots.
- (b) As for part a), there was a wide range of responses. Candidate's lack of chronology was highlighted in this question. Many ignored the date in the question and instead wrote about events in the late 1940s and the 1950s. Some wrote in-depth answers about the building of the Berlin Wall. There were, however, some excellent answers, with candidates displaying detailed knowledge of the events of the 1980s based around Gorbachev's actions, Solidarity and the actions of people in Eastern Europe.

Section B

Question 3

- (a) A large number of candidates were able to achieve the full four marks for this question. The most common point made was the loss of Alsace-Lorraine to France which was credited with two marks. Other often mentioned losses included the German colonies, Upper Silesia and the Polish Corridor. Some candidates ignored the actual requirements of the question and wrote, sometimes in great detail, about the various terms of the Treaty of Versailles often omitting land loss details. Incorrect answers were common. The most repeated one was the loss of the Rhineland closely followed by the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia. Another common mistake was to only state which countries gained land from Germany.

- (b)** The majority of candidates were able to offer clear and relevant explanation in their answers, with reference to damage, loss of life, guilt, revenge and the prevention of future war. However, many candidates wrote about the aims of the Allies, rather than why they wanted to punish Germany. A small number of candidates confused the outcome of the First World War with Hitler and the Second World War. As in all (b) parts of the questions in this section, full marks can be achieved by clearly developing two explanations.
- (c)** Answers to this question varied widely. Many candidates wrote extensively about each leader's aims when they went into the negotiations, but some made no comment whatsoever upon satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the actual terms of the Treaty. Many candidates achieved Level 3 by writing about the dissatisfaction of all three leaders, but few progressed to Level 4, mainly because they did not link satisfaction to the actual terms of the Treaty. It was apparent that some candidates were not answering the actual question set; rather they were answering a question from a previous paper – probably done as part of their revision. Those who came to terms with the question often moved into the top level by explaining why each of the leaders might well claim to have been both satisfied and dissatisfied.

Question 4

- (a)** Overall, very few candidates seemed aware of what was actually meant by the structure of the League. Most answers focused on the aims, or membership, of the League. A substantial number of candidates failed to achieve a mark for this question.
- (b)** This question also proved problematic for most candidates, with the majority writing an answer about political problems rather than social problems. There was also some evidence of confusion with the Liberal Reforms of Lloyd George. On the other hand there were some excellent answers to this question, with detailed knowledge of how the League tried to solve social problems – but these were relatively few in number. Generally if 'social' was understood in the context of the League, answers were often vague in relation to 'helping refugees' and 'dealing with disease'. It would be appropriate if, when a similar question appears in the future, candidates are able to give specific answers to particular work done by the League's committees.
- (c)** Answers here varied widely. There were excellent answers with detailed knowledge and explanation of the League's successes and failures. However, there were many answers where the candidates explained why the League failed – the absence of the USA, the Depression, the League's voting system- without any focus upon its actual failure/success at all. This appeared again to be due to candidates answering a question from a past paper rather than the actual question given this year. Most candidates were stronger on the explanation of the League's failures, especially Manchuria and Abyssinia, than on the explanation of successes.

Question 5

- (a)** There were a variety of responses to this question, some excellent and others very weak. Most answers concentrated on the division of Germany and Berlin into four zones. By naming correctly the countries involved in this division, candidates could achieve three of the four marks available.
- (b)** Again there were some excellent responses, with detailed knowledge of why the Marshall Plan was introduced. The less strong answers relied solely on the explanation relating to the attempt to stop the spread of communism. However, there were some very weak answers where candidates appeared to have no understanding at all of the Marshall Plan.

- (c) There were many generalised answers to this question, where candidates made no specific reference to any country. There were some detailed responses concentrating on Stalin's success, but few were able to identify and/or explain his failures. Many candidates ignored the dates 'between 1945 and 1949' and many also ignored the word 'Europe'. Candidates included information relating to Cuba, Vietnam, China and Korea.

Question 6

- (a) Responses to this question varied. There were some excellent answers, but also a number of responses that gained no marks. Points often mentioned included the overthrow of Batista, the coming to power of Castro and the links with communism. A significant number of candidates ignored the dates in the question and wrote about events from 1962 onwards in relation to missiles.
- (b) There were again some excellent answers, giving a range of reasons for the failure of the Bay of Pigs invasion highlighting the lack of preparation and the larger Cuban defence force. However, some candidates gave generalised answers and appeared to have little knowledge of the actual invasion or the reasons for its failure.
- (c) A significant number of candidates reached Level 3 by explaining the success of Kennedy in securing the removal of missiles from Cuba. It was relatively rare for candidates to then explain failure. A number of candidates wrote very detailed and lengthy descriptions of events without addressing the issues of success and/or failure thus restricting achievement to Level 2.

Section C

Paper 11: Germany, 1919–1945

Question 7

- (a) This question provided an opportunity for candidates to show their knowledge of the reasons behind Hitler's policies in relation to Jews. Surprisingly many failed to do this. The source provided a number of reasons which candidates were expected to develop in order to explain some of these reasons, whilst contextual knowledge provided others. All too often, answers wrote out or paraphrased the source and failed to add any other explained reasons.
- (b) Many good answers were seen which identified the purpose of the cartoon without any trouble. The purpose of persuasion to reject Jews and to support the Aryan race was usually well supported by the use of features of the cartoon and put the answer firmly into Level 3, gaining four of the six marks. Less secure was the contextual knowledge offered. Mention of the Nazi anti-Jewish campaigns or the Nazification of the German education system would have added the other two marks.
- (c) Most candidates grasped the significance of the cartoon but then fell down in their technique for answering the question. Most answers described suppression as portrayed by the source but then failed to introduce contextual knowledge to explain why they were making this statement. It was anticipated that candidates would give explanations along the lines of '*Hitler suppressed freedom in Germany by banning all trade unions and thus there was no freedom in Germany*' and then use their contextual knowledge to argue that in some areas honour and freedom were restored. This could have been done by using, for example, the fact that by 1936 Hitler had got most of them back to work. The good candidates looked at both sides and usually concluded 'that honour might have been restored but freedom certainly was not'.

Question 8

- (a) This produced many high marks with candidates able to refer to political, economic and military reasons. If there was to be a criticism it would relate to the length of many answers being overly long.
- (b) Answers demonstrated the ability of candidates to identify revolts that had taken place with many describing those of the Spartacists and Kapp. Less secure was the ability to explain why they failed. Those with this understanding had little trouble in achieving high marks.
- (c) This question highlighted the limited technique of some candidates. Many were able to offer sound narrative of each of the three events but few were able to explain clearly why each of the events constituted a threat to the Weimar Republic. Some candidates started their answer with hyperinflation and then argued this was the cause of the French invasion of the Ruhr. Others thought hyperinflation and the Great Depression were the same.

Question 9

- (a) Whilst there were many good answers to this question dealing with the politically controlled curriculum and gaining high marks, too many candidates wrote extensively about the Hitler Youth and their activities. This approach did not receive credit.
- (b) Many answers to this question developed into a 'how' response. Candidates were able to identify the different groups of opposition but the explanation for their opposition was weak and often limited to a vague idea of 'control'. The two most dealt with opposition groups were the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Any explanation as to why these existed would have secured a top level mark.

Paper 12: Russia, 1905–1941

Question 7

- (a) The majority of candidates were able to use the detail of the cartoon to support their answer as to why this poster was published. The purpose given by many revolved around the idea of uniting together, showing of patriotism and the need to protect Petrograd. The purpose was then supported by the fact that the poster shows the men 'shoulder to shoulder'. Less secure was the development of putting the poster into a context and even more specifically 1919. This latter point was often not dealt with.
- (b) Some very good responses to this question were seen. The message that '*foreign powers are controlling the White Army generals*' was accessed by a significant number. This message was then ably supported by content from the cartoon relating to the use of leads. Some developed this further by commenting on the fierce nature of the dogs and the fact that they are pulling in different directions. Approaches like this easily allowed the introduction of contextual knowledge putting the response in the highest level.
- (c) Many answers to this question were disappointing. Many resorted to just paraphrasing the source which kept their answers in the lowest level. Those who knew about Trotsky and his relationship with the army were able to put the source into context but then often failed to offer other reasons from their own knowledge to explain the success of the Bolsheviks. The number of candidates considering 'how far' was relatively small.

Question 8

- (a) There were some very detailed answers about Bloody Sunday often mentioning Father Gapon, the fact that the march was peaceful and that they were taking a petition. Occasionally errors occurred with some candidates stating that the Tsar ordered soldiers to open fire and then the protest was against the Tsar.
- (b) The reasons why the Tsar survived the 1905 Revolution were generally well explained, particularly in relation to the Duma, free speech and the role of his returning soldiers. If one was to be critical there was less evidence of how the Tsar satisfied different groups by his actions.
- (c) There were many detailed descriptions of the three elements showing the candidates held a strong sense of story, particularly in relation to Rasputin and the Tsarina. However, the question required the candidates to use more than just recall as they were expected to use the three elements to explain the part played in the ending of the Tsar's rule. Of the three, the 'collapse of the army' proved to be the most difficult for candidates. Those that realised what was required were often able to make the links both in terms of the three elements in relation to 1917 but also in relation to each other.

Question 9

- (a) In answering this question information could be taken from any of the plans but it was expected that the correct plan would be identified. For example, '*The first Five-Year Plan set targets for heavy industry production*' would have been credited with two marks.
- (b) As with 8(c) there were many good answers dealing with the modernisation of industry to bring the Soviet Union into the twentieth century. The benefits of this, including modern armaments and the improvements in agriculture, were recognised and explained.

- (c)** Again there were many answers that were strong on description and weaker on explanation. It is important to ensure that candidates look at the question as a whole and not just the three identified aspects. In this question the link was to greatest misery. Fear obviously featured large and for the better candidates the kulaks, but beyond this few links were made.

Paper 13: The USA, 1919–1941

Question 7

- (a) Many candidates were able to identify the message of the cartoon and the concept of change and the failure of the previous Republican policies. This was well supported with reference to the bin containing Hoover's policies and to Hoover walking away. However, there were also significant numbers of candidates who misinterpreted the images, believing Hoover to be Roosevelt and vice versa. There was also confusion about the ownership of the policies in the bin, with many believing that the bin contained Roosevelt's policies. Some candidates also thought that the cartoon was an election poster, believing that the election was actually in 1932, while the poster was published in 1933.
- (b) There was a variety of responses to this question. There were some very detailed responses showing clear understanding of the purpose of the cartoon and the significance of the NRA's role in improving working conditions, wages and the relationship between the employer and the employee – hence the images in the cartoon. However, there were also a number of candidates who simply described the images in the cartoon without addressing its purpose.
- (c) A large number achieved Level 2, relying solely on the source to explain the success of the New Deal. Some candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to show failure, with emphasis on the treatment of black people, women and also the level of opposition to the New Deal. Relatively few looked at both success and failure using their contextual knowledge; thus few were able to achieve Level 4. A number of candidates based most of their answer on reliability comments, such as the source being written years after the event, it was an American historian so was bound to be biased – all learned responses which did not address the question of whether Roosevelt's New Deal was a success.

Question 8

- (a) The vast majority of candidates were able to achieve four marks here, with points about racism, segregation, poor employment prospects, poor wages and the activities of the KKK. A common error was to write about black people still being slaves.
- (b) Again there were some very good answers here. Most candidates were able to give one reason with a valid explanation, with the majority explaining over-production and its effects on farmers. Some were also able to explain Republican tariffs and the loss of European markets after the First World War. A frequent misconception was to attribute farmers' problems to a decline in population in the USA, something that is simply not true. The 1920s census recorded an urban population of 54,157,073 and a rural population of 51,552,647. By 1930 the figures were: urban 68,954,823, rural 53,820,233.
- (c) Most candidates were able to gain at least five marks here, usually by choosing one factor and explaining it thoroughly. The new methods of production was the most popular choice, with many candidates revealing detailed knowledge. Explanation of the effects of the First World War was not always convincing as the role of the US in the war was developed rather than the impact on the boom in the 1920s. Many were also able to explain the Republican policies, particularly laissez-faire and tariffs. A minority of candidates misunderstood the term 'boom' and interpreted it as 'bust/blew up/fell apart/declined.' They thus wrote about the Wall Street Crash, rather than the boom. Some weaker candidates wrote very detailed descriptions of jazz music and flappers, without ever answering the question set.

Question 9

- (a)** Most candidates struggled with this question. Some achieved four marks, but the majority gained one or two. Many focused on the effects of the Crash rather than the features of stock market speculation.
- (b)** Many candidates were able to give a valid explanation of over production and relate it clearly to the Wall Street Crash. However, many did not explain the causes at all, but focused on the effects of the Crash, writing in depth about unemployment and homelessness.
- (c)** There was a wide variety of responses here. Some were excellent, with clear explanation of how factors developed, relating the Wall Street Crash to factory closures and subsequent unemployment. Many also proved to have detailed knowledge and understanding of bank speculation in the stock market and were able to relate this to the rush on the banks and the later closures. Explanations for homelessness included detailed knowledge of Hooverilles and how the Crash meant this was the only option for many people. However, there were also a significant number of generalised answers, with candidates showing very little contextual knowledge. This question tended to be answered very well indeed or very poorly.

China, 1945–c.1976

Comments on this option are based on a relatively small entry compared to the other options.

Question 7

- (a) This inference-based question was very well answered by the vast majority of candidates, who clearly understood the need to support their inference with information from both within and outside the source. A small number of candidates failed to support with clear information from the source itself relying just on their contextual knowledge.
- (b) This question was less well answered than part (a). Whilst many candidates could make clear links to contextual knowledge to show Jiang's failures, they were less confident in coming up with successes, and thus failed to reach Level 4 in considering 'how far'.
- (c) This question was generally well answered by candidates, but again the 'how far' for Level 4 was reached less frequently than it should have been, as many candidates failed to move outside the source for points to develop. In some instances this was a matter of technique, with candidates using factors that were largely outside of the source (such as peasant support for the Red Army) but linking the factor to the source itself.

The vast majority of candidates attempted Question 8 rather than Question 9, and produced answers which were overall of better quality

Question 8

- (a) This was generally well answered by candidates, though some veered from the focus of the question and wrote about social rather than economic reforms.
- (b) This was generally well answered, with the majority of candidates able to explain more than one reason why communes were established in China. Some very perceptive answers were seen from some candidates in one centre. Several, though, went on to explain why communes were unsuccessful, which was outside of the question's scope and detracted from the amount of time that might otherwise have been spent on the more challenging part (c) question. In some instances candidates merely wrote a narrative of agricultural developments across the period, limiting themselves to description only and low Level 2.
- (c) This question produced a mixed range of responses from candidates. Many produced focused responses displaying strong contextual knowledge with clear causal links to the question, and a fair number of these reached Level 5. That said, candidates failed to access the higher levels since they merely described the reforms without focusing on their impact in modernising China. Others missed the thrust of the question and focused on the failure of one or more of the reforms. Candidates are encouraged to address the specific question set. The impact of reforms increasing women's rights in China were not fully appreciated by a number of candidates.

Question 9 was not popular and relatively few responses to were seen with the overall quality of these not of the same standard as responses to Question 8.

Question 9

- (a)** Candidates were able to establish that relations between China and Taiwan were poor, and could offer reasons for this, though few made four relevant points (or two developed ones) to achieve the full four marks.
- (b)** This question was well answered, possibly due to the study of the Vietnam War elsewhere within the course itself, and most candidates could give multiple reasons why the Chinese assisted the Vietcong.
- (c)** Some sound answers to this question were seen, though others lacked the specific contextual knowledge needed to develop causal explanations, and instead wrote in very anecdotal terms about the factors listed. Candidates are reminded that such answers are not going to move outside of Levels 1 and 2.

1937/02 - Paper 2

Did government propaganda fail to convince the British public to support World War One?

General Comments

Candidates responded well to the topic, were at ease with the broader question at issue and there were many high quality scripts. Candidates, at all levels of ability, showed clear evidence of having been prepared for the demands of the paper in terms of skills and knowledge. They were very aware of the skills required, but there were too many instances of candidates who ignored what they had written in their determination to apply 'rules' of source analysis. For example, in responding to Source B in Q2, after quoting detail about a gas attack and 'wholesale murder', it was not uncommon for candidates to assert the purpose of the letter was to reassure family at home! Overwhelmingly, candidates treated the paper seriously and, as in previous years, there were exceptionally few frivolous or nonsensical answers. Candidates were familiar with the broader context of the Home Front and had a good understanding of the nature of propaganda within that context.

There does continue to be a tendency for even the most able to omit source content from their answers, and an inclination among weak candidates to give contextual knowledge without relating it to the question or the sources involved.

Previous reports have reminded Centres that this is a source-based paper and candidates must use information taken directly from the sources. Again, this message is repeated. 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.

This answer to Q4 exemplifies the point about the need to support an answer with source detail:

Source F has been issued by the government because they are trying to get women to work in the factories. In 1917 many factories were short of workers and women were needed to produce things for the war effort. This poster tells us that women are needed to fill the places in the factories.

This Level 2 answer could so easily have been raised to Level 3 by the inclusion of simple detail from the source in question. Such omission of source detail, or even any sense of what a source is saying, is a fundamental error in a source-based assessment.

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 number of scripts enclosed clearly written on them.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

The great majority of candidates reached Level 3, supporting their inference about the poster's message with telling detail. It was interesting to read how many candidates expressed their clear understanding of the emotional blackmail in the poster through a limited vocabulary such as 'guilt tripped' and 'guilted'.

A lengthy answer was not required and even without the final contextual paragraph the following answer would have been marked at Level 3 / 5 marks. This answer was typical of the high proportion of those candidates who gave a clear context for the poster.

Level 4 answer

The message of this poster is that men should join up to fight in the war for the sake of their pride and to make sure that their children won't see them as a coward.

The poster shows a man sitting at home watching over his children. He is not wearing any uniform which shows he has not yet volunteered to fight. His daughter is reading a book and his son is playing with toy soldiers. The caption "Daddy, what did YOU do in the Great War?" is trying to make men ashamed if they haven't signed up.

The poster was published by the government in 1915. I know that at this time conscription was not yet introduced and the government were relying on the public to voluntarily sign up. This was successful, but in 1915 the government saw a drop in volunteers. The government desperately needed more men to fight as many were being killed or injured in battle and this poster was designed to get more men especially family men.

6 marks

Question 2

Candidates responded to this question in a variety of ways with the great majority of answers forming two groups – stereotypical treatment of the sources, or evaluation of at least one of the sources. Despite rather long answers successful evaluation of both sources was uncommon. Candidates found it easier to evaluate Source B, but many candidates had an over-simple view of the nature and extent of censorship of letters from the front. Also, a common error was to presume the soldier was in Germany and it was disappointing that so many ignored the reference to miners being on strike. With Source C a number of candidates simply wrote about the suffrage campaign before 1914 and another common error was the claim that Mrs. Sennett believed women in Britain would be better off under German rule.

This answer illustrates the process of identifying attitudes, explaining why they were different and evaluating their viewpoints.

Level 5 answer

Source B is an extract from a letter written by a British soldier to his family. It was published in a Yorkshire newspaper in 1915. In the letter the soldier writes about the German Emperor as “Wilhelm the Murderer” and portrays the Germans in a bad light – “ruined towns and villages, the wholesale murder of helpless women and children”. The soldier has a negative attitude towards the Germans.

Source C on the other hand shows the Germans in a totally different way. The letter was written to Lloyd George from a woman’s suffrage leader. Mrs. Sennett says that “women have suffered terribly because of the cruelty of the government”. She feels that they would be “no worse off under German rule”. This letter doesn’t exactly show Germany in a good light, but it compares the Germans to the British government indicating that they are just as bad as each other.

The soldier’s attitude to Germany would be expected because he enrolled in the hope of defeating them. Also, the fact that this letter was published in a newspaper further explains the negative attitude shown to Germany. At the time the government was focusing on boosting British morale and to do this they portrayed the Germans as barbaric and as people who murdered babies and children. This letter would support what the British government were trying to do and could do because of DORA controls at the start of the war.

Mrs. Sennett has a different purpose. Her letter was written in 1915, which was about a year after the war started and most suffragists and suffragettes at this time were more concentrated on the war effort. She was still concentrating on getting the vote and although saying something so strong would be considered an exaggeration, it is a very effective way of getting her point across. She would be aware that Lloyd George would resent the British government being likened to the Germans. When she wrote about “the inhuman conditions of our suffering working women”, she was referring to the dangerous jobs women had in factories making shells. Also, the letter is quite emotive using words such as “terribly” and “cruelty”. **9 marks**

Question 3

Candidates were more successful at reaching the higher levels than they were with Q2, albeit again with over-long answers. Many were dismissive of Source D because it was German and a common mistake was to concentrate on the film (often referred to as a video!) rather than comment on the nature of the source. Most candidates were aware of the importance of Lloyd George, but evaluation was often of the simplistic variety that journalists are liars

The following answer is a good example of a relatively concise style. Although it reached Level 5 it was not awarded 9 marks because it did not develop the points made. For example, the Germans were the object of the attack on the Somme and therefore a valid commentator. Also, the origin and nature of British government censorship of the press.

Level 5 answer

Both sources I believe are trustworthy about control of propaganda by the British government. Source D tells us about what the Germans think of a film shown in England about the Battle of the Somme. They say the film is made by the British government and it ‘emphasises English bravery and minimises our (German) efforts’. This shows us British government control of propaganda on film during the war and I believe it is trustworthy because the source has been produced by the opposing side, German War Ministry. You don’t expect the enemy to say good things about you. The Germans say the film ‘is an actual, generally truthful war film’.

Source E again is trustworthy because we are clearly told that war is a bad thing, ‘If the public really knew what the war is like, it would be stopped tomorrow’. Then Lloyd George highlights the fact that ‘they don’t know and can’t know because the censors (the government) will not allow newspapers to publish the truth.’ Instead the newspapers describe ‘just a pretty picture of the war’. This source was produced by Lloyd George and he was the prime minister. I believe its maybe more trustworthy than the German one because in a way Lloyd George discredits his

own government so he is being very honest. At this time the British government did have control of propaganda because it was the only way to raise the peoples morale, keep them under control and most importantly to maintain support for the war. **8 marks**

Question 4

This question produced the next uniformly strongest answers after Q1, although there was a greater variety of interpretation of the poster than was the case with Source A. Some candidates strayed down the line of 'votes for women', rather than concentrating on the topic of government propaganda during the war. Amongst candidates of all abilities there was the error that the munitions crisis was in 1917 (rather than 1915).

This answer is typical of the many which rooted the source firmly in 1917.

Level 4 answer

*The poster shows a woman putting on her overall to help to make shells in a factory. There is also a soldier in the background waving to her as he leaves for war. This shows that by making munitions women are aiding the war effort, they are 'Doing Their Bit'. This poster was issued in 1917 a year after conscription was introduced. All men not in "Vital" occupations such as mining which helped the war were entered into military service. This left huge gaps in the work place. At first the government encouraged women just to support and encourage men, but as the war progressed it was clear that they were needed. Women were encouraged to "fill the gaps" left by men. This was particularly emphasised in the munitions trade. The government started a new propaganda campaign, urging women to "do their bit" for the war. Women were eager to help and by the end of the war there were 6 million more women in work. **7 marks***

Question 5

This question also stimulated many very good answers and most candidates reached Level 3. Surprisingly, with the great majority of candidates there was an overwhelmingly narrow interpretation of the question – an exclusive concentration on conscientious objectors. Broader consideration of opposition to the war was unusual. Weaker candidates tended to interpret the source as showing the middle classes supported the war. Moreover, many candidates dismissed the usefulness of the source because it was published in 2001. The unusual nature of the information and conclusion in the source tended to puzzle some candidates rather than cause them to test it against their knowledge. Also, the proportion of candidates who evaluated the source on the basis of its language and tone was less than expected.

Level 5 answer

This source describes how conscientious objectors or 'conchies' were supported by the well-off and "politically important middle classes" in a Yorkshire industrial town. The source also says that the town was not an exception, meaning that other towns too were in opposition to the war and didn't trust what they were being told. This source finishes by saying that for this reason the usual picture of support for the war just isn't true because it doesn't reflect reality.

Source G is therefore quite useful for understanding how much opposition to the war there was. However I know that this source does not agree with many accounts about the war from the time. For example, this source claims that conchies received support from the people of the town and appeared in court "proud to show their feelings". In fact, more often than not, this was not the case. Conchies were usually victimised because they refused to fight and most were made to feel ashamed. They definitely did not receive the level of support described here and a lot of them were actually sent to jail, not as this source claims "dealt with less severely". Also, most accounts from the time describe how people supported the war effort. Women in particular proved their responsibility by filling in for the jobs of men and most sources describe a unity between the whole country. This source says the exact opposite, claiming most people of the

Yorkshire town didn't trust the war and that other towns felt the same. For this reason this source appears to be inaccurate. However, it is still useful because it describes a different reaction to the war than most other sources. **7 marks**

Question 6

It is now a relatively unusual candidate who is not aware of the need to present a balanced response to this type of question. Consequently, it is typical that candidates reach Level 4 and for a significant number of them this question provides a high proportion of their total mark. What is so pleasing to note is the great variety in the actual use of sources to support a valid argument.

This answer grouped the sources into two camps, arrived at a conclusion and also evaluated Source C.

Level 4 answer

There are some sources that agree with this statement. Source C shows that propaganda failed to convince this woman to support world war one. It says in the source "If the Germans invaded England we could not see worse things than we see today". This shows that she does not support the war effort because Britain would be no worse off if the Germans invaded. This therefore shows a failure of propaganda and it agrees with the statement.

Source G also agrees with the statement. It shows a group of 120 people known as conscientious objectors who did not support the war effort. These people refused to go to war because of their beliefs. It also mentions in the source "A general mood of mistrust about the war". This shows that there were a number of other people outside the Yorkshire town that did not support the war. Therefore propaganda failed to convince these people to support world war one.

The majority of sources disagree with this statement. Source D shows that propaganda influenced many British citizens to support the war effort. In the source it says "Recently a film about the Battle of the Somme was shown in England...it has enjoyed enormous success with the English public". This film was released by the British government as propaganda to show the bravery of English soldiers in the war. This encouraged people to support the war effort as it also showed the Germans being evil which caused people to want revenge on Germany. This shows that propaganda films were successful and encouraged people to support the war.

Source E also disagrees with this statement. It says "What newspapers describe is not the war, but just a pretty picture of the war". This shows that the propaganda filtered the bad news out of the newspapers to make the public think that the war was good and positive. This influenced many people in supporting the war and this is why it disagrees with the statement.

In source F propaganda has created posters to encourage women to support world war one. In the source it says "These women are doing their bit. Learn to make munitions". This is encouraging women to support the war effort. Propaganda like this did work and many women replaced men in the factories.

Overall there are more sources which disagree with the statement which shows that government propaganda did convince the British public to a certain extent more than they failed to convince them, such as Source E. However, it could be argued that some of these sources are not trustworthy. Source C is not trustworthy because it is written by a womens suffrage leader to Lloyd George and it is very emotional using words such as 'suffered terribly' 'cruelty' and 'outlaws'. When women did this they wanted the right to vote and weren't really bothered about the war. So you can't trust it as evidence that government propaganda failed.

10 marks plus 1 mark for evaluation

**1937/03, 1037/02 - Coursework
(Full and short course)**

General comments

The overall quality of coursework submitted to moderators was most impressive. The quality of the best work was stunning, while it was most encouraging to see the weaker candidates taking the exercise seriously, making a real effort, and producing work that they could be proud of.

The moderation of this year's coursework generally proceeded smoothly. Most centres sent their mark sheets to moderators by, or before, the required date, and replied promptly to requests for samples of candidates' work. It is very helpful to moderators if the coursework summary sheet is sent with the mark sheet. This provides moderators with information about different teaching sets and a breakdown of marks across the two assignments. It is also essential that a Centre Authentication Form is completed. Moderators also need a copy of the mark scheme, the assignments and the letter from the centre's coursework consultant approving the assignments. It is helpful if each candidate's work is clearly labelled with the candidate's name, number and mark. The majority of centres efficiently provide all this material and make it possible for the moderator to quickly work out the shape and content of the coursework scheme. However, every year a small minority of centres cause moderators hours of unnecessary work. Some of these centres are weeks late, almost impossible to contact and fail to return phone calls. Others appear to have simply shovelled all the materials into a sack making it unclear which pieces of work belong to which candidates. In a few cases it is not even possible to work out what the questions are, with candidates writing different versions of these at the top of their work.

However, these comments apply to a very few centres. Most packages of coursework are clearly organised and easy to find one's way around. Much of the work is carefully marked with helpful comments provided. Few centres had their marks changed although there were more centres this year whose marking was a little generous, but just within the tolerance. When this happened it has been noted in the reports issued to those centres.

As was mentioned in last year's report the widespread use of the OCR 'off the peg' assignments does help achieve consistency across the specification and makes moderation a relatively problem-free exercise. However, websites have appeared claiming to offer 'model answers' to some of the assignments. While many of these answers are far from being 'models', they do put temptation in the way of candidates. Now that most centres are fully aware of the requirements of the assignments, it might be a good time for many to think of setting their own questions. Guidance and support for this is provided by the regional Coursework Consultants. An alternative approach, used by a rapidly increasing number of schools, is to use the OCR assignments but to require candidates to complete the work under supervised conditions in school. Many teachers using this approach have reported the additional benefit of the work becoming more focused, relevant and concise, with candidates less inclined to write down everything they know about the topic.

Questions are still asked about the nature of the guidance that teachers can give candidates. It is therefore worth repeating what was said in last year's report: it is appropriate to briefly discuss the meaning of a question and to make sure that none of the sources used are too difficult; it is not appropriate to suggest to candidates the points that should go into their answers. It is entirely inappropriate for teachers to correct rough drafts. Once candidates commence their answers they should be on their own. The best way to help candidates do well in coursework is to ensure that the normal work they complete in class contains exercises testing the same skills as those assessed in the coursework. Candidates should not be facing these kinds of questions for the first time when they sit down to do their coursework.

Assignment 1

Virtually all the questions asked in this assignment were suitable and tested the necessary skills and understanding. Despite some further improvement in the relevance and focus of much of this work, there are still many candidates who write far too much. It is important to remind candidates that we are not interested in how much they can write. Their task is to answer the question in a relevant and concise way. It is still not unusual to have to read several passages of an answer before it begins to have a relevance to the question. When marking this assignment, teachers should reward positively answers that get straight to the point and do not contain irrelevant description and narrative. Many centres have discovered that such answers are more likely if coursework is completed under supervised conditions in class.

Assignment 2

Answers to this assignment are usually more relevant. However, some candidates still spend a long time explaining what sources show instead of answering the question. A few almost ignore the sources and write down everything they know about the topic. Generally, however, the quality of the work is very high with candidates informing their interpretation, evaluation and use of the sources with relevant contextual knowledge.

Grade Thresholds

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Modern World History (Short Course) 1037
June 2006**

Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01	60	43	35	28	23	18	14	10
02	25	22	19	16	13	10	7	4

Option and Overall (weighted marks)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	100	86	74	62	51	42	33	25	17
Percentage in Grade		2.8	12.7	16.3	18.4	14.2	14.2	9.1	5.9
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		2.8	15.5	31.8	50.2	64.4	78.6	87.8	93.7

The total entry for the examination was 793.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
Modern World History 1937
June 2006**

Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	55	46	37	31	26	21	16
12	75	55	46	37	31	26	21	16
13	75	56	47	38	32	26	21	16
14	75	52	44	37	31	26	21	16
02	50	35	31	27	24	20	16	13
03	50	42	37	32	25	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	166	147	128	109	91	73	55	37
Percentage in Grade		12.8	22.7	21.6	17.3	11.0	7.2	4.2	2.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		12.8	35.5	57.1	74.4	85.4	92.6	96.8	98.7

The total entry for the examination was 30496.

Option B (depth study Russia)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	168	148	128	109	91	73	55	37
Percentage in Grade		21.2	22.7	18.1	14.3	8.8	7.6	4.3	1.9
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		21.2	43.9	62.0	76.3	85.1	92.7	97.0	98.9

The total entry for the examination was 3231.

Option C (depth study The USA)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	167	148	129	110	91	73	55	37
Percentage in Grade		12.0	22.0	20.4	16.8	12.0	7.8	5.0	2.5
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		12.0	34.0	54.5	71.3	83.3	91.1	96.1	98.6

The total entry for the examination was 13945.

Option D (depth study China)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	165	146	127	109	91	73	55	39
Percentage in Grade		34.6	40.8	20.0	3.9	0	0.8	0	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		34.6	75.4	95.4	99.2	99.2	100	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 130.

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	13.2	22.6	21.0	17.0	11.1	7.4	4.4	2.1
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	13.2	35.8	56.8	73.7	84.8	92.2	96.6	98.7

The total entry for the examination was 47811.

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

OCR Information Bureau

(General Qualifications)

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: helpdesk@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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 2006

