

History A

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1935**

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

Report on the Components

June 2008

1935/1035/MS/R/08

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

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

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

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

© OCR 2008

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 A (1935)

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

REPORT ON THE COMPONENTS

Component/Content	Page
1035/01 Paper 1 (Short Course)	1
1935/11-15 Paper 1	1
1935/21 Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time	12
1935/22 Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time	15
1035/02, 1935/03 Coursework	19
Grade Thresholds	21

1935 11-15 and 1035/01

General comments

The overall standard of candidates' answers was a little better than last year although some of the weaknesses highlighted in recent reports still remain. The general impression gained from candidates' scripts was that most had enjoyed the course and benefited from it. There were many excellent answers that were a delight to read, and it was also encouraging to see the vast majority of less able candidates taking the examination seriously and making a real attempt to grapple with the questions. There was plenty of evidence in the scripts that SHP remains a worthwhile and beneficial course of study for adolescents. Indeed, it could be argued that the rationale for the course is stronger today than it was over twenty years ago.

The entry for Crime and Punishment increased a little but Medicine still remains far more popular. In the Depth Studies, American West still remains the most popular option with Germany still some way behind. Elizabethan England and Britain 1815-1851 each had just over a thousand candidates each although the entry for Elizabethan England did fall a little. The candidates entered for Britain 1815-1851 were clearly a more able group than the groups entered for the other options.

Although there were many strengths in this year's answers this report will now focus on those areas where there is room for improvement.

There was an increase this year in the number of rubric errors. Not a few candidates answered questions on both Development Studies then realised what they had done, crossed out one set of answers and then found they had too little time left for the Depth Study. Candidates should also be reminded that they cannot pick and choose between sub-parts of questions e.g. they cannot answer 2(a), 3 (b) and 4(c) - only one of these will be marked. It is important that candidates are made thoroughly familiar with the structure of this paper and are aware of which sections they do, and do not, have to answer.

It is instructive to look at candidates' final four marks on the front of their scripts. It is not unusual to find some candidates scoring much better on both source questions while other candidates will do much worse on the structured essay questions. These differences are usually far more significant than those between how candidates have done on the Development Study and the Depth Study. If such weaknesses were identified early this would allow teachers and candidates to target the weaker areas.

Chronology remains an issue for many candidates. Chronology lies at the heart of the Development Studies and more attention needs to be paid to it. It was noticeable this year that candidates were happy when asked to write about a named individual or development in isolation but struggled when required to identify which individuals and developments belonged to a particular period or to make links with other developments or periods. So when they were asked to write about the Medical Renaissance they were unsure which individuals and developments to write about and anyone from Galen to Pasteur to Fleming appeared. The same problems occurred when candidates were asked to write about crimes in the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. A significant number of candidates do not appear to have a mental map of the overall story of the Development Studies. Some of them have detailed knowledge and understanding of a series of patch studies, especially when there is a story attached to them. For example, they know the story of Pare or of Fleming well, but struggle when they have to place them in the history of medicine as a whole or have to relate them to other developments. Candidates need more practice in looking at patterns and in making links. Many candidates would benefit if less time was spent on the detailed examination of particular developments or stories and more time was spent reinforcing the following: how centuries work e.g. dates

beginning with 18 are in the nineteenth century; the order in which the main periods studied come e.g. Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Middle Ages, Renaissance and nineteenth and twentieth centuries; some sense of how close or how far apart periods and developments were from one another; the main individuals, developments, beliefs and practices associated with each period; and the links between these e.g. between Jenner and Pasteur or between the Greeks and the Romans. All of these need to be constantly revisited and reinforced by e.g. the use of timelines and cards. The Development Studies should never be taught as a series of unconnected stories - always connect.

Selection and deployment remain challenges for some candidates. It was not uncommon to find candidates writing long and well-informed answers, three quarters of which were completely irrelevant to the question. The best part of an answer is often to be found tucked in towards the end almost as an afterthought. This happens in source answers as well as in essays. In source questions it is not unusual to find candidates spending half a page or more filling in the background to the source but making no specific reference to the source at all. In the essay questions many candidates find it necessary to write long rambling introductions and many end up losing sight of the question. It is good advice to candidates to tackle the question directly in the first sentence of the answer. When asked why a source was published, they should address this at the beginning of the answer. When asked in an essay question why there was such a fear of witches they should be explaining the reason in the first sentence or two. However, specifically addressing the question from the beginning of the answer is only half the battle. Candidates also need to practice identifying from everything they know which sections of content are relevant to a particular question. They also need to leave out material that they know but which is irrelevant. It is worth reminding candidates that examiners are not impressed by how much candidates know, but they are impressed by how well candidates can use what they know to answer the question.

Some candidates are still struggling with source questions because they fail to do what the question asks. They insist on writing at length about the topic and ignore the source until the end of their answer or they automatically evaluate the source even when this is not required by the question. Other candidates struggle with questions about message and purpose and do not go beyond the surface information of the source. Many need to have a clearer understanding of the distinction between message and purpose.

Some topics e.g. twentieth century crime and punishment, witches, the cowboys and the Gestapo and the SS do feature in popular films, in the media, in computer games or in other areas which candidates might encounter by chance. The evidence from candidates' answers is that when candidates have come across a topic in, for example, a computer game the inaccurate and generalised knowledge they have picked up from this will drive out the knowledge and understanding acquired in the classroom. It might be worthwhile identifying such topics and ensuring that historical understanding developed at school drives out the often inaccurate knowledge acquired from elsewhere.

Medicine Through Time

1 (a) This question was generally answered well with few candidates failing to make the crucial move which was to tell the examiner whether they were surprised or not. Most candidates used knowledge of Asclepius and the Romans to explain why they were not surprised (e.g. Roman use of gods, Roman conquest of Greeks, Roman habit of adopting practices from other civilisations) but only a few went on to additionally explain why there are good reasons for being surprised e.g. the Roman attitude towards public health or Roman suspicion of Greek doctors. Some candidates lost marks by merely identifying reasons for being surprised or not surprised while a small minority wrote only about Asclepius and the Greeks and failed to mention the Romans.

1 (b) This question was also answered well by the majority of candidates. A small number compared the sources at surface level and found similarities and a few based their comparisons on issues other than impressions of medicine. The majority however were able to make inferences about supernatural and natural approaches although candidates in some centres did not have the necessary vocabulary to explain these ideas clearly and struggled to make the distinction clear. The concepts of natural and supernatural should be amongst the first that candidates are introduced to in this course. Some candidates stopped at the point where they identified supernatural and natural but the better candidates went on to use their contextual knowledge to explain their answer e.g. belief about the divine nature of kings and Hippocrates' ideas and methods. A small number of candidates were confused by seeing Hippocrates in the Middle Ages, claimed he was a god and then argued that Source C therefore shows supernatural methods. Candidates should be aware of the popularity of both Hippocrates and Galen in the Middle Ages.

1 (c) This question split candidates into two groups. The first group thought the hospital looked wonderful. They argued it was clean, the patients were being looked after well and claimed that it represented a massive improvement from previous practices. Some of these candidates developed their answers by explaining how Florence Nightingale was obviously behind the improvements seen in the source while others claimed that the improvements were explained by the development of the germ theory. The other group of candidates thought about the source more carefully and made valid inferences from the source about the level of medical knowledge at the time. They based these inferences on e.g. the role of religion in medicine and the sharing of beds by patients. Only a few candidates developed these answers by using contextual knowledge e.g. knowledge that hospitals in the Middle Ages often looked after the poor and the old rather than treating people that were ill. A minority of candidates got into a real mess and explained how the nuns were copying the Egyptians and were mummifying the bodies while a number ignored the source and wrote an essay about medical knowledge generally in 1500.

2 This question was more popular than Questions 3 and 4 and was answered better. Part (a) was answered well with most candidates demonstrating good, specific relevant knowledge. Some went no further than the Four Humours and ignored other aspects of Hippocrates' work. They were limited to 3 marks. A few candidates mixed up Hippocrates and Galen and thought Hippocrates was developing Galen's ideas. In (b) candidates again showed detailed and accurate knowledge but a number of them were satisfied with merely describing what Galen did rather than explaining why what he did was important in the history of medicine. The candidates who wrote the best answers were those that focused on Galen's influence in the Middle Ages. A minority claimed that Galen invented the theory of the Four Humours - the whole area of Galen rediscovering and developing Hippocrates' ideas is one that could be investigated in more depth. Part (c) divided candidates into three clear groups. The first group wrote general answers about the roles of individuals and other factors in the history of medicine. Specific examples were absent. The second group had no idea of when the Medical Renaissance was or who was involved in it. Answers ranged over Hippocrates, Jenner, Pasteur, Simpson and Fleming - in fact anyone that the candidates knew something about. The third group knew when the Medical Renaissance was and who was involved and answered the question well. Other factors such as the diminishing influence of the Church, war, chance, water pumps and printing were explained very well and there were some excellent answers combining individuals and other factors.

3 This question was a little more popular than Question 4. Some of the answers to (a) lacked any knowledge of what was distinctive about medieval surgery and wrote answers that were really describing the situation at the beginning of the nineteenth century. These candidates were given marks if the points they made could be applied to the Middle Ages although such answers were limited to 3 marks. A few went the other way and based their accounts on prehistoric practices. However, there was a minority of candidates who actually know something about medieval surgeons and explained about e.g. bleeding, setting broken bones, cauterisation, lack of training and barber surgeons. Part (b) was answered well and some candidates appeared to have chosen Question 3 simply because they wanted to answer a question on Pare. Candidates

demonstrated a detailed knowledge of Pare and his discoveries although some simply described what he did and failed to explain why what he did was important. However, a good number of candidates were able to explain about his ointment, ligatures and even bezoar. Part (c) caused some candidates similar difficulties to those caused by 2(c) - candidates did not know when the nineteenth and twentieth centuries took place (thinking that dates starting with 19 must be in the nineteenth century was not unusual) and other could not match the right people/developments to the right century. Some candidates also struggled with the term surgery and wrote about any aspect of medical development. Some answers included Galen, Jenner, Pasteur and Fleming. There were also some general answers that lacked specific examples and could have applied to any period. However, about half the candidates who answered this question knew what to write about and found the question perfectly accessible. Many earned full marks by explaining how the developments in the twentieth century were dependent on those in the nineteenth century.

4 Part (a) produced a range of answers. Some candidates had no idea about the beginning of the nineteenth century and wrote down every belief they could think of. Some scored a few marks almost by accident by mentioning God and the Four Humours although gods and spirits were not allowed. Thankfully, a minority of candidates actually knew something about the period and wrote well on bad air and spontaneous generation. A number of candidates spent most of their answers by explaining what people at the time did not know about e.g. germ theory. This was not what the question was asking for. There was a full range of answers to (b). Some candidates focused on what Pasteur did but a good number of candidates were able to explain two or three enabling factors such as recent developments in microscopes (the invention of the microscope was not allowed but there were some excellent answers about developments in lenses), help from the French government, team work, the requirements of French industry and rivalry with Koch/Germany. Part (c) also produced a full range of answers. Most candidates were able to explain Pasteur's importance and many also knew about Koch's work although weaker candidates did sometimes confuse the work of the two men. It was good to see that many of the candidates who knew about both Pasteur and Koch were able to go on and explain valid reasons why one was more important than the other or why they were equally important.

Crime and Punishment Through Time

1 (a) This question was surprisingly well answered with many candidates scoring full marks. They could explain why it was not surprising that someone was being burned for his religious beliefs in the sixteenth century and many were able to put their answers into the context of Mary's reign and explain about her attempts to reintroduce Catholicism. Only a few candidates failed to say whether they were surprised or not and a very few were outraged and astonished that they were doing such cruel things then.

1(b) This question was not answered so well. Some candidates focused on the attitudes of the people shown in the sources rather than the attitudes of the artists while others took pity on the people shown, especially those in Source B, and argued that the artist was against transportation because he felt sorry for the characters shown. A good number of candidates did understand the significance of the reference to hanging (especially in Source C) and used this to argue that the artist was pointing out how lucky the people were to be transported rather than hanged. A much smaller number of candidates realised that the artist of Source B had drawn such a disreputable collection of characters to make the point that they deserve to be transported. Some candidates decided to ignore the sources and to write down everything they knew about transportation.

1 (c) Most candidates understood that the cartoon is against public executions. Many managed a reasonable mark for this question but a much smaller number managed to score full marks. The former group saw the cartoon as a warning about the threat posed by public executions to law and order. The latter group looked at the crowd more carefully and were able to explain that the artist was making a point about the undesirability of public executions by referring to the

effect they had on the people who watched them or to the kind of people who went to watch them. Many of these candidates were able to place their answers in the context of the growing opposition to public executions in the 1860s and a few even made reference to Darwinian ideas.

2 This question was the least popular of the three optional questions but was generally chosen by more able candidates and as a result was answered much better. Part (a) was well answered. Most candidates knew a range of methods and described them accurately. In response to (b) some candidates got no further than describing the changes made by William. Many knew a lot about this but unfortunately this was not what they were being asked to do. However, a reasonable number were able to explain at least two or three reasons e.g. raising money, wanting crimes to be seen as crimes against the king, and his love of hunting. (c) raised the problem for candidates of chronology. This issue has already been mentioned in the introduction to this report and in the section on Medicine. A good number of candidates appeared to have little idea of when the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries were and if they did they then struggled with matching the right crimes to the right period. Some candidates appeared to think the dates starting with 16 were in the sixteenth century and dates starting with 18 were in the eighteenth century. Crimes such as smuggling, poaching and highway robbery were thus attributed to the nineteenth century. However, a large minority of candidates who managed to get past the hurdle of chronology went on to answer the question well although struggled with the sixteenth century.

3 Most candidates achieved at least 3 marks here with a number of good candidates having no trouble in scoring the full 5 marks. Some of the weaker candidates simply listed every punishment they could think of and by chance managed to pick up a couple of marks. In response to (b) the answers of weak candidates degenerated into general claims about strange women with warts, cats and peculiar habits. However about half the candidates were able to write some serious history about factors such as instability caused by religious and economic change and the role of Hopkins and witch-hunters in stirring up people's fears. Most candidates were much happier with part (c) and even weak candidates were able to write reasonable answers although some of these did struggle with finding arguments for the Bloody Code being a success. Better candidates managed to write more balanced answers that were supported by good contextual knowledge and understanding.

4 A number of reports over the last few years have identified prison reform in the nineteenth century as an area of difficulty for many candidates. This is probably because there was no clear pattern of reform during the period with seemingly contradictory reforms being tried at the same time. Many of the textbooks fail to deal with it in a clear way. This topic requires the textbooks to be thrown away and the teacher to provide a clear explanation of the main trends avoiding too much detail which will only confuse many candidates. The 'big points' need to be identified and reinforced. Better candidates found it easy to score 5 marks in part (a) but many others wrote general answers about terrible conditions that could have applied to almost any period and anywhere. Part (b) divided candidates into two groups. It was often the refuge of the desperate and these candidates relied on their general knowledge and their life experiences to write vague answers. Many did not understand what is meant by 'new types of crime' and simply described new versions of old crimes. However, a minority found this an easy question and developed answers based on technological developments and globalisation. Some even raised the issue of different attitudes or morals creating new crimes. Chronology was again a problem for some candidates in answering (c). The nineteenth and twentieth centuries were mixed up with some candidates thinking all the events in years starting with 19 were taking place in the nineteenth century. It was clear from some of these answers that the twentieth century is as far away for some candidates as the tenth or eleventh centuries. Robert Peel and the formation of the police force were both found in the twentieth century, with the nineteenth century being dismissed as a desert as far as the development of the police force was concerned. Some weak candidates knew nothing about the nineteenth century but managed to identify some points relating to the twentieth century e.g. cars, fingerprinting and DNA. However, there was a solid core of better

candidates (about one third of the candidates who attempted this question) who answered it well and demonstrated good knowledge of developments in both centuries.

Elizabethan England

1 (a) This question allowed many candidates to achieve a good mark but very few scored full marks. Most candidates were able to explain how the source is useful by using their contextual knowledge to explain the different images in the source. Some went further and tackled the 'how useful' part of the question by explaining the limitations of the source in terms of what it does not tell us about the poor in Elizabeth's reign - many explained that the source tells us little about the genuine poor. However, only a few realised that the source could also be used as evidence about the attitudes of the artist (and therefore of the other people) towards the poor.

1(b) Only a few candidates were surprised that they were being so cruel in Elizabethan times and only a very few forgot to tell the examiner whether they were surprised or not. A large majority of candidates explained that they were not surprised. Some left their answers at the level of 'that was what they in those times' but more went on to explain in detail the punishments shown. A smaller number of candidates took the crucial next step which was to explain why they punished beggars in these ways. This led them to explaining the attitudes e.g. to be idle was a sin in the eyes of some, behind the punishments.

1(c) This question produced a range of answers. The weaker candidates accepted the source as evidence that the government was dealing with the problem of poverty. Slightly better answers questioned how representative the source is but failed to develop this through knowledge of the period. A good number of candidates questioned the source and then used their knowledge to explain ways in which the government was or was not dealing the problem. The best candidates, and there were a reasonable number of these, explained both.

2 This question was rather more popular than Question 3 but some candidates seem to have chosen it on the basis that they could answer parts (a) and (c) and not worrying about the fact that they knew little about the Earl of Essex and his rebellion in (b). Part (a) was answered very well with many candidates able to identify methods such as progresses, portraits and her coronation. Some candidates took an alternative approach and wrote about her attempts to unify the country through her religious policy. Only a very few candidates wrote general answers along the lines of 'she tried to be nice to people'. Part (b) divided candidates into two groups - those who knew something about the Earl of Essex and those who knew nothing. The latter group was in the majority with most claiming that he was a supporter of Mary, Queen of Scots and rebelled to put her on the throne. The minority of candidates who knew about him were able to write perfectly good answers explaining several reasons why he rebelled. This topic appears to be less well known than any other topic in the entire specification. Candidates who could not answer part (b) were much happier with (c) and it was answered well. Many candidates incorporated into their answers explanations of why the problem of Mary was such a difficult one for Elizabeth. This added an extra dimension to their answers and allowed a more subtle answer to the question. Some candidates, and this does include some of the more able candidates got carried away with their enthusiasm for this topic and wrote long detailed narratives of the story of Mary with judgements on Elizabeth's handling of the situation only appearing implicitly in their answers.

3 This question tended to be chosen by more able candidates and as a result was answered better than Question 2. There were many good answers to (a) with the more able candidates able to produce detailed accounts of Catholic religious beliefs. Even the weaker candidates were able to score some marks by focusing on Catholic beliefs about Elizabeth's and Mary's right to the English throne. Some credit was given to these types of answers. Most candidates had at least some vague idea of the general nature of the Puritans and their beliefs. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the theatre (this was allowed) but many candidates were able to range over

issues such as Puritan objections to aspects of the religious settlement and to Elizabeth's partial tolerance towards Catholics. The better candidates were even knowledgeable about objections to bishops and the hierarchical nature of the organisation of the Church of England. There were also many good answers to part (c) with candidates able to reach mature and sensible judgements. Many started with the religious settlement and then judged how well it had worked in practice. They covered opposition from Catholics and Puritans and were able to bring into their assessment the fact that the majority of Catholics were able to separate out their political and their religious feelings towards Elizabeth.

Britain, 1815–1851

1 (a) This question got candidates off to a good start. The source acted as a trigger for the recall of the weakest candidates. Most candidates were able to use their knowledge and understanding to explain and develop relevant points in the source and many were able to go on and add other reasons of their own. Most of the reasons explained were to do, in one way or another, with the working conditions, and few candidates mentioned Lord Shaftesbury and moral and religious arguments.

1(b) A good number of candidates knew a lot about factory inspectors. They knew when they were introduced, their duties and their shortcomings. They were also critical of the impression given by the source. The main weakness of some of the answers was the negative attitude many candidates took towards the reforms. According to many of them the reforms were completely ineffective and useless. Only a few were able to explain that while the early reforms may have been flawed they did have some impact and certainly created the opportunity for more reforms to follow.

1(c) A few weaker candidates misunderstood Londonderry's speech and thought he was supporting the reforms while others simply paraphrased the speech. Most candidates, however, considered Londonderry's message in context and many went on to consider his purpose in context. Many developed the context in terms of Londonderry's interests and the situation in relation to the reform of mines 1840-1842. Overall, this question was answered well.

2 This question was more popular than Question 3 and was answered rather better. Many candidates scored good marks but one major flaw undermined some candidates' answers to all three parts. These candidates were convinced that the Chartists pre-dated not only the 1832 Reform Act but also Peterloo. Some claimed that the 1832 Reform Act was a result of the activities of the Chartists. There does appear to be some confusion about this topic especially in the minds of weaker candidates. More work needs to be done on establishing the Chartists as a reaction to the 1832 Act and the 1834 reform to the Poor Law. However, the majority of had little trouble with any of the three parts of the question. Part (a) was answered in detail with most candidates knowing the full story. Some candidates wrote far too much. (b) was also answered well with many candidates able to explain a range of reasons. Issues such as distribution of seats, bribery and intimidation, the increasing importance of the middle classes and fear of revolution were all explained well. Good understanding of the main issues was demonstrated. Many candidates produced good answers to (c) by using the reasons explained in answer to (b) and exploring how far these had been satisfied by the Act. There were many that were able to explain both sides of the argument. Weaker candidates, however, were convinced that Act brought votes for everyone, including women, and a secret ballot. It is encouraging to be able to report that the topic of electoral reform which used to mystify candidates is now much better understood.

3 All parts of this question were on the whole answered well. However it was disappointing to see a minority of good candidates apply detailed and correct knowledge to the wrong question. For example in response to (a) they described the reformed system or the Roundsman System, while in (c) the described Speenhamland as the new system. Such mistakes, of course, seriously undermined their answers. However, most candidates for (a) knew the Speenhamland

System in detail and even added criticisms of it. There were many good answers to (b) based on cost, high rates and moral arguments about improving the character of the poor. A few candidates got confused with electoral reform and suggested fear of revolution as a reason. In response to (c) there were many well informed and balanced answers although even the best candidates did struggle to explain a reason for coming down on one side or the other.

The American West, 1840–1895

1 (a) The majority of candidates understood that the cartoon is about polygamy and that it is critical of the Mormons. This led many to be able to explain the message of the cartoon and most were able to develop their answers by explaining the message in the context of events in the 1830s and 40s e.g. the collapse of the Mormon bank, the unpopularity of the Mormons, and Smith's introduction of polygamy and his decision to run for the presidency. Better candidates went one step further and considered the purpose of the cartoon in the context of the 1830s and 40s. It is important that when candidates are encouraged to look beyond message and to consider purpose when faced with questions like this one. A few weaker candidates considered the cartoon as a warning to men of the dangers of marriage.

1(b) Weaker candidates decided that, given the information in the source, Young would have been mad to have gone to Salt Lake while others thought it was sufficient to simply state that he did not agree because the Mormons settled at Salt Lake and are still there today. Most candidates realised that an explanation was required and were able to provide at least one reason why Young disagreed. Answers mentioned persecution back East, the need to be outside the USA, and reasons why the obvious unattractiveness of Salt Lake were advantages as far as Young was concerned.

1(c) This question was answered less well than (a) and (b). What happened after the Mormons reached Salt Lake is less well known than what happened to them before. Some candidates merely paraphrased the information in the source and gave the points in the source such as irrigation as reasons for Mormon success. Few were able to develop the points in the source. Others decided that the source was totally biased and simply dismissed it. Some candidates were able to explain Young's leadership as an important factor and there was the odd candidate who knew about factors such as the Emigrating Fund, but overall this is a part of the specification that needs better coverage.

2 This question was more popular than Question 3 but there was little difference in how well the two questions were answered. The answers to (a) were generally disappointing. Some candidates had no idea of what the Great Plains were, while others ranged in their answers from the east coast to the west coast and threw everything in including mountains, gold and Salt Lake. Somewhere in these answers were usually some details that could be given credit. Better candidates restricted themselves to the question and had little trouble in scoring full marks. All the candidates, including weak candidates, fell on part (b) with enthusiasm and, in some cases, relief. It was answered very well with reasons such as their nomadic lifestyle, the importance of the buffalo and the advantages of its shape being prominent. It was good to see even the weaker candidates writing genuine explanations and not just describing. Part (c) produced more varied answers. Some candidates were confused and had the homesteaders launching campaigns to kill the buffalo. Better candidates were able to write more subtle explanations of the impact of the homesteaders. The US army produced difficulties for weaker candidates who could not get beyond general assertions about the army slaughtering the Indians but better candidates were able to consider specific examples and to explain about the use and impact of reservations.

3 Part (a) produced many good answers and even the weakest candidates were able to score a couple of marks. The only worrying feature of many answers was the fact that candidates seem to have got it into their heads that the East was massively over-crowded with hardly room to move. Some candidates did not read (b) carefully enough and launched

themselves into pre-prepared answers that covered reasons for success as well as reasons why the homesteaders had difficulties. However, a wide range of factors were explained and many candidates achieved good marks. Part (c) was less well done despite, or perhaps because of, some candidates writing about relevant factors in their answers to (b). Many candidates did not appear to have any idea of what fry farming was and even struggled with new types of crops. They were happier when they moved on to other factors such as windpumps, barbed wire and new types of machines such as sodbusters. This did mean that many answers were one-sided and could not get beyond Level 4 in the mark scheme.

Germany, c.1919–1945

1(a) Many candidates were able to score half marks on this question because although they misinterpreted the cartoon they did produce and explain a sensible interpretation. The most common was that Germans would have agreed with the cartoon because it is showing that Germany was suffering from the harsh reparations or from the harsh peace treaty. However, a good number of candidates recognised the significance of the dodge and the kneeling and were able to explain that Germans would not have agreed that they were exaggerating their problems. The candidates developed their answers by explaining the very real problems facing Germany at the time. A few weak candidates managed to argue that the cartoon is about Hitler.

1(b) This question produced answers across the whole range. Some candidates ignored the source and wrote detailed accounts of the French occupation of the Ruhr. They were not awarded many marks. Many candidates dismissed the source because it is written by an SA officer although some of these candidates did go on and produce good answers and move to a higher level in the marking scheme by suggesting why he would want to published such an account in 1938. There were also many candidates who used the source as evidence of German attitudes in 1923 and/or discussed the limitations of the source by explaining what it had left out e.g. the reasons for the French occupation.

1(c) Nearly all candidates made a serious effort to interpret the message of this cartoon. Some explained why they thought it was pro-Hitler and was showing Hitler as a hero. These were often backed up by good knowledge of the Putsch. The more convincing answers explained that the cartoon is making fun of Hitler or of the judicial process. These answers were also supported by sound contextual knowledge e.g. the failure of the Putsch or the mockery of a trial.

2 This question was slightly less popular than Question 3. There was little difference in how well the two questions were answered. In response to (a) some candidates ignored the year 1933 and described methods that belonged to later in the period. The Night of the Long Knives was mentioned by a number of candidates. However, there were a good number of candidates who were able to focus on 1933 and wrote about the events following the Reichstag Fire, the Enabling Act, the banning of political parties and trade unions and the activities of the SA. Part (b) was generally answered well with candidates able to explain a number of reasons. including racial ideas, the idea of the November criminals and Jewish success in business. However, some candidates got bogged down in description of what happened to the Jews e.g. Kristalnacht. Part (c) also produced good answers. Most candidates were strong on explaining how Hitler had complete control through the Gestapo and the SS and the better candidates also wrote very good answers about opposition from youth groups and the churches, and about general grumbling that never turned into opposition. A few candidates were also aware of the debate about how strong a leader Hitler was and introduced this into their answers. Nearly all candidates found it much harder to reach an argued conclusion - many simply asserted their conclusions.

3 Part (a) was answered well with many candidates have a detailed knowledge of a range of different aspects of what went on in schools and classrooms. A few candidates wandered off into the Hitler Youth but they had usually picked up achieved marks before they did this. Part (b)

was not answered so well because a number of candidates, despite showing detailed knowledge of Nazi policies towards women, failed to explain their reasons. Having said this there were still plenty of candidates who explained a range of reasons very well e.g. the need to build a master race, the need for a large army and views about the role of, and the importance of, the family. Not a few candidates also pointed out the reversal in policy during the Second World War and the need for more workers in industry. There were many good answers to (c). Most candidates realised the need to deal with different groups. Women, children, Jews, opposition groups, the SA, workers, farmers and small and large businesses all featured in answers.

South Africa, 1948–c.1995

1 (a) This question was answered reasonably well. Most candidates were able to find and explain ways in which the two sources disagreed e.g. about the role of foreigners, but some found it more difficult to find agreements e.g. they both say that sabotage took place. Some candidates used the fact that one source is by Mandela at his trial and the other comes from the prosecutor at the trial to simply assert that they were bound to differ.

1(b) There were two main points that candidates needed to use to be able to move to the high levels in the mark scheme: the contrast between the strong and powerful Black South African being pinned down and the puny figures representing the South African apartheid authorities; and the context of the Rivonia Trial. About half of the candidates used both of these to explain the message of the cartoon and the best candidates went on to explain the cartoon's purpose. Weaker candidates simply described the cartoon or misread it and claimed that it was published to show everyone that Black South Africans had been defeated - of course, the cartoon has exactly the opposite message.

1(c) This question was answered quite well. Weaker candidates simply used and repeated the surface information and some used it as information about 1964 rather than the late 1980s. However, many candidates were able to make inferences about the late 1980s in terms of the oppression of the government or the continued opposition. The best answers added context to develop these inferences e.g. the increased violence of the period.

2 This question was more popular than Question 3 and produced better answers. Part (a) was answered well by most candidates with the events at Sharpeville being known in some detail. Some answers to (b) tended to be rather general with the descriptions of oppression being applicable to almost any period. However, the better candidates did demonstrate knowledge of the 1950s in particular by mentioning and explaining particular pieces of legislation or actions such as the banning orders and the extension of the Pass Laws. There were some excellent answers from the better candidates to part (c) with thoughtful considerations of Sharpeville as a turning point. Good contextual arguments were presented on both sides. Weaker candidates struggled with the notion of a turning point and simply made assertions about how important Sharpeville was.

3 Only a small number of candidates answered this question. Part (a), about Black Consciousness, was answered very well by the few candidates who knew anything about the subject, but the remaining candidates wrote general answers. Answers to (b) followed the same pattern - a few well-informed answers and the rest very vague. Answers to (c) were rather better with even the weaker candidates being able to identify a range of reasons. The best candidates wrote well-informed answers with both sides of the argument being explored intelligently.

Comments on 1035/01 short course questions not appearing in the long course papers

Medicine Through Time

1(a) Weaker candidates argued that the source is useful for the information it contains but a good number of candidates were able to make inferences about Greek medicine from the source e.g. supernatural approaches, and pointed out the limitations of the source by explaining that the Greeks also had natural approaches which are not mentioned by the source.

1 (e) This question produced a range of marks. A few candidates ignored the sources and wrote generally about whether or not there had been progress between 1365 and 1854. Most candidates were able to identify the fact that both sources believed in bad air but the better candidates were also able to make an important distinction between the two ie the ideas in Source F are based on an acceptance of the Four Humours. The claim by by Snow in Source G about the important role of water also led to some interesting discussion especially because the idea was rejected in the same source. It was good to see a good number of candidates using their contextual knowledge to make a meaningful comparison of the two sources.

1(f) Most candidates were able to achieve at least a reasonable mark for this question because they explained which sources demonstrated a dependence on religion. However, it was disappointing to see so many candidates stopping there and not attempting to also explain how some sources do not show this and instead show that other ideas were believed. There was also a minority of candidates who ignored all the sources and wrote an essay about religion and medicine.

Crime and Punishment Through Time

1(a) There were few candidates who answered the Short Course questions on Crime and Punishment. The few that did were able to make some reasonable inferences from Source A about Roman attitudes.

1(d) Most of the answers to this question were restricted to comparing details in the two sources. There were, however, a few better candidates who able to bring in their contextual knowledge to add to their evaluation of Source E.

1(f) Most candidates were able to explain how some sources suggest that punishment was used to reform criminals but few attempted to explain how other sources suggest that punishment was used for other reasons.

1935/21 Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time

How Important was William Harvey?

General Comments

Responses from this year's candidates showed that they were comfortable with the topic set and there were many thoughtful and well supported answers. The work of Harvey was obviously well known and where this knowledge was used to support answers, high marks were awarded. Candidates must, however, consider the wording of individual questions carefully to ensure that support from outside the source is relevant. Whilst it is vital to bring in contextual knowledge on, for example, Question 4, answers to Question 1 should be restricted to what can be gleaned from that source.

Having said that, it was pleasing to see that most candidates answered well and demonstrated sound technique in answering source-based questions.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

Answers to this question were rather disappointing. Often on Paper 2 it is good practice to support an answer by cross-referring either to another source on the paper or to candidates' knowledge. However, this is not the case on a question which asks 'What can we learn about?' from the source. Here the task for candidates is to use their contextual knowledge to interpret the source and make inferences from what it tells us. Where candidates were able to make three such references (and support them from the source), full marks were awarded. Such answers were rare, but the response below is a good example of how a direct approach can bring high reward.

'Harvey was obviously a very important man in the history of medicine (inference) as it was his work which changed the entire thinking on the blood system (support) He was obviously brave (inference), as he was prepared to challenge the work of those who went before him (support). I also think he must have been careful (inference), because we are told that he built up his discovery step by step with each advance proved by experiments (support).'

Candidates need to be aware that in this type of question their answers should be rooted in the source provided, not based on 'from my knowledge'.

Question 2

This question posed few difficulties for candidates and scoring was high. Some candidates restricted their answers to superficial detail ('we can see that Harvey met the king, carried out experiments' etc) and received low reward. Most, however, were able to draw conclusions about Harvey's importance from the fact that both Charles and his son were obviously listening intently to Harvey. Some astute candidates noted that Harvey was central to the picture ('in the light') and so deemed to be of more importance in this context than royalty. Another route to high reward for considering Harvey's importance was to use the information in the caption to argue that you have to be important to be the subject of a painting in the Royal College of Physicians. Highest reward went to candidates who established Harvey's importance and then went on to consider the reliability of the source ('of course, as Harvey was a Fellow of the Royal College of

Physicians, perhaps they wanted to portray him as important. It does seem to suggest that he was more important than the king, which is rather unlikely)

Question 3

This was a question where it was essential that candidates used their contextual knowledge or cross-referred to other sources to support their answers. A superficial answer was provided in the caption of the source (*'to illustrate the experiment which proved his theory'*) and candidates who repeated this were marked at Level 1. What was required here was to explain why Harvey felt the need to illustrate his experiment. The following levels were used in assessing candidates' answers. They begin with the least rewardable and finish with the highest-scoring.

- Because pictures make it easier to understand
- Because it proves his theory. (Here candidates had to link what shown in the diagram to Harvey's beliefs (*'Harvey was able to show that by pressing a vein in a direction away from the heart, the vein stayed empty, because blood did not flow back towards the vein as people had thought'*))
- To help educate others and spread his beliefs in the field of medicine.
- To put Harvey's decision in the historical context. (This could be done, for example, by establishing that Harvey was keen on proving the validity of his work through experimentation (Source A), needed to prove his beliefs because they were controversially different to those of Galen (Background Information) or that illustration was an established practice during the medical renaissance, as witnessed in the work of Vesalius.

Question 4

Candidates were obviously fascinated by what Aubrey had to say about Harvey and many of them could not see how a man who drew his dagger on *'every slight occasion'* or *'put his feet in a bucket of water until he was almost dead with cold'* could be a great medical scientist. Some tried to square the circle by arguing that the cold water affair had something to do with experiments in circulation, but there was little reward in such an argument. More productive was to argue that Aubrey was little more than a gossip and that what was being said about Harvey was either irrelevant to his skills as a scientist, or was contradicted by other evidence. The response below is an example of how that might be done.

'I can understand how people might think that what Aubrey says shows that Harvey could not have been a great scientist. You would expect him to know better than sit with his feet in icy water and it is surprising that he liked drawing a dagger on people. However, even if these things are true (which I doubt, as Aubrey was just a gossip), it doesn't take away from the greatness of the man. In Source A we are told that he was genius who altered the entire thinking on blood circulation. We are also told in the Background Information that he was a Fellow of the College of Physicians and was physician to two kings. That tells a rather different story and suggests that he was a great scientist.'

Question 5

This question highlighted some basic misunderstandings in the candidates' knowledge of Harvey's work. Some candidates claimed that Harvey's methods were being used because bloodletting was being done from a vein, when the reality was that Harvey was opposed to the use of bloodletting. What was most significant in Source E was that when it came to the treatment of the most important person in the kingdom (the king) the doctors resorted to the old methods of giving an emetic and an enema, taking pills to drain away the humours and then blood-letting. That suggested a deliberate rejection of Harvey's work. Candidates who noted this were well rewarded. Equally well rewarded were those candidates who argued that the source told us very little about the impact of Harvey's work. The king required treatment, but as Harvey

himself admitted in Source F, his work was based on gaining a greater understanding of the human body. It could not be used in curing diseases or working out the causes of symptoms.

Question 6

Candidates are now well versed in answering this type of question and many were able to reach the top level by providing evidence of support for and opposition to the hypothesis. Where candidates scored poorly, it was usually the result of failing to provide support for their argument (for example, 'Source B shows that Harvey was a very important person', but with no detail to show how or why) or where sources were linked together and a comment made which did not apply to all of them (for example, 'Sources A, B and C show that Harvey changed the way people thought about the circulation of blood.' - Source B does not.)

It is, perhaps, worth re-iterating that there are marks awarded for reliability in this question, but few candidates seem to realise this. At any level one mark might be awarded for recognising that reliability might be an issue. Where developed evaluation had taken place, a bonus of two marks could be awarded. An example of how this might work in practice is provided below.

The following comment would be rewarded as support for the hypothesis:

"I think Source B shows that Harvey's work was of huge importance in the development of medicine. You can see him lecturing the king and his son and there is a group of people outside trying to hear what is being said. Obviously, Harvey was considered a real expert so will have been of great importance."

With the following additions it would score a bonus mark for recognising that reliability is an issue.

'...however, the painting hangs in the College so it might be unreliable'

Amended as follows it would score two bonus marks.

'...however, the painting hangs in the College so it might be unreliable. The College would want to show one of its members in the best light possible. So Harvey is made to look more important than the king. I am not sure that would be the case.'

1935/22 Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time

Were the Suffragettes Fanatics and Criminals?

General Comments

The paper was straightforward and candidates were able to answer the questions without difficulty, albeit at their own different levels of ability. Apart from some problems with the word 'fanatics' in Question 6, there were very few answers that showed signs of miscomprehension, either of the questions or of the sources. Incomplete scripts were rare. The most obvious feature that characterised answers this year, when compared with those of previous years, was the use of contextual knowledge. Candidates knew a good deal about the Suffragettes, and were often able to use this knowledge to enhance their answers. Several questions demanded evaluation of the reliability of the sources, which gave candidates opportunities to cross-refer claims in the sources against their own knowledge. Unfortunately, as in previous years, many answers demonstrated that candidates do not understand the purpose of cross-reference – they note that other sources say similar/different things, but without drawing any conclusion from this about the reliability of the account being evaluated. In short, they do not realise that the reason they are cross-referencing is to check whether or not they can believe what a source tells them.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

Question 1 is deliberately intended to offer candidates a gentle introduction to the paper. The task is to demonstrate comprehension of a source and to make inferences from it. This is signalled by the wording of the question which asks not what the source says, but what it tells you. Most candidates realise this, make one or more inferences, and explain how they have reached these inferences by illustrating them from the source content. For example, many candidates wrote:

I can tell the Suffragettes were violent [inference] because the source says Miss Pankhurst struck the inspector in the mouth [support].

A couple of supported inferences will earn full marks, and many, if not most, candidates achieve this. However, answers still show various weaknesses. There is a lot of aimless copying of the source. Less commonly, but equally a waste of time, some candidates try to evaluate the source, almost inevitably concluding that it is biased and useless – not what the question is after since it asks what you *can* tell, not what you cannot.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of answers using many different approaches to assessing the reliability of the source. Unfortunately some of these approaches were very weak, relying entirely on assertions based on the source provenance or on historical inaccuracies. For example, it was almost universally assumed that the government controlled the press, and that this accounted for the anti-Suffragette nature of the source. Better answers dealt with the content of the source, and focused on the plausibility (or lack of it) of what was described. There were two distinct ways of doing this. First, there was the account of the attack on the cliffs, and whether this was credible or not. Second, there were other aspects of the source, such as the

fact that Sir Henry had been involved in convicting Suffragettes for window-smashing, which might make him a credible target for an attack. A slightly better approach was to use the language of the source to detect its anti-Suffragette bias – for example, its description of the attack as ‘cowardly’. However, all these answers were constrained within the source content, and made no attempt to judge the likelihood of these events against background knowledge of the Suffragettes. The best answers did this, or used other sources on the paper as the basis for cross-reference, not least because Question 1 and Source A had already dealt with an example of Suffragette violence.

Question 3

This was probably the most demanding question on the paper. Candidates often find it hard to interpret cartoons, and here they needed to interpret two. Not surprisingly, many found it possible to make sense of one, but not the other, which made it hard to carry out valid comparisons. The cartoon which gave the greater difficulties was Source D. In seeking similarities between this cartoon and Source C (which showed a violent Suffragette), many candidates concluded that Source D also showed violence. The problem is that it shows the opposite – an orderly Suffragette demonstration. The fact that the politicians are shown as frightened, and the policeman promises to protect them, is a comment on the cowardice of the government, not on the violence of the Suffragettes.

Another weakness in answers was that many candidates still have problems with the concepts of similarity and difference. Valid comparisons can only occur when there is a common criterion against which the similarity or difference can be judged. The fact that two sources show entirely unrelated things does not constitute a valid difference. For example, some candidates wrote:

Source C is similar to Source D because it shows that violent methods of protest will not work, but Source D shows the politicians are frightened of the Suffragettes.

Both sources are correctly interpreted, but the comparison lacks a common criterion. However, if the following sentence is added to the answer, then the comparison is achieved, using the criterion of the most effective method of protest:

In Source D the Suffragettes are demonstrating peacefully, so this too shows that violent methods are not the most effective.

Given that a valid comparison was achieved, the prime determinant of the mark awarded was the nature of the comparison. At the lowest level, surface details could be compared – for example, the cartoons are different because there are only two Suffragettes in Source C but a whole crowd of them in Source D. Slightly better was to answer on the similarity of topic – both cartoons are about the Suffragettes. The best answers were based on similarity or difference of interpretations of the cartoons – such as were they for or against the Suffragettes? – with the top marks reserved for those answers that understood both cartoons believed non-violent protest was more likely to succeed. Two further points are worth mentioning. First, answers which gave a valid interpretation of one cartoon, but a misinterpretation of the other, were still given a reasonable mark, even though no valid comparison was possible. Second, for Source C, it was not essential to identify the ‘Sensible Woman’ as a Suffragist. Interpretations based on the idea that she was a ‘sensible’ Suffragette, or indeed just any women more sensible than the ‘Shrieking Sister’, were also allowed.

Question 4

Questions about source utility are nowadays answered more effectively than used to be the case, if only because many candidates have absorbed the idea that utility and reliability are

related concepts. The problem is that, whilst they may be related, they are not the same. We are therefore at the point where many answers are prepared to reject the utility of a source because they do not believe it, but fail to ask how the source might still be useful *even though you don't believe it*. Question 4 illustrated these issues perfectly because, for many candidates, the story of Emily Davison was well known. All kinds of contextual knowledge were used to question the accuracy of a Suffragette account that represented Emily as wittingly 'giving her life for the cause'. So far so good. But what then can one tell from the fact that the Suffragettes wanted to represent events in this way? This is where the true utility of Source E can be identified, yet only a tiny minority of candidates took their analysis that far.

The other problem with using reliability as the basis for answering utility questions is that many candidates are not very skilled at evaluating sources, and therefore rely only on the provenance. Large numbers of answers dismissed Source E because it was written forty years after the events, by a Suffragette, or accepted it as it was from an eye-witness, without ever considering what, in fact, the source said. These answers received very little reward. There were two valid routes into questioning the reliability of Source E – first, as mentioned above, the account could be cross-referenced against contextual knowledge or, indeed, against other sources, and second, the language/tone of the source could be used to demonstrate the partiality of the writer. These answers earned a high mark, but fell short of the top level by failing to perceive the true utility of the source, i.e. as evidence of the way in which the Suffragettes wanted people to think about Emily Davison.

Despite all of the above comments, most candidates, most of the time, continue to regard sources as factual information. For them, a source is useful or not useful because of what it says (taken at face value). Thus, Source E was useful, for example, because it showed how far Suffragettes would go in support of their cause, but was not useful, for example, because it showed nothing of other methods of protest like chaining themselves to railings. These kinds of comments are the basic building blocks of answers on utility – even better candidates will often start their answers in this way before moving on to some worthwhile analysis.

Question 5

This proved, perhaps unexpectedly, to be one of the more straightforward questions on the paper. There were a couple of traps that small numbers of candidates fell into, but overall the question was well answered. These traps were, first, failing to state whether or not one was surprised, which happened most often when candidates distracted themselves into answering on whether or not they thought the Suffragettes should be pardoned. The other problem was with answers that stated they were surprised, and then gave reasons for not being surprised, or vice versa.

As Source F gave several reasons for not being surprised – they broke the law, there is no new evidence, it would set a dangerous precedent etc – most answers went along with these. It was also possible to detect reasons in the source for being surprised – for example, it says 'they were tremendous' – but all answers based on source content, surprised or not, achieved a reasonable mark. Better answers went outside the source to place the issue in a wider context. This could be using other sources or background knowledge to explain the attitudes in Source F. Mostly this meant using further information on the Suffragettes to judge whether or not a pardon was deserved – for example, many argued they were not surprised since it was not the Suffragettes who won the right for women to vote, but rather the efforts of women workers during the First World War – but the highest marks were given to answers that focused their use of contextual knowledge on other groups that might seek pardons if the Suffragettes were to be pardoned, thus explaining the government's reluctance, whilst also demonstrating a broader awareness of the issues of Crime, Punishment and Protest over time.

Question 6

Inevitably, the hypothesis given in the question has a significant shaping effect on how candidates respond. This year two aspects of the hypothesis were particularly significant. First, candidates were given two words to test – criminals and fanatics. As far as the markers were concerned, it made no difference whether these were treated separately or as one, although the support from the sources would, as ever, have to be valid. A second, and related, point was that whilst everyone (more or less) knew what a criminal was, there was a significant minority that had a problem with fanatics (sometimes known alternatively as ‘frantics’ or ‘fantastics’). This produced many answers like this:

I think they were criminals in Source E because Emily Davison deliberately ran in front of the horses, but I don't think she was a fanatic because she was only doing what she believed in.

So although the sources offered lots of opportunities to explore different elements of criminality and fanaticism, in practice, relatively few candidates actually did this. Answers were generally much more constrained and focused on whether the Suffragettes were criminals or not. Indeed, a strangely common distraction was for answers to stray onto a focus of whether or not they were *violent*, which unfortunately was completely invalid. As most of the sources did suggest some aspect of criminal or fanatical behaviour (Source D was the only obvious exception, but even there many candidates had convinced themselves that it showed violent protest), answers were more one-sided than in most previous years, thereby producing somewhat lower marks.

The fact that two marks are reserved for evaluation of the sources seems to be known by candidates as many scripts attempt evaluation of every source. Almost invariably this is solely in relation to the sources' provenance, and therefore earns nothing. Valid evaluation must deal with the *content* of the source, and why it can/cannot be believed.

1035/02, 1935/03 Coursework

Report for Coursework 1935/03 History A (SHP)

Many moderators were keen to praise the vast majority of centres who completed their administration in good time and with accuracy. Some centres, especially those with unusual holiday patterns, tended to create the odd problem with late arrivals. Most centres also helped the moderation process by enclosing the GCW582 form (Coursework Summary Form) with the MS1. Given the difficulty in deciphering some MS1s, this greatly aids the selection of the sample for moderation.

There was a more mixed range of comments by moderators concerning word recommendations. Some noted a number of centres attempting to keep a reasonable control over their students' length of response, whilst other centres still seem to allow students to write well over the recommendations. Writing large amounts often encourages students to fall into the trap of writing long passages of narrative without really tackling the specific objectives. As controlled assessment approaches, this gives another reason for tackling this problem, as time will be used to control how much students write, giving an additional need for focus.

History Around Us

History Around Us remains a great strength of the SHP course, as many moderators praised the variety and quality of the assignments. It was said that centres with a "custom-built study to suit the centre worked better than the stereotypical visit to a castle." Many centres combine the use of a site and visual evidence together with a range of other sources to encourage candidates to write developed interpretations and evaluations. Students were often adept at cross referencing. Tasks that focus clearly on the objectives and create an interesting hypothesis work really well. Tasks which only use the objectives do not always engender much interest amongst the candidates.

Support material that comprises a good mixture of types, such as trade directories, census data, newspaper reports and visual evidence usually encourages better responses than a guidebook. Finally, carefully chosen sets of sources are better than huge ones and only partially related source booklets. Some centres add a few new sources each year but do not remove any, resulting in less than analytical thinking.

Modern World Study

The peaceful situation in Northern Ireland has encouraged a number of centres to try pastures new, with many using the Terrorism assignment. This has proved very successful for many, but shows how the way tasks are interpreted can make a huge difference to the candidates. In one case, the first task became an opportunity to write a very detailed account of the 9/11 disaster, but there was no analysis of the influence of the past on the present situation, which is the intended outcome. The vast majority of the centres who tackled Terrorism managed to concentrate on this aim better. Other centres went onto their own themes and produced some very interesting assignments including Kashmir, Iraq, Falkland Islands and Darfur. The purpose of the Modern World Study within the SHP specification is to show students how history is relevant to the present day, and each of these subjects, through some route or another, has the potential to achieve this. The best centres have become adept at encouraging their students to use good context for their analysis combined with contemporary referencing.

Report on the Components taken in June 2008

Controlled assessment will again create a challenge for centres in deciding which of their tasks best suits their students. Centres would be wise to use the last couple of opportunities under the current specification to make some important decisions in preparation for the future.

Report for Coursework 1035/02 Short Course History A SHP

The short course has now separated into two distinct sets of centres. A few have large entries with students from across the ability range, whilst the majority enter a small number of candidates who, they feel, cannot cope with the full award for whatever reason. Much that has been said about the long course also applies to the short course. However, the need to cover all three objectives does create an additional challenge. It is important to maintain a clear focus with these demands over a short word recommendation and three tasks to hit each objective directly is a good idea. Centres should also remember that the subject area can come from the depth study of the long course, or the Modern World Study. American West topics such as Custer and the battle for the Plains remain favourites amongst centres.

Grade Thresholds

General Certificate of Secondary Education
Schools History Project (Specification Code 1935)
June 2008 Examination Series

Component Thresholds (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	55	46	37	30	23	17	11
12	75	59	51	43	36	27	20	13
13	75	58	48	39	32	24	17	10
14	75	55	47	39	32	25	19	13
15	75	55	46	38	31	24	17	14
21	50	37	33	30	26	22	17	13
22	50	31	27	24	21	18	14	11
03	50	42	36	30	24	19	14	09

Option Thresholds (weighted marks)

Option A (Medicine with Elizabethan England)

	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		6.05	13.01	14.72	21.68	15.9	12.0	8.28	5.13
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		6.05	19.0	33.8	55.4	71.3	83.4	91.7	96.8

The total entry for the examination was 768.

Option B (Medicine with Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	172	154	136	118	98	78	58	38
Percentage in Grade		13.9	17.8	18.8	15.35	11.7	11.25	6	3.26
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		13.9	31.65	50.47	65.83	77.5	88.75	94.74	98

The total entry for the examination was 954.

Option C (Medicine with American West)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	170	151	132	113	93	74	55	36
Percentage in Grade		6.6	16.7	20.65	17.6	15.11	10.32	6.9	3.86
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		6.6	23.31	44	61.55	76.66	87	93.8	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 15564.

Option D (Medicine with Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	166	148	130	113	94	75	57	39
Percentage in Grade		7.64	16.3	20.8	17.7	14.9	10.6	6.54	3.21
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.64	23.9	44.8	62.5	77.35	88	94.5	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 10447.

Option E (Medicine with S Africa)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	159	138	117	97	83	69	55	41
Percentage in Grade		0.00	5.56	22.22	5.56	33.33	5.56	16.7	0.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		0.00	5.56	27.8	33.33	66.67	72.22	89	89

The total entry for the examination was 18.

Option F (Crime with Elizabethan England)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	158	139	120	102	85	68	51	34
Percentage in Grade		8.1	16.3	20.1	22	15.8	8.6	7.18	0.96
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		8.1	24.4	44.5	66.5	82.3	91	98.09	99

The total entry for the examination was 213.

Option G (Crime with Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	166	147	128	110	91	73	55	37
Percentage in Grade		15.8	24.2	17.7	18.6	12.0	7.5	2.3	1.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		15.8	40	57.7	76.3	88.4	95.8	98.1	99.6

The total entry for the examination was 215.

Option H (Crime with American West)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	159	141	123	106	87	69	51	33
Percentage in Grade		4.8	10	16.3	18.8	15.2	15.2	11.1	5.9
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.84	14.8	31.07	50	65.1	80.4	91.5	97.3

The total entry for the examination was 974.

Option J (Crime with Germany)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	159	141	123	106	88	71	54	37
Percentage in Grade		7.3	16.6	18.6	19.7	14.8	10.2	6.4	4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.3	23.8	42.5	62.2	77	87.2	93.6	97.6

The total entry for the examination was 2376.

Option K (Crime with South Africa)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	166	145	124	104	86	68	51	34
Percentage in Grade		37.5	50	12.5	0	0	0	0	0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		37.5	87.5	100	100	100	100	100	100

The total entry for the examination was 8.

Overall

	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Percentage in Grade	7.22	16.3	20.2	17.9	14.9	10.6	6.8	3.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	7.22	23.5	43.8	61.6	76.55	87.1	94	97.7

The total entry for the examination was 31566.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)
Schools History Project (Specification Code 1035)**

Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
01	60	44	36	29	24	19	14	10
02	25	21	17	14	12	10	8	6

Overall (weighted marks)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	100	88	75	62	49	41	33	26	19
Percentage in Grade		1.8	7.9	13.1	16.0	13.7	16.5	12.4	7.2
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		1.8	9.7	22.8	38.7	52.5	68.9	81.3	88.5

The total entry for the examination was 486.

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 2008

