OCR Report to Centres

January 2013

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

History A (Schools History Project) (J415)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

A951/11-14 Medicine Through Time/Crime and Punishment Through Time Development Study/Depth Study

General comments

The entry was larger than previous January sessions and there was a wide range of answers in all the options. Medicine and Crime and Punishment had about the same number of candidates as each other, while in the Depth Studies American West and Germany were more popular than Elizabethan England or Britain 1815-51.

Many candidates demonstrated sound contextual knowledge. The best candidates were able to select from what they knew and apply what was relevant for a particular question. They were also able to use this knowledge to help them construct an explanation or argument. Some candidates, however, were unable to deploy their knowledge so effectively.

Selection is a key skill in history. It enables candidates to make that crucial decision about what knowledge to use, and what to leave out. It is a skill that can, and should, be practiced in lessons. It is crucial in answering all questions but particularly important in part (a) of the essay questions. Without it, candidates write about the wrong things.

Deployment is also a key skill. The best candidates used their knowledge as building blocks to produce explanations. It is important that candidates understand what an explanation is. They need to understand the difference between a description and an explanation. This understanding can be targeted and worked on in lessons. Candidates sometimes fall short of producing proper explanations because they do not go far enough in their answers. For example, to state that Simpson was important in the history of medicine because he developed the use of chloroform is not to produce an explanation. One more step is required - why did the use of chloroform matter, what difference did it make? Candidates should be aware of the fact that explanations always require these two steps.

It was nonetheless encouraging to see so few candidates failing to directly address questions. For example, when they were asked if they were surprised, virtually all candidates stated whether they were surprised or not. When candidates were asked about the message of a source, the overwhelming majority did attempt to give a message. The number of candidates who directly address the question in the first sentence of their answers is increasing. This is an encouraging sign.

One strength of many answers was the ease with which candidates used their contextual knowledge sensibly and relevantly to inform their interpretation and evaluation of sources. Few tried to use the sources as if there was no historical context, but others resorted to writing about the context instead of the source. Most referred to their knowledge when it helped them explain the meaning of a source or helped them evaluate a source.

Comments on specific questions

Medicine through time

1 (a) The best answers, and there was a good number of these, focused on medical details and directly compared the two sources e.g. a lack of concern for hygiene as demonstrated by the equipment on the floor in Source A, compared to the greater awareness of hygiene as seen in Source B. Weaker answers were distracted by the clothes shown or by the drawing/photograph difference. This was despite the question's emphasis on 'medical reasons'. In comparison questions it is always important to compare like with like - e.g. lack of anesthetics with use of anesthetics. Some candidates simply listed aspects of each source without making any direct linking and comparison.

1 (b) There were many good answers to this question. Most candidates recognised, and were able to explain, cauterisation. Better answers went on and explained that Paré's new methods would have persuaded some to reject cauterisation. A few candidates failed to realise that 1530 was in the sixteenth century and argued that the treatment would not be accepted because it was much earlier.

1 (c) Most candidates were able to recognise blood transfusion. Better answers explained why it was important by referring to the problem of loss of blood in surgery. It was encouraging to see many of these answers developed further by explanations of other problems that needed to be solved before the full benefits of transfusions could be felt - e.g. recognition of different blood groups.

2 This question was by far the most popular choice and produced a full range of answers. (a) was generally answered well. The best answers were able to explain the link between balancing the Four Humours and lifestyle. Weaker answers ignored 'healthy' and wrote about any aspect of life in Greek times. Some answers were more about Egyptian and Roman practices, than about the Greeks. In response to Part (b) descriptions of Roman public health gained some marks but reasons such as the importance of a healthy army and the Roman's practical approach to medicine had to be explained for high marks. Explanation, rather than description, was the key to writing a good answer. There were some excellent answers to part (c) with candidates able to explain examples of religion helping progress (e.g. mummification), and hindering it (e.g. ban on dissections). Weaker answers tried to argue that religious beliefs did enormous harm to Greek medicine because as long as they thought gods were cause and cure, they would not make any progress (ignoring all the progress that did take place during the Greek period). Some candidates identified relevant examples, e.g. mummification, but were unable to explain how they helped medical progress.

3 Part (a) the best answers mentioned laughing gas, ether and even alcohol, while others resorted to referring to 'knocking people out with hammers'. Part (b) was answered well. Many candidates knew about both religious and practical arguments. The ability to turn this knowledge into proper explanations separated the good answers from the rest. Knowledge of Nightingale's importance, especially beyond the Crimea, has improved enormously over the last few years and an encouraging number of candidates were able to put this knowledge to good use in Part (c). Simpson's importance was also understood by many. However, only a few candidates were able to reach the top level in the mark scheme by arguing why one can be seen as more important than the other. A few did this well by explaining the example that Simpson's chloroform at first led to an increase in the death rate during surgery. Weaker answers simply described what one, or both, individuals did, without explaining why this mattered in the history of medicine.

4 This question was not chosen by many candidates and was either answered very well or very poorly. In Part (a), the better answers focused on the impact of living conditions on health. Weaker answers either simply described living conditions or described conditions in factories. For Part (b) most candidates were able to explain what John Snow discovered, but far fewer explained why it mattered - e.g. by comparing it with existing explanations of cholera or by explaining what it led to. There were some good answers to Part (c) with candidates able to explain the importance of both Pasteur and the Liberal reforms, but too many candidates simply described Pasteur's work or his germ theory, and had little knowledge of Liberal reforms. There were many vague references to reform of public health, while the best answers linked Pasteur's discoveries with later developments in public health.

Crime and Punishment

1 (a) was answered well by most candidates. They were able to explain that they were not surprised because this was an accepted way of finding out of someone was innocent or guilty. Better answers explained why this method was used. A few candidates thought that witches were involved or got the sinking and floating the wrong way round. In Part (b) the best answers focused on the apparent popularity of Jack Shepherd and even compared popular romantic portrayals of highwaymen with the reality. This enabled them to tackle the issue of 'usefulness'. Weaker answers described the drawing and were unable to make inferences from the source. Part (c) asked candidates to explain why there are two different impressions of prisons. Some candidates did focus on the role of prison reformers such as Fry and Howard, but many simply explained how the two impressions are different.

2 This question was the most popular of the optional questions. Many candidates scored high marks in Part (a) and many were able to go beyond simply identifying features, such as familiars, by explaining their significance. A few thought that witches were identified by people at the time because they were flying around on broomsticks. Some candidates found it difficult to distinguish between parts (a) and (b) and in response to the latter simply wrote more about how witches were identified. Better answers focused on the broader context and explained reasons such as religious changes at the time and the activities of witch-hunters like Hopkins. Fears about vagrants were generally explained well in Part (c) but it was clear that some candidates were not familiar with the term 'religious heretic', despite it being listed in the specification. There were still an encouraging number of outstanding answers with some excellent explanations of why heretics were more of a problem than vagrants.

3 The best answers to Part (a) named precise examples such as constables, the Bow Street Runners and watchmen. Weaker responses gave very general information about the situation in 1800, although some did suggest Peel's police force. Good answers to Part (b) had to identify particular and valid reasons such as the fear of popular protest at the time or the inadequacy of existing systems. Weaker answers rested on general references to 'lots of crime'. The crucial difference between good answers and the rest was often the ability to write a proper explanation. For Part (c) many candidates understood that the police became more effective as the century went on but to achieve high marks it was necessary to state and explain precise reasons.

4 This question was answered by very few candidates. In Part (a) it was necessary to describe the impact of popular protests such as Peterloo on crime and punishment. However, most candidates got no further than naming or describing a protest and not all of them from the period - e.g. the hunger strikes of suffragettes. In answers to Part (b) there were many vague assertions that large cities led to an increase in crime. In response to Part (c) there were some good explanations of the importance of religion in the history of crime and punishment but surprisingly few good explanations of the role of government.

Elizabethan England

5   Good answers to Part (a) were able to explain, and make inferences from, Source A, through the use of relevant contextual knowledge of vagrants. Weaker answers simply repeated, or paraphrased, the information in the source. Part (b) produced some interesting answers, with the better candidates focusing on explaining the Earl of Bath's fears about the general situation in the country at the time or on the fears of landowners in particular. Part (c) produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates were not surprised by the sources because of the general problem of the poor. In effect, they treated the two sources as the same. Better answers understood the difference in approach between the two sources and were surprised by this. The best answers understood the difference in approach but were able to use their knowledge and understanding to explain why they were not surprised. It was encouraging to see a good number of candidates reaching the top level in the mark scheme by doing some careful thinking.

6   Questions 6 and 7 were equally popular. The best answers to Question 6, Part (a) were able to identify particular events - e.g. the marriage with Darnley, his murder, marriage to Bothwell and the abdication. Weaker answers described events after Mary had arrived in England. Part (b) was answered well. Most candidates knew several reasons but what made the key difference to the quality of the answers was whether this knowledge was turned into proper explanations. There were some excellent answers to Part (c) where candidates were able to compare the threats posed by Mary and the Earl of Essex. Candidates usually, and wisely, argued that Mary was the greater threat. Weaker candidates were able to explain the threat posed by Mary but struggled with the Earl of Essex. Some got no further than the fact that he wanted to marry her.

7   The best answers to Part (a) focused on particular events of the voyage e.g. the attacks on Spanish settlements and the mutiny of Doughty. The accounts provided by weaker answers could have applied to almost any sea voyage at the time. Part (b) was answered very well. Most candidates were able to explain several reasons and seemed to know the events in detail. Part (c) also produced many good answers with the benefits of the voyages being dealt with rather more effectively than the benefits of the defeat of the Armada. Even some of the better candidates failed to explain the political and religious significance of the Armada's failure. However, there were some excellent explanations, from the best candidates, of why the Armada mattered more than the voyages.

Britain, 1815-1851

5   In response to Part (a) many candidates were able to work out that the public notice referred to the Swing Riots. The best answers went on to use this context to explain the possible purpose of the notice. There were many excellent answers to Part (b). These answers explained how both sources are criticising the New Poor Law but in different ways. Examiners were impressed with how well the sources were interpreted - e.g. the reference in Source C to the division of families by the Poor Law. Part (c) produced a range of interesting answers. The best answers were based on knowledge and understanding of the context. These focused on aspects such as the lack of outdoor relief or the principle of 'less eligibility'. These were used as reasons for being surprised or not surprised. Weaker answers resorted to 'everyday empathy'.

6 This question was slightly more popular than Question 7 although both produced many good answers. Part (a) was answered well. The use of precise examples related to the period, e.g. the polluted air in textile factories, separated good answers from the rest. In the latter the descriptions rested on general assertions such as 'it was very hard' and 'it was very unpleasant'. Part (b) produced many good answers with candidates able to explain several valid reasons. The best answers looked at the issue from the point of view of both the factory owners and the workers. In response to Part (c) candidates were very effective in explaining the lack of success of the reforms by explaining factors such as the small number of inspectors and the difficulty in knowing the age of the children. They were less familiar with the positive outcomes of the reforms.

7 Candidates usually only chose this question if they were confident that they could answer all parts well. This led to many good answers. In Part (a), knowledge of pocket and rotten boroughs was generally sound. Candidates were able to explain several reasons for Part (b) including revolutions in Europe and events such as Peterloo. Part (c) also produced many good answers with some very interesting points being made - e.g. the Chartists were more concerned about issues such as the New Poor Law and so their existence tells us little about the effectiveness of the Reform Act.

The American West

5 For Part (a) most candidates worked out that Source A is about polygamy and were able to explain why this made the Mormons unpopular. The best answers addressed the 'how far' part of the answer and also explained other reasons why they were unpopular - e.g. the collapse of the Mormon banks. In Part (b) the best answers were set in the context of either the Mormon War or the Mountain Meadow Massacre. However, there were not many of these. Most candidates were able to explain how the cartoon is ridiculing the Mormons and this led some to suggest a valid purpose. In response to Part (c) the best answers focused on the significance of the immigrants. Fair answers suggested that the cartoon is making Utah or the Mormons look bad. The weakest answers thought that the cartoon was about Young's journey to Salt Lake.

6 This question was far more popular than Question 7. It was answered well. Part (a) produced many good answers with most candidates able to provide precise and relevant examples rather than general descriptions. There were also many excellent answers to Part (b). Candidates were able to explain the importance of both hunting and burial grounds. There were few general answers lacking contextual detail. Part (c) was also answered very well. Many candidates were able to explain how both groups tried to adapt to the conditions on the Plains, although only a few were able to produce a convincing reason why one group was more successful than the other.

7 Few candidates attempted this question. The best answers to Part (a) were limited to what happed in the towns. Many answers, however, ranged over all the activities of cowboys. Part (b) produced some better answers with the best ones focusing on both problems between miners, and between miners and the Plains Indians. In response to Part (c) candidates often knew about the events of the Johnson County War but found it difficult to use this knowledge to form judgments about law and order.

Germany 1919-1945

5   Many answers to Part (a) differentiated between the attitudes of Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau in the cartoon as well as explaining the context of the Treaty of Versailles. The best answers went one step further and explained the point of view of the cartoonist about the events. For Part (b) most candidates were able to place their reading of Source B in the context of the French occupation of the Ruhr. Many were able to explain the anti-French message and the best candidates explained a valid purpose - e.g. to encourage Germans to take part in the passive resistance. The best responses to Part (c) placed their answers in the context of 1935 and addressed the question of why were the Germans able to/willing to celebrate the failed Putsch. Most candidates got as far as explaining that they were surprised because the Putsch was a failure. Some took the opposite view because of how Hitler turned the failed Putsch and the resulting imprisonment to his advantage. A few candidates used both arguments.

6   The best answers to Part (a) focused on aims and beliefs from, or based on, the 25-point Programme. Weaker answers wrote about the Nazis more generally and ended up including aspects that were not present in the early 1920s - e.g. points about the role of women. Part (b) was generally answered well. The best answers explained precise examples - e.g. the French leaving the Ruhr, the Rentenmark, the Dawes Plan and admittance to the League of Nations and international acceptance. Weaker answers identified these points but were unable to explain how they contributed to recovery. In response to Part (c) many candidates were able to explain other factors for the growing popularity of the Nazis but struggled with the concept of 'within the political system'. This was surprising considering how much they usually know about Hitler's change of tactics after the Munich Putsch.

7   This question was more popular than Question 6. Part (a) produced many good answers but many candidates struggled with Part (b). Most could get as far as explaining the changes in role for women but got no further. There were many answers that could have applied to any society in any war. Part (c) produced much better answers. The best were able to explain why there was little opposition and explain what opposition did exist - this was usually about youth opposition.

A952/21 Developments in British Medicine, 1200-1945

This was the fourth January examination for this component. Whilst there is evidence that candidates are being well prepared for the examination in terms of their knowledge of the prescribed topic, some familiar issues remain. Candidates entering this examination at this stage of their course tend not to do as well as candidates who enter at the end of their course. Whilst they have appropriate contextual knowledge, they are not as skilled at applying it to particular questions. They lack an overview of wider developments in context and their ability to analyse and evaluate historical sources can be fairly simplistic.

However, there was a good range of responses to the paper overall. There was still a tendency for weaker candidates to write down everything they knew about Lister in Q1 and Q6, but a good number of candidates deployed their contextual knowledge reasonably well.

Some centres are still clearly advising candidates to start by answering Q6 first. Whilst one can understand the reasoning behind this, it is a strategy that rarely serves candidates well. There was evidence that a number of candidates who tackled the paper this way ran out of time and missed out a question, or answered one question very briefly. For these reasons, centres would be better advised not to encourage this strategy.

Question 1

Source A proved challenging for a number of candidates. They misread key sentences in the source, leading to invalid inferences about Lister's work. The sentence in lines 3-4, 'hardly one of Lister's methods has not been abandoned' was taken to mean that the methods must have been good because they stood the test of time. Such candidates often linked this to the statement, 'The spray was the most completely logical appliance that could have occurred to the mind of man.' They believed, therefore, that Lawson Tait was praising Lister's work and said that the source created a good impression of his discovery. This was not valid. Some candidates noted that Tait gave Lister's spray a 'protracted trial' and the fact that he was still preoccupied with his rivalry with Lister in 1890 showed how influential Lister's work must have been. This was valid. However, most candidates were able to spot Tait's negative tone and his scepticism about Lister's work. They usually supported this by using good detail from the source. Relatively few candidates fell into the trap of focusing their inferences on Tait or on Lister (rather than his work) which was pleasing. There were plenty of possible inferences that could be made about Lister's work from this source, and most candidates were able to make them well. A small percentage of candidates still did not understand the requirements and simply either copied the source or paraphrased it with a potted history of Lister's work.

Question 2

There was a wide variety of answers to this question. Disappointingly, some candidates focused on simplistic considerations of the reliability of the sources, with many arguing that Source C was more useful because it was an actual photograph from the time and therefore, in their view, it could not have been altered in any way. Most candidates pointed out details about Lister in one or both sources that they found useful. The presence of the spray was the most obvious detail, but the absence of specialist clothing was often used to make valid points about the fact that Lister's work was only a step on the way towards aseptic surgery. A number of candidates made inferences about how the sources were useful in showing Lister's importance to surgery, or his impact on other surgeons. These candidates usually reached level four or five. Centres need to encourage candidates to recognise that even biased or unreliable sources can be very useful. Some candidates tended to dismiss one or both sources once they had established the fact that neither of them can be relied upon to give us an accurate or comprehensive picture of Lister's work. Questions about utility continue to be challenging for average and below average candidates.

Question 3

This question was generally answered quite well. Candidates were able to address the question of trust by going beyond the detail in the source and using either other sources or contextual knowledge to show that parts of the source might be exaggerated, whilst other parts might be entirely trustworthy. Relatively few candidates got bogged down by the fact that this was one of Lister's students. Pleasingly, those candidates that made this observation were able to point to the fact that the balanced nature of the student's judgements made the source even more trustworthy. There were the usual comments about 'memories' being unreliable over time, but these were very few in number. Some candidates displayed impressive contextual knowledge about the state of pre-Listerian surgery to accept the details in the first paragraph as being entirely true.

Question 4

This appeared to be a very familiar source to most candidates, and the overwhelming majority successfully interpreted the statistics in the table. Moreover, many recognised the limitations of the statistics, being recorded in one hospital in Glasgow by one surgeon carrying out one type of operation. Several pointed to the impressive statistics quoted by the doctor in Source G as further proof that Source E showed that surgery got better after 1867. It was quite surprising, given the level of knowledge about Lister shown by candidates that few talked about the surgical problems that remained after 1867 or the continued opposition to Lister's methods, particularly by surgeons in London

Question 5

This question caused some problems for weaker candidates. Several focused on whether they were surprised by Source F and not Source G. Some were able to rescue their answer by saying that Source G's praise of Lister should not be that surprising, given the unreliable nature of Source F. Many knew about Simpson's role in developing chloroform and put forward an argument that perhaps Simpson was jealous of the publicity Lister was getting, especially since he had had such a battle to gain recognition for 'the blessed chloroform'. Some pointed to the significance of the time gap between the two sources and the further work that had been done on antiseptic surgery in that time. They were able to say why this made them less surprised about Source G. Cross-reference to other sources featured well in the better answers. The most common answer, however, was surprise at Source G, given the fact that here was a German doctor singing Lister's praises, when Simpson in Source F predicted that there would be considerable discredit from 'our French and German neighbours'. Such answers rarely progressed beyond level two.

Question 6

The quotation in this question was more difficult for candidates to come to terms with than usual. A lot of candidates made good use of sources, but addressed the wrong question. They sought to demonstrate whether the sources showed that Lister had solved the problems of infection in surgery, rather than the more complex question of whether the sources showed that ***people accepted*** that he had solved the problems. This did not need to be limited to his contemporaries. Candidates could equally address whether modern historians have accepted this or not. As such, there was plenty for candidates to consider. Centres need to reinforce the need for candidates to read questions carefully before committing pen to paper. As a result of this misinterpretation of the question, marks were lower for question 6 than is usually the case. Very few candidates picked up any extra marks for consideration of the reliability of the sources. Too many made simplistic comments about such issues, which were insufficient to gain the extra marks available. Spelling, punctuation and grammar were, on the whole, reasonably accurate.

A952/22 Developments in Crime and Punishment in Britain, 1200-1945

General Comments

In most respects this paper produced work from candidates that was much in line with performance in previous years. The level of comprehension of sources was good, and all questions worked well in producing a full range of responses. However, the one unusual feature was the high proportion of candidates who were able to evaluate sources for reliability in one or more of the questions. In most years, much of the attempted source evaluation is little more than generalisation about source type. This time, though, candidates were much more readily able to see possible arguments based on the purpose of the author of a source, or on the nature of the language used. The probable explanation of this was the topic on which the paper was based – Peterloo. Candidates had a high level of contextual knowledge around which to form their answers, along with preconceived notions of who the 'baddies' were. This enabled them to see the self-serving nature of many of the arguments contained within the sources, which in turn had a significant benefit on the quality of the answers they were able to produce.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

As is generally the case, the first question asked candidates to draw inferences from a source. One of the keys to answering these questions is to focus properly on the specific nature of the inference required – here this was on the government's attitude to the meeting. Inferences about the magistrates, say, would not therefore be relevant. Another issue is what counts as an inference. This has always been defined as something you can tell from a source, even though the source does not actually say it. Some candidates made what they took to be an inference – that the government wanted to stop the meeting – yet the source said, 'Every obstacle should be used to try and prevent the meeting.' So this answer was barely inferential at all, but was still given some credit as being more than simply repeating source detail. The valid inferences were that the government was, for example, worried, wary, cautious or concerned. Many candidates used one or more of these words, or other synonyms, and then used the sentence on trying to prevent the meeting as support for their inference(s).

Question 2

This was the first question where the issues of what, and who, you can believe about Peterloo were central. There were certainly plenty of assertions about whether or not one could believe, for example, magistrates, letters or eye-witnesses, but most answers were able to move beyond these and construct a properly argued answer based on one or more of the usual techniques for testing source reliability. The limitations of cross-reference were exposed by the fact that it was possible elsewhere on the paper to find.sources both to challenge and corroborate the magistrate's letter. Better answers found other ways to argue that the magistrate was not telling the whole truth. The language of the source – such as referring to the crowd as a 'mob' - and the focus on casualties suffered by the authorities, betrayed the magistrate's bias in representing the events in a manner favourable to himself. The best answers provided explanations of why he would do this. Source A made it clear that the government did not want violence. The magistrate therefore had to find some way of justifying what had happened.

Question 3

The question asked 'why' the magistrates seized the drawing. This meant that those few candidates who failed to give a reason, and merely described the drawing, could not score. Almost every other candidate made the point that one reason for seizing the drawing was that it showed the soldiers/magistrates in a bad light, effectively blaming them for the events of Peterloo. This was certainly a sound reason, but it left unanswered the issue of why they would be worried by this. Better answers therefore showed an awareness of the possible audience for the drawing. Viewed in this light, the magistrates would be worried that the drawing might turn people against them. Many answers used contextual knowledge of the period to suggest that the magistrates' fear of revolution would have been their motive. A few answers added to this the possible purpose of the artist in drawing the engraving; the idea that the magistrates would have perceived the engraving as being deliberately subversive, and would not have been prepared to tolerate such material being available to the public.

Question 4

In this question, as in Question 3, there were a few candidates who failed to score because of not answering the question. The question asked whether Source E proved Source D wrong. It was, then, essential to address the issue of proof, and merely comparing the two sources was not enough. Perhaps more than in Question 2, some answers limited themselves to arguments based on provenance. Better answers addressed the contradictions between the two sources, and stated that these meant that one at least, and possibly both, of the sources could not be believed, and reached a conclusion about proof. Of course, at this level, this conclusion could only be an assertion, since no developed explanation of which was the more credible had been provided. This was the additional element which characterised the best answers. Some of these used cross-reference to other sources to check claims in Sources D and E. As in Question 2, this approach was flawed by the fact that, with opinions as polarised as they were over Peterloo, the fact that another source corroborates or questions the source being checked shows little more than that it is on the same or the opposite 'side'. The strongest answers resolved this by demonstrating that Birley (Source E) would have had a specific purpose in representing the events as he did. He had a reason to lie – he had been in charge of the Yeomanry sent to arrest Hunt and therefore had to explain away the violence. His account could not therefore disprove Source D.

Question 5

The cartoon (Source F) could be interpreted in different ways. Interpreted in context, it is clearly critical of the authorities; whether it is actively supporting the crowd at Peterloo is more arguable. Answers were definable in relation to two variables: did the answer conclude that the cartoon supported the crowd or the authorities, and was the answer based on source interpretation or on source detail? Interpretation was better than detail, and the crowd was better than the authorities. In practice, better answers (i.e. those based on interpretation) would explain why it had to be a supporter of the authorities or the crowd who drew the cartoon, whereas weaker answers (source detail) would merely imply this. Thus, *'I think the cartoon supports the crowd because it shows the monster chasing the government away'* was not providing an explanation, whereas *'I think the cartoon supports the crowd because it shows the monster chasing the government away, and this means that the person who drew the cartoon wanted to overthrow the government'* was making it clear why the cartoon could only be seen as supporting the crowd.

Question 6

The fact that candidates found source evaluation more accessible than usual on earlier questions meant also that the bonus marks available for source evaluation on this question were more often earned than in previous years. The given hypothesis asked whether the magistrates were to blame. For the purposes of marking this was taken to mean the authorities in general (i.e. government, magistrates, soldiers). Sources B, C, D and E were clearly divided, two supporting the hypothesis and two questioning it. The majority of candidates were able to use these four sources in the proper manner and thus achieve a high level answer. Sources A and F provided more difficulties since neither was directly about the Peterloo massacre. To use these effectively required some additional explanation. For example, Source A could be seen as supporting the hypothesis, as the magistrates were told not to prevent the meeting by force, yet they did. Alternatively, Source A could be seen as questioning the hypothesis since the magistrates were told not to use violence, yet there was violence so it must have been the crowd's fault. The additional argument, beyond what the source actually said, would often be missed. One innovation was the award of 3 marks on this question for spelling, punctuation and grammar (SPaG). Given that the quality of SPaG was generally good, one may assume that candidates were well aware of the change. However, there were a few candidates who did not answer Question 6 at all. Given that this is the highest tariff question on the paper, missing it out has always been very damaging to a candidate's prospects. However, SPaG means that this penalty is now even greater. Candidates should ensure that whatever the time pressures they feel under in the examination, they always answer Question 6.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning
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

PART OF THE
CAMBRIDGE ASSESSMENT
GROUP

UKAS
MANAGEMENT
SYSTEMS
001