

History B

Advanced GCE A2 H508

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H108

Report on the Units

January 2010

HX08/MS/R/10J

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

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

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification 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 2010

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

Advanced GCE History (H508)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H108)

REPORT ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
Chief Examiner Report	1
F981 Historical Explanation - British History and F982 Historical Explanation - Non British History	2
F983 Using Historical Evidence - British History and F984 Using Historical Evidence - Non British History	6
F985 and 986: Historical Controversies	15
F987 Coursework	19
Grade Thresholds	22

Chief Examiner Report

The overall performance of candidates was most encouraging. In the A2 part of the course this winter saw the first candidates attempting the paper on Historical Controversies. The quality of the answers exceeded the examiners' expectations and the scripts were fascinating to mark. It was pleasing to see so many candidates understanding the intentions behind this unit and as a result displaying a sophisticated and mature approach towards the subject. There was also small quantity of coursework submitted for moderation for the first time. The overall quality was not as high as in the Controversies work but there was evidence that candidates were beginning to display a sound grasp of the concept of historical significance. Some candidates tried to turn the exercise into one about causation and it is important that they understand the difference between this and significance. However, there was also some very good work. The centres' marking of the work was generally accurate.

The work submitted for the AS papers showed progress being made compared to last summer's examinations. There was rather more explicit and constructive use of the modes in answers for the Historical Explanation units, and more explicit testing of the given interpretation in answers in the Using Historical Evidence units.

Altogether, the quality of work emerging from examinations, controlled assessment and coursework for this Specification, fully justifies OCR's decision to try and attempt something different with A level History.

F981 Historical Explanation - British History and F982 Historical Explanation - Non British History

General comments

There were approximately 400 candidates for F981 and 300 for F982, which was an increase on January 2009. Although some of these candidates may well have been re-sitting papers, several centres were new to these Specification B examinations for this entry, which was welcome and encouraging.

It may be helpful to centres if we look immediately at an example of a successful approach to one of the questions on the January paper. This was in response to Q 3 (a) *Why did Mary Queen of Scots give up the Scottish throne in 1567?* The essay begins 'The first reason was Mary Queen of Scots beliefs on religion' and goes on in the paragraph to talk about her openly Catholic practices and the difficulties this caused for her largely Protestant nobles. The next paragraph explains why, as a woman, she faced difficulties because there were those who did not believe a Queen had the ability or the strength to rule effectively. The next paragraph begins 'Another reason was her actions towards marriage.' It goes on to explain how and why her series of marriages caused political opposition. The next paragraph discusses the belief of some in Scotland that Mary was more French than Scottish. Finally, a conclusion argues that Mary's religious views were the most important reason for her being forced to give up the throne, linking it to the other reasons discussed. This essay was given Level1 for its integral use of modes of explanation, particularly beliefs. The essay was organised around the modes, without being a mechanical 'trot-through' of them.

Another essay explains why Mary was executed in 1587, Question 3(b), using 'belief, intention and cause reasoning.' The first paragraph gives a causal explanation: that Mary was involved in the Babington Plot. She was caught in the act of treason, which is then linked to the next paragraph, a brief explanation that the reason why she was executed in 1587 (and not another year) was because of the decision to put her on trial for treason that year. Next the essay moves to Mary's intentions to claim the English throne and the Privy Council's intentions to stop that happening. Mary's religious beliefs are then discussed in another paragraph and explained in terms of the threat they posed to the 1559 Settlement, and then another paragraph discusses the international situation: the interests of Spain in securing a Catholic England are made germane to the essay. A conclusion links together the combined pressure which religious faith and the international situation placed on Elizabeth I as best explaining the decision to have Mary executed in 1587.

So, what we see in these two essays, which were not uncharacteristic of the centres which produced them, is a way of getting to the heart of historical explanation simply and effectively. What explains why something happened when it did? Often, it is a trigger, an event such as a decision to put someone on trial. But that trigger needs a context of its own, because events don't just happen. This context or state of affairs might be worked out by stepping back and looking at the 'bigger picture' in so far as it is relevant to the question. Within that bigger picture there will be people, in very large numbers such as entire populations or Liberal voters, or smaller groups such as nobles or Jacobins or a Privy Council, or individuals such as Joseph Chamberlain or Edward IV, with attitudes and beliefs, political or religious or social, which we need to understand if we want to know why they acted as they did. Individuals and groups of individuals have intentions and beliefs and attitudes which are often much discussed and debated but which are always relevant to historical explanation. This in turn can help to explain why people acted as they did, when they did. These are of course universal methods which can be applied equally well to the Russian Revolution or the Heath Government of 1970-74, and it is

to be hoped that as teachers and students gain experience with F981 and F982 they see the positive advantages in terms of levels and marks which such an approach brings.

First of all, any tendency to write in a narrative and descriptive way will be diminished. To be fair, this has not been a regular feature of this paper hitherto. Secondly, such an approach will encourage candidates always to have questions in their minds and always to link points together. In any class discussion of question 7(b), *How would you best explain why Russia became involved in the First World War?* it would not be long before students were talking about the international situation of alliances and diplomatic ties; someone would raise the issue of Serbia and Russia's historic ties in the Balkans; another student might question what the Tsar's motives were and point to his need to distract attention away from difficult internal problems. Encouraging students to explain complex events and situations using modes of explanation such as examining intentions, actions and attitudes and beliefs will produce good historical writing, critical thinking and strong foundations for Specification B A2 courses on Historical Controversies and questions of Historical Significance. **Responses which do not show any explicit use of modes of explanation are capped at 22/25; marks of 23, 24 and 25 are reserved for answers which make a genuine attempt to explain the past using modes.** It is difficult, if not impossible, for students to apply in an examination methods which they have not previously been taught and practised. Methods of historical explanation do therefore need to be taught so that they become second nature. There is plenty of evidence within answer booklets that students are being taught to plan their answers before they start to write, which is encouraging, but looking at some of those plans shows more interest in the content of the answer than the methods of approaching it. Regular practice of timed essay plans which focus only on the best way into a question may be useful; some centres clearly do teach their students to look for the connections between themes and to draw attention to them explicitly and directly. Some students enjoy using phrases or terminology which work well for them in History essays of this kind, such as 'this was the final straw needed to get conclusive evidence...' or, as follows, the idea of a chain of events in discussing Q 5 (b), *Why was the fall of the Bastille in 1789 important?*

After the events which lead to its fall its symbolic meaning changed, it showed the third estate what power they actually held in France and this was the first deliberate act of revolution against the king, even though they found only a few prisoners in the Bastille the point of it was they destroyed a symbol of the king's tyranny, and replaced it with a symbol of the revolution, themselves. This gave great confidence to the women of Paris and they marched 10 miles to Versailles picking up other women and groups of the national guard and demanded from the king more bread. It did not end there and the king was forced the next morning by the national guard and women back to Paris and imprisoned in the Tuileries. This chain of events all sprouted from the anger and discontent of the common people not being allowed to have a say in what happened to the country they were 95% of.

Comments on individual questions

F981

The most popular topics here were once again *Tudor Finale: The Reign of Elizabeth I, 1558-1603* and *Liberal Sunset: The rise and fall of 'New Liberalism', 1890-1922*. There were several examples of rubric infringements, mostly where candidates attempted part (a) from one question and part (b) from another. **Centres are reminded that what happens here is that the examiner marks both questions but only one mark, the higher of the two, is counted. It would also be appreciated if centres could ask their candidates to leave a few lines of space between the (a) and (b) questions for an examiner's comments, or to start their (b) question on a new page.** There were some intelligent responses to the questions on Lancastrians and Yorkists which revealed both detailed knowledge and a subtle grasp of how actions and beliefs can be tied together, for example here in response to Q2 (a) *How would you best explain the influence of Richard Neville, Earl of Warwick, in the period 1461-71? If Warwick had not had a great affinity he would not have gained the support of Clarence and Margaret of Anjou as they would not see any personal gains being made by joining him.*

Equally, if Warwick had not been a key minister of Edward IV his impact would not have had such a significance when he broke from Edward IV. The argument that Warwick had such an influence because of his power and alliances is more important in explaining his influence than the fact he gained foreign support because without his initial power he would not have been able to threaten Edward IV.

More candidates attempted responses to questions on Mary Queen of Scots than to those on governance and parliament. Examiners report that the quality of knowledge on Mary was variable, and in some cases weak across whole centres. For example, responses argued that Mary was unconcerned about the Scottish throne and just wanted to rule England, or reported that she was lured by English gold. Such comments are dubious at best. Factual knowledge to support Question 3(a) was particularly weak, and this cannot wholly be laid at the door of candidates themselves. Contrariwise, there were some good answers which explained why Mary was executed, as already indicated. Several candidates were willing to take the productive line that Elizabeth had tried all the alternatives and was left with no choice, or that the war with Spain which began in 1587 meant that Elizabeth now had little to lose by the execution and everything to gain. Questions on Elizabeth and her parliaments, or court factions, were poorly attempted in many cases. Responses showed a lack of familiarity with key terms, with events, with key figures and with ideas.

Questions on *Liberal Sunset* met with variable responses. Ideas such as tariff reform and 'new liberalism' were generally well explained, but particular political events or actions were often omitted altogether or skated over, for example the legislative record of the Lloyd George Coalition of 1918-22, with a resultant excessive focus on one personality, usually a leading politician. For *The End of Consensus* there were likewise mixed fortunes. Many candidates could explain very effectively why there was pressure for social and economic reform by 1945, and although a few could not resist writing about what the Attlee governments then did, balanced responses which explored disillusionment with the Conservatives and the expectations shown towards the Labour Party were well rewarded. The independence of India was often less successfully tackled, however. Some candidates were very much 'clutching at straws' and could offer little detail, especially from an Indian perspective. More pleasingly, some centres are clearly teaching the Heath Government of 1970-74 well, to judge by responses which were seen on internment, linking beliefs, actions and triggers effectively; likewise, the election of 1974 was persuasively analysed by candidates.

F982

No responses were seen on Charlemagne; there were some on Luther and the German Reformation, some on the French Revolution and the great majority on Russia in Turmoil 1900-1921. Several general observations arise which can be applied across these papers. First, a key point can be made from Question 7 (b) on why Russia became involved in WW1. **An explanation which only looks at external factors, thereby ignoring the domestic picture entirely, or vice versa, cannot be expected to be better rewarded than at Level 2.** Secondly, Question 5 (b), *Why was the fall of the Bastille in 1789 important?*, requires an answer which is focussed on the significance of such an action or event, not a casual explanation of it. Candidates who insisted on explaining why the Bastille fell have not answered the question.

As indicated, responses were more effective to Question 5(a) than to 5(b) as a rule. Question 6 was less often chosen but saw a more even quality of answer, with Robespierre's fall at times explained with a subtle analysis of competing factions set against a broader context of the revolutionary wars. This was most impressive. Answers on Russia mostly settled on Question 7, with a significant minority attempting Question 8 with mixed fortunes. Answers to Question 7 (a) shared a common weakness which has been mentioned in these reports previously, namely a tendency to spend too long on background state of affairs, in some cases involving lengthy explanations of Tsarism reaching back into the nineteenth-century, or focussing on anticipated questions on 1905, leaving too little time and energy to answer the question as set. Paragraphs

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

on the Russo-Japanese War, the 1905 Revolution, and details of Stolypin's reforms and the setting up of Dumas were often not made relevant to the wording of the question. One more effective response said a little about the Russo-Japanese War and ended it by explaining: *This control over the army meant that the Tsar could crush worker's strikes and demonstrations within the cities. It was a major factor in why the tsar still had control in 1914; why Russia still had a Tsarist government. It enabled him to crush rebels and demonstration opposing Tsardom.* The next paragraph on the Fundamental Laws and the Duma ended: *The fact that [the Vyborg Manifesto] was ignored showed the strength of the Tsar's hold on Russia which he refused to let go of.* The response then set out very briefly Stolypin's actions, ending: *As a result of the agricultural reforms and end of redemption payments, peasants stopped seizing land; decreasing opposition to Tsardom, allowing it to survive.*

Question 8 saw a weaker level of answer than Question 7, overall. The appeal of Bolshevik ideas in themselves was well grasped, with some effectively contextualised comments on 'Peace, Bread and Land'. However, the word 'some' in the title was often overlooked, and indeed the limited appeal of Bolshevism, the existence of competing ideas, and knowledge in particular of the Socialist Revolutionaries and their appeal to the peasantry, was often lacking. Examiners report that Question 8 (b) saw many polarised responses. Some students were struggling to reveal any knowledge at all about the Kornilov Revolt, or were offering a narrative of it at best. Others could produce subtle responses such as this, given Level 2:

In conclusion, the Kornilov revolt allowed the Bolsheviks to gain popular support and showed the whole of Russia the weakness of the Provisional Government. These two linked together caused the damage to Kerensky's government as seen by the fact that it was seen that the Provisional Government could not stand against any kind of military threat and Kerensky himself then ironically arming members of the Bolshevik party. It also allowed people to see the strengths of the Bolshevik party through being able to defend the city and the apparent weakness of the Provisional Government which had failed to do so. However, despite these links it still remains that the increase in support for the Bolsheviks was the largest damage done to Kerensky's government. This is because the Kornilov Affair diminished the bad reputation the Bolsheviks had received as a result of the July Days. It also led to an increasing amount of members who joined and allowed the Bolsheviks to exploit future weaknesses of the Provisional Government.

It is hoped that these comments will aid centres and students as they prepare for Summer 2010 and future examinations. Examiners have been privileged to read some excellent analysis, some effective use of modes across whole centres and, in short, some first-rate History. There remains plenty of scope in some centres, however, for improvements along the lines of those suggested here. As one candidate wrote, *The start of the French Revolution was more than just simply a couple of people meeting at a pub and thinking let's change things.*

F983 Using Historical Evidence - British History and F984 Using Historical Evidence - Non British History

The report on these two papers has been separated, however it might prove useful to read reports on both papers and all the questions. Examples included in the comments on individual questions can serve to exemplify both good and weaker approaches regardless of the topic. It should be noted that in the answers quoted, spelling, punctuation and grammar have not been corrected.

F983

General remarks

There was a far larger candidature in January 2010 than in January 2009, probably due to a number of candidates re-taking the examination. As might be expected, this left relatively few very weak candidates and many who appeared to have gained a better understanding of the requirements of the paper over the previous six months. There were consequently many pleasing scripts where candidates engaged effectively with the tasks. There are nevertheless a number of areas in which candidates could make improvements.

This time around the majority of candidates managed their time effectively, apparently completing both questions to the best of their ability. Few left too little time for part (b), with many writing at considerable length. There were very few rubric infringements, although occasionally a candidate failed to spot the sources set on the topic that had been taught, instead answering the first question found in the paper.

As has become habitual, several examiners deplored the poor level of English of many candidates. These included the usual colloquialisms, failure to use upper case letters in the conventional way and stray apostrophes. When the way in which ideas are expressed lacks clarity, examiners are not expected to guess what the candidate may have meant. Inappropriate use of 'want of' to mean 'desire for' rather than 'lack of' makes frequent appearances, often changing the meaning apparently intended by the candidate.

Approaches identified and advice

Candidates who unpicked the interpretation to establish what kind of evidence would support or challenge it and also what exactly was being claimed benefited in that they were more likely to set up a clear argument. For example, in addressing what might be meant or implied by terms such as 'improve' and 'driven' they established criteria for judging how evidence inferred from the sources might be used. This usually led to better focus on the task of evaluating the interpretation.

Many candidates begin their answers with an amended or new interpretation. While there is no problem with this as a strategy – after all it is to be hoped that candidates have read the sources carefully before starting to write – it does present some candidates with a dilemma regarding the use of the sources. The need remains to support and challenge the existing interpretation. If candidates are able to handle doing this at the same time as justifying a new or revised interpretation then this approach can work well. However in the process of justifying their new interpretations a number of candidates lost sight of the original task, only testing the given interpretation implicitly.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

For the majority of candidates a more straightforward approach might be advised. The revised interpretation can equally readily emerge from a testing of the given one and the argument is often clearer.

Some candidates analyse the sources then arrive at an overall conclusion without explicitly using the evidence inferred to test the interpretation. This can work, but only if the argument is very clear. It is a risky strategy; candidates would be better advised to make it clear how they think each point inferred from individual sources or groups of sources can be used in evaluating the interpretation.

Relatively few candidates made good use of the provenance to evaluate the evidence in the source in relation to the interpretation. This is a difficult skill, but one which candidates must exhibit in a range of ways if they are to reach Level 1 in AO2a. Assessing the typicality of a source can be a useful approach, and one that does not interfere overly with the flow of argument, when considered the weight to give to a source in relation to the interpretation in part (a).

A particular issue was the face value use of evidence from sources in part (a) despite the candidate making clear in part (b) that the source was atypical, unreliable or otherwise of questionable worth. On occasion evaluation that could have been used very effectively in (b) was included in (a) where it was less effective in relation to the task of testing a given interpretation, yet omitted in (b). More common was evidence that all the elements required for a sound response were present, but not related to each other or left undeveloped.

Part (b) continues to present problems for more candidates than part (a). It does appear to be conceptually more difficult, and candidates should not underestimate the level of analysis and evaluation of the content and provenance of individual sources that is required. Candidates need to display an awareness of the kinds of questions that historians ask and how, precisely, the sources provided might help in answering these questions.

There were indications that some candidates were following the advice provided in previous reports by attempting to relate generic points about types of sources to those provided, identifying which sources fell into each category. Many candidates were well versed in the uses, problems and issues associated with different categories of source. However too many confined their answers to general points about each category, identifying a source as being of a particular type then describing some of the uses, issues and problems associated with such sources in general. These responses cannot be awarded at more than Level 4 if the candidate links the comment to a specific part of the source and lower if there is no specific reference. The question is not intended to be a test of what the candidate can remember about different categories of source, but an opportunity to apply that understanding to the specific sources, their content and provenance, provided on the question paper.

Weaker answers were littered with speculation about the sources. A chronicle might be influenced by a patron, a newspaper might display political bias, a photograph might not show the whole picture. Candidates need to demonstrate how the sources provided demonstrate the problems and issues suggested. The following is regrettably typical of weaker answers:

Source 2 is a primary source and can be trusted as it is from the period.

Comments on individual questions

F983

1 (a) The most successful approach, and one adopted by many candidates, was to explore what might be meant by 'improve' and then to apply the interpretation to different categories of women and different aspects of their lives.

Many candidates found it difficult to apply their understanding of the period to their use of the sources. Simplistic 'before and after' comparisons were made, showing little sense of period. It was claimed that sexual incontinence was unheard of before the Black Death, as was the phenomenon of women working in the fields or in any other capacity, thus indicating that sources were being taken at no more than face value. Instead women were engaged in housework and child-rearing, effectively tied to the kitchen sink, or its medieval equivalent.

Some candidates related the criticisms to the views of the Church and some also noted that the sources that criticised the sexual behaviour of the women were written by clergy. However, these two points were rarely combined to evaluate the sources.

1 (b) The main criticisms concern the comments made about the type of source. Literature is written to entertain while chronicles are biased because they are written on the orders of the king. Few candidates questioned the typicality of the incidents in the sources.

2 (a) Some candidates recognised that Source 1 gave a good lead into the question by establishing a contemporary image of the social hierarchy and relations within it, although a few rejected it on the grounds it did not fall into the period studied. This might then lead to cross-referencing with Source 5 which made clear reference to the need for a hierarchical society.

A sound approach adopted by several candidates involved grouping sources according to the class of people shown leading the revolt or rebellion – nobles, clergy, gentry – and using this to construct an argument about the types of rebellion most feared.

In this topic weaker candidates have a tendency to identify the rebellion to which the source refers, then to use their contextual knowledge rather than evidence from the sources to test the given interpretation and generate an amended or new one. This was particularly noted with Source 7 where the reference to the Earl of Essex led candidates straight into an account of his rebellion several years after the source was written. This approach is to be discouraged as candidates are not doing what the instructions ask them to do – to use the sources to evaluate and improve the interpretation.

2 (b) There was a tendency to generic comments. The following extract is typical; there are several points that could have been developed, but since none are exemplified this leaves this part of the response at Level 4. The standard of English was sometimes unclear or careless.

Source 3 is written to the king chief minister but is good cause it does not show to much biased in fact it speaks of the churchs power. but as a letter does not show huge amounts as it was never intended as a record of history.

Better answers addressed their analysis more effectively to the sources provided. In the following example, the candidate shows clear use of contextual knowledge in evaluating sources and suggesting differing interpretations.

Source 7 is useful because it is a private letter between friends. It is likely to be truthful because Francis Bacon wanted honestly to advise his friend that his behaviour could land him in trouble with the Queen. However it is possible that Bacon could be playing up the threat to Essex in order to give a better argument for the Earl to be more cautious. This latter theory, though, isn't

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

really supported by my knowledge of events, as the Queen did end up executing Essex – suggesting that Bacon’s warnings were correct and not overly dramatic.

Source 5 is clearly biased against the commons, and also seems to have been written without any relation to what Kett actually did. This source insinuated that a group like Kett’s rebels, uncontrolled by gentry or nobles, would kill people in their beds and make others suffer, “all abuse, sins of the flesh, outrageous behaviour and confusion.” This obviously shows the author’s prejudiced view of the commons. In reality Kett kept the rebels extremely orderly, he even organised courts on his camp at Mousehold Heath. He was recognised in the 1940s as a fighter for equality by the Norfolk County Council. So Source 5 is not terribly useful due to its huge bias against the commons, however it does give an insight into the attitudes of the gentry and also shows us how important many took the Great Chain of Being to be.”

3 (a) Most candidates recognised that the causes of radicalism changed over time. Stronger candidates inferred this from the sources, although clearly it would have been an issue raised as they studied the course. Among weaker candidates there was a tendency to let this knowledge, rather than evidence inferred from the sources, drive the argument.

There were many sophisticated inferences from sources on the basis of contextual knowledge, although use of provenance was less well handled. The following extract is from a candidate who was able to use both approaches with some success, although comments linked to both contextual knowledge and provenance could have been slightly more developed.

There are sources that agree with the original interpretation, for example Source 2, which shows that economic problems were to blame for the labourer’s strikes and protests in Manchester 1818, and if we take this as a general example of the atmosphere of the time, that the lower classes did not have political aims at all. Source 3 also appears to agree with the original interpretation, listing the driving force of such a radical statement as “enclosure laws, game laws, tithes” which are all very economic. However if one takes into account the fact that it has been published by the “National Union of the Working Class”, it can be argued that while appearing to be driven by the economic issues of the lower classes, the mention of “unrepresented classes” supports that the leadership had more political aims.

3 (b) Many candidates were well aware of the range of sources available on this topic. When listing omitted types of source they need to explain the benefits that would have accrued had sources of different types been included in the set.

4 (a) The best approach noted to this question involved breaking down the term ‘society’; the sources covered issues of class, gender, race. This provided a structure for the answer, with candidates exploring the ways in which the sources reflected division or unity between groups within these categories before reaching a conclusion. On this basis, there was useful cross-referencing between sources, comparing and contrasting, for example, attitudes towards those of the race or religion widely deemed to be responsible for the First World War (in the case of Source 1) and the July 7 bombings (Source 7). Candidates often used their knowledge of the ‘blitz spirit’ to interpret Source 4, with better candidates discussing whether this phenomenon existed or was a creation of the propagandists – making use of incidents such as that shown in the photograph. Candidates found evaluation of the sources challenging. This was largely because they attempted to apply inappropriate evaluative criteria. Suggesting that the photographs were staged was reasonable in the case of Source 4, but implausible in the case of Source 6. Much was made of the fact that memory alters with time, yet the trauma experienced by the Jewish evacuee clearly made a vivid impression that remained clear in her memory. There was useful discussion of different interpretations of Source 1. Did it show solidarity between dock workers and the German bakers, or were the dock workers simply trying to ensure an adequate food supply for their members?

4 (b) Candidates often grouped sources by type: photograph, newspaper and so on. Typically the answers made generic points that did not demonstrate how the given sources demonstrated the characteristics claimed. Better candidates were able to identify sources that could be evaluated in relation to specific criteria, for example, by questioning the typicality of the evacuee experience, or the purpose of the dock workers' letter.

F984

General comments

The quality of answers showed some improvement over work submitted last year. Fewer candidates struggled to complete both answers and appeared to divide their time more appropriately between (a) and (b). The skills shown in these answers also appeared stronger in the work from many Centres. Most candidates are now cross-referencing evidence from the sources rather than treating each source individually. In this way, they were able to make sound inferences about changes and developments over time (by, for example, comparing Source 2 about the treatment of Native Americans in Question 4 with the statement of their treatment given in Source 7 to argue that there had been little real change). Inevitably, there are still areas where candidates are not as confident. It is the purpose of this report to point out these areas in the hope that future candidates will continue to show the progress in historical skills that we have already seen in the short time since this syllabus began.

In answers to part (a) it was noticeable that many struggled to go beyond a basic or face value reading of the sources. Level 1 specifically talks about candidates making a 'sophisticated' use of evidence. This can mean that candidates find different ways of reading the same source. For example, Question 4 Source 6 was a speech by President Johnson about civil rights. Candidates understood that his reference to the issue becoming 'an American problem' rather than one just for African Americans showed a positive development of attitudes (especially when compared to Source 3). Fewer read the source differently by noting the reference to Selma and drawing the inference that there were still many problems to be resolved. This way of using a source both to support and challenge the interpretation could also be applied to Source 5 in the same question. Here, a government report sets out aspirations for Native American equality, but it was just that – a set of aspirations, rather than a report about actual policies. It is this more complex reading of sources that provides a way of accessing Level 1. However, the issue of 'sophistication' could be approached in an alternative way. Candidates are advised to go beyond face value in their reading of sources. This requires them to think about the provenance of the source - something many think about in question (b) but forget is also part of (a). So, for example, all candidates understood that Question 4 Source 1 (a newspaper account of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan) showed hostile attitudes, but virtually all accepted the account entirely at face value – they did not stop to think about the typicality of such a view (printed in a Louisiana newspaper) and question whether the source represented the attitudes held in the northern states. More noticeably, most accepted Question 4 Source 4 without question (an army report about the integration of black and white regiments). Few used contextual knowledge about the treatment of black soldiers when they returned home to the southern states to challenge the 'facts' of the source. While examiners do not expect detailed knowledge of the topic being studied, they do assume that candidates will have studied content sufficiently to comment on evidence that seems out of step with broad developments.

It is important that candidates are shown how to think 'beyond face value' in these ways as these approaches can help improve their ability to score marks in A01 (knowledge and understanding) since it might help candidates to understand the point of A01 – it is not to 'show off' how much else they know about a topic or fill in what happened in the time gaps between the sources but to use what they know to evaluate the information in the sources for its typicality and consistency with the big picture of what was happening. In turn, this should also lead candidates

to improve interpretations in a more subtle way by deriving amendments only from the strongest evidence.

As noted already, answers to (b) were longer and generally more informative than last summer. Issues such as the use, typicality and bias of evidence were often understood well, allowing access to marks at Level 3. To improve answers further, candidates need to be more aware of the checklist of comments suggested in the Level 1 mark-scheme since many limited themselves by not dealing with a sufficient range of ideas. Typically, candidates repeated the same points about different sources, so the use to which they could be put was rehearsed for all seven sources, or all were challenged in terms of possible bias. Examiners need to see that students understand these issues, but once a candidate has made a point about use satisfactorily they should move on – there is simply not the time to indulge in repetition.

Similarly, candidates often waste time by considering the type of source that has been provided, rather than focusing on the actual sources themselves. So, it was common to see general criticisms levelled at ‘speeches’ (that the person delivering it probably did not write it so it will not really reflect what they thought) or ‘books’ (which only seem to be written to sell copies) or ‘newspapers’ (which are there to entertain). Such generalisations would only be valid if students applied them to the content of the given sources.

What became a clear discriminator was the way candidates discussed the sources, exposing the tendency of many to stick at generalisations. Phrases such as ‘so it could be biased’, ‘it might be untypical’ are side-stepping the issue – candidates should have sufficient own knowledge to go beyond speculating about sources and say whether and how they actually are typical, biased etc (see example in 4 (b) below).

Finally, candidates commented on the range and variety of sources provided and offered comments about what was missing. While this is a valid element of answers, the discussion did not include a vital element – what impact this missing information has on the overall value of the set of sources. Thus, in any of the (b) questions, it was interesting to be told that no sources were written by women, but candidates did not continue by explaining how a female perspective would affect understanding of the issue or add to what was provided.

Comments on individual questions

1 (a) Most candidates displayed sound knowledge of Viking culture and were able to identify examples in the sources of Vikings adopting native culture and integrating or imposing their own. There were occasional errors such as equating paradise (source 4) with Valhalla, despite the clue that the king was visiting Jerusalem on a pilgrimage (as a Christian). Most candidates were able to amend the interpretation, recognising that the transfer of culture was by no means a one-way process:

“It can be said that that they imposed their own culture on the territories they settled upon, but of course they also changed and adapted their own culture when taking on board the cultures of the people they were now imposing on. As in many of the sources given they show how the Vikings and especially their leaders changed the culture in which they were very much a part of and adapted into the Christian belief.”

1 (b) There were too many generalised answers, although some were able to use their understanding to make more developed points specific to individual sources. For example they recognised the significance of the writer of source 5 being descended from the Vikings. One candidate who gave a sound example of evaluation based on knowledge wrote:

“Sources 1 and 2 are useful because they are taken from earlier accounts of the situations, however ... they are probably based on the writings of Dudo who is an unreliable source. The

story of the kissing of the foot is believed by many to be false. Dudo didn't like the Vikings so could have made up the story to make them seem ignorant and savage."

Sources from recent historians are likely to be included at times for the overview they can provide by processing source material. The date of publication will be provided, but the title of the book will not necessarily be given. In the case of Source 3, some candidates described at length how a historian goes about his or her task. This showed good understanding but not in relation to what is required by this question.

2 (a) Candidates usually tackled this question well and showed few problems in understanding or interpreting the sources at least at a basic level. Many were able to read sources in different ways (seeing Source 2 for example, as both evidence of innovative thinking to support the interpretation but little actual progress as these plans were not realised at the time). Candidates also often went beyond face value, by discussing the provenance of Source 1, for example to suggest the purpose of Vasari's account and how the language of the source reflected this. Improvements to the interpretation included contrasting the progress of knowledge against its practical application and developments of the interpretation by bringing in the obstacles to progress shown in the sources.

2 (b) Candidates recognised the tone used by Copernicus (source 4) as well as the audience as presenting issues. Several commented on the use that could be made of Source 1 in showing continued admiration for Brunelleschi's dome over a century after its construction. Candidates made less use than might be expected of the images. The status of Leonardo's notebooks, for example, might have been the subject of comment.

3 (a) The issue of what drove German and Italian nationalism was clearly one in which many candidates were well versed. Some candidates approached the question by adding other explanations of what 'drove developments' including economic factors, the role of monarchs and their ministers and the role of individuals as well as the concept of nationalism. At times this approach appeared more a re-hash of the themes used in past questions ('great men' etc) rather than a response that candidates had derived firmly from the sources provided.

Differentiating between what the sources showed about the two countries provided another useful route into constructing an amended interpretation. A further example of a successful approach was demonstrated by candidates who noted that Source 1 could be used to support the idea of a popular movement expressing radical aims but also commented that the outcomes achieved by Young Italy were rather different. This approach of comparing intentions with actions or outcomes allowed candidates to create a logical improvement to the interpretation.

Candidates who made clear what they meant by popular movements and who explored this in relation to the movements covered by the sources had a clear basis for evaluation of the sources based on contextual knowledge. Young Italy was one example of a popular movement and several candidates discussed whether this term was applicable to Garibaldi's Thousand. However, fewer candidates recognised that socialism (Source 7) might also fall into this category. Definitions of developments also played a part to good effect in some responses.

Sources 1 and 6 provided clear opportunity for cross-referencing that was adopted by many candidates. This was also used as a basis for establishing change over time in relation to developments in Italy.

3 (b) Candidates often had good knowledge of the writers and the context in which they are writing. This enabled them to recognise the uses to which a historian might put the sources. Nevertheless, even the best candidates often leave ideas undeveloped, as the following extract demonstrates. The candidate raises the issue of purpose, but makes no suggestion as to what the purpose might be.

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

Source 5 is useful because it gives the view and opinion of one of the soldiers fighting to unite Italy. It also shows that Garibaldi played a key role and was inspiring because he showed courage and proved to them it was not impossible. However, it raises problems because the purpose of the source is unclear, and it would be written differently for different purposes.

Similarly, in the following extract the candidate suggests a problem but does not provide alternative interpretations.

Source 7 is a cartoon and can be interpreted in different ways. It is limited because it does not give any facts and doesn't explain why or how Bismarck and Bülow dealt with socialism.

In the next extract the candidate raises a valid issue, but offers no examples.

As a set these sources raise problems as a lot of them are unreliable, because they come from people at the time who would have their own opinions and want to make themselves look good.

4 (a) This question attracts the largest number of Centres and many of the comments made in the general part of this report apply particularly here. The most successful candidates realised that this was a question about a pattern of development and understood that Sources 1 and 2 in particular could be used as benchmarks against which to compare later evidence. A common strategy was to separate the sources dealing with Native Americans from African Americans to clarify the discussion and allow an amendment to be made along the lines that the interpretation fitted attitudes towards African Americans more closely than Native Americans. Some candidates noted a theme of 'self help' running through the sources and were able to link their reading of Source 3 to ideas of accommodationism. However, many candidates were content to offer simple, one-dimensional, face value reading of the sources which seriously weakened their ability to suggest a more complex amended interpretation.

At face value the sources gave a clear steer that, by the end of the period in question, the situation of African Americans had benefited from improved attitudes towards them while that of Native Americans had not. Many candidates used this to construct an argument. Stronger candidates were able to recognise that, when subjected to evaluative techniques, the message given by the sources was less clear cut. The official version given by presidents and the army seemed to suggest progress, while candidates could use their knowledge of the reality of life for many African Americans to challenge the impression given by these sources. Most candidates were able to address the issue of change over time and recognised the need to cross-reference sources to test whether or not this occurred.

The following is an example of a purposeful introduction:

"Through the seven sources as time passes you begin to see a dramatic change in attitudes towards Native and African American peoples. Sources 1 and 2 set up a picture of what Native and African American attitudes were like in 1860s – 1880s. ..."

At the opposite extreme were candidates who were unfamiliar with the term 'Native American', unable to distinguish between sources referring to African Americans on the one hand and Native Americans on the other, and even referred to 'Indians' as a separate and distinct minority.

4 (b) Many candidates pointed out the lack of evidence from African Americans or civil rights leaders. What they needed to do was to go on to explain that this evidence would be useful to confirm, for example, whether the promises made by Presidents Roosevelt and Johnson became a reality for the people they were aimed at.

Compare these two examples (discussing Question 4 Source 1):

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

Source 1 is from a newspaper published in Louisiana. It is useful because it tells us about people's attitudes to the KKK, that they were terrifying and dramatic figures. However the information could be biased because it is from a newspaper and the point of newspapers is to sell copies so the description might be exaggerated to interest readers.

Source 1, from a Louisiana newspaper, shows us how the KKK was seen at the time. The image presented was intended to scare African Americans into obedience. However, a historian must remember that this source only presents a view of the KKK in one state and a southern one at that, so is hardly typical of the whole of the USA. In the north these sorts of attitudes were less common. Also, the way the account is written – its comparison of the KKK to supernatural beings – suggests that the writer is hoping to create a strong image in readers' minds, rather than describing reality. This can be seen in language such as...

F985 and 986: Historical Controversies

This was the first assessment of the Historical Controversies units and the examiners had some fascinating answers to read. The overall performance of the candidates was most encouraging and the standard of work was impressive considering candidates had little more than a term to prepare. To see candidates using terms such as functionalism, gender analysis and history from below, and to see them referring to a range of historians, correctly, with genuine understanding, and with confidence, was very pleasing. Many candidates demonstrated a reflective, sophisticated and mature grasp of the nature of the subject in a way that would not be present in more traditional history examination scripts. Many of the answers seen by the examiners were by themselves a justification for the existence of this Specification.

The entry, as expected for the winter series, was small. There were no entries for Unit F985 (British), and all the entries for Unit F986 were either for Different Interpretations of Witch-hunting or Debates about the Holocaust. The total entry was about 200.

This assessment is conducted as a Controlled Assessment over 3 hours with candidates working under supervision but with full access to their notes, books and other materials. Most candidates made sensible and effective use of the time and the availability of reference materials. There were few examples of candidates running out of time, although a few did spend too long on part (a) and wrote significantly shorter answers to part (b). It was clear that nearly all candidates had a solid understanding of the controversy studied and the range of interpretations, approaches and methods associated with it. This allowed them to use their notes and books eg to add a quotation to their answer or to check a reference. They were not, however, dependent on these materials for understanding the extract or for the bulk of their answers.

The best answers analysed and explained the extract (rather than trying to pull it to pieces) in part (a), and in (b) evaluated the approach (rather than simply describing it).

Part (a)

In part (a) candidates are required to base their answers on the extract. They need to explain the interpretation, approaches and methods of the historian who wrote the extract. In this paper both extracts provided candidates with plenty of scope for doing this and many made good use of the opportunities. It is important that candidates base their answers on the extract. They are being asked to analyse the extract, and they must not wander too far from it.

Interpretations

When candidates make claims about the interpretations, approaches or methods, they must support these claims by detailed references to the extract and by using their wider knowledge and understanding. These should be used to explain the interpretations, approaches and methods. For example, the extract on witch-hunting clearly contains an interpretation about the oppression of women, and about witch-hunting as a way of men exerting power over women. This should be explained by using the extract and by candidates drawing on their wider knowledge and understanding of this type of interpretation. Examples of historians producing similar interpretations could be referred to but it is important that candidates do not get carried away and do not wander further and further away from the extract. If other historians are referred to, this should be done to add to the analysis of the extract. It is also legitimate for candidates to refer to alternative interpretations. However, this should be done briefly, and with the intention of throwing further light on the interpretation of the extract eg by placing it into the broader context of interpretations of witch-hunting.

Most candidates dealt with the interpretations in the two extracts very well and with good understanding. There were, however, some answers where more detailed references to the extract would have helped. Some candidates were too keen to move away from the extract and tell the examiner everything they knew about that type of interpretation.

Approaches and methods

Candidates were able to infer much about the approaches and methods of the two historians responsible for the extracts. The witch-hunting extract led candidates to write about gender analysis and feminism, while those who had studied the Holocaust investigated intentionalism and functionalism. Not all candidates were clear about the distinction between approaches and methods. The former are broad and will indicate the direction from which a historian is studying a topic and the issues or questions he or she might be posing. They will include eg gender analysis, history from below, regional studies, functionalism. Methods are narrower and focus more on the details of how the historian has worked eg the types of sources that have been used, or whether any use has been made of, for example, anthropology or sociology, or of statistical analyses.

A good number of candidates detected a wide range of approaches and methods from both extracts. Just as importantly, they supported their answers with close references to the extract.

The main weaknesses

There were two main weaknesses in the answers of some candidates. Firstly, there was a tendency to evaluate the extracts rather than analyse and explain them. This Specification takes a very clear view about historical interpretations, approaches and methods. They are to be regarded as different ways of studying and throwing further light on an area of history, and all of them add to our understanding. It is obvious that none of them are complete in themselves. They will not, by themselves, produce a totally comprehensive and satisfactory explanation of the past. Each, however, adds to previous attempts to understand and explain the past.

When a historian, such as the author of the extract on witch-hunting, examines a historical topic from a certain angle, they are not attempting to produce a complete and true account of that topic. They are trying to approach it from a new direction that raises different questions and will enrich our understanding. The author of the witch-hunting extract mentions that in the 1960s she was surprised 'by the lack of gender analysis in most of these works.'

It is therefore not productive for candidates to criticise an extract for what it does not do, or for being biased. Some candidates criticised the extract they were working on for not including all the other possible interpretations, approaches and methods. Candidates must analyse extracts for what they are, and not for what they are not. It would, in any case, be impossible for an historian to cover a range of interpretations, approaches and methods in an extract of this length. Candidates should understand that the extracts are not meant to be surveys of the historiography of an issue. They represent the interpretation, approaches and methods of one historian. To sum up - candidates should explore and analyse what is in the extract, and not worry about what is not in it.

The extracts are not to be evaluated as if they are historical sources. A few candidates attempted to criticise every aspect of their extract concluding that it was totally unsatisfactory and practically worthless. They are not being asked to do this. They are being asked to understand, analyse and explain the extract.

Secondly, some candidates quickly wandered away from the extract. They seemed more interested in producing a general, perhaps prepared, survey of the historiography of the issue. It should be emphasised to candidates that this is not what they are being asked to do. They are

being asked to analyse the extract. It is important to use wider knowledge and understanding into answers, but only to improve the quality of the analysis of the extract.

Part (b)

There were many excellent answers to part (b). The best candidates divided their answers into two parts. They first discussed ways in which regional studies or structuralist approaches have contributed to our understanding. Some candidates drifted into long descriptions of these approaches without evaluating them, but there were many excellent evaluations of what these approaches have contributed to our understanding of either witch-hunting or the Holocaust. If candidates do feel more comfortable with explaining the main characteristics of the approach first, there is nothing wrong with this as long as they keep it reasonably brief and do go on to explain what it has contributed. There were several useful approaches that enable candidates to accomplish this. Some candidates compared regional studies with other approaches and used this to explain what was distinctive about what has been learned from regional studies. Other candidates explained how structuralist approaches have led to new ways of looking at the Holocaust that have provided particular insights that we would not have without those approaches.

The second part of many good answers moved to an explicit consideration of the disadvantages or shortcomings of the approach under question. Here it is important that candidates try to compare the named approach with other approaches. This should enable them to discuss its shortcomings.

Witch-hunting

There were many excellent answers to (a) with candidates able to interpret and explain interpretations, approaches and methods. Some candidates thought that gender was the interpretation rather than it providing the basis for the approach. The interpretation is very much to do with men exerting power over women. There were plenty of hints in the passage with regards to approaches and methods eg the focus on careful analysis of material already available rather than looking for new material, the use of the case study of Walpurga Hausmanin, references to history from below and to class. There is also some interest in 'mentalities' and even a nod to some psychoanalytical analysis. The key to the best answers was the ability to keep the focus on the extract itself with wider knowledge and understanding being used to improve the quality of the analysis of the extract. Weaker answers wandered away from the extract.

Answers to part (b) varied a great deal. Some candidates were clearly not very familiar with the term regional studies and could provide few examples. They often made simplistic statements such as 'it is limited because it will mean only one region is studied'. Other candidates wrote endlessly, describing one example of regional studies after another without ever getting to any worthwhile evaluation. The best answers produced a brief explanation of what is meant by regional studies, and then proceeded to make relevant use of examples to explain the new insights this approach has provided, as well as exploring its shortcomings. One general weakness that does need to be addressed was the belief held by a number of candidates that regional studies are just a 'start' to understanding witch-hunting rather than an end in themselves.

The Holocaust

In response to the extract there was a fascinating division between those candidates who thought the passage represented a functionalist approach and those who thought it was intentionalist. Marks were awarded to the quality of analysis and understanding rather than to which of these possibilities candidates opted for. Some candidates spotted the extract as coming from Goldhagen and then made the mistake of writing an essay about him rather than about the

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

extract. There were, however, many excellent answers. Most candidates were clear about the main interpretation in the passage and a wide range of approaches and methods were detected including: history from below, the focus on certain police battalions and the reasons for this, the use of examples, as well as functionalism and intentionalism.

In response to (b) there were many good answers that provided clear examples of structuralist approaches enriching our understanding of the Holocaust. Comparisons with intentionalist approaches often worked well here as well as in the later sections about the shortcomings of structuralist approaches. Weaker answers tended to describe structuralism, rather than evaluate it.

F987 Coursework

General points:

Whilst the candidature was too small (22 entries) to draw any meaningful conclusions, it was pleasing to note that candidates responded well to the demands of the new coursework and in some cases produced work of high quality. This needs to be remembered when reading the following report, which focuses necessarily on some of the more evident shortcomings or areas of misunderstanding.

A: The Study

Choice of titles:

Out of the 22 entries, the best titles were those that focused on an individual or an event (no sites were chosen) and contained either a reference to 'significance' (eg 'How significant was Tsar Nicholas II in the development of modern Russia from feudal autocracy to an emerging Communist state by 1924?'), or a reference to 'markers' of significance (eg 'How much of a *turning point* was the First World war in the social and economic advancement of women?'). Less successful titles were either too restricted in scope (eg 'How significant was Thomas Edison in the invention of the phonograph and electric light bulb?'), or too wide and complex (eg 'Who was more significant in Russian history – Lenin or Stalin?'). The latter title is complex in structure as well as in content. In order to answer the question, the candidate needs to (i) assess the significance of Lenin across and over time; (ii) assess the significance of Stalin across and over time; and (iii) combine these calculations into an overall assessment/answer to the question. For this reason, candidates are advised to choose a *single* individual, event or site as the focus for their study in significance.

Significance across time:

In most studies, the 'across time' (synchronic) calculation was generally the stronger of the two – probably because it requires more familiar 'moves' – developing a two-sided argument around an individual event or site; comparing and contrasting the views of historians; making critical use of primary sources. In other words, it resembles, in outline at least, the structure of a traditional essay. However, stronger candidates recognised that they needed to go beyond this – to focus on the *impact* of an individual, event or site on contemporary society, on different groups within society, and/or on factors determining the nature, speed and profundity of the impact. Some candidates were clearly confused between 'significance' and 'importance' - a difficulty commonly compounded by a misdirected title. Consider, for example, the titles: 'How significant were economic conditions in assisting the rise of the Nazi Party?' and 'How far was Stalingrad a turning point in the outcome of the Second World War?' These may contain the word 'significant', or 'turning point' but they are not *about* significance. In fact, each requires a *causal explanation* (of the rise of the Nazi Party and the outcome of the Second World War, respectively), in which the *relative importance* of different causal factors needs to be assessed.

Significance over time:

The 'over time' (diachronic) calculation tended to cause more problems – this time, presumably, for reasons of lack of familiarity with ways of presenting the 'long view'. There are several ways of doing this. For example:

- **The developmental perspective.** This involves the construction of a narrative showing developments before and after the event or individual achievement in question. The timescale covered by the narrative needs to be long enough to identify movement in the

speed and direction of change – characterised as trends, turning points, ‘false dawns’ etc. This might show, for example, that the execution of Charles I - already shown to have had a massive contemporary impact – was of limited significance in a line of development in the relations between Crown and Parliament between, say, 1509 and 1685. It follows from this that the ‘over time’ narrative does not need to be a detailed story – the candidate needs instead to identify a range of ‘salient points’ spanning the event in question – sufficient to enable the calculation of longer-term significance to be made.

- The **historiographical** perspective. This involves critical use of the work of historians who have **either** *already* debated the longer-term significance of the individual, event or site in question, **or** have written on the topic at different points in time, or been subject to different contextual influences. In either case, the work of at least two historians needs to be used, in order to create an argument.
- The **commemorative** perspective. Certain individuals, events or sites can be said to have iconic significance – for example, Magna Carta, the Storming of the Bastille, or ‘9/11’. In these cases, the longer-term significance of the event may appear self-evident; however, the candidate will still need to explain the nature of the phenomenon - how and why is the event commemorated? Why does it seem to transcend the passage of time? What is it about the event etc that causes such an imprint to be left on national consciousness? Does widespread commemoration of an event etc indicate that its significance should be unquestioningly accepted?

Combining the calculations:

There were few examples of genuine integration – or synthesis. One candidate, trying to reconcile the apparent conflict between the contemporary and longer-term significance of WW1 on the economic position of women, argued that the real significance of women’s war work was not so much that occurred, or even that it ended after the war - but that it changed women *themselves*, so that they were more ready to take their opportunities after 1939.

Critical use of evidence:

It is clear from both guidance material and the mark scheme (where separate marks are awarded for the candidate’s use of primary and secondary source material) that calculations of significance are negotiable – ie they are themselves interpretations based partly on the evidence used (and partly on the candidate’s contextual knowledge). The critical use of different kinds of sources is therefore important if calculations of significance are not simply to be based on assertion, or common sense reasoning.

Candidates’ use of sources was variable in quality. Weaker candidates either made no use of sources at all, or inserted short quotations, which, though relevant, served only to illustrate what was being said in the text. Stronger candidates, on the other hand, considered the value as well as the content of source material, interpreted sources in context or with provenance in mind and exploited opportunities for cross and counter-reference. Most important of all, they made critical use of source material in this way to *advance the argument* in some way. In other words, sources were being used critically to generate evidence, rather than simply to display information.

The marking of candidates’ work:

Given the novelty of the new coursework component, it is pleasing to note that the marking of candidates’ work was generally accurate though too generous in some cases. Where this occurred, it tended to be because of one or other of the following:

Report on the Units taken in January 2010

- The rewarding of assertions of significance – usually arrived at by common sense reasoning. In some cases candidates would be rewarded for mere use of the word ‘significant’ or ‘important’ – whether or not what was being so described had any bearing on the central question. In order to gain the higher levels, candidates have to *demonstrate* significance by one or other of the methods outlined above (or another valid method of their own).
- The rewarding of candidates’ use of source material where quotations are used simply to illustrate – or otherwise adorn - what is being said in the main text.
- The rewarding of simplistic ‘then/now’ assertions – ‘If it hadn’t been for Henry VIII we might all still be living in a Catholic country’.

B: The Diary

Several diaries were of high quality, showing clear evidence of the evolution and refinement of the study title in the light of research carried out by the candidate and the amount and quality of the available evidence. The best diaries also contained detailed records of discussions with teachers, such that changes – often quite subtle - in the direction of research were charted.

Weaknesses were also noted in some diaries. For example, there was a tendency to record everything, whether significant or not, in the process. It makes more sense to reader (and in view of the word limit) if there is a focus, either on changes in the direction of research, or on experiences that confirm and deepen the original direction.

The same applies to discussion of individual sources. In the work of stronger candidates, there was a clear sense of the book – or its relevant sections - having been read; in that of weaker candidates, there was a tendency simply to record its acquisition or express an intention to read it by the following week etc.

Grade Thresholds

Advanced GCE History (H508)
 Advanced Subsidiary GCE History (H108)
 January 2010 Examination Series

Unit Threshold Marks

Unit		Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
F981	Raw	50	38	33	28	23	18	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F982	Raw	50	36	31	27	23	19	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F983	Raw	50	34	30	26	23	20	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F984	Raw	50	37	33	29	25	21	0
	UMS	100	80	70	60	50	40	0
F985	Raw	60						
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F986	Raw	60	49	42	36	30	24	0
	UMS	120	96	84	72	60	48	0
F987	Raw	40	32	28	24	20	16	0
	UMS	80	64	56	48	40	32	0

Specification Aggregation Results

Overall threshold marks in UMS (ie after conversion of raw marks to uniform marks)

	Maximum Mark	A	B	C	D	E	U
H108	200	160	140	120	100	80	0

The cumulative percentage of candidates awarded each grade was as follows:

	A	B	C	D	E	U	Total Number of Candidates
H108	11.89	39.86	67.83	88.11	97.20	0	165

For a description of how UMS marks are calculated see:
<http://www.ocr.org.uk/learners/ums/index.html>

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 2010

