

# **History B (Modern World)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J417**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **J117**

## **Examiners' Reports**

---

**January 2011**

**J117/J417/R/11J**

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 2011

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](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## CONTENTS

### General Certificate of Secondary Education

#### History B (Modern World) (J417)

### General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)

#### History B (Modern World) (J117)

## EXAMINERS' REPORTS

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
A971/11-17 Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005 with the Study in Depth	1
A972/21 British Depth Study, 1890-1918	13
A972/22 British Depth Study, 1939-1975	16

## **A971/11-17 Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005 with the Study in Depth**

### **General Comments**

Many responses were of a high standard, using appropriate, well-explained contextual knowledge which focused on the question as set. This resulted in credit being gained for explanation of causation and well thought out argument on either side of the debate where required. However, in other responses candidates needed to develop more than a basic grasp of fundamental facts if they were to develop explanations required by many questions if the higher levels of the mark scheme were to be accessed. Some candidates thought it more appropriate to 'tell the story', over-concentrating on description and narrative, resulting in an impoverished mark.

Sometimes the question itself was not adequately addressed or candidates did not take account of the dates in the question. Candidates need to answer the question as set. Those who provided an answer for a question they had been prepared for, rather than for the question on the paper, were limited to low level marks.

In answering questions relating to 'message' many candidates focused on the main message the cartoonist intended to give and started their answer with this main message. Once the main message had been established it was well-supported using detail from the cartoon. Contextual knowledge directly related to the cartoon completed the process. This approach gained full marks. Some candidates focused more on describing what they could see in the cartoon ('This cartoon shows...'), often with limited interpretation, perhaps in the hope the examiner might try to find a message. Often the knowledge lacked focus on the time period of the cartoon. This approach limited marks.

Some responses indicated that there is a need to be clearer on the demands of a 'purpose' question, compared to the demands of a question with a target of message. Purpose revolves around 'why did they want this poster published' as opposed to message which is 'what does it tell me'. This lack of awareness resulted in many responses to 'purpose' questions remaining weak, with candidates concentrating on 'message'.

There were far more rubric errors than in previous years. A number of candidates attempted all questions in the Aspects of International Relations section of the paper and were then unable to complete the depth study questions as they clearly did not have sufficient time. Some attempted both questions 5 and 6 on the depth study.

## **Core Content**

### **Part 1: Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005**

#### **Section A: The Inter-War Years, 1919-1939**

##### **Q1(a)**

Some of the responses were excellent with immediate recognition of the main message. This related to Stalin not being 'invited' or 'excluded'. Reference to aspects of the cartoon followed to support the message and finally the meeting was put in an historical context. Other responses needed to avoid phrases such as 'the cartoon shows', as this approach often failed to lead to the main message and also led to the use of knowledge reflecting a much wider period than was necessary.

##### **Q1(b)**

The best answers were based on a strong understanding of the significance of the Pact in relation to Hitler's policies and British promises to Poland. This understanding was demonstrated through clear explanation. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of explanation. Sometimes the question itself was not adequately addressed. Candidates did not take account of the final four words ('made war more likely') producing descriptive accounts of the benefits of the Pact, particularly for the Soviet Union.

##### **Q2(a)**

There were many responses showing strong factual detail of Germany's territorial losses under the Treaty. Weaker answers concentrated more on other aspects of the Treaty, such as military terms whilst many erroneously thought Germany had lost the Ruhr, the Rhineland, Austria and the Sudetenland.

##### **Q2(b)**

There were answers which showed a clarity of thinking about the question resulting in a clear, well-explained comparison as to why the aims of the 'Big Three' differed. Other weaker answers described the aims of each individual without making individual links to explain the difficulties.

##### **Q2(c)**

The very best answers to this question were extremely well argued and logically organised. Here the candidates addressed one side of the argument with each explanation presented in a separate paragraph before proceeding to do the same to challenge the question's hypothesis. Occasionally, where an issue could be argued from differing points of view, this was explained in the same paragraph, adding to the overall evaluation of 'how far'. More often 'how far' was addressed in a final evaluative paragraph. Weaker answers often failed to move beyond a one-sided approach which often related to how unfair the Treaty was. Some candidates failed to take account of the fact that Germany had just lost a war and that the treatment they were to receive would reflect that defeat. This approach was often reflected by the candidate writing 'I think...'. These candidates needed to focus more on the historical context.

##### **Q3(a)**

Candidates need to understand what the League of Nations did specifically to improve living and working conditions around the world. Answers were too often limited to general phrases such as 'they improved health' and 'helped refugees' and incorrect phrases such as they 'reduced the hours of work to 48'.

**Q3(b)**

Some responses were good, explaining why, for example, the absence of the USA and the self-centred approach of Britain and France contributed to the difficulties of the League of Nations. Better answers additionally explained the significance of the absence of Germany and Russia and the impact of the withdrawal from membership of Japan. Other answers needed to develop explanation rather than an identification of some of these points.

**Q3(c)**

Some responses were excellent with detailed explanation on either side of the debate. These answers were particularly strong on the events in the 1920s which were considered a success for the League of Nations, and Manchuria and Abyssinia in the 1930s where the League was considered a failure. Others needed to develop identification and description of these events into explanation in order to achieve higher marks.

**Part 1: Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005**

**Section B: The Cold War, 1945-1975**

**Q1(a)**

The best answers recognised that this was not the first time that America had responded to Western Europe's needs and were able to put this in a relevant historical context. Most candidates picked up on Marshall wanting to do something to help Western Europe but most failed to pick up on the disinterest shown by, and positioning of, Uncle Sam. Weaker answers concentrated too much on the idea of Capitalism v Communism in more general terms.

**Q1(b)**

The best answers were based on a sound understanding of the period of history around 1948 with awareness of the problematic nature of Berlin following the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences and the interpretation of 'sphere of control'. Weaker answers were characterised by an attempt to describe the blockade. Some answers showed confusion between the Berlin Blockade and the building of the Berlin Wall.

**Q2(a)**

Many answers demonstrated sound knowledge of the Bay of Pigs invasion and scored highly. Others needed to answer the question as set. Here the content was less focused and ranged from the rule of Batista to the threat of weapon sites. This resulted in overlong answers which used time more valuable for the writing of responses to the high tariff questions.

**Q2(b)**

Many excellent responses showed a good understanding of the reasons for the Soviet Union becoming involved in Cuba, allowing achievement at the highest level. The issues of nearness of the USA and the threat of US missiles in Turkey were particularly well explained. Other responses showed a lack of awareness of what constitutes explanation, relying heavily on identification and description. This approach limited the marks to the lower levels.

**Q2(c)**

There were responses which showed explanation and analysis, a clear presentational style and an ability to consider and judge alternative viewpoints. This question required candidates to consider the different events during the crisis coming to a view as to whether it was Kennedy or Khrushchev who handled these better. Weaker answers lacked this focus on explanation being more comfortable concentrating on a descriptive approach to the crisis. Some confusion existed over the exact nature of the US withdrawal of US missiles from Turkey.

**Q3(a)**

The best responses concentrated on the specific question asked and described issues such as US support for France, the provision of 'military advisers' and the prevention of free elections. Too many answers concentrated on the issue of 'why' the USA was involved in Vietnam. This resulted in many answers focused on the 'domino theory' and 'containment'.

**Q3(b)**

Many answers showed a thorough knowledge of the tactics used by the Communists in Vietnam. However, this seemed to lead to many responses being over descriptive and not adequately addressing the question about why the tactics were effective.

**Q3(c)**

There were responses which showed the need for careful planning of an answer before committing pen to paper. These answers took the two issues from the question and constructed sound explanations, supported by examples from contextual knowledge, producing a balanced, clear argument around the question hypothesis. Other answers failed to show the difference between the two issues resulting in generalised comment about the US withdrawal from Vietnam and a lack of clarity as to the side of the argument being supported.

**Part 1: Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005**

**Section C: A New World? 1948-2005**

**Q1(a)**

Many answers went straight for the main message of the cartoon. This revolved around the point that 'Bush is going to ignore the UN and public opinion'. The support for this message from the cartoon was not as strong with many missing the link between Bush's words, 'They can go hang' with the idea of him being shown as a sheriff. Much stronger was the contextual knowledge applied by many relating to Iraq's failure to comply with the UN over weapons of mass destruction.

**Q1(b)**

Many excellent responses were able to offer at least two explanations of the reasons for the invasion of Iraq. These included the continuing defiance of the UN, weapons of mass destruction and Saddam's human rights record. Others needed to develop their descriptions and identification of reasons into full explanation. Simple listing should be avoided if higher levels are to be achieved.

**Q2(a)**

There were many responses which fell short of gaining full credit. Candidates were often unable to give four pieces of information about the Warsaw Pact. The main point made by the majority was that it was a Communist Pact. Some did go on to indicate that it was dominated by the Soviet Union but most could offer little else.

**Q2(b)**

Good answers produced convincing explanations as to why the Berlin Wall was built. Good detail was offered of the developing West on its impact on people in the East and why this might encourage a loss of both the ordinary citizen and the talented. The best answers put the answer into the context of the time with the challenge to a new US President. Some candidates needed to focus more on these issues rather than the identified point, ie 'to stop movement from the east'. Between 1948 and the early 1960s Berlin was an important aspect of the Cold War and some candidates need to develop a greater awareness of this.

**Q2(c)**

There were responses which showed a full awareness of the part played by Gorbachev in the collapse of Soviet control. These responses featured well-explained reasons putting the response fully into context. The best responses additionally addressed other reasons, to provide a balanced response which placed the answer into the higher mark bands. This included a good explanation as to why Solidarity set an example to others and thus contributed to the collapse of control. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of explanation resulting in an answer which was of a more descriptive nature. Often very little extra was needed to turn this description into explanation.

**Q3(a)**

Most answers offered good definition of what 'terrorism' meant with in some instances examples of terrorist acts. High marks resulted.

**Q3(b)**

Candidates who included examples of events to explain their point as to why people condemned terrorism produced the best answers. Here there were many well constructed arguments using examples such as 11<sup>th</sup> September and the PLO at the Munich Olympics of 1972. These examples were developed into explanations of reasons. Weaker answers were characterised by responses which were description of reasons which identified why people objected to terrorism such as 'the large number of civilian casualties' and 'its destructive effects on normal life'.

**Q3(c)**

Good answers focused on specific events or actions to support arguments. This mainly related to the actions of the British government in relation to the IRA with a consideration of the level of success of a particular action. In order to achieve the highest marks consideration of relative success was crucial. Weaker answers were characterised by the descriptive nature of government action and over-reliance on speculation rather than a basis of fact. This speculation was often in the form of 'If this (government action) had been carried out ... that (event) would not have happened'.

## **Part 2: Depth Study**

### **Germany, 1918-1945**

#### **Q4(a)**

This question was answered well by significant numbers of candidates who correctly recognised that the purpose of the cartoon was to persuade children to mistrust or hate Jews. Less successful responses focused on the message rather than the purpose, typically commenting on the way the picture presented the Nazi stereotype of Jews. The best responses used contextual knowledge about anti-Semitic race studies which formed part of children's education to explain the purpose fully.

#### **Q4(b)**

Most answers tended to focus on the source content to explain (using contextual knowledge) the importance of rallies as a part of Nazi propaganda, which were rewarded at Level 3. There were fewer examples of answers which explained other forms of Nazi propaganda not referred to in the source, eg radios, newspapers, the 1936 Olympics, which would have attracted the higher marks allocated within the mark scheme. A significant number of candidates attempted to evaluate the source using provenance and were rewarded at Level 2.

#### **Q4(c)**

There were many good responses to the question, with candidates recognizing that the cartoon was exposing the suppression of freedoms under the Nazi regime whilst Hitler made hypocritical public proclamations. Most candidates achieved Level 4. Better candidates were able to use their knowledge about the suppression of press, religious or judicial freedom to the cartoon, thereby gaining Level 5.

#### **Q5(a)**

There were many good answers to this question with candidates displaying a good knowledge of the Weimar Constitution which received full marks.

#### **Q5(b)**

Candidates clearly knew a great deal about Weimar up to 1923 and their descriptions of the risings and crises which beset Germany at this time were often detailed, but they tended to describe problems rather than explaining why they posed a threat to the new Republic. Many candidates focused entirely on the economic crisis but failed to relate this to the precise demands of the question. The best responses explained what it was which made the problems or risings a threat to the new Republic.

#### **Q5(c)**

Most candidates were able to explain successes and failures, although there was sometimes a lack of balance as many focused heavily on successes. Candidates were able to make reference to a range of successes including economic, cultural and foreign policy issues. The better responses focused on the question rather than simply describing developments.

**Q6(a)**

Answers to this question were mixed. The best responses recognised that the Nazis struggled during the stated period because of declining support for extremists but still made some progress in terms of membership, organisation and legal strategy. A significant number of candidates wrongly commented on the period before 1924.

**Q6(b)**

Candidates seemed able to identify numerous factors without explaining them fully in the context of the question. Many recognised the importance of Nazi promises, their anti-Semitism, the pledge to overturn the Treaty of Versailles, but needed to go further and explain how each factor contributed to successful election campaigns and results. Inclusion of material after 1932 did not gain credit, and teachers are right to emphasise the importance of looking carefully at the dates given in the question.

**Q6(c)**

Better answers displayed specific knowledge of both the Reichstag Fire and Enabling Act, explaining the impact of both on Hitler's consolidation of power after he became Chancellor, to gain up to 9 marks. Disappointingly, there were a number of unbalanced descriptions of each aspect which, while detailed, did not always meet the demands of the question.

**Russia, 1905-1941**

**Q4(a)**

Most candidates were able to explain the significance of the photograph and use contextual knowledge to explain the problem of food shortages as a failing of the Provisional Government and were rewarded at Level 3. There were fewer attempts to use contextual knowledge to explain other failures, the majority of candidates tending to simply identify other failures which were rewarded at Level 4. Better answers explained other failures such as the continuation of the war, failure to carry out land reform and increasing support for the Bolsheviks.

**Q4(b)**

There were many good answers to the question with candidates recognizing the message and explaining this in a variety of thoughtful responses. The idea of Lenin sweeping away the inequalities of the old regime and ushering in a new era of communism was supported well by own knowledge ranging from the context of the Civil War to the Bolshevik domestic agenda.

**Q4(c)**

Many candidates responded well to this question with good understanding of the context in which Lenin introduced the NEP. A significant number of candidates failed to achieve Level 4 because of one-sided responses which typically expressed surprise because of the capitalistic elements which were a feature of the NEP. These responses could only be rewarded at Level 3.

**Q5(a)**

Most candidates answered this question well. Less successful responses provided general answers about Russian society rather than focusing on the system of rule.

**Q5(b)**

Candidates were generally able to identify or describe issues which caused revolution in 1905 but a significant number tended to simply describe events such as Bloody Sunday. Better responses linked these issues or events to the unrest in 1905.

**Q5(c)**

Candidates tended to answer this question well with a good understanding of the factors which contributed to the Tsar's abdication. Less successful answers simply described issues such as the discrediting of the monarchy by Rasputin and the tsarina or the failure to prosecute the War effort effectively without linking this to the growing disaffection towards the Tsar from various quarters.

**Q6(a)**

There were mixed responses to this question with a significant number of candidates describing general features of Stalin's rule rather than focusing on the specific issue raised in the question. Better responses were able to describe the main features of the 'cult of personality' focusing on the manipulation of Stalin's image by the regime.

**Q6(b)**

Most candidates were able to explain the use of camps to eliminate opponents or 'enemies of the people' and it was good to see that candidates generally understood how the camps became an integral part of the soviet economic planning.

**Q6(c)**

Most candidates identified the positive and negative aspects of Stalin's rule and were able to present a balanced account of his leadership and policies. Very few simply provided one-sided answers. The best responses provided supporting details rather than simply making limited assertions, typically that millions died from famine under Stalin's rule.

**The USA, 1919-1941**

**Q4(a)**

Most candidates were able to give the message of the cartoon, with 'Men spend all their money on drink and neglect their families', 'Drink is evil' and 'Alcohol wrecks families' being the most common messages given. Fewer were able to identify the purpose of the poster; most who did focused on the poster trying to encourage people to support prohibition. Candidates did not often manage to support either message or purpose with contextual knowledge; instead they repeated details from the source. Where contextual knowledge was used, candidates explained that members of the Anti-Saloon League were concerned about the effects of alcohol on family life, with domestic violence and crime being prevalent. Others explained how the USA entering the war increased the desire for prohibition; supporters of prohibition argued that alcohol caused German aggression and also that drinking alcohol was unpatriotic as many brewers were of German descent. Some candidates misinterpreted the cartoon, believing it to be a commentary on speakeasies during the prohibition era.

**Q4(b)**

The best answers explained effectively that although the source explained one aspect of enforcement, there were others. Explanation of these other reasons place the answer in the higher mark ranges. Other reasons offered included the fact that alcohol was easily obtainable in speakeasies and that moonshine was made in people's own homes. Others explained the widespread corruption amongst law enforcement officers and the unsuccessful attempts to police America's borders against the smuggling of alcohol. Weaker answers were often limited to a description of others methods of Prohibition enforcement.

**Q4(c)**

Effective answers expressed lack of surprise by explaining that women had increased opportunities in the job market and had more independence through earning their own money; including the choice about how to spend it. Candidates expressed surprise by explaining that for many women such opportunities did not exist; they were housewives, reliant upon their husbands for money or were employed in low paid jobs. Some candidates focused entirely upon the liberation of women. Clearly this type of response did not actually answer the question.

**Q5(a)**

Some candidates were able to achieve full marks by detailing that older industries faced competition from the newer industries; for example, rayon being used instead of cotton, and electricity being used instead of oil. The fact that newer products were seen as more exciting, modern and were cheaper was also correctly offered. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of knowledge of the older, more established industries.

**Q5(b)**

Good answers focused mainly upon farmers and the black community. Good explanations relating to farmers detailed the effects of over production linked to the increase in international competition and the decreasing overseas market. Answers were developed further by the explanation falling prices, decreasing profits, the inability of farmers to pay their mortgages and the consequent loss of their farms. Explanations relating to the black community either detailed the problems faced by sharecroppers or detailed the discrimination against black people more generally in the job market, with black people only being given the low paid jobs and being the 'last to be hired, first to be fired.' Some candidates wrote about the segregation of black people, but needed to develop this by explaining how this meant they did not benefit from the economic boom.

**Q5(c)**

There were some excellent answers to the question. Candidates explained how the mass production methods pioneered by Henry Ford made the production of cars easier and cheaper and then explained how many other industries were stimulated by the increasing production of cars. Explanations focused on the need for steel, glass and rubber to manufacture the cars, petrol to fuel them and the building of roads to accommodate them. On the other side of the argument policies of the Republican governments (including laissez-faire, low taxation and tariffs), hire purchase, the use of advertisements and mail order were explained to present a balanced answer to the question. Weaker responses were limited to description of the automobile industry and the assembly line, thus failing to establish the link to the economic boom. Other factors contributing to the economic boom were not mentioned.

**Q6(a)**

Candidates displaying detailed knowledge of the effects of the Wall Street Crash for American people. Answers focused upon unemployment, homelessness, bankruptcies and reliance on charity soup kitchens for food.

**Q6(b)**

There were a number of very well presented answers. Candidates explained the dangers of buying on the margin and the failure of many investors to think about the possibility of share prices falling. The better answers showed a clear understanding of how declining confidence led to panic selling of shares. Others answers lacked an understanding of the term speculation. Some were brief, lacking in explanation and failed to relate to the stock market.

**Q6(c)**

Many good responses to this question focused on the American people's perception that Hoover did not care about them. Rugged individualism, laissez-faire and the belief that eventually everything would return to normal were clearly explained to show Hoover's lack of understanding of the plight of ordinary Americans. Some candidates also explained that any action taken by Hoover was seen as too little, too late, as many families had already lost their homes and were living in Hoovervilles. The treatment of the Bonus Marchers was also given as an example of how little Hoover was seen to care. Explanations of the popularity of Roosevelt focused upon his record as Governor of New York State, where he organised the first scheme by any state to help the unemployed. Others explained his public speaking and his great efforts in travelling around the country to talk to people about the problems they faced. Weaker answers having produced explanation relating to Hoover then wrote about Roosevelt's policies after the election, rather than why he gained victory in the election. This meant that many candidates wrote at considerable length about issues not relevant to this particular question.

**Causes and Events of the First World War, 1890-1918**

**Q4(a)**

Some responses were high quality with detailed explanation of the source and of other reasons for the high casualty rate suffered by the British on the first day of the Battle of the Somme. The implication of the failure to breach the wire was well-explained in relation to having to go 'over-the-top'. The security of the German defences and the chance to make preparations having been forewarned were prominent explanations of what was not in the source. Other responses were brief dealing only with the source and thus neglecting to address the 'how far' of the question.

**Q4(b)**

Many answers indicated surprise and supported this view by reference to the source and contextual knowledge. 'If the British and French had such high casualties and faced such a disaster why was the official history saying German troops were losing confidence' was often put forward as an argument for this point of view. Less strong was explanation in relation to 'not surprised'. Only a few answers attempted explanation in relation to the source being an attempt to explain German defeat, being more secure in commenting on the inexperience of the German military.

**Q4(c)**

Many excellent responses gave the message in the early part of the answer and then supported the idea of 'time running out' with reference to aspects of the cartoon including militarism, the posture of the Kaiser and the title. Finally the source was put firmly in the context of the date given in the attribution. Others needed to study the source more carefully. The date was ignored resulting in attempts to place the cartoon either prior to the outbreak of war or after the war had ended. This approach made it more difficult to link to the main message.

**Q5(a)**

There were many very good answers referring to naval rivalry, including the building of Dreadnoughts and the stance of the Kaiser. Some answers concentrated on the naval race rather than answering the question as set. This made it more difficult to achieve full marks.

**Q5(b)**

Some responses were excellent. These contained a number of explanations as to why events in Morocco in 1905-6 increased tension in Europe. Answers were put in the context of the Entente and the Kaiser's interference, the push for Germany to become a major power in Africa and the international conference held in Algeciras. Other responses needed to develop identification and description into explanation to access higher marks. Some responses did not take account of the dates in the question writing at length about the Moroccan Crisis of 1911.

**Q5(c)**

There were responses which showed consistent explanation, a clear and logical style and an ability to consider alternative causes. These responses were characterised by a clear understanding of the significance of the Alliance System and particularly how this impacted on relations between Serbia, Austria and Germany. This approach resulted in the main short-term cause, the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand being viewed within a context, rather than in isolation. On the other side the arms race, a powerful empire and the invasion of Belgium provided alternative explanations. Weaker answers often failed to adequately address the question presenting material which was highly descriptive.

**Q6**

There were too few responses to this question to make comment appropriate and helpful.

**End of Empire, c.1919-1969**

There were too few entries for this option to make comment appropriate and helpful.

**The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom**

**Q4(a)**

Some responses were good. These developed the idea of distrust and suspicion of communism from the source and then went on to explain the role played by McCarthy in exaggerating the threats brought by communism as he capitalised on people's fear and uncertainty. Less strong answers failed to offer explained reasons not given in the source or failed to develop the information in the source. A small number did not get beyond paraphrasing the source.

**Q4(b)**

A significant number of candidates give a correct main message when answering this question. Many of these went on to support their answer from the cartoon by making reference to the letter going up in smoke. The good answers were completed by the use of relevant knowledge which for some was very strong. The weaker answers concentrated too much on describing what they could see in the cartoon.

**Q4(c)**

The best answers saw the purpose of the cartoon, noting that it was a British cartoon for a British audience. However, in many instances candidates were not able to support their answer with contextual knowledge about the House Un-American Activities Committee.

**Q5(a)**

Some candidates were able to link their responses to the end of segregation in the armed forces to the impact of the Second World War. Less strong answers often contained more general information about the position of African Americans in American society without making reference to the War.

**Q5(b)**

There were many strong answers to this question. Many of these answers were explained, highlighting differences in education and discrimination in relation to employment. Less strong answers failed to explain the reasons they had identified and this approach limited the marks achievable.

**Q5(c)**

There were many answers which showed good understanding of the Montgomery Bus Boycott in relation to the struggle for civil rights. However, many did not take their answer further to explain other factors, thus limiting the marks achieved. Some answers were limited as they only described the Bus Boycott.

There were too few answers to question 6 to make comment appropriate and helpful beyond noting that most answers confused Native Americans and Hispanic Americans.

## **A972/21 British Depth Study, 1890-1918**

### **General Comments**

The overall impression gained from this session was that the majority of candidates found the examination difficult. There was little reason to assume that the paper itself was particularly difficult, and the impression of most examiners was that candidates were not ready for the demands which this paper places on them. This would be consistent with a large number of candidates taking the paper at a comparatively early stage of the course. It was suggested last year that this may not be beneficial to many candidates in terms of the effect on their confidence. On the other hand, it may be the view of centres that candidates gain useful experience.

It is not the role of examiners to advise on teaching methods in preparation for this paper. However, it is hoped that this report can be used as a guide to inform how the paper is taught. What is apparent is that very few if any candidates lack a good working knowledge of the period. In fact, more of a problem is the candidates' desire to share that knowledge with the examiner, irrespective of the question. We see relatively few answers where the contextual knowledge is irrelevant to the general topic of the question. However, we do see a great deal of contextual knowledge which makes no contribution to answering the question. In short, candidates have little trouble remembering information, but they sometimes have considerable trouble in making constructive use of it. Centres may wish to consider ways of devoting less time to enabling candidates to acquire information and more time to strategies which help students to discuss the intent and value (in historical terms) of the sources they are exposed to. Most candidates appear to start from a position that sources are inherently useful or reliable. In reality, the key questions centre not on whether sources are useful or reliable but on what they are useful or reliable for. This understanding is conceptually challenging and requires time and skill to develop.

Centres are advised to make candidates aware that the priority of the examiners as they apply the mark scheme is to reward answers which actually address the question. Many candidates seem to believe that the object of the paper is to showcase skills of evaluation irrespective of their relevance to the question. To award marks for such answers is clearly unfair on candidates who apply themselves to answering the actual question which is set.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

Most candidates were able to reach Level 2 and explain the secondary message of the source. It is worth considering the fine differences between the different levels within this question. They are intellectually subtle but they are also clear. Centres may wish to share examples of good answers with candidates and ask them to consider why one answer is better than another. For example:

- L2 Secondary message: The message of the poster is that women around the world are getting the vote.
- L3 Main message: The message of the poster is that women around the world are getting the vote, so the Suffragettes are saying why are women not getting the vote in Britain?
- L4 Main message in context: The message of the poster is that women around the world are getting the vote, so the Suffragettes are saying why are women not getting the vote in Britain? Countries like New Zealand are in the British Empire so it is stupid that women in Britain do not have the vote.

The key to getting beyond Level 2 is to stop treating the scene in the source as a real scene and to realise it is an authored artefact, and it has been authored in order to convey a message. In short, candidates would do well to ask themselves 'why did someone go to the trouble of

creating this image?'. A final point is that source detail simply decides the candidate's mark within level. Selecting detail is not creditworthy in its own right, only when it supports the answer being put forward.

## Question 2

Responses to this question were generally disappointing. In a question which asks candidates which source they trust, examiners find it very difficult to award marks to answers which do not use the word trust, or a synonym, anywhere in the answer. To do so is unfair on candidates who have taken the time and effort to consider their answer.

The weakest responses simply summarised each source, or picked out points and asserted they were true. Many answers limited themselves to the level of stock evaluation. Typical examples were statements such as 'Source B only tells one side and misses a lot out' or 'Source C was by Emmeline Pankhurst'. It seems likely that in many cases such statements were implying mistrust of C because Pankhurst was the leader of the Suffragettes and was praising the suffragettes using language such as 'wonderful triumph'. Candidates who did explain this point were rewarded at the evaluation level. Candidates who did not explain such points fully cannot expect examiners to complete their thinking for them and reward them. To do so would be unfair to candidates who had explained their thinking. Similarly, candidates who launched into accurate and detailed accounts of Suffragette campaigns were not rewarded for their knowledge. If they used this knowledge to show that Source B was reliable and therefore trustworthy then they were credited.

Many candidates did take the obvious opportunities to evaluate each source. The purpose, tone, provenance and content of each source were all suitable subjects for evaluation either by use of knowledge or the content of the sources. Some candidates made good use of Sources F, G and or H to support their arguments. In fact, it was very clear to examiners that candidates who had taken the time to read all of the sources before starting on the paper benefited hugely from doing so.

Numerous scripts bore the evidence of acronyms such as WWWW (Who? What? Where? When? Why?). It may be that for some candidates such approaches can be counter-productive, as we saw many answers which were simply general commentaries on the sources, occasionally teetering on a valid point but then moving on to the next 'W'. If weaker candidates do need such frameworks, then they might be better advised to focus primarily on the purpose of any source. The purpose of any source holds the key to its value to the historian.

## Question 3

Most candidates found it relatively easy to use details from the photograph to argue that the Suffragists were effective campaigners and thereby reach Level 3. Relatively few got beyond this level. Many of those who did took an unexpected but completely valid approach, arguing that the detail of the source suggested the Suffragists were effective but then using their contextual knowledge of the Conciliation Bill to argue that their success was not unlimited. Rather more candidates simply wrote about the Conciliation Bill, limiting themselves to Level 2 or lower on the grounds that it was unfair to reward answers which did not consider at all whether the source proved the Suffragists were effective campaigners. A small but pleasing number of candidates reached the very top level, recognising that the very existence of the photograph proved the effectiveness of the Suffragists as campaigners. By taking the staged picture, the movement demonstrated its understanding of the propaganda potential of new technology such as photography, and some candidates developed this further with references to the effective use of film by Suffragists.

#### Question 4

In this question candidates tended to be at Level 3 with the secondary message of the source or leap to much higher levels by commenting on the purpose of the source. As with Question 1, candidates might benefit from some class time being invested in explaining the distinctions herein:

- Secondary message: Women have stopped thinking about the vote as they think the war effort is more important.
- Main message: Women should stop thinking about the vote because the war effort is more important.
- Main purpose: The source was published to encourage women to stop thinking about the vote and concentrate on the war effort because it was more important.

As with question 1, source detail and/or contextual knowledge determined marks within levels and were not rewarded in their own right. Centres are advised to encourage candidates to think about the main topic of the paper when using their contextual knowledge to tackle questions such as this. The focus was on the vote, and so detail about the importance of the war effort in securing victory (or indeed what women did more generally) was unlikely to be rewarded except where it was used to make a point about the vote.

#### Question 5

Many candidates found this question very difficult. As with question 2, in a question which asks candidates which source they think is more useful, examiners find it very difficult to award marks to answers which do not use the word useful, or a synonym, anywhere in the answer. And in the interests of fairness, candidates who did try to evaluate the usefulness of the sources were rewarded. Source F was generally handled better than Source G. Asquith's change of mind was pinpointed as useful in showing the impact of war work in terms of getting the vote. Many answers used their knowledge of Asquith's pre-war experiences and attitudes to good effect. Source G was generally not tackled well, despite the potential for effective cross reference with Source H which immediately followed it. One excellent response pointed out that: "The fact that Millicent Fawcett is now a "Dame" shows that maybe the war was not the defining factor in women getting the vote, she has been officially recognised and rewarded for her efforts, so therefore the source says that the suffragists were the most important factor in women gaining the vote."

#### Question 6

Most candidates seem to have a very good understanding of what is required in this question. Centres might be interested in examiners' comments about the approaches taken by candidates. For example, many candidates draw up a small diagram and list sources on the 'Yes' or 'No' side. This does seem to help produce well argued answers. On the other hand, some candidates struggle to manage the process of grouping sources and then explaining how the sources support the statement. Often such answers start by saying that Sources P, Q, R, S support the statement and then simply writing out the contents of these sources without explaining why they support the statement. Once again, centres might wish to consider practice sessions in which candidates try this grouped approach and a source by source approach and see which they find better suited to them.

## **A972/22 British Depth Study, 1939-1975**

### **General Comments**

The general standard in this session was comparable to January 2010, perhaps a little stronger. At the quality end of performances there was clear knowledge, good technique and an understanding of what was required in response to each type of question. At the weaker end, there were a number of regularly occurring problems. Often, candidates would spend too much time describing the content of the source(s) before dealing with the focus of the question. Many candidates filled their answers with general contextual knowledge without much thought as to its relevance or how to make it relevant. These candidates tended to drift from the main focus of the questions. Some candidates answered their own questions rather than the ones set for the paper, or they described the content of the sources without addressing the question. This would seem to be consistent with a large number of candidates taking the paper at a comparatively early stage of the course. It was suggested last year that this may not be beneficial to many candidates in terms of the effect on their confidence. On the other hand, it may be the view of centres that candidates gain useful experience.

It is not the role of examiners to advise on teaching methods in preparation for this paper. However, it is hoped that this report can be used as a guide to inform how the paper is taught. Centres are advised to make candidates aware that the priority of the examiners as they apply the mark scheme is to reward answers which actually address the question. Many candidates seem to believe that the object of the paper is to showcase skills of evaluation irrespective of their relevance to the question. To award marks for such answers is clearly unfair on candidates who apply themselves to answering the actual question which is set.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### **Question 1**

This question was generally answered well. Some candidates were unable to restrain their own personal views that they felt the scene in the source was unfair to women. Other answers at the weaker end of the scale simply listed details in the source. Most candidates, however, were able to see that source was useful in that it illustrated the role of a woman in the 1950s.

A pleasing number of candidates were able to see that more could be gained from this source by recognising that the key approach with such sources is to stop treating the scene in the source as a real scene and to realise it is an authored artefact, and it has been authored in order to convey a message. In short, candidates would do well with all such sources to ask themselves 'why did someone go to the trouble of creating this image?'. In this case, the image's purpose was to sell bread, and it did so by creating an idealised image of a woman's role. Many candidates challenged the source on this basis. At the highest level candidates were able to see that this bias was extremely useful in that it unconsciously revealed much about society's attitudes towards women and how they were reinforced.

#### **Question 2**

Responses to this question were mixed, but for many candidates this was the weakest question in their paper. In a question which asks candidates whether they are surprised, examiners find it very difficult to award marks to answers which do not use the word surprised, or a synonym, anywhere in the answer. To do so is unfair on candidates who have taken the time and effort to consider their answer.

Most candidates were able to reach Level 3 by contrasting the content of each source. A significant minority simply failed to address the differences between each source and simply performed a general and generalised attempted evaluation of each source. Interestingly, a noticeable number of candidates did recognise the patronising tone of Source B but were unable to work out what to do with their understanding. Those who were able to make use of this understanding to show that B and C were in fact very similar in their content scored at the higher levels.

### Question 3

The majority of candidates understood the main purpose of the source although many struggled to frame their explanations clearly or to put their answers into the context of 1969. Large numbers of candidates saw the message and/or purpose of source D and linked that to legislation, and changes in education, to evaluate the source. However, many candidates could not readily understand that the leaflet was giving information to parents and suggesting that their daughters should consider remaining at school to acquire better qualifications and to secure a career rather than get a job. There were also strange answers driven by conspiracy theories. Motives that the government were supposed to have behind this leaflet were plots to keep girls at school so boys could have the jobs at the school leaving age, to keep immigrants from stealing jobs, and to make parents think more about their daughters and refrain from divorcing. Such candidates might be encouraged to think through a process in which they distinguish secondary message, main message and purpose:

- Secondary message: Girls are going to get better qualifications.
- Main message: Get your daughter to see the careers teacher to advise her about getting qualifications and a better job in the future.
- Main purpose in context: The government wants a skilled workforce and is responding to changes in society such as feminism but also changes like the Pill. Government wants girls to see the careers teacher for advice about getting qualifications and a better job in the future.

### Question 4

Many candidates found it difficult to tackle this question. As with question 2, examiners found many answers which did not address the accuracy of either source. Such answers were not credited, in fairness to candidates who had answered the question. Many candidates simply summarised each source, with some simply asserting the veracity of each. Although there were some excellent evaluations of both sources by contextual knowledge, this question saw many stock evaluations for example on Source E: 'She would know it was right as it happened to a family member' or 'You can't trust it as it is from a feminist website' or 'Much later on'. For Source F we had oft repeated, 'You can't trust an MP' and 'As a campaigner for women, she would exaggerate everything.' Some tried to answer about accuracy by comparing the content of both sources. There were also ample opportunities to cross reference to sources B, C and H at the very least.

### Question 5

Responses to this question were very mixed. Most candidates were able to see at least the secondary message of the cartoon. Again, this is where their general experience of sources lets them down. They need to ask themselves why a cartoonist would draw a cartoon to set out the terms of the Act when this would have been widely reported. Many candidates treated the cartoon as a real scene, rather than realising that the cartoon was authored in order to express an opinion, in this case critical of the effects of the divorce laws. It would be beneficial to get students to discuss in the class the difference between statements such as these:

- The message of the cartoon is that when there is a divorce the woman gets half of everything.

- The message of the cartoon is that it is not right that when there is a divorce the woman gets half of everything.

### **Question 6**

Most candidates seem to have a very good understanding of what is required in this question. Centres might be interested in examiners' comments about the approaches taken by candidates. For example, many candidates draw up a small diagram and list sources on the 'Yes' or 'No' side. This does seem to help produce well argued answers. On the other hand, some candidates struggle to manage the process of grouping sources and then explaining how the sources support the statement. Often such answers start by saying that Sources P, Q, R, S support the statement and then simply writing out the contents of these sources without explaining why they support the statement. Once again, centres might wish to consider practice sessions in which candidates try this grouped approach and a source by source approach and see which they find better suited to them.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2011

