

# **History A (Schools History Project)**

General Certificate of Secondary Education

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

## **Mark Scheme for June 2011**

---

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

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

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the Report on the Examination.

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

© 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)

**PAPER A952/22 CRIME AND PUNISHMENT****Introduction**

OCR will have provided you with a CD disk copy of the ASSESSORS' INSTRUCTIONS. This gives details of all administrative procedures. You should read it carefully before starting to mark. The additional notes below deal with instructions that are specific to this paper and how it is to be marked.

- 1 This marking scheme has been designed to assess candidates' skills in using sources, and their understanding of concepts relating to these skills, such as reliability, proof, similarity/difference. None of these skills and conceptual understandings can be demonstrated without the use of knowledge and information, but the testing of knowledge for its own sake is never the primary objective.
- 2 The marking scheme does not give examples of all possible, rewardable answers. There will almost always be a range of support which could be used in an answer. *Examiners must recognise and reward relevant material, even if it is not included in the marking scheme.* Just as important, where an example of an answer is given in the marking scheme, markers should not expect all rewardable answers to duplicate the example.
- 3 *It is important to keep in mind that in the examination candidates have a limited amount of time to demonstrate what they can do. The skills and concepts being assessed are not all straightforward. Marking should not, therefore, be punitive. It should reward candidates for what they have managed to achieve, and not penalise them for lack of knowledge, understanding or skill.*

**Levels of Response Marking**

- 4 This type of marking scheme rewards the level of skill or understanding displayed in an answer. The marker's task is to read the answer and identify the level it has reached. If a candidate's answer reaches a particular level, it **MUST** be awarded a mark within that level, regardless of any other considerations. A marker does not have the discretion to place what s/he regards as a weak/strong example in a level lower/higher than that to which it corresponds.
- 5 Often a level will comprise a band of marks. The marking scheme will usually give specific directions for the award of marks within a band, but where it does not, the marker has discretion to choose an appropriate mark within the band, bearing in mind the amount of supporting information used, and whether the answer can be regarded as a strong/weak example of the level.
- 6 Do not expect the whole of an answer to demonstrate attainment at the same level. Candidates may include a variety of perceptions, at various levels, in their answers. It is the highest level achieved in any part of the answer, no matter how brief, that earns the final mark to be awarded.
- 7 In levels of response marking, the award of marks within an answer is not cumulative, and neither does an answer have to demonstrate achievement in lower levels to be awarded a higher level mark.

- 8 Examples of responses which are given in the marking scheme are no more than examples. They are not prescriptive. There will be many other answers which fall within a given level. **The important aspect of each level is the LEVEL DESCRIPTOR.** Do not try to match the candidate's words with those in the example; rather, match the quality of the answer with the level descriptor.
- 9 If you come across an answer which is valid, but which does not fit into any of the level descriptors, consult the senior examiner who is supervising your work. He will advise you on placing the answer in the most appropriate equivalent level.
- 10 As a marker, your most important task is correctly to identify the level into which an answer falls. Deciding on the correct mark *within* a level is also significant, but it is unlikely to make such a difference as an incorrect decision about a level.
- 11 Where an answer merits the top mark in a level, do not hesitate to award it. There is no sense in artificially deflating marks by always awarding low marks within a level. If all markers were to adopt such an ungenerous approach, the effect would simply be to narrow and bunch the total mark range available.

### Marking Technique

- 12 Half marks are never used, and must never be awarded.
- 13 The maximum mark for each question is fixed. Never transfer marks from one question to another.
- 14 You must mark the scripts in the following way:
- As you read an answer, you will come across certain passages which clearly satisfy the requirements of a particular level. Underline such material, and note in the right-hand margin the level being achieved (eg L2). By the end of the answer there may be several such annotations.
  - You may, if you wish, make other notes in the margin, briefly explaining why you have awarded a certain level. These will be helpful to anyone who subsequently checks your marking.
  - When you finish reading an answer, the highest level achieved will be evident from your notes in the right-hand margin. Now you must decide the mark within that level to be awarded. When you have decided, write the level and the mark as follows in the right-hand margin at the end of the answer (eg L4/7) and draw a circle round it to indicate that this is the final mark awarded. There will, then, be a circled mark for every question.
  - *When you have finished a script, transcribe the circled question marks to the front page of the script for totaling.*

## A952/22 Final Marking Scheme, June 2011 Examination

## Question 1 [6 marks]

Study Source A. Why do you think the Government produced this notice? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

<b>Level 1</b>	<p><b>Repeats details of the source</b> [1]          ie no valid reasons, just quoting from the source/provenance.  <i>eg They posted up this notice before the demonstration.</i>  <b>OR</b>  <b>Misinterpretations</b>          ie reasons based on the idea that the notice is in favour of the demonstration.</p>
<b>Level 2</b>	<p><b>Because of the meeting</b> [2]          But no reason given for why the government would wish to stop it.</p>
<b>Level 3</b>	<p><b>Valid reasons from the source</b> [3-5]          One mark per reason.          To stop the meeting/stop people going/warn people against going  <b>OR</b>          Because of reasons given in the source about the nature of the meeting  <i>eg Because the meeting would be illegal, it would be dangerous to public peace etc.</i>  <b>OR</b>          To tell people about the instructions that had been given to the police</p>
<b>Level 4</b>	<p><b>Reasons based on valid inference(s) about the Government's attitude towards the campaign for workers' rights/greater democracy/danger of revolution</b> [6]  <i>eg Because they were frightened of the campaign for workers' rights.</i></p>

## Notes:

1. Don't allow any reasons based on the unpopularity of the police.
2. Above L1, all you will be rewarding will be **reasons**.

**Question 2 [8 marks]**

*Study Source B. How far do you believe this account? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.*

- Level 1**      **Uncritical acceptance**      **[1]**  
 ie no valid reason given.  
*eg I do believe that the police attacked the crowd.*  
**OR**  
**Unsupported assertions**  
*eg No I don't believe it because it is obviously biased.*
- Level 2**      **Yes, because it tells me that it's true**      **[2]**  
*eg I do believe it because it says it's a full and true account.*
- Level 3**      **Explained provenance**      **[3]**  
 ie explaining whether or not you would believe a broadsheet/something published close to the date. Unexplained comments about provenance = L1  
*eg I'm not sure it's very credible because this kind of sheet would just get printed quickly after the event and it could be written by anyone. Who knows where they got their information?*
- Level 4**      **No: because at that time people hated the police, so it will be biased**      **[4]**  
 ie uses contextual knowledge about attitudes to the police, but no use of source content to illustrate bias.
- Level 5**      **Yes/No, answers explained through source content**      **[5-6]**  
 These answers must be explained and logical. Assertions = L1  
**(i) Yes: because the source is balanced in its sympathies**  
*eg Yes, it is believable because it is not one-sided. Although it obviously thinks the police are to blame for attacking the crowd, it still shows concern for the fact that a policeman was murdered.*  
**(ii) No: lack of plausibility/reliability of content**  
*eg No, is it likely that 3000 police would be needed to control 1000 demonstrators?*  
**(iii) No: language shows bias against the police**  
*eg It's not believable. It says the police made a 'desperate attack'. This is biased against them. I'm sure it wasn't like that.*
- Level 6**      **Cross-references details of source to decide un/reliable**      **[7-8]**  
*eg It doesn't seem reliable to me. It claims that there were 3000 police to deal with the crowd, but the Background Information tells me that there were only about 3000 men in the whole force so the source is obviously wrong.*  
*eg I don't find it very reliable at all. It claims that the police made a desperate attack on the demonstrators but we know from the government statement in Source E that this is not true because the Minister says that not one policeman took action until the crowd started throwing stones at them.*

**Question 3 [9 marks]**

*Study Source C. How useful is this source as evidence about the Coldbath Fields riot? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.*

Note: the answer must address the concept of utility (or reliability). The word 'useful' might not be there, but eg 'the source says.....' is not enough.

- Level 1 Undeveloped provenance [1]**  
*eg It's very useful because it's a picture from the nineteenth century.*  
 [Don't allow any speculation about provenance: all we know is that it is a 19<sup>th</sup> century drawing.]  
**OR**  
**Unsupported assertions**  
*eg Not useful because it's biased against the police.*
- Level 2 Useful for what it shows OR not useful for what it does not show [2-3]**  
 ie about the riot. For 'not useful', they must identify something specific about the riot that the source does not tell them.  
*eg I think it is useful because it shows the way the crowd were attacking the police and that there were more rioters than police.*
- Level 3 Both aspects of L2 [4]**  
*eg [L2 example plus] But there are some things it is not useful for, such as showing whether or not the police had closed off all the routes by which people could escape.*
- Level 4 Not useful: typicality/plausibility [5]**  
*eg Not useful as it only shows a small section of the crowd. How can we know what was going on elsewhere?/ Not useful. It doesn't make sense that in the middle of a riot someone would throw a dog up in the air.*
- Level 5 Useful because it's balanced, so reliable [6]**  
 ie it shows both sides of the crowd in an even-handed way, so you can trust it.
- Level 6 Not reliable so not useful, explained using source detail [7-8]**  
 ie this will argue that the source is biased, so is therefore unreliable: they can argue bias either way, ie for or against the police, but MUST use source content to show this.  
*eg Not useful because it is biased in favour of the police. You can see this because one of the rioters is beating up a policeman on the ground which makes them look like they were to blame.*
- Level 7 Useful as evidence of attitudes towards the police [9]**  
 Attitude can be sympathetic or hostile, but must be illustrated from source content, or just L2.  
*eg It is obviously biased in favour of the police. You can see this because one of the rioters is beating up a policeman on the ground. However, it still tells us something useful about peoples' attitudes at the time. It's obvious that not everyone opposed the new police force otherwise the artist would not have drawn a picture sympathetic to them*

**Question 4 [9 marks]**

Study Sources D and E. Does Source D make you surprised by what Source E says? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Note: the answer must address 'surprise', and logic of the answer must be consistent with surprised/not.

- Level 1**      **Identifies aspects of source(s) that are/are not surprising, but no reasons given** [1]  
*eg It is surprising that the eye-witness thinks the meeting was legal.*  
**OR**  
**Unsupported assertions**
- Level 2**      **Misinterpretations: not surprised because they agree** [2]  
*eg No, Source D does not make me surprised because he says he saw the police knock people down and Source E agrees that the police could hit people who resisted.*
- Level 3**      **Surprised/not surprised, reasons based on purpose/lack of reliability of Source D and/or E** [3-4]  
 ie evaluates Source D/E (which can be by cross-reference to other sources) to decide surprised/not, but without comparison of source content for differences.  
*eg I am surprised that the Minister claims that the police did nothing until the mob starting throwing stones, because if you look at Source B you can see that it was the police who attacked first. The Minister is obviously just trying to protect the police and to cover up the truth.*
- Level 4**      **Surprised, compares content for difference** [4-5]  
*eg I'm surprised because the two accounts differ so much. For example, in Source D he says that the police had closed off all the routes of escape, but in Source E it says the opposite – that the police deliberately made space for the rioters to pass.*
- Level 5**      **Not surprised: L4 difference of content explained by undeveloped provenance** [6]  
*eg [L4 plus] But this isn't that surprising given that Source E is the Minister who is on the side of the police, and Source D was one of the rioters.*
- Level 6**      **Compares content for difference, decides surprised/not through cross-reference to other source(s)** [7]  
 ie but no explanation of purpose.  
*eg The two accounts differ a lot. For example, in Source D he says that the police attacked innocent women and children, and in Source E the Minister says there was no deliberate attack on women and children. It's obvious who is telling the truth though. In Source F the cup that they presented to the jury man said that the police were brutally attacking the people who were peacefully assembled. So I am surprised that the Minister says different.*
- Level 7**      **Compares content for difference, explains lack of surprise by evaluating Source D and/or Source E through purpose** [8-9]  
 One source evaluated at this level = 8 marks, both = 9 marks.  
*eg The two accounts differ a lot. For example, in Source D he says that the police attacked innocent women and children, and in Source E the Minister says there was no deliberate attack on women and children. This isn't surprising though. The Minister obviously would want to cover up the brutality of the police as he doesn't want a big scandal.*

**Question 5 [8 marks]**

*Study Source F. Does this source prove that PC Culley was guilty of 'brutally attacking' people at Coldbath Fields? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.*

- Level 1 Provenance: it's just a cup [1]**  
*eg It can't prove it one way or the other. It's just a cup.*
- Level 2 Yes, the inscription says so [2]**  
*eg It does prove it. The inscription on the cup says he was killed while he was brutally attacking the people who were peacefully assembled.*
- Level 3 Yes, because of the jury's verdict [3]**  
*eg It proves it. The jury found that Culley's murder was justified so this means they thought he was attacking the crowd.*
- Level 4 No, because of the bias of the Milton Street Committee [4-5]**  
*ie this can be detected through the language of the inscription, or from the political sympathies of the Committee.  
 eg I don't think it proves it. The Committee sounds like it was a bunch of people who supported what the crowd did because it calls the jury's verdict 'glorious', which means they were against the police and the government.*
- Level 5 No: generalised reference to confusion of the riot [6]**  
*eg No it doesn't. How can anyone be sure what happened given the confusion that occurs in the middle of a riot?*
- Level 6 Cross-reference to other sources on the events of the riot [7]**  
*eg The cup claims that Culley was brutally attacking the crowd, but there's a lot of doubt about this. We don't really know who started the riot. In Source E the Minister doesn't think that the police were to blame in any way. So I don't think the cup is proof.*
- Level 7 No: Use of specific contextual knowledge/Background Information on hostility to police at that time [8]**  
*eg I think you would have to be careful about believing what it says on the cup. There were many people at that time who were suspicious of the police, and who never wanted the Metropolitan Police to be set up. They would be ready to take advantage of any chance to embarrass the police, so they would be delighted at the jury's verdict. It doesn't prove that Culley was attacking anyone, it just shows how suspicious people were of the police.*

**Question 6 [10 marks]**

Study all the sources. 'The police were to blame for the Coldbath Fields riot.' How far do the sources on this paper support this view? Use the sources and your knowledge to explain your answer. Remember to identify the sources you use.

- Level 1**      **Answers on the police and the riot – no valid source use [1-2]**
- Level 2**      **Non-specific source use**      **[3]**  
 ie no supporting detail, no reference to source by letter or quote.  
 At this level candidates may talk of 'the sources', 'some sources', or even identify sources without using the detail in them.
- Level 3**      **Uses source(s) for *or* against the idea that the police were to blame**      **[4-6]**
- Level 4**      **Uses source(s) for *and* against the idea that the police were to blame**      **[7-9]**

Bonus of up to two marks in any level for any qualification of a source in relation to its reliability, sufficiency etc but total for question must not exceed 10.

**Notes:**

- To score in L3/L4 there must be source **use**, ie direct reference to source content, showing **how** it supports/does not support the hypothesis.
- Only credit source use where reference is made to a source by letter or direct quote. Simply writing about issues in the sources is not enough.
- Higher marks in L3/L4 to be awarded on numbers of sources used.
- When marking, indicate each valid source use with 'Y' for police to blame and 'N' for police not to blame.
- When sources are grouped together by the candidate, the conclusion reached must be valid for all the sources grouped. If so, award one Y/N. If not, no Y/N awarded.

<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
<b>B C D F</b>	<b>(A) C E</b>

**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