

History B (Modern World)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE J417**

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

Reports on the Units

June 2010

J417/J117/R/10

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

General Certificate of Secondary Education History B (Modern World) (J417)

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) History B (Modern World) (J117)

REPORTS ON THE UNITS

Unit/Content	Page
A971/11-17 Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005 with the Study in Depth	1
A981 Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005	13
A972/21 British Depth Study, 1890-1918	14
A972/22 British Depth Study, 1939-1975	19
A973 and A982 Historical Enquiry Controlled Assessment	23

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

General Comments

Whilst many candidates possessed a sound knowledge of the period studied, many others lacked even a basic grasp of fundamental facts, making it more difficult for them to develop the explanations required by many questions if the higher levels of the mark scheme were to be accessed. Others thought it more appropriate to 'tell the story', concentrating too much on description and narrative, which resulted in an impoverished mark.

Similarly the ability to deal with sources varied considerably. In answering questions relating to 'message' it is important that candidates focus on the main message the cartoonist, etc, intended to give and for this to be stated at the beginning of the answer. Adopting this approach ensures an answer to the question which will usually gain at least four of the seven marks available. Once the main message has been established it can be supported using evidence from the detail of the cartoon. The final step is to include contextual knowledge directly related to the cartoon, not just the period. Many markers observed that candidates were prepared to describe what they could see in the cartoon ('The cartoon shows...'), perhaps with limited interpretation, and expect the examiner to try and find the message. A good example of description against interpretation came in the 'Iron Curtain' cartoon where a common descriptive answer was 'Churchill is looking under the iron curtain', a Level 1 response, as opposed to 'Churchill wants to know what is happening behind the Iron Curtain', a Level 3 response.

Many responses to 'purpose' questions remain weak, with candidates thinking the target is the same as 'message'. The answer should make clear the purpose of publication very early in the answer and then support it with contextual knowledge.

Candidates should take the opportunity to be flexible in their learning so that they can apply their knowledge in a variety of ways which answer the question as set. Too often it seems that candidates do not like the question as set and therefore want to write their own.

The paper now has questions based on three different core content sections. Unfortunately a number of candidates appeared to find this confusing, answering or attempting questions from more than one core content section. Candidates should be made more clearly aware of the core content they have been prepared for, so as to ensure they answer the correct questions. Questions across the different cores cannot be mixed. Whilst the Inter-War Years remained the most popular, it was noted by examiners that more candidates were being prepared for the Cold War core. A small number answered questions from A New World?

Core Content

Part 1 Section A

- 1 (a) Most candidates were able to identify the message of the cartoon, either the hypocrisy of Germany's apparent claims of peace, yet heavily armed, or the breaking of the Treaty of Locarno/other agreements. Details from the cartoon were used well to support assertions and most were able to offer some form of contextual support, either from the terms of Locarno itself or by relating back to demilitarisation established at Versailles. Some more able candidates were able to make full use of the sarcastic nature of the rhyme, seeing the message as more of a test for Britain and France to judge their reaction. However, the majority ignored the rhyme in this way, using it only to impart the fact that Germany was re-entering the Rhineland.

Common errors seemed to be the belief that the League of Nations was somehow responsible for the Rhineland and that it was their duty to step in and resolve the crisis. Many believed that Germany had defied the League by entering in the first place.

- 1 (b) Most candidates were able to tackle this question with little apparent difficulty offering a range of reasons for appeasement. The most popular explanation related to the fear of another war. This was explained well in many cases with details of the horrors of trench warfare, the death toll, huge financial cost and impact on the Home Front. Some also linked this into the personal military experience of the government and thus their unwillingness to proceed militarily against Hitler. Others used the fact that Germany would be a useful ally against Communist Russia, although this tended to be less well explained. Reference to Britain's belief that Versailles was too harsh was a common theme, as was the need to generate a delay before the start of war in order to build up the armed forces. Some made reference to Britain's perceived selfishness, either by making reference to the Great Depression and the need to focus on internal affairs, or the fact that Hitler did not seem to be heading our way given his pronouncements on the East!

- 2 (a) This was generally well known although there was some confusion over precise numbers for the army and navy. The number and type of ships in the navy were also a difficulty with some confusing 'ships' for 'battleships'. Others remained confused about the Rhineland. Time was occasionally wasted by candidates who offered other terms of the Treaty, ignoring the question.

- (b) In the majority of cases this was done well, although there were a few candidates who interpreted this question as referring solely to aims rather than an explanation of why he adopted those aims. The most popular explanation tended to be based on France's experiences in WW1. Many made the usual comments about the size of land destroyed, number of dead and infrastructure ruined. Others made comments about the huge debts that France owed and the cost of rebuilding, linking this to the need to make Germany pay, especially as Germany had suffered little damage. Again candidates were usually well informed, although some were determined to explain why Lloyd George also wanted harsh treatment whilst Wilson did not. Although often mentioned, the dates of the Franco-Prussian war were not well known. Disappointingly there was some evidence to suggest that candidates were not aware of the difference between description and explanation.

- (c) The meaning of 'justified' was not apparent to a number of candidates and they resorted to describing the terms in detail or explaining why they were harsh. Thus, they commented on the fact that Woodrow-Wilson wanted world peace through the 14 points or that Lloyd George wanted to punish Germany but not too much. These responses scored in the Level 2 range at best. The other common error was to merely cite the terms of the Treaty and simply add the word justified without ever developing an argument. However, many more were able to do better. Common explanations of justified tended to revolve around the War Guilt clause and thus Germany was deserving of punishment. This then naturally linked into Reparations – if she was guilty she should pay for all the damages. Others explained that Germany had a history of aggression and therefore it was justified that she should lose her military capability, especially on the border zones with France, her previous target. The Treaty of Brest Litovsk was not used as often as might have been hoped.

Popular explanations for the unjustified nature of the Treaty tended to revolve around the impact of reparations on the German people, leading to starvation, invasion and eventually hyperinflation. Links were then made to War Guilt and the fact that responsibility fell to the Kaiser and not the German people, yet they were paying for

it. Non-admittance into the League was seen as churlish and foolhardy given the fact that Germany was an aggressive nation and the League was meant to be acting as a pseudo world policeman. The military terms and the fact that they left Germany vulnerable to attack was also seen as unjustified by some, often linking this to German militarism and former pride in their forces.

- 3 (a) Too many candidates confused this with the aims of the League, reflecting on collective security rather than the organisation. Thus, it was more a comment on the organisation of their response rather than the League's main structure. For those who did get beyond this, many went on to give details of the Assembly, Council and Secretariat.
- (b) Far too many believed that the Commissions had something to do with border disputes so the Aland Islands, Corfu, Vilna, etc and details of these events were all trotted out, which scored no marks. Some were able to identify the Commissions but rarely went beyond describing their work. There was a tendency to simply list or describe a number of agencies. A significant majority appeared to believe that the League fixed minimum working hours and abolished child labour. Better answers involved the health aspects and work with refugees and slavery to explain why the League was successful. References to Mandates were limited.
- (c) Many candidates preferred to describe the Abyssinian Crisis rather than refer to its subsequent effects on the standing and proficiency of the League. Others merely described the role the League took in the Crisis, again without ever considering its impact. At the same time alternative reasons for the League's failure were limited. There were numerous references to 'the League had no army', the Depression or the fact that the USA was not a member, none of which were used to explain failure, only to identify deficiencies. A small number of candidates was completely confused over Manchuria and Abyssinia, so did not get above Level 2 although some candidates seemed better versed on Manchuria than Abyssinia. Details of the Lytton Commission and time delays that left the League a laughing stock were well conveyed.

For those that did progress into Level 3, many were able to argue the impact of the Abyssinian Crisis on the League. Reference was made to the increasing isolation of Britain and France after the Hoare-Laval Pact and the fact that the League was effectively reliant upon these two countries to work effectively. This was explained through reluctance to close the Suez Canal and general apathy about committing large sums to prevent the occupation of Abyssinia. Many more were able to relate the League's apparent weakness to the encouragement perhaps of other aggressors, namely Hitler, and his decision to test Britain and France in 1936 when he re-militarised the Rhineland.

Part 1 Section B

- 1 (a) Many candidates were able to identify a message in this cartoon with most identifying the main message. Most went for the idea of some form of separation, division or barrier between Eastern and Western Europe or Communist East and Capitalist West. Contextual detail was often good with many candidates having detailed knowledge of the Iron Curtain speech at Fulton Missouri, 1946. Others identified Churchill peeping under the curtain in an endeavour to find out what was going on, picking up on the idea of mutual suspicion and mistrust. Common errors tended to be a misinterpretation of the cartoon, believing it to be a representation of the Berlin Blockade, despite the date. Others believed it to be the Berlin Wall, built some 20 years later, whilst some thought the left hand side of the curtain to be the East and the right hand side the West.

- (b) Some found it very difficult to retain the focus of the question on the USA and general comments about why the Cold War deepened abounded. Better answers were able to develop the idea of the differing ideologies to explain their conflict, their diametrically opposed views making it almost impossible to reach some form of concord. Others considered the Berlin Blockade and the US belief that it was a clear example of Russian aggression. Some did relate it to the Marshall Plan but managed to restrict comments to reflect US disappointment that Stalin deliberately blocked Eastern Europe's access to it. More mentioned the personal rivalry between the two men, Truman and Stalin, and the differing US-Soviet relations at both Yalta and Potsdam. Fear of Communism usually led to comments regarding broken agreements, especially regarding Stalin's promise of free elections yet subsequently imposing Communist regimes.
- 2 (a) Most were aware of the US response to the coming to power of Castro such as the breaking of diplomatic relations and the banning of the sugar trade. A criticism would be in relation to the Bay of Pigs which was often presented, unnecessarily, in great detail.
- (b) Weaker answers tended to describe, again, the details of the Bay of Pigs thus limiting progress to Level 2. Slightly better candidates could relate it to the embarrassment caused by the whole incident and the damage done to both Kennedy's reputation and that of the USA as a 'protector' of the West. Good answers went beyond this and related the incident to the Russian response. Many gave details of the increasingly friendly relations that developed between the USSR and Cuba, commenting on the military aid that subsequently developed into nuclear capability which placed the USA in grave danger. Others developed the idea of a personal victory for Khrushchev as the older and more experienced of the two rivals, a point difficult to develop.
- (c) This was generally well done with most candidates able to offer an alternative argument. Common points regarding US victory tended to refer to the removal of the missiles from Cuba whilst keeping the agreement to remove US missiles from Turkey under wraps. The fact that Kennedy acted decisively and against the advice of his military leaders was also used to explain his enhanced standing as a result of peaceful resolution. His handling and decision to impose a blockade were seen as a victory for the USA, especially as Russian ships were forced to turn around and Khrushchev forced to back down. Similarly, his decision to respond to the first communication rather than the second was seen as a victorious and statesmanlike move. Comparison to the later fate of Khrushchev was often used to highlight Kennedy's political victory. Alternative responses focussed on the concept of the continued Communist threat which remained on Cuba even after the crisis, defeating the US attempts to contain its spread. The removal of the direct threat of intermediate missiles in Turkey was also discussed in detail. Judgement comments tended to relate to the idea of victory for the 'world'. Many opted for this approach stating that neither won, conveying instead that world peace was the main beneficiary of the crisis. Comments related to the establishment of the 'Hotline', Test Ban Treaty and subsequent thaw in Cold War relations, both appreciating that brinkmanship was not a viable tool in their foreign policy arsenals.
- 3 (a) Many candidates were aware of the concept of the Domino Theory but some had difficulty in describing it. Most were able to convey the idea of the collapse of neighbouring countries once one has fallen to Communism. Some linked this to direct US involvement in Vietnam and the idea of containment as a tool of US policy. Fewer were able to offer details of those countries under direct threat, or if they did they were geographically wide of the mark.

- (b) Questions on the Vietnam War are usually popular and this was no exception with many explaining the impact of the media, the draft and military tactics. The most common phrase was 'first televised war' which scored at L2 but the vast majority were able to take this further, commenting on the capacity of events like Mai Lai and Napalm attacks to genuinely shock and appal the US population. Many others referred to events at Kent State University and public outrage at the death of students at the hands of their own army. The profligacy involved and drain on resources was a less popular choice with its subsequent impact on US taxes. The absolute futility of the campaign, especially after the Tet Offensives, was also used in some better responses to convey anger and anti-war sentiments.
- (c) This question was an opportunity seized by many to tell an interesting story about American tactics and guerrilla warfare by merely describing the tactics on both sides rather than explaining how they caused failure or victory in either case. This resulted in many candidates failing to address the question and thus achieving a lower mark than they might have expected. Points made on US tactics tended to revolve around the futility of bombing raids, given the underground tunnels built by the Vietcong, and the failure of the Search and Destroy missions. Many candidates were able to offer the negative effect this had on the 'hearts and minds' campaign. The US decision to use young, inexperienced troops was also commented upon, as was their subsequent withdrawal after one year. A common reference was the use of defoliants, Agent Orange and Agent Blue, as well as Napalm to further examine the damage done to US-Vietnamese relations.

For many the nature of the tactics used by the Vietcong was even greater source of interest than the tactics of the US. Their wily use of the forest, giving them excellent opportunities to ambush the US troops was a popular choice. Similarly, booby-traps which maimed and killed the enemy was another obvious point. Dress also featured heavily as did the supply line along the Ho Chi Min Trail. Fewer commented on the external support offered to the Vietcong by both the Chinese and Russian governments.

Part 1 Section C

Answers to this section were limited, and often from candidates who had misinterpreted the rubric.

- 1
 - (a) In a rush to provide an answer to the Berlin Wall cartoon many failed to study the cartoon carefully enough and concluded that Khrushchev was welcoming people to 'his side', thus ignoring the portrayal of dead bodies on top of the Wall. Most missed the idea that Khrushchev was giving a convincing performance to say how happy people were on the Soviet side of the Wall and thus not wanting to go to the West. This approach ignored the reality of the situation.
 - (b) Whilst many candidates were aware of the rise of Solidarity in Poland, the introduction of 'perestroika' by Gorbachev together with changes in the role of the Red Army, the development of these issues to explain the collapse of Soviet control was weak. Even the significance of the fall of the Berlin Wall was more often than not ignored.
- 2
 - (a) Apart from the destruction of the USA (capitalism) the knowledge of the aims of al-Qaeda was limited to threats to other countries. Reference to American influence in Muslim countries was rare as was any reference to destroying Israel. Islamic influences were also ignored.

- (b) Answers to this question often brought basic statements which consigned the answer to Level 2. Some candidates were content to describe bin Laden's early life rather than considering its influence on his increasing links to the Taliban in Afghanistan. The use of his personal wealth was often over-played to the almost total exclusion of his access to funding based on illegal drugs. Reference to a developing sense of radicalism was also limited.
 - (c) Understanding of how to approach this new style of question was often sketchy. It is important that criteria against which judgement is to be made are established early in the answer. Specific examples of terrorism can then be judged against the criteria to quantify the level of success. These specific examples must be taken from the terrorist groups identified in the specification. Where this approach was used candidates produced good examples particularly in relation to the PLO.
- 3 There were insufficient answers to Question 3 to form any useful judgement.

Part 2 Depth Studies

Germany, 1918–1945

- 1
- (a) Significant numbers of candidates were aware of an election in Germany in 1932 and immediately tried to link the cartoon to Hitler giving money to voters. The link with big business was understood by very few. Better answers did actually demonstrate knowledge about such individuals as Thyssen and Krupp and how they were being portrayed. Disappointingly few picked up on the idea of Hitler being portrayed as a little man.
 - (b) The Reichstag fire was well known and most candidates focused on the link with the Communists telling the story of the Nazi's use of the events for their own benefit, thus developing an explanation relating to the source. Less well developed was consideration of what was not in the source, such as speculation that it might even have been started by the Nazis.
 - (c) The vast majority of candidates had no trouble understanding this cartoon and were able to gain Level 4 by identifying the main message which related to intimidation and the lack of democracy. This message was very well supported by detail from the cartoon. Few knew enough about the Emergency Decree or made any link with the Reichstag fire but were able to gain the top level by mentioning intimidation by the S.A. and S.S.
- 2
- (a) Some candidates struggled to gain 4 marks here, as knowledge relating to the events was often limited to the loss of the war and the abdication of the Kaiser. Occasionally the role of the Allies was mentioned but more often candidates went on to describe problems faced by the Weimar republic.
 - (b) For large numbers of candidates this was a well known topic with many achieving maximum marks with a well detailed explanation starting with non payment of reparations, occupation of the Ruhr, passive resistance and the printing of money used to explain hyperinflation. Some just described the events which limited the mark achieved whilst others were convinced that the invasion in itself triggered hyperinflation.

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

- (c) There were some very good answers to this question in which candidates covered a number of areas including the economy, foreign relations, political instability and cultural issues. The lack of recovery was not usually done as well as the recovery as candidates displayed limited knowledge beyond 'recovery being based on loans'.
- 3 (a) Most achieved 4 marks here by writing a long list of all the various tasks allocated to women. Those brave enough to have a go at a full version of the 3 K's rarely managed the correct spelling. Candidates should be encouraged to be more selective to reduce the length of their answers.
- (b) Candidates were able to develop a number of reasons into explanation and thus achieve very high marks. These explanations often centred around social aspects. Very few responses related to the militaristic aspects and even fewer to the fact that membership was made compulsory. Some candidates mistakenly thought the question related to the changes made by the Nazis to the school curriculum.
- (c) Some candidates did not read this question carefully enough and wrote about policies in general or racial policies in particular. Possibly this was because they simply did not know enough about economic policy or even did not understand what the word 'economic' meant. Those who did understand usually knew about job creation, particularly through the construction of autobahns, and re-armament. However, few got further than Level 3 either because they claimed that the policies were wholly successful or because they simply did not know anything about lack of success or the implication of the Nazi's economic policies.

Russia, 1905–1941

- 1 (a) Many candidates produced very good responses to this question. They were fully conversant with the events of 1905, explaining what was in the source in relation to unrest. Those who were aware of the demands of this type of question then followed with explanation of other events such as the losing of the war against Japan and issues such as that of land.
- (b) Answers to this were mixed. Those who took notice of the date were able to indicate the intended main message – that by that date any form of revolution had been violently subdued by the Tsar. Some also realised that Stolypin had just started his harsh dispensation of justice.
- (c) When answering 'message' questions it is important that candidates study the attribution to ascertain who published the source as this may well give a clue as to the reason for publication, as in this case. Here those who did this were able to offer meaningful purpose such as 'to warn ordinary people that the Tsarist rule is leading the country to ruin', and to support this with contextual knowledge from the period of the First World War. It is not necessary for purpose to use material from the cartoon in support.
- 2 (a) Often well known with the main issues of land, war and food being given and often developed to give a second mark. There were fewer responses which mentioned the fact that the Government was not elected and that its members lacked experience.
- (b) Answers were less strong on this aspect of the content and were often limited to a development of the ideas already given in (a) together with a descriptive approach documenting the return of Lenin.

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

- (c) There were many strong answers explaining the positive nature of the New Economic Policy putting the answer firmly into Level 3. Candidates were particularly keen to point out how the evils of War Communism had been removed. Less strong was the consideration of 'unsuccessful' which was often limited to the introduction of non-communist ideas.
- 3 (a) Well answered with much detail on what industries were to be developed, targets and the fact that substantial growth was achieved.
- (b) Reasons for the introduction of collectivisation were generally well known and often well explained. The idea of the need to increase exports to fund developing industry was particularly well documented. Stalin's need for control of the countryside and the need to remove the kulaks were also developed in detail.
- (c) There were many excellent answers to this question with arguments being put for both sides. Weaker answers were characterised by a heavy reliance on the social impact to the almost total exclusion of the economic.

The USA, 1919-1941

- 1 (a) Weaker answers paraphrased the source details, often highlighting their use of the source through quotation marks. A better group realised that by adding some contextual support they were able to explain the comments of the businessman. The better answers commented on the loss of confidence which led experienced speculators to sell their shares. 'Amateurs' soon followed, causing the dumping of millions of shares, whilst the better answers were able to develop this, highlighting 'Buying on the Margin' as a means to purchase shares in the hope of stock market rises. Overproduction, both in industry and agriculture, was a common feature of the best answers.
- (b) As expected most candidates were strong on Hooverilles and offered some source-based comment about living conditions, perhaps highlighting the shacks made from wood and other debris. Others were able to add contextual support for the conditions inside a Hooverville, perhaps making reference to the lack of electricity, running water or even basic sanitary conditions. Others made some comparison between the Hooverville and the city in the distance offering that life does not seem like this for all. Better candidates then went on to offer some explanation of the wider effects of the Depression, thus accessing Level 5. Common themes were an explanation of business closure as a result of the Crash and overproduction, causing loss of jobs and subsequent financial collapse. Others commented on the fate of the farmers, forced off their land by their inability to pay mortgages or loans, possibly as a result of tariffs or overproduction. Some also made the comment that the Depression made little difference to the lives of either the extremely poor, blacks or immigrants.
- (c) When answering this question some candidates misinterpreted the cartoon, believing the man to be one of the 'inexperienced speculators' who, having gambled all his money on shares, is now bankrupt and beginning to regret his greed. The squirrel was used to support these types of interpretations in a 'told you so' way. However, most could clearly relate the man's fate to bank failure and the fact that he has lost all of his money. The squirrel was used to better effect here, highlighting the fact that he did save. Others picked up on the idea that its message was anti-Hoover, although a large number believed the man on the bench was actually Hoover (!), perhaps sitting there rueing his actions. Others commented that it might have been produced as some form of pro-Roosevelt propoganda.

- 2 (a) Many candidates were able to score well here. Popular options tended to be the development of supply routes between the US and the allies, either for food or munitions, as a result of their difficulties in producing their own. Others highlighted the fact that the US was able to take over international trade, especially at the expense of Britain. This takeover was also applied to advanced processes, for example, the chemical industry from Germany. Many more made the point that the US joined the war late, thus not sustaining the huge damage seen in Europe or the drain on its resources. Making money was a key feature, especially from loans and the subsequent interest paid back in the post-war years.
- (b) Better candidates were able to relate to the fact that the US had expanded production to meet war demands, yet failed to reduce production in peacetime. Others developed this further by explaining that this expansion had only been possible by the adoption of mechanised techniques which merely exacerbated the problem. Others linked the mechanisation to loss of jobs, especially for black migrant workers, or the fact that loans had been taken from the bank to pay for these but could now not be repaid. As a result, banks called in their loans and farmers were forced to sell their farms and leave in search of work. Another popular reference was to tariffs and the fact that this overproduction could not be shipped to Europe because of reciprocal tariffs imposed as a result of America's earlier protectionist measures.
- (c) Disappointingly some candidates failed to fully develop the factor given in the question. Most tended to view 'New Methods' as the car industry, going on to make the point that the assembly line and mass production reduced prices and thus made the products more widely accessible. The better candidates were able to then take this further, developing the idea that this would have resulted in industrial expansion and required more workers. Increased employment meant that more were earning good wages and some explanation of the cycle of prosperity resulted. Better answers developed a plethora of alternative explanations for the boom. Benefits from WW1 featured prominently, and the availability of credit and the fact that it afforded more buying power within the economy were also a common theme. The confidence and state of mind of the American public, despite being overplayed at times, was also an acceptable explanation, making them more willing to spend and thus inject money into the economy. The role of the government, or lack of, featured prominently in the process and their 'hands off' approach was viewed as a positive asset. Similarly, their decision to allow large trusts to develop was seen as a progressive move with many commenting that the business leaders knew their market best. Catalogues and advertising were also seen as important in generating the boom, allowing consumers knowledge of the goods available and an easy way of purchasing them.
- 3 (a) Most found this question to their liking and even the very weak candidates could make four reasonable points here. In the main, the KKK was described as a white supremacist movement which believed blacks had no place in American society. Many highlighted their methods such as lynching and burning, whilst others focussed on membership and the fact that the enrolment of sheriffs and judges meant that blacks often had little justice or recourse to action. Some also highlighted the increase in membership over the 1920s as proof of the intolerance present in American society.
- (b) A new focus for this period which highlighted a lack in their knowledge for some candidates relating to a major feature of 1920s America. It was clear that some had little idea who or what Sacco and Vanzetti were. Common errors regarding the KKK being involved in their murder reflected the fact that many believed the pair to be black. Some believed that they were lynched at the hands of the KKK. Where known, explanation came from the prejudice of the judge and his racist comments. Others

highlighted the fact that they were known anarchists at the time of the Red Scare and were executed, both as scapegoats and as an example to others. Very few focussed on the actual details of the crime or the nature of the evidence presented against them to explain the injustice of their death.

- (c) This question tended to elicit a narrative rather an explanatory / analytical approach. Many could describe the activities of the gangsters without really linking this to the failure of prohibition directly as comments were more implicit than explicit in their nature. Most could describe their moneymaking activities and the fact that Al Capone became the richest man in America. This was developed using the examples of speakeasies, bootlegging and their control of the Moonshine industries. Bribery and corruption of local officials were also viewed in a negative light. Alternative arguments tended to be better and more focussed on the question. A popular choice was the issue of tax and the need to provide income to fund the New Deal. Many commented that the government was aware of the huge incomes made by the gangsters and realised that this would be better paid to them directly. Others developed the fact that crime had actually increased over the period, with innocent men arrested merely because they wanted a drink; this was then linked to the general unpopularity of the law and the fact that its origins lay in religious objection and not popular will.

Mao's China, c.1930–1976

There were no entries for this Depth Study.

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

- 1 (a) Candidates had little difficulty identifying the three figures represented, the British tar, the French maiden, and the skulking German (almost always correctly identified as the Kaiser, although a small minority considered it to be Hitler). However the vast majority struggled to get beyond that to the main message. Most could not handle the ideas of reinforced friendship or a failed German attempt to destroy the friendship. They could only say that it 'showed' friendship. On a general note candidates may find it beneficial to avoid beginning their answers with 'The cartoon / poster shows...' because this invariably leads to mere description, and more often than not to either failing to apply the source detail in support of an answer or forgetting to actually address message or purpose.

With regard to contextual knowledge perhaps 20% of candidates were unable to put this cartoon within the context of the Moroccan crisis of 1905. Several candidates who were aware of the Entente also showed the limitations of their contextual knowledge by referring to it as the Triple Entente. Others used the ships in the source to discuss Dreadnoughts, despite the anachronism involved there too.

- (b) The vast majority of candidates answering this question showed a lack of technique by failing to use their knowledge in support of their answer either as development of the source or offering explained reasons not in the source to show an understanding of why the arms race happened.
- (c) Many answers to this question demonstrated a lack of understanding of the difference between 'message' and 'purpose'. Many easily gained Level 2 for suggesting a message such as 'the Kaiser is trying to grab Europe' but then got no further than offering support for their message from the cartoon. Little opportunity

was taken to build on the danger indicated by the words 'He won't be happy till he gets it'. Context was often limited to the idea that war had started.

- 2 (a) Generally well done although answers were often overlong and focussed entirely on rats and mud. Some confusion existed over the difference between trenches and 'no man's land'. Few referred to the dangers from the opposition whilst others thought rations were extremely limited.
 - (b) Some reasonably knowledgeable candidates explained it was due to the failure of the Schlieffen Plan and the Battle of the Marne where neither side made progress and thus needed to dig themselves in for protection. Weaker answers did occasionally go beyond the mud to suggest that barbed wire, machine guns and outdated tactics might have contributed.
 - (c) The Ludendorff Offensive was generally weak in the vast majority of responses offering little more than that it was 'the last opportunity'. Awareness of other reasons was much better with explanations relating to the entry of the USA, conditions in Germany in relation to food shortages and possible revolution and the abdication of the Kaiser.
- 3 (a) Many responses got no further than 'To win the war at sea' failing to recognise the importance of u-boats. Some were not even aware of what a u-boat was, suggesting it was something akin to a destroyer or battleship that might fire against land targets on the British mainland.
 - (b) Some of the better answers wrote about the conflicting opinions of the outcome of the Battle of Jutland with a valid conclusion that as the German navy never reappeared, Britain had been successful. Few got to the techniques used by the British navy such as depth charges and mines, although convoys featured often.
 - (c) Significant numbers of candidates were aware of the weather conditions in both summer and winter, the use of mines and the retreat of the navy and the advantageous position of the Turks. If these had moved beyond fairly vague statements into even basic explanations some high marks would have been generated.

End of Empire, c.1919-1969

The entry for this Depth Study was around 30 candidates making detailed analysis impossible. However, centres may find the following comments useful.

- 1 (a) Many candidates were able to get the main message – the humiliation of Britain and France – and support this by both use of the cartoon and contextual knowledge. Some started the answer with contextual knowledge which in itself is not an answer to the question.
- (b) Most were not surprised and supported this with contextual knowledge about Churchill's stance in relation to the Empire. Often less strong was the contextual support for 'surprised'.
- (c) The majority of candidates recognised this source and were able to put it into a context of national consciousness. Surprisingly, some candidates failed to display contextual knowledge to explain other reasons – the 'how far' of the question.

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

- 2 A significant number failed to demonstrate the main terms of the India Act of 1919, often confusing it with independence. Most were able to describe the violence of the Amritsar Massacre but were much less secure on the reasons why it took place. This approach limits the marks to a low level. Part (c) brought much story telling, particularly in relation to Ghandi. Nehru was much less well known. Lacking in responses was the importance of the individual's work in relation to independence.
- 3 A much better answered question with detail of removal of white settlers and the achievement of black majority rule featuring strongly. This then flowed seamlessly into the next question where again candidates had the ability to develop their explanations. Predictably the Mau Mau featured strongly. As with 5(c) candidates were less strong in addressing the question. Although many were aware of Kenyatta, not all were capable of moving from descriptive mode.

The USA, 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

There were no entries for this Depth Study.

A981 Aspects of International Relations, 1919-2005

The new short course now has three sections with candidates answering the appropriate questions from one of these sections. Each section corresponds to the three sections of the full course core. Two parts of Question 1 and both Questions 2 and 3 are identical to those on the full course and for information about these questions the report on the full course paper (A971) should be consulted. Below are comments on the two questions from each section that do not appear on the full course.

Several examiners commented on the standard produced by many candidates which showed aspects of good teaching and learning.

Section A

- 1 (a) Many candidates were able to progress beyond surface features and simple provenance to compare, and use, the contradictory information in the sources to argue their surprise that the Austrians were welcoming despite Hitler threatening violence which suggested the opposite would happen. What was less secure was the use of contextual knowledge to explain 'not surprised' at Hitler's actions to carry out Anschluss.
- (b) Whilst some candidates managed to get the purpose of the poster, few were able to put it in the context of the period after Munich. Others were more secure in just describing the source or in some instances suggesting a message.

Section B

- 1 (a) Many answers just described the content of one or both sources, leaving them firmly in Level 2. Others went much further in their interpretation of Source B, even on occasions noting the split of Germany. This interpretation suggested that the take-over of the countries named was not achieved willingly, although some did note the significance of the attribution to France. Many suggested, therefore, that perhaps Stalin was not lying in Source B but was certainly economical with the truth. Others were more forthright. Both supported approaches were acceptable for the higher levels.
- (b) Contextual knowledge was less strong in relation to Source D. Beyond the idea of Communism v Capitalism candidates were floundering. Few mentioned Greece and most resorted to general views about containment.

Section C

There were very few responses to this section making valid comment meaningless.

A972/21 British Depth Study, 1890-1918

General Comments

The experience of the January 2010 session suggested that while many of the more able Year 10 students were able to cope with the demands of this paper at an earlier stage than has traditionally been the case, this was less true for the middle order candidates. As a result, the number of candidates achieving a mark close to or above the Grade C boundary was noticeably smaller than those reaching the same level in the Legacy Specification, where the candidates were almost all Year 11 students at the end of a two year course.

As in January, most candidates had a reasonable working knowledge of the topic. There was clear evidence that in some cases they had been prepared for the type of question which this paper often asks. What was also apparent, however, was that while the more able candidates were able to apply source details, cross references and their contextual knowledge to good effect in order to answer the question, the middle order candidates struggled to manage the challenges of answering the question, using the source(s) effectively and bringing in their own knowledge in order to develop a basic answer into a good one. These challenges are very real and candidates who achieve them deserve to be rewarded and indeed congratulated. At the same time, centres may wish to consider how far the weaker candidates gain from the experience of not meeting the challenge. Centres may judge that candidates gain valuable experience which they apply to other components of the course and or to a retake of this paper, but on the whole examiners expressed concern that many candidates may have found the paper a disheartening experience.

Centres may wish to consider other approaches, such as entering candidates at a later point in the course or altering teaching approaches to take into account the fact that at the end of Year 10 many students are some distance away from reaching the level of maturity and experience required to do themselves justice in this paper. As in January, this lack of experience was again shown by the inability of some candidates to get beyond pre-rehearsed answers. The essence of the paper is that students carry out a source based investigation, using their skills and their knowledge to respond to the source material in front of them. Those who addressed the questions directly rather than trying to use formulaic, pre-prepared routines for evaluating sources, usually fared well.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question was generally tackled very well with many candidates achieving the top marks. It was possible to achieve Level 4 by the more traditional route of explaining the main message of the source – that the pension might have been small but the poor were very grateful for it – and supporting the answer and putting the answer into context. An alternative route was to recognise that the cartoon had a political dimension and that a further message of the cartoonist was that the Conservative Party was criticising the wealthy generally, and the Conservatives in particular, for their opposition to the Old Age Pension and in the process the cartoon would generate support for the Liberals. As this was a more sophisticated analysis candidates could go straight to Level 4 with this approach. Here is such an example:

Source A is a picture of Lord Halsbury, the former Conservative government minister before the Liberals came to power, and an old man. Both are accompanied by dogs. The old man's dog is smaller and represents his old age

pension. While Lord Halsbury's dog, or pension, is much larger, showing he is better off.

I believe the message that this source gives is that the Conservatives were harsh towards the aged poor and that they offered them no help at all. In fact the Conservative is mocking the pension. The Liberals on the other hand have passed the old age pension measure and the old man is grateful to them and will support them.

It is worth noting that the first paragraph of the answer on its own would only achieve Level 2 but recognising the political intent takes the candidate to the top level. Other points of note also arise from this question, particularly in relation to candidates' ability to use their knowledge effectively and link it to the point they have made in answering the question. Many candidates concluded their answer by listing the terms of the pension, such as it was 5 shillings per week. Simply listing terms, or pointing out that the Act was passed in 1908, was not enough for Level 4. Answers needed to make the point that 5 shillings was not a great deal but that it made all the difference (as indeed Source B shows). In a similar vein many candidates put examiners in a difficult position by saying that the message of the cartoon was that the pension was a wonderful comfort. Such candidates might have understood the message of the source but they might simply be lifting details from the source, only achieving Level 1. Candidates need to recognise that their answers need to show without doubt that they recognise the message of the source. This example scored 4 marks:

The message of the picture is that no matter how small the pension may be it is still a big help to the old man. The pension is pictured in the cartoon as a little dog. It is not as big as the other dog but it is still a wonderful comfort to the old man.

Question 2

Candidates generally found this question difficult and there was a tendency to accept each source at face value and explain how they differed rather than why they differed, gaining Level 4. This gained a respectable 5 marks, but many candidates showed their inexperience by failing to achieve this. Too many of them simply summarised each source, failing to make any kind of comparison. This is another example of a lack of maturity and experience. To many candidates it probably seemed obvious that by summarising each source they had identified differences, but examiners cannot award marks for implicit answers. Candidates who reached Level 4 generally used words and phrases such as 'whereas' or 'in contrast'. The following example was awarded 7 marks:

Both Sources B and C give different viewpoints on the pensions scheme. Flora Thompson in Source B tells us that the old age pensions 'transformed the lives of old people in the village'. Thompson tells us that the old people were no longer worried and that they were rich and independent for life. Joseph Clynes, however, in Source C takes a more critical approach. He seems to go against what the pensioners in Source B thought about Lloyd George being blessed and says the only reason he brought in pensions was because of pressure from the Labour Party. He also says the pensions did not go far enough. Clynes is obviously criticising the pensions because he is from the rival Labour Party. He wants Labour to get all the credit for old age pensions because they are so popular and he is attacking the Liberals when he says that the measures did not go far enough.

It is the final two sentences which take the answer into Level 5 because here the candidate is beginning to consider Clynes' motive for saying what he said rather than simply reporting it. Without these final sentences the answer would have been marked at Level 4, 5 marks.

A further point of interest in this question was the negative impact of coaching candidates to look for particular elements in a source. A substantial number of candidates attempted to evaluate each source without any reference to the question at all, clearly misunderstanding the coaching they had received. Thus there were answers which simply attacked Clynes for being biased and Flora Thompson for being over the top in her praise and concluding that both sources were unreliable. Such answers contained the raw materials necessary for a reasonable response but were frequently unrelated to the actual question set in any meaningful way.

Question 3

This question generated a large number of very effective responses. Most candidates were able to reach Level 3 by using details from the photograph to argue for or against Lloyd George being popular (or indeed both). Unlike most other questions, candidates in this question used other sources very effectively in cross references which developed and extended their answers. Many candidates used Sources A and B to support the argument that Lloyd George was popular, demonstrating that even the weakest candidates are able to handle this skill in some situations. The most enterprising candidates produced balanced answers which used detail from the source and cross reference to other sources and contextual knowledge. The example below was awarded full marks:

I think on face value Source D does make Lloyd George look popular. He is clutching a bundle of flowers and shaking the hands of elderly ladies. He was obviously very popular with old age pensioners after the introduction of the act and in Source B we learn that pensioners were saying things like 'God bless Lloyd George'.

On the other hand there are only three women here. Also it is a Liberal party rally so the photograph was showing Liberal supporters. We also know that Lloyd George was unpopular with many people, especially the more wealthy who had to pay the taxes in Lloyd George's 1909 People's Budget to pay for the pensions. Later on we also know that Suffragettes firebombed his house for not doing enough to support votes for women.

One disappointing aspect of this question was the number of candidates who simply ignored the source and launched into an account of the work of Lloyd George and the passing of the Old Age Pensions Act and other measures. Once again, it may be an example of inexperience and a lack of maturity among younger candidates to ignore the source in a question which specifically asks for details from the source.

Question 4

Questions which require candidates to work with more than one source often cause problems. Similarly, many candidates seem to struggle with the concept of utility. Some candidates were very confused by Source F, seeing it as a comment on Labour Exchanges, presumably because Source E was about Labour Exchanges. A substantial number also misread the source and believed that the workers in F were unemployed rather than locked out of work because of strikes. A further misreading of Source F which occurred was an assumption that the source was about the Labour Party.

Candidates who struggled with this question usually adopted one of two approaches. The first was to simply summarise each source, presumably thinking that by doing so they were addressing the question of how each source was useful. A simple reference to the word useful, or a synonym, would have taken them to Level 3 but examiners cannot award marks for answers which simply recite the sources and do not even mention usefulness.

A further weakness was irrelevant or inappropriate evaluation, usually at the level of stock evaluation (Level 2). Many candidates ignored the question and simply tried to argue that one source had a particular purpose or was unreliable for some other reason. In most cases they were unsuccessful in making the case and they also failed to relate this argument to the question. A small number of candidates suggested that Source E might only be showing a positive picture of the work of Labour Exchanges but then, frustratingly, failed to develop this line of argument.

Where candidates did reach Level 4 they usually did so by pointing out that Source E was useful because it showed the government was working hard to help the unemployed and then supported this inference with details from the source. Likewise the candidates who recognised that Source F was about National Insurance had little trouble in making and supporting a relevant inference. Where candidates reached the top levels it was usually by using contextual knowledge to argue that Source E was trustworthy and to question the tone and purpose of Source F. This response received top marks, including the bonus mark for a relevant comparison at the end of the answer.

Source E is useful because it shows there was an unemployment problem and that the Liberal government was trying to do something to help the unemployed. It says that they set up 414 Labour Exchanges by 1912 and that 567000 people got jobs in 1912. We know the Labour Exchanges were successful because by 1913 Labour Exchanges were putting 3000 people into jobs every day so the source is very useful in showing that this Liberal reform was successful. Source F is not as useful as Source E. It simply states the case of some iron workers who are not getting benefits in a dispute in Scotland. Also, the writer is clearly very angry about what is happening where he says that 'our members feel very strongly' and he is trying to put pressure on the government to give in and let the men have benefits.

So overall I think E is more useful because it is more trustworthy and it shows us what is happening across the whole country to unemployed workers whereas Source F is trying to put pressure on the government and also only tells us about one small dispute in Scotland.

Question 5

Weaker candidates did seem to struggle disproportionately. There were several answers which saw the source as an advertisement for a train service. Clearly such candidates lacked the knowledge and ability to handle the paper. A larger number simply assumed that there was an election in 1911 (or their knowledge was inaccurate) and that was why the poster was published. Another substantial body of candidates ignored the question altogether and attempted, usually unconvincingly, to explain how and why the source was biased and therefore unreliable. These approaches are typical of candidates who have yet to develop the range of knowledge and skills required for this paper.

By contrast, the majority of candidates were successful in this question and reached at least 3 by explaining the message of the source or asserting its purpose without development. Recognising purpose is a higher order skill than recognising the message and was credited in this way as a result. The following answer was marked at Level 4, 6 marks.

Reports on the Units taken in June 2010

This source was published in 1911 because this is when the National Insurance Act was brought in. The poster is clearly trying to advertise the Act and get people to support it. The Liberals did this as many workers were apprehensive about the fact that they would lose money out of their pay to pay for National Insurance. The poster is trying to stress what they get in return eg 10 shillings a week when you are ill. They emphasise how safe this is.

Question 6

Almost all candidates have now worked out how to tackle this question and they and their teachers should be congratulated because a good answer does involve marshalling a lot of material. This illustrates that almost all candidates are capable of working with the quantity and level of the material in the paper, and would seem to further support the contention that many candidates needed more time to develop the skills required for the other types of questions.

The majority of answers reached Level 3 by addressing both sources of the question and supporting what they said with extracts from the sources. The two main approaches were to group the 'Yes' or 'No' sources together or to work through each source one at a time. There was no discernible advantage in either method.

Despite being a well known question type there were substantial numbers of candidates who still took only one side of the argument and so limited themselves to Level 2, 7 marks. Some of these were quite impressive in their execution. Once again, a lack of experience seems to have hampered them.

Relatively few candidates succeeded in making a convincing case about how far the sources proved the statement to be correct or incorrect but some did. This concluding paragraph took the candidate into Level 4 on the back of a strong Level 3 answer:

Overall, I believe that that the statement cannot be backed extensively by the sources. Source G in particular gives very strong opposition to it. Also, many of the sources which agree with it are extremely in favour – almost too much. Source B, for example, talks about tears of joy. So because of all of this I do not believe that it is completely clear cut that all people welcomed the Liberal reforms.

A972/22 British Depth Study, 1939-1975

General Comments

Candidates seemed to have a good working knowledge of the subject matter in this paper, perhaps a little stronger in fact than in January 2010. There was also a sense that the candidates were a little more mature and had developed their historical understanding and examination technique to a greater degree. That said, it was still clear that many candidates were unready for the challenges of the paper. Many failed to realise that Sources A-D referred to teenagers generally, while Sources E-G referred to students. This caused some problems in interpreting the sources and answering questions relevantly. Another phenomenon observed was the dogged determination of some candidates to comment on the reliability of sources in every question, irrespective of what that question was. Similarly, the Notting Hill riots and the Teddy Boys appeared on a regular basis but were rarely used in a way which was germane to the question. These behaviours suggest that a substantial body of the cohort were not really ready to take the examination. Candidates would benefit from a critical look at their own work when they reach the end of the paper, given that few seem to struggle to finish on time. For example, a hard look at whether their contextual knowledge is relevant to their answer – what might be termed a ‘so what?’ test – would pay dividends.

As with Component 21, centres may wish to consider other approaches, such as entering candidates at a later point in the course or altering teaching approaches to take into account the fact that at the end of Year 10 many students are some distance away from reaching the level of maturity and experience required to do themselves justice in this paper. As in January, this lack of experience was again shown by the inability of some candidates to get beyond pre-rehearsed answers. The essence of the paper is that students carry out a source based investigation, using their skills and their knowledge to respond to the source material in front of them. Those who addressed the questions directly rather than trying to use formulaic, pre-prepared routines for evaluating sources, usually fared well.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question was generally tackled well, although there was a wide range of answers with fewer than usual candidates reaching the very top marks on this type of question. A substantial number failed to get beyond Level 2 because they argued that the message was that teenagers were bored. This was not enough to reach Level 3, because the main message was that teenagers were violent and rebellious. Candidates could progress within Level 4 by pointing out that the cartoonist was mocking their claims that they were simply bored. The following example was a Level 2, 2 marks because it addressed the content rather than the message (or intent) of the cartoon.

The message of Source A is that teenagers are only doing what they are doing because they are bored – ‘victim of an acute attack of boredom’. From my own knowledge I know that the youth did not like their parents type of music and they had jobs and money so they could rebel.

Few candidates seem to struggle to finish the paper in time, so they would benefit from taking a rational look at their answer and considering why a cartoonist would create a cartoon showing that teenagers were bored. A further disappointing type of answer was the answer which

dismissed the source as biased and therefore irrelevant. Clearly this failed to answer the question being asked.

Happily, more candidates did manage to explain the main message of the cartoon, often supporting the answer with copious detail and impressive contextual knowledge. The example below received full marks.

The message of this source is that teenagers are out of control. It shows this by showing a boy on a small motorbike running down a policeman. The cartoon is very negative towards the teenager because it shows the boy trying to excuse his actions, claiming he is bored. The cartoon does not believe this excuse and it is trying to put teenagers in a bad light because in 1964 there was a lot of teenage violence in Margate and Clacton where mods and rockers fought with each other.

Question 2

A large proportion of candidates were able to reach Level 3 and gain 5 marks in this question through intelligent contrasting of the content of the sources. There were also many candidates who struggled to make effective use of pre-prepared answers. In one centre almost every candidate used the same phrase to argue that 'newspapers bend the truth and exaggerate to sell stories' but it was clear that while the more able candidates used this platform to select detail and argue that the newspaper had a commercial purpose, weaker candidates simply wrote the phrase without any genuine understanding of what it meant in the context of the question and of Source B. There were many other weak evaluations of Source B, and it is surprising to see candidates still contending that a source is reliable because the writer was there at the time.

On the other hand, many candidates did comment on the commercial or other purposes which underpinned Source B and other used the tone of Sources B and or C to reach Level 4. A weak Level 4 example is shown below, which was awarded 6 marks.

Source B does not prove that Source C is wrong. Source B has a very aggressive tone towards the clashes at the beach between the mods and the rockers. The article describes them as 'The Wild Ones' and uses phrases such as 'rampaging youths'. This shows the author has a low opinion of youth culture so it is not a trustworthy account. Source C is much more informative and sensible.

Almost no candidates used any cross references to Sources A or D although many did use their contextual knowledge of events in Margate and Clacton. A substantial number were determined to include information about Teddy Boys and the Notting Hill riots but none were able to make any connection between this information and the answer they were giving. In fact this determination to include certain pieces of knowledge hampered many weaker candidates.

Question 3

This question was generally handled well. There were some weaker answers, often when candidates became distracted by details in the photograph or simply asserted the purpose of the source without any explanation or development at all. However, most candidates saw that the purpose of the photograph was to confirm violence among adolescents, to sensationalise newspaper reports to sell them, or to confirm to the older generation that teenagers were out of control. Many candidates used the detail and the purpose well together and some answers used effective cross references to Sources A and or B. The example below reached Level 5 for 6 marks. It was not awarded Level 6 because the cross reference was used to argue that the

source was unreliable, a comment which was valid but irrelevant to the question which asked about purpose.

The photograph was taken to shock the nation over the clashes between mods and rockers in and the general violence of youth culture. The photograph shows the beach being ruined by youths charging up and down and breaking deck chairs. There were other fights as well as this one in other seaside resorts, in Clacton and Brighton in 1964. The source is very similar to Source B, and because they both agree this makes the source very reliable. However, it was produced for a newspaper which most likely wanted a shocking picture to sell newspapers and convince people that youth culture was out of control.

Question 4

The majority of candidates managed to reach Level 3 in this question and achieve 4 marks with little difficulty. A wide range of reasons for being surprised were put forward, most commonly the calm and peaceful nature of the protest. Reasons for not being surprised included the general climate of student protest in the period and the sensitivity of Powell and his views. Many were able to harness their knowledge of Enoch Powell to good effect. The answer below reached Level 4, but gained 5 marks rather than 6 because the source detail was rather limited.

No I am not surprised by this source because 1968 was the year that Enoch Powell gave his 'Rivers of Blood' speech in which he saw the decline of whites in Britain. The students are protesting against him and his ideas. Students during the sixties did a lot of protesting, eg against the Vietnam War and against nuclear weapons with CND.

The candidate refers to Vietnam and CND in this answer. A significant number of candidates referred to Notting Hill in 1958 or indeed to the events in Clacton and Margate in 1964. Whilst it is possible to construct an argument in which such information might improve an answer to this question, Vietnam and CND were much more relevant and easy to assimilate into a quality answer. The effective use of contextual knowledge is something which weaker candidates do need to develop and improve. In this question many were anxious to write copious details about Enoch Powell and in the process ended up drifting a long way from the central thrust of the question.

Question 5

On the whole responses to this question were very disappointing. Candidates tend to struggle when they have to work with two sources, but in the case of this question the problems centred on the fact that so many candidates simply failed to recognise that Source F claimed that young people were only playing at rebels. As a result, a very large number simply said that they did believe the source because young people did grow their hair, have sit-ins etc. Many candidates either under-used Source G to support the claim that students held sit-ins or ignored Source G altogether. This may have been because they could not see how to make use of the source once they had failed to see the importance of Source F's claim that students were playing at rebellion.

Strangely, many candidates who failed to see this distinction in this question then went on to refer to it in Question 6 as evidence that young people were not out of control. Perhaps the most logical explanation for this discrepancy is the lack of experience in exam technique and the need to re-read answers at the end of the paper.

There were some effective responses to the question. The following response reached Level 4, 7 marks, by using details of the sources and effective cross-reference, having first spotted the true point being made in Source F.

No, I do not believe what Source F says about students only playing at being rebels in the 1960s. Students wanted to stand up for their own beliefs and were prepared to do something about it. Source G shows that students were prepared to stand up for their rights. It shows very large numbers of students involved in the sit-in which shows that many students were committed to their cause and when it says 'the sit-in continues' it shows that they were prepared to stick at their protest and not just give up. In 1968 students were protesting about their beliefs in many places. For example, Source E shows us students protesting against Enoch Powell in Birmingham in 1968. So Source F is wrong about students not really being rebels and only protesting because of peer pressure.

Question 6

Almost all candidates have now worked out how to tackle this question and they and their teachers should be congratulated because a good answer involves marshalling a lot of material. This illustrates that almost all candidates are capable of working with the quantity and level of the material in the paper. In fact in this particular component it was striking how many candidates scored very highly on this question when they had struggled with much of the rest of the paper.

The majority of answers reached Level 3 by addressing both sources of the question and supporting what they said with extracts from the sources. The two main approaches were to group the 'Yes' or 'No' sources together or to work through each source one at a time. There was no discernible advantage in either method.

Despite being a well known question type there were substantial numbers of candidates who still took only one side of the argument and so limited themselves to Level 2, 7 marks. Some of these were quite impressive in their execution. Once again, a lack of experience seems to have hampered them.

Relatively few candidates succeeded in making a convincing case about how far the sources proved the statement to be correct or incorrect but some did. This concluding paragraph took the candidate into Level 4 on the back of a strong Level 3 answer:

In conclusion, I think that the sources are split two ways on the statement. However, the newspaper sources A, B and D placed great emphasis on the point of view that teenagers were out of control in order to make a point and sell papers, so that means a large section of the evidence for the statement is not very good. The majority of the reliable sources are against the statement, especially trustworthy sources like the history book in Source B so overall I think the statement is wrong.

A973 and A982 Historical Enquiry Controlled Assessment

This was the first moderation of the new controlled assessment work. On the whole the new scheme worked very well and there was some very impressive work. Centres amended the generic questions sensibly and nearly all candidates were given full opportunities to fulfil the requirements of the marking criteria. The entry was small compared to the normal entry at the end of Year 11 but there were several thousand candidates – enough on which to base a few tentative conclusions. Most centres used the Depth Study or The Role of the Individual options. There were just a few entries for the Thematic Study and the Modern World Study.

There was also a small entry for the short course unit A982 where the controlled assessment is based on the chosen British Depth Study. Most of the comments that follow apply equally to that work.

The generic mark scheme appears to have worked well with centres using it to assess the qualities of the work as a whole. Detailed instructions about using this mark scheme can be found in the Teachers' Guide to Controlled Assessment for this specification. The moderators did make some changes to centres' marks. Marks were reduced more often than they were increased, although nearly all the changes were relatively minor. The biggest area of disagreement between centres and moderators was in the mark range 40-50. It should be remembered that marks of 45 and above should only be awarded to outstanding work. A mark of 45 is the notional mark for the A* grade. At this level moderators expect either critical use of sources or of interpretations to be integral to, and supporting, the overall analysis and argument.

Nearly all the work was properly organised and presented with the appropriate cover sheets being used for the work of each candidate. Most centres carefully annotated the work throughout but most useful for moderators were the summative comments at the end. These summed up the main characteristics of the work as whole and explained why it had been placed in a particular band of the mark scheme. Such comments were most useful when they were concise and focused – just four or five lines long and referring directly to the criteria in the mark scheme.

The overall grades awarded were not quite as good as those awarded in the past for coursework. However, most of the candidates submitting work were in Year 10 rather than Year 11 and moderators were impressed with the overall standard of work. It was encouraging to see candidates writing relevant and focused work at length. The mark scheme does put an emphasis on candidates directly answering the question and avoiding irrelevant description and narrative. Many candidates had clearly used the planning stages wisely and produced coherent, well organised and relevant answers.

A minority of candidates still found it necessary to write a page or two of background or to start by telling the story. Candidates have plenty of time to plan their answers before the final draft is produced. They should therefore know what their argument/answer is going to be before they write the final draft. This means that they can state what their answer to the question is in the first few lines. They can also state what their line of argument is going to be. The rest of the answer should be used to support and justify their initial statement. Such an approach helps to ensure that the whole answer will be focused on the question and is in contrast to the approach adopted by many candidates who only directly addressed the question in their conclusions. These candidates produced perfectly reasonable answers that explained a number of factors. However, the key issue was often left until the end.

Candidates should be encouraged to form their own views about the question and be ready to argue them and support them. Of course, this does not mean they should only concern themselves with arguments and evidence that support their argument. They also need to consider alternative arguments/factors/evidence to explain why they are not as convincing as the ones they have adopted. Such an approach is to be preferred to a routine run through all the possible factors and a limp conclusion which is asserted rather than supported and which in no way emerges naturally from the earlier analysis.

Most candidates seem to have used the allowed 8 hours wisely. Their main task for much of this time is to go through all their materials (class notes, textbooks, other reference materials) and select what will be useful and relevant for answering the question. Candidates should be encouraged to have the confidence to leave out material which, although accurate and interesting, is not relevant.

Candidates are also expected to integrate into their answers critical use of sources or interpretations. Most candidates used the former. It is important to remember that the main focus of candidates should be to answer the question. How well this is done will largely determine which band the answer will go into. The critical use of sources or interpretations is secondary but is still important. Set piece evaluations where candidates suddenly depart from their focus on the question and spend a paragraph or two evaluating a source were thankfully rare. Instead, many candidates used evidence from sources to support the arguments they were making. Statements such as 'this source is useful' or 'this source is reliable' become unnecessary. It is obvious the candidate finds the source useful otherwise he or she would not be using it. As for reliability – this is also implicit.

When the work is being assessed one of the issues to be considered by marker and moderator is: does the evidence being referred to satisfactorily do the job it is being used for by the candidate? If clearly questionable, unsatisfactory or irrelevant evidence is being used then the answer will be 'no'. Candidates need to reference the sources for the evidence they have used. This can be done in the body of the answer or by the use of footnotes. The reference should be to the original source of the evidence, for example, if evidence from a letter by Martin Luther King is being used, the reference should be to the letter not to the textbook where the letter was located.

The new controlled assessment requires candidates to develop different skills from those present in the old coursework. It was encouraging to see so many candidates getting it right so quickly.

Centres are reminded that OCR consultants are available to comment on centres' questions and programmes of study and to offer advice on all matters related to controlled assessment. Centres are also directed to the Guide to Controlled Assessment which contains detailed advice and support. Both can be accessed through the OCR website.

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

