

GCSE (9-1)

Examiners' report

HISTORY B

(SCHOOLS HISTORY PROJECT)

J411

For first teaching in 2016

J411/14 Summer 2024 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 14 series overview	4
Section A: Crime & Punishment, c.1250 to present overview	5
Question 1 (a)	6
Question 1 (b)	6
Question 1 (c)	6
Question 2	7
Question 3	8
Question 4*	10
Question 5*	11
Section B: The Norman Conquest, 1065–1087 overview	15
Question 6 (a)	16
Question 6 (b)	17
Question 7	18
Question 8*	21
Question 9*	22

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers is also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 14 series overview

This paper incorporates the Thematic Study and the British Depth Study, each accounting for half the marks of this paper. To do well on the Thematic Study, candidates need to be able to present a historical summary of an area of content they have learned (Question 2), offer an explanation in response to a historical question (e.g. explaining the causes or consequences of something) in Question 3 and recall and apply their knowledge to support and challenge a statement in an essay style question from either Question 4 or Question 5.

To do well in the British Depth Study, candidates need to be able to identify and explain how producers of interpretations portray historical events, utilise second order concepts to develop an enquiry (Question 6a and 6b), analyse and compare historical interpretations (Question 7) whilst recalling and applying their knowledge in a further essay-style question from either Question 8 or Question 9.

The ability of candidates to use different techniques, from employing second order historical concepts to organise their responses around, to comparing historical interpretations, was impressive across the range of questions. Areas which continue to require further preparation are being analytical in Question 2 and selecting valid historical investigations in Question 6b.

OCR support



Please note the date of the upcoming [Exam Review session](#) which is 15th October 4-6pm.

Section A: Crime & Punishment, c.1250 to present overview

The thematic study requires candidates to understand change and continuity from c.1250 to the present. The study requires them to consider historical development over a long period and to identify and explain why certain developments occurred. The questions test various historical skills from the ability to deploy second order concepts in their answers to writing explained arguments for or against certain views.

The Crime and Punishment c.1250 to the present option focuses on crime, punishment, and law enforcement throughout the period. This year's focus was on law enforcement in the medieval and early modern periods, transportation to Australia, punishments in the early modern period and why crime changed between 1900 and c.2015. There were some very good responses with candidates demonstrating their competence in all aspects of the paper.

It was clear that most candidates had been well prepared for this section and were able to deploy their knowledge accurately, particularly in the essay style questions (questions 4 and 5).

With Question 2, while most candidates were able to provide accurate and often detailed summaries, many did not present the analytical response necessary for the higher levels. It was obvious that candidates knew the content that they needed to use to answer the question, in this case law enforcement between 1250 and 1750, and the reasons for transportation. What they need to focus on is organising thoughts to answer the question.

In questions 4 and 5 candidates in general, focused their responses on the argument and emphasised points of agreement and disagreement. However, some responses lacked the detail necessary to reach the higher levels and were identifying or describing rather than explaining. One main issue that arose was candidates not reading the question carefully and then producing invalid responses.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrated a sound knowledge of law enforcement throughout the period and organised their response using second order concepts (Question 2) identified and fully explained two reasons for why transportation became a common punishment in the period 1750–1900 using precise examples that went beyond overcrowding causing crime (Question 3) understood the demands of the question, demonstrated knowledge of the topic, and produced four explanations on whether punishments in 1750 were harsher than those in 1500. Answers were balanced and well supported (Question 4) answered the question precisely, making full use of their knowledge of new crimes that had emerged between 1900 and c.2015 to provide a balanced answer on how far the emergence of new technology contributed to these changes (Question 5). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not have a strong sense of chronology and could not produce specific examples confused law enforcement with punishment or crime wrote a descriptive answer without the use of second order concepts or used second order concepts but lacked the knowledge to support the answer (Question 2) identified several reasons without the support necessary for a higher mark and often lacked the specific knowledge to produce more informed responses (Question 3) relied on common sense answers with very little specific evidence to back up their opinions (questions 4 and 5).

Question 1 (a)

1

(a) Name **one** way criminals could avoid being executed in the medieval period (1250–1500). [1]

The majority of candidates answered this question correctly. The most popular answers included joining the king's army, pardon from the king, women being pregnant and claiming sanctuary.

Question 1 (b)

(b) Name **one** reason people made accusations of witchcraft in the early modern period (1500–1750). [1]

There were a number of valid answers to this question. Many involved placing the blame on a person for something going wrong in their lives such as the death of a family member or a bad harvest. Others focused on the lack of scientific explanations and belief in magic and the devil. There were also answers that blamed misogyny referring to old women who lived alone or who had a wart. Candidates also blamed King James' Daemonology.

Question 1 (c)

(c) Name **one** development that improved policing in the **second half** of the 1800s. [1]

Correct answers referred to the County and Borough Police Act 1856, use of photographs in crime scenes, the CID and fingerprinting.

Many candidates were unaware of developments in the second half of the 1800s. There were many answers that wrongly referred to the development of the Metropolitan Police.

Question 2

2 Write a clear and organised summary that analyses law enforcement between 1250 and 1750.

Support your summary with examples.

[9]

Candidates who did well based their answers on second order concepts and produced a summary with two clear examples. Change, continuity, causation and consequence were the typical ones used for their analysis. Many began by focusing on the lack of a professional police force explaining this was the reason for the introduction of the hue and cry. They explained that the possibility of a fine for not complying contributed to its success. Others concentrated on its use throughout the period and why it became less effective as communities grew bigger. Some answers also included the Bow Street Runners which just scraped into the period. The role of the Justice of the Peace was often used for a second example with details of how this role changed as that of the sheriff declined. There were also answers on the changing roles of the courts.

Candidates who did less well simply described, for example, the hue and cry with no organising concept. Other responses simply identified a change without any development which confined them to Level 1. There were a number of candidates who were unaware of what was meant by 'law enforcement'. They usually proceeded to write about different types of punishment and there were several references to the Bloody Code. Answers at Level 1 varied from those who wrote descriptions not based on a second order concept to those who simply lacked specific knowledge. The majority of candidates were able to focus on the correct period with just the occasional reference to Robert Peel. Too often candidates divided their answer into the medieval period and early modern period. As a result, they tended to write an account of each period with no comparison and this led to answers with no organising second order concept.

Advice to centres

Remind candidates of ALL the second order concepts that they can use to answer this question.

Candidates should spend some of their time thinking about how to organise their response before putting pen to paper.

Question 3

3 Why did transportation to Australia become a common punishment in the period 1750–1900?

Explain your answer.

[10]

Generally, candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of transportation, and many were able to make full use of this to provide at least one good explanation. However, some answers were repetitive indicating that more thought needed to be given to providing two clear reasons. Candidates should be able to identify a reason, then support it with precise evidence and relate it to the question. Stronger responses often referred to the Bloody Code and the fact that judges were reluctant to impose the death penalty for minor offences and thus transportation was an alternative punishment. Other answers revolved around the fact that, following independence, America was no longer available, so Australia was chosen as it had recently become a British colony. This was further developed by explaining why so many prisoners were needed and what they did in Australia. Another approach focused on overcrowded prisons, the increasing crime rate and why Australia was the solution to this. Some candidates successfully considered the more humanitarian attitude towards punishment and the opportunity for rehabilitation.

Candidates who did less well often stopped at just identifying a reason or proceeded to describe the conditions on the boats. Such answers omitted to explain why transportation became a common punishment and lacked the knowledge required to develop the answers. Many answers lacked organisation. Candidates need to be aware that only two fully explained reasons are required for Level 5. They often split their answers into a series of identifications. In many cases some of the points they made could have been combined to attain at least Level 3 or even Level 4 if they had linked the points together.

Exemplar 1

3	Transportation had been a punishment long before it was used in 1780-1900 as America was the place in which people were transported to. This changed
	because of the war for the control of America in 1776 in which America became independent from Britain. So as Britain had lost America it needed a new place to send people. That is when Australia became the new place to send people who need were punished with transportation. So that is one of the reasons why Australia had become a common punishment in the period of 1780-1900.
	Another reason why transportation to Australia became a common punishment in Industrial England was that the prisons simply became far too full. Prisons during the Industrial Revolution were filled with men, women and children. With no education for children they could quickly turn to crime for work. This meant that any young adults only would know crime as reformation was never used to try to stop crime. This meant prisons were filled with quickly leading to them becoming over populated and a need for people to be moved away. This is why transportation to Australia became a common punishment during the Industrial Revolution.
	Another reason for transportation becoming more common was that the overall population was growing and everywhere was becoming over populated meaning more chance of crime more targets and more criminals. This led to more people becoming punished for crime meaning that transportation to Australia had become more common during the period of 1780-1900.

This response shows an example of the candidate doing this question well. The reason given is that Britain needed somewhere to send prisoners, with precise detail such as that Britain was already sending prisoners to America but could no longer do so because of American independence. The candidate then answers the question linking back to Australia being the new place to send people.

A second reason is then identified in that prisons are too full, precise detail and a key word is used to say that prisons were full of women and children because there was no **reform**. The question is answered with the need to get people to move away.

Question 4*

4* 'By 1750, punishments for committing crimes were harsher than they had been in 1500.'

How far do you agree?

Give reasons for your answer.

[18]

Stronger responses reflected an organised approach to the question producing four clear explanations with valid arguments. They ensured that they produced a balanced answer. Such responses often began by emphasising that many punishments remained the same referring especially to fines, execution, and humiliation. A few commented on the fact that it was the extent to which they were used that varied which was particularly applicable to the death penalty. Humiliation was one example used to explain that punishments were not becoming harsher. Candidates focused on the scold's bridle, the stocks, pillory, cucking and ducking stools. The majority related various crimes to the punishments to produce a sound explanation. Many argued that punishments had become harsher by 1750 because of the introduction of the Bloody Code and the extension of the death penalty for so many minor offences. They also realised that the Bloody Code could be used to produce a counter-argument by explaining the increasing reluctance of juries to convict people for lesser crimes which saw a reduction in the number of death sentences. The growth of bridewells and the harsh treatment of vagrants were often used to exemplify punishments becoming harsher.

Candidates who did less well often struggled to confine their answer to the period. There were many references to the long drop and even the silent and separate systems, all outside the scope of the question. Generally, there was a lack of specific knowledge and too many answers did not contain the detail needed for an explanation. Descriptions of punishments were often provided without any real link to the question. Often responses were very brief and showed clearly that the candidate was not familiar with the developments of the period.

Points for centres to consider

As in previous years all candidates are attempting to provide four explanations. They know how to structure the answer in terms of agreeing or disagreeing but need to be more aware of what is required for an explanation.

Some candidates clearly struggle to provide four explanations and would benefit from providing fewer more detailed ones.

Candidates should be encouraged to include specific details in their answers rather than making generalised unsupported points.

Question 5*

5* 'The main reason crime changed between 1900 and c.2015 was the emergence of new technology.'

How far do you agree?

Give reasons for your answer.

[18]

This was by far the most popular optional question and candidates generally answered it well.

Candidates who did well focused clearly on the question. They stated at the beginning of each paragraph whether they agreed or disagreed with the view and developed their answer accordingly. Such answers usually began with the emergence of new technology and referred to the development of the internet explaining examples of different types of cybercrime. Some referred to social media and how it could be used for bullying. Car crime was another example often used to explain how new technology had led to new types of crime. These answers were supported with examples including laws concerning the wearing of seatbelts, drink driving and the use of a mobile phone in a car. Drug crime was often used as a counter-argument with candidates referring to the classification of drugs and the 1971 Misuse of Drugs Act. Another example was how immigration following the end of the Second World War led to the passing of Race Relations Acts in 1965, 1968 and 1976 and many candidates also referred to hate crime. Some of the best answers were able to explain that the emergence of new technology had resulted in new laws being passed which created new crimes as the government responded to new situations.

Candidates who did less well were those who were rewriting the question. Such answers focused on how technology was being used to combat crime including whole paragraphs on CCTV, the development of fingerprinting and DNA. The focus of the question was why crime changed and some candidates concentrated on continuity with answers stating, for example, that murder and theft continued. There is still an issue for some candidates on how to construct an explanation. Many identify a claim or argument but do not go on to develop it and show how their evidence answers the question. Some responses were quite long but contained little specific detail and more thorough revision would have helped in some cases. For example, answers on cybercrime would give an example of phishing or hacking, explain what they were and develop the answer no further. A significant number did not even mention the internet. Candidates need to ensure that they have specific knowledge to support their answers.

Exemplar 2

5	<p>Overall, I agree with this statement. One reason why is the emergence of more and newer cars. While cars existed before 1900, more and more emerged and this caused them to become more popular. This in turn led to new crimes being created for safety on the roads. For example, it became a crime to have a certain amount of alcohol in your bloodstream when driving. This was a new law created due to more cars emerging, which is an example of new technology. Another crime which was created is driving without a seatbelt. These were both crimes which emerged due to new technology as a way of protecting drivers, passengers and people walking nearby.</p> <p>Another reason crime changed in this period is the creation of computers and the internet, a form of new technology. The emergence of these two things opened up a lot of new crimes which people could commit. For example, phishing. This is when people send fake e-mails to people in an attempt to gain personal information. Furthermore, hacking became a new crime, which is when people can try gaining personal information on big businesses through certain methods. As well as this, illegal downloading became a crime, which is when people get games, movies, shows and more for free when it in fact costs money. These are all crimes created due to the emergence of the internet and computers. Cybercrime has become increasingly common and was included in on the other hand the crime statistics in 2015 for the first time, which doubled the overall crime rate.</p>
---	--

On the other hand, there are many other factors which caused crime to change. One crime which emerged is hate crime, which appeared due to beliefs, attitudes and values. Immigration to Britain has become more common since 1900, especially due to the Second World War. This increased immigration has led to ~~clashes~~ clashes between people of different cultures. There were three Race Relations Acts which were created ~~there~~ in the mid 20th century due to these clashes. However, it became even worse during the Stephen Lawrence case, who was killed due to the colour of his skin. Two laws were created in 1998 and 2003 ~~for~~ due to this and hate crimes ~~specifically~~ were ~~specifically~~ created. This new crime had nothing to do with new technology.

Another ~~crime~~ ~~not~~ reason crime changed was due to the increased popularity of drugs, which are not a form of new technology. Drugs became the most popular in the 1960s, and the government

had to act to decrease the use of them. Due to this, drugs were classed into 3 groups, A, B and C. Drugs in class A carried the harshest punishment. This new crime was solely to deter people from using illegal drugs, which isn't a new technology. However, these new crimes ~~hasn't~~ ^{haven't} completely worked and ~~the~~ illegal drugs are still popular. Therefore, new crimes are still being created to try stop drug use.

In conclusion, I agree with this statement, purely due to the emergence of the internet and computers. To protect data and more, cybercrime was created. This category is extremely broad and covers multiple crimes. Due to this, I believe new technology was the main reason crime changed as it caused an abundance of new crimes to be created.

This candidate response shows a high level answer.

They agree with the statement using the technology of cars with new crimes being failing to wear seatbelts or drinking and driving.

The second argument links the internet effectively to the question using specific detail of phishing and hacking.

The candidate then moves onto talk about attitudes and beliefs linking them to crimes being brought into legislation; the Race Relations Act with detail about Stephen Lawrence.

Finally, the candidate uses drug popularity in the 1960s with specific detail of the categorisation of drugs into law.

Section B: The Norman Conquest, 1065–1087 overview

To do well on the British Depth Study, candidates need to be able to:

- analyse and compare interpretations
- devise historical questions
- recall and apply their knowledge to support and challenge a historical interpretation in an essay-style question.

It was clear from the majority of responses that most candidates had been well-prepared for Questions 6 and 7, although many candidates still struggled to think of wider, historical questions or lines of enquiry for Question 6b. Most candidates remain comfortable with the premise of Question 7 and were able either to compare the overall impression given about the Battle of Stamford Bridge, or else compare details between the two interpretations.

In the essay style questions, most candidates opted for Question 9 and were able to deploy accurately their knowledge about the reasons why William transformed England. There were fewer candidates who opted to answer Question 8, and this question tended to be answered less successfully. Generally, candidates focused their responses on the argument and emphasised points of agreement and disagreement. However, some responses lacked the detail necessary to reach the higher levels and were identifying or describing rather than explaining.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identified and explained (supported with two points of development) one way the interpretation portrayed Anglo-Saxon culture as spectacular (Question 6a) • used Interpretation A to ask a historical question (i.e. based on a second-order concept such as causation, consequence or change), and gave some kind of indication of how that might help us to further understand Anglo-Saxon culture (Question 6b) • compared the overall message about the Battle of Stamford Bridge (or the people involved), and went on to give a reason that they differed (e.g. given the nature and purpose of Interpretation B as a saga) (Question 7) • effectively addressed the seriousness of the threat of Northern resistance in Question 8 or the extent of transformation in the Norman Conquest in Question 9 • effectively deployed a range of knowledge in the essay question, using precise evidence to support their answers (Questions 8 and 9). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • did not explain how Interpretation A portrayed Anglo-Saxon culture as spectacular or identified more than one way the interpretation did this (Question 6a) • asked for more details about Interpretation A; or identified elements or objects from it, rather than concentrating upon a second-order concept; or didn't ask a question or tell us something they wanted to find out; or stated what they knew about Anglo-Saxon culture; or tried to contrive the use of particular phrases like 'diversity' or 'causation' (Question 6b) • summarised Interpretation B and Interpretation C separately; or only compared their provenances; or wrote about how reliable each interpretation was (Question 7) • did not fully engage with resistance in different parts of the country in Question 8; or made accurate but generalised points but did not provide sufficient supporting evidence in either Question 8 or Question 9; or told a narrative of events in Question 9 including the events of 1066 itself.

Question 6 (a)

6

(a) In **Interpretation A**, the website portrays Anglo-Saxon culture as spectacular.

Identify and explain **one** way in which it does this.

[3]

The aim of this question is to get candidates thinking about the methods used by writers, artists, film-makers, etc. to put forward a particular interpretation of a historical figure, period or event.

The vast majority of candidates were able to access the interpretation and they understood the question. Most scored 1 or 2 marks by picking out a specific feature (e.g. 'It says that visitors will 'marvel at the humour and wisdom of the Anglo-Saxons') and then going on to develop their response by explaining how that feature made Anglo-Saxon culture seem spectacular. Where candidates started with a very specific feature such as this, they sometimes struggled to make two points of development about their feature.

The most successful responses were the ones which began with a more general point (e.g. 'The website repeatedly uses positive verbs to describe the actions of visitors at the exhibition'). Then went on to give an example of this (e.g. 'For instance, it says that visitors will 'marvel', 'discover' and 'encounter'). Then said how this made Anglo-Saxon culture seem spectacular (e.g. 'This implies that the visitors will be amazed and stunned at Anglo-Saxon culture').

Responses which picked out several features rather than one feature as the question asked were unable to move past 1 mark.

There was a definite improvement from 2023 in respect of candidates remaining focused on the interpretation itself, and the techniques used by its creators to give a certain impression. Examiners saw fewer responses which ignored the interpretation and drifted off into recounting features of Anglo-Saxon culture from their own knowledge.

Question 6 (b)

- (b) If you were asked to do further research on **one** aspect of **Interpretation A**, what would you choose to investigate?

Explain how this would help us to analyse and understand the culture of late Anglo-Saxon England.

[5]

The idea of this question is to test candidates' ability to come up with a genuine historical enquiry, using the interpretation as a starting point.

The vast majority of candidates were able to ask a question, or questions, or indicate something that they would like to find out. At Level 1, these were typically things such as finding out more information about the items in the interpretation, such as how the Anglo-Saxons made objects out of metal, or what the content of the letter was.

Responses rewarded at Level 2, framed a wider historical enquiry around a second-order concept, such as consequence or diversity. These tended to be things such as, 'How important was religion in Anglo-Saxon culture?'; 'How much did the Norman Conquest change Anglo-Saxon culture?'; or 'Did different areas of the country (or different social groups) share a common culture, or were there differences between them?'

A few candidates were able to go on to explain how this might help us to analyse and understand the culture of late Anglo-Saxon England (Level 3).

However, many candidates did not achieve any marks because they didn't ask a question or identify something they would like to know or find out about. These responses tended simply to identify objects named in the text (e.g. 'I would investigate the Codex Amiatinus') and sometimes go on to recite information they already knew about Anglo-Saxon culture, which was not rewardable in the mark scheme as this is not what the question was asking them to do.

Several candidates had clearly been told to use certain words such as 'significance' or 'diversity' but their attempts to place these within their response often betrayed a lack of understanding and came across as muddled or contrived. Similarly, some candidates came prepared with an enquiry question which didn't bear any relation to Anglo-Saxon culture or to Interpretation A (such as 'How different were the lives of different kind of people?') and were again not creditable.

Misconception



This question does not require candidates to answer their question and it is not asking what candidates already know. Although it is expected that candidates should be familiar with the concept of historical enquiry, there is no requirement that they use particular words or phrases and sometimes it is counter-productive to instruct them to do so. Candidates should also make sure they consider the second part of the question, and explain how their question will help further understanding of X.

Question 7

7 Interpretations B and C both focus on the Battle of Stamford Bridge.

How far do they differ and what might explain any differences?

[12]

This question offers candidates the opportunity to show that they can identify the different ways that historical events, periods or figures are presented, and explain why they may differ.

The vast majority of candidates were able to pick out individual points from the interpretations to show how they were similar or different and were rewarded at Level 2. Most frequently, this was pointing out that the interpretations both agreed that the Norwegians were caught without their armour. Differences at this level included contrasting the armies' actions or events in the battle (e.g. Interpretation B said the Norwegians 'bravely held back the attack from the English', while Interpretation C said they were 'slaughtered without mercy' or 'frantically tried to escape').

Plenty of candidates were able to explain the different overall impressions given about the battle, the armies, or their leaders. Most typically, this involved comparing Interpretation B's sympathetic portrayal of Harald Hardrada and/or the Norwegians' performance with Interpretations C's more critical one. Another popular approach was to compare how Interpretation B attempted to persuade us that the battle was quite close, whereas Interpretation C made it seem like the Norwegians were just completely destroyed. A few candidates chose to explain how the focus of each interpretation was different, with Interpretation B being much more focused on the bravery of the Norwegians and Harald Hardrada, whereas Interpretation C was telling us more about what a great victory it was for the English. These responses were placed in Level 3 and awarded a higher mark within the level where valid support was given from the interpretations.

A fair number of candidates were then able to explain why Interpretation B painted such a flattering picture of Hardrada or his army, and these responses moved into Level 4. Successful responses went beyond duplicating the lines in the provenance. Responses which simply repeated, for example, that 'Interpretation B was favourable towards the Norwegians because Snorri had links to the Norwegian royal family' did not meet the Level 4 criteria. Better responses explained what Snorri was trying to do as a result of this, e.g. 'Interpretation B focuses on Harald's bravery and the Norwegians' courage because Snorri had links to the Norwegian royal family, so he wants to make the King of Norway seem like a hero'. The very best responses examined the nature of this piece of writing as a saga, and considered what impact this had on how Hardrada is presented, i.e. Snorri was focusing on the personal story and courage of King Harald in order to glorify his achievements and make it seem like he died a hero's death.

A minority of candidates' responses did not proceed beyond Level 1 because they either dealt with the interpretations separately, with no valid comparison, or else compared the provenance of the interpretations rather than their content.

Only a very few candidates misunderstood the question and attempted to evaluate the interpretations by explaining how reliable they were given what they had learned (this is not what the question is asking).

Advice to centres



Candidates should take a moment before beginning their response to consider, 'What impression does the author (or artist, etc.) want to give me about X?' They should then select details from the extract (or image) to support their response. They should also be encouraged to consider specific reasons that a particular organisation or individual might want to give us that impression. Because these will be interpretation-specific, it is important that candidates are given numerous opportunities to 'bump into' historical interpretations to practise this kind of thing routinely. Generic or pre-learned responses will rarely make it to the higher levels.

Exemplar 3

7	<p>Interpretation B suggests that the Vikings put up a good fight and that they only narrowly lost to the English despite them having no armour whereas Interpretation C suggests the English easily destroyed the Vikings. with Interpretation B could be displaying Hardrada and his army in a noble light as Sturluson had links with the Norwegian royal family and wanted to make them look as good as possible despite their loss. This decreases the reliability of the se Interpretation as the author is biased. Interpretation C however could differ for a similar reason as the TV documentary was was made for Brits so it could present the English on a pedestal to increase the amount of viewers it received. This also leads to a decrease in reliability of the interpretation as it is biased in order to appeal to the audience.</p> <p>Interpretation B suggests that the Norwegians were had removed their armour due to weather being too hot whereas Interpretation C suggests that the Vikings were relaxing in the sun and that is why they had no armour. Interpretation B may display twist the truth a little here as Sturluson was writing a saga of Hardrada, made to present him as a hero so the narrative of them being forced to remove the armour due to the sun may be a result of</p>
---	---

		Sturluson attempting to make Hardrada look less arrogant and more heroic. Furthermore, Snorri states that Godwinson had a cavalry which is strictly untrue as the Normans were the only group who could ride horses. This false information may show that Sturluson is an incapable and biased historian as he may present Godwinson's army as powerful to further push the narrative that Hardrada was a hero and this decreases his reliability. Interpretation B Interpretation C however may provide more accurate insight as they are a documentary which could increase reliability as they can do more research with their funding. They could be different from the Interpretation B because they are retelling the real story of what happened.
--	--	---

The exemplar shows a high level performance.

At the start of the answer the candidate clearly demonstrates an understanding of how the interpretations differ in their portrayal of the two sides: the Vikings put up a good fight (Interpretation B); the English easily destroyed the Vikings (Interpretation C). This is then explained when the candidate shows an understanding that as the author of Interpretation B is related to the Norwegians he would want to make them look as good as possible despite their loss. The purpose is further reinforced later on when reference is made to the nature of a saga meaning that Hardrada would be made to look brave rather than arrogant.

Question 8*

8* According to the website 'worldhistory.org', northern resistance was 'the most serious threat to William's rule in England' in the years **1067 to 1071**.

How far do you agree with this view?

Give reasons for your answer.

[20]

This was less popular than Question 9 and not as well answered.

Candidates who chose this question had clearly studied resistance to William's rule in the period identified and understood what the question was asking. Valid points raised to support the interpretation included:

- The widespread/ recurring nature of the northern resistance, meaning William had to make repeated trips to deal with the threat.
- The fact that Edgar Aetheling and the Danes lent support with 250 ships, increasing the threat.
- The impact of the rebellion on York.
- The difficulty William had in capturing the rebels and dealing with the rebellion.
- The harsh response from William as compared to other rebellions, the Harrying of the North, demonstrates how serious a threat he perceived it to be.
- Some candidates argued the less serious nature of other rebellions, e.g. Exeter, in comparison to northern resistance.

Valid points raised to challenge the statement included:

- By paying off the Danes and carrying out the Harrying of the North, William was able to deal with northern resistance and it therefore did not constitute a 'serious threat' in the end.
- Other rebellions (e.g. Exeter, Ely), or Danish involvement generally, were more serious. Rebels repeatedly gathered under the leadership of Edgar, Edwin & Morcar, Hereward the Wake/ Danes in Ely.

At Level 2 and above, candidates included precise evidence to support their point and, crucially, explained how it addressed the question of why something was a 'serious threat' (or not) to William's rule. Responses that reached Level 5 put forward four explained points, with at least one point on either side of the argument.

There were many responses, or parts of responses, which demonstrated good knowledge by offering extended narratives (e.g. of events during the Exeter or Ely rebellions) but did not meet the criteria for an explained point because they did not make a case for why these were a 'serious threat' or not. These kinds of responses could not be credited beyond Level 1.

Less successful candidates tended to list facts they knew rather than make a wider point and then use specific evidence to support it, or else made accurate but vague assertions which did not demonstrate the knowledge required. These responses were also generally placed in Level 1.

Question 9*

- 9* In the 2010 TV documentary 'The Normans', historian Robert Bartlett argued that the Norman Conquest 'transformed England' between **1066 and 1087**.

How far do you agree with this view of the impact of the Norman Conquest?

Give reasons for your answer.

[20]

This was the more popular choice of the two essay-style questions.

On the whole, candidates seemed well-prepared for this question, which asked candidates to consider to what extent England was 'transformed' by the Norman Conquest.

Most candidates opted for a '3-1' approach, making three points in favour of the interpretation. A wide range of valid points was credited to support England's 'transformation' and included:

- Evidence in relation to dispossession/changes in land ownership, with only 5 per cent of English land being in the hands of English landowners by 1086.
- Changes to the social hierarchy, e.g. the introduction of the feudal system, ceorls having less freedom, and the gradual abolition of slavery.
- Changes to language, both written and spoken with Latin becoming the official written language.
- Introduction of new or harsher laws such as the Murdrum Fine or the Forest Law.
- Changes to the Church, e.g. the replacement of the people at the top with Normans like Lanfranc and the eradication of Anglo-Saxon saints. By 1080, only one of the sixteen English bishops remained in office.
- Loss of Anglo Saxon religious traditions/culture, e.g. saints of the Anglo-Saxons disappeared, traditions of stone crosses replaced.
- Changes to architecture, e.g. the introduction of hundreds of motte and bailey castles and the rebuilding/revival of cathedrals and monasteries, e.g. Canterbury, York and Durham – much larger and more beautiful than Saxon buildings.
- Increased taxation.
- The long-term impact of the Harrying of the North.

To challenge the interpretation, candidates were mainly credited for points such as:

- The feudal system was very similar to the Anglo-Saxon hierarchy.
- There was continuity in law enforcement, e.g. trial by combat was very similar to trial by ordeal, which also continued under the Normans.
- For some sections of society, daily life continued as usual: England continued to be a rural society with 90 per cent of the population working in agriculture.
- Spoken language was, for most people, only enriched by the introduction, or blending, of new words; this did not constitute a 'transformation' as the English language survived.
- The Normans retained Anglo-Saxon systems of law, administration and coinage.

As with Question 8, candidates were rewarded at Level 2 and above when they included precise evidence to support their point and explained why this meant England was or was not 'transformed'.

Responses which attained Level 5 put forward four explained points, with at least one point on either side of the argument.

Examiners came across a number of misconceptions in these responses. For example, many candidates incorrectly asserted that William forced everyone to speak French; that he had built hundreds of stone castles by 1087; and that it was William who made the Anglo-Saxons Christian instead of Pagan.

There were several reasons why responses (or parts of responses) were not awarded above Level 1. Firstly, many candidates made valid points but were unable develop these sufficiently with precise evidence. There were also many responses which did not fully engage with the question of 'transformation'. For example, they gave detail about things such as the Forest Law, but did not say why this was a change or transformation. Some candidates tried to say that the Norman feudal system was a complete change to Saxon traditions because it introduced a hierarchy which was not valid. References to the Domesday Book being a new way of taxing people was also not valid. Finally, we saw some responses which tried to argue that the Conquest 'transformed' England on the basis of very simplistic or incomplete evidence, for example, that lots of people had died in the Battle of Hastings or in rebellions; these responses did not fully get to grips with the long-term impact required for a 'transformation'.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Access to Scripts

We've made it easier for Exams Officers to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts'. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular professional development courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

[ExamBuilder](#) is a free test-building platform, providing unlimited users exclusively for staff at OCR centres with an [Interchange](#) account.

Choose from a large bank of questions to build personalised tests and custom mark schemes, with the option to add custom cover pages to simulate real examinations. You can also edit and download complete past papers.

[Find out more](#).

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals (examined units only).

[Find out more](#).

You will need an Interchange account to access our digital products. If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Need to get in touch?


If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2024 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource in your centre, in line with any specific restrictions detailed in the resource. Resources intended for teacher use should not be shared with students. Resources should not be published on social media platforms or other websites.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.