

## **History A**

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1935**

General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course) **GCSE 1035**

# **Report on the Components**

---

**June 2009**

**1935/1035/MS/R/09**

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, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, 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 syllabuses 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 syllabus 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 2009

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications  
PO Box 5050  
Annesley  
NOTTINGHAM  
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622  
Facsimile: 01223 552610  
E-mail: [publications@ocr.org.uk](mailto:publications@ocr.org.uk)

## **CONTENTS**

**General Certificate of Secondary Education History A (1935)**

**General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)  
History A (1035)**

### **REPORTS ON THE COMPONENTS**

<b>Unit/Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
Chief Examiner's Report	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
1935 11-15 Paper 1 and 1035/01 Paper 1 (Short Course)	1
1935/21 Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time	11
1935/22 Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time	14
1035/02, 1935/03 Coursework	17
Grade Thresholds	20

# **1935 11-15 Paper 1 and 1035/01 Paper 1 (Short Course)**

## **General comments**

The total number of candidates entered for this specification was practically identical to last year's entry. Of the two Development Studies, Medicine remains far more popular than Crime and Punishment. Both Depth Studies Britain and Elizabethan England are still losing candidates. Most of these appear to be going to American West which remains the most popular Depth Study with a clear lead over Germany. There were only a handful of candidates entered for South Africa. The rapid reduction in numbers for both Britain and Elizabethan England is worrying. Both of these can be stimulating, accessible and worthwhile for candidates and there is no evidence that either is more demanding than American West or Germany. Elizabethan England, in particular, provides the essential elements that can make history accessible and memorable for candidates – larger than life individuals and great stories. It would be a tremendous shame if these two Depth Studies disappeared. Elizabethan England represents one of the few opportunities to study an earlier period at GCSE level and given the popularity of the Tudors in the popular media its rapidly approaching demise in examinations is a surprise.

The total number of candidates for this specification remains stable as does the general performance of the candidates. The results were similar to those in 2008. This year's papers contained some unusual sources that many candidates would not have seen before. It was encouraging to see most rise to the challenge and produce interesting and valid answers.

There are a few areas where candidate performance could be improved. Firstly, some candidates need to use more specific contextual examples when analysing sources. Sometimes a question will ask why a source was published at a certain date. When this is the case candidates need to be able to explain why the source was published then. However, even when a date is not mentioned in the question candidates should still try and use specific contextual knowledge to explain the source. Candidates should also be aware of the differences between questions that ask for the message of a source and those that require its purpose. If the wording of a question is along the lines of 'why was this source published then', purpose will be required for the highest level in the mark scheme, but this needs to be purpose in context. Candidates need to first interpret the message of the source and then ask themselves why that person (or organisation) would want to publish that message at that time. This should lead them to thinking about the impact the person behind the source wants to have on the audience. How does he or she want to change the thinking or behaviour of members of the audience? For example, with Medicine Question 1(c) the source might have been published to influence people to accept that they would have to pay more for clean healthy water. The explanation of this would be set in the context of the later 1850s. The message, on the other hand, might simply be that dirty water kills.

Some candidates find it difficult to focus their answers to source questions. The best advice is for them to work out their answer to the question before putting pen to paper and then, when they have a clear idea of what their response is going to be, use the first sentence of their answer to give a clear direct answer to the question. For example, American West Q1(d), 'No, I am not surprised by this source because the officer thought that by killing the buffalo, the Indians would be defeated.' The rest of the answer can then be used to support this opening sentence. Such an approach makes it much more likely that the whole answer will have a focus on the question. In some responses seen this year the actual answer to the question emerges late in the answer almost by accident or as an afterthought. This is after the candidate might have

spent half a page or more writing about the source and the context generally without directly addressing the question.

There were many good answers this year to the structured essay questions. Many candidates are now writing explanations rather than descriptions or narratives. The one area that still defeats many candidates, even the better ones, is reaching and supporting a proper conclusion in part (c). Often, candidates simply assert that, for example, one reason was more important than the other. If they provide support, they simply repeat what they have already written about the chosen reason. The key to a good conclusion is to compare the relative merits of the factors under consideration, the two sides of the argument. For example, if the question is about which reason was more important, or which individual was more important, criteria for importance (for example, long-term impact in a Development Study) could be identified which could be used for comparing the two reasons or individuals. An argument (even if only a couple of sentences) must be provided about why one is more important than the other, and this argument must be based on comparison.

An alternative approach is to argue that they were equally important because they were connected or dependent on each other. This then needs to be illustrated and explained. The very best candidates state at the beginning of their answers which factor they think is the most important and then spend the rest of the answer comparing the factors and justifying their opening statement. Such an approach can go badly wrong in the hands of more average candidates who are advised to explain the importance of each factor first, and move to a conclusion.

Finally, it is important to state that, as this is SHP, the examiners are as interested in the candidates thinking through issues and solving problems as they are in how much the candidates know. Quite often topics will be approached in questions from unusual directions and unusual sources will be used. Candidates have to be able to adapt and deploy what they have learned to the particular requirements of these questions and sources. The best preparation for this is to spend the teaching and learning time to develop the candidates' mental agility. Encourage them to take risks with their ideas, make sure they are not looking for the 'right answer', and give them plenty of practice in solving tricky problems that arise out of the content and sources studied. This will prepare them much more satisfactorily than getting them to follow a series of rules. Examiners have seen plenty of examples of such rules leading to inappropriate answers because the question has been slightly different from previous years. Candidates who are entirely dependent on such rules have nothing to fall back on when the rules turn out to be too inflexible to be of any use.

## **Medicine through Time**

**1 (a)** This question produced a very wide range of answers. The key word in the question is 'ideas'. This makes it necessary for candidates to make inferences from the sources. The best way to answer this type of question (indeed most types of questions) is to state the answer in the opening sentence, for example, 'The ideas about disease are not similar because Source A is based on natural ideas while Source B is based on supernatural ideas'. The rest of the answer can then use the sources and knowledge to support this opening statement. An encouraging number of candidates did eventually get round to making these points but did so in a very tortuous way and it was often not until the final sentence that crucial points about natural and supernatural were made. Weaker candidates described the activities in both sources in great detail but either failed to make inferences about ideas or claimed that the sources were similar because Source A was based on supernatural ideas. A number of candidates seemed to understand both sources but lacked the necessary vocabulary to clearly express their understanding. Terms such as 'natural' and 'supernatural' should be key words that form part of the basis of teaching and learning the history of medicine. Some candidates still think that anything that is not believed today such as the Theory of the Four Humours is supernatural.

Weaker candidates would benefit from regular exercises which develop their understanding and their ability to infer from sources ideas such as natural and supernatural.

**1(b)** There were many good answers to this question. Most candidates were able to explain the difference in ideas between the two sources but some thought that was sufficient as a reason for being surprised. Better candidates went on and used their contextual knowledge to explain either why they were surprised that they differ or why they were not surprised. For example, the belief in bad air spreading disease had been around so long that they were not surprised that people did not immediately accept Snow's claims about water.

**1(c)** Cartoons such as this one still present an enormous challenge for some candidates. A few candidates interpreted the cartoon literally and claimed that skeletons were offering boat rides on the Thames while other suggestions included the Loch Ness Monster. Some candidates' grasp of chronology was shown to be weak when they explained that the cartoon is about the Black Death. However, most candidates were able to work out that the cartoon was published to tell everyone about the dangers of dirty water. If this was stated in the opening sentence of the answer, candidates usually went on to write excellent answers. For other candidates this message emerged from large amounts of description almost by accident. The best candidates wrote about the purpose of the cartoon rather than about its message and were able to place the purpose in the context of the later 1850s, for example, the Great Stink or Snow's work on the spread of cholera and water.

**2** This question was by far the most popular and all parts were generally answered well. Part (a) produced many detailed and accurate answers. Many candidates scored full marks. The main weaknesses included a tendency to write in generalities that could have been about any period. For example, they believed gods caused disease; a number of candidates were convinced that the Egyptians developed the Theory of the Four Humours, and some described the mummifying of bodies but failed to explain how this helped their medical knowledge. However, many candidates were able to write about amulets, specialist doctors, the channels theory, simple surgery and religious reasons for keeping clean.

In (b) candidates often knew in detail about Greek medicine but did not always explain whether what they were describing was supernatural or natural. A number of candidates thought that the Theory of the Four Humours was a supernatural belief. There was a tendency for candidates to describe Greek medical ideas and practices without explaining why they were using supernatural and/or natural ideas.

There were many excellent answers to (c) with candidates able to explain ways in which the Romans borrowed from the Greeks and ways in which they developed new ideas and methods of their own. Some candidates attempted to turn the question on its head and claim that the Romans had taught the Greeks! One common misunderstanding was to claim that the Romans copied their public health system from the Greeks. This is probably explained by the Greek emphasis on keeping clean but candidates should understand that the 'public' aspect of Roman provision, the idea that the health of a whole city should be provided for through public facilities such as baths and fresh water, was largely a new one. The best candidates made extended comparisons between Greeks and Romans throughout their answers while less good candidates wrote about each separately leaving it to the examiner to spot the differences and similarities. Even the best candidates still struggle with the 'how far' part of this question. Candidates need to do more than make an assertion. They need to give a reasoned argument supporting a conclusion about the degree of Roman dependency.

**3** Parts (b) and (c) were answered better than part (a). In part (a) many candidates either wrote very general answers, for example, they prayed to God or wrote answers that described surgery at the beginning of the nineteenth century. These answers sometimes scored a mark or two but lacked the specific knowledge of the work of medieval doctors required for high marks. Reference to, for example, purging, bleeding and use of the cautery was required. Most

candidates recall material well when it forms part of a story and knowledge of Pare's exploits was good. However, too many candidates simply explained what he did instead of explaining why he was able to do what he did. Sometimes they could get away with the latter approach, for example, by telling the story of chance and running out of boiling oil they inadvertently explained an enabling reason. Better candidates started with the factors, for example, chance, his experience as an army doctor, the context of the Renaissance and the testing of ideas, and then used parts of Pare's story to provide examples of advances. There were also plenty of good answers to part (c). Most candidates were familiar with the work of both Vesalius and Harvey and were able to explain, for at least one of them, why their work was important. The best candidates compared the achievements of both and supported a conclusion about why one was the more important. Candidates seemed to find it easier to reach this top level in 3(c) than they did for 2(c).

4 This was the least popular question and the answers were very mixed in quality. Part (a) was answered reasonably well although there were still too many general answers that could have been about almost any period before 1800. The question did cover the first half of the nineteenth century and so references to chloroform were allowed even although these candidates also listed the carbolic spray, successful blood transfusions and transplant surgery. Some candidates seemed to think that 'the first half of the nineteenth century' is anywhere between 1850 and 2000. The best candidates simply stuck to the three crucial reference points of bleeding, pain and infection and developed answers worth full marks. Part (b) produced better answers with nearly all candidates able to at least identify several valid reasons for the opposition. Better candidates were able to produce perfectly good explanations. In answer to part (c) a number of candidates thought that Lister was responsible for chloroform while others claimed that Fleming was responsible for germ theory. However, many candidates wrote accurate and valid answers explaining the importance of both men. There were also many interesting arguments for why one was more important than the other which directly compared the importance of their contributions to the development of medicine.

## **Crime and Punishment through Time**

**1 (a)** This question produced a range of responses. Some candidates failed to go outside Source A and so explained why the actions of the Romans did or did not make sense from the evidence within the source. Better candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge of the Roman's legal system or their attitudes towards crime and punishment to express surprise or lack of surprise.

**1(b)** There were many disappointing answers. Some candidates' answers failed to go beyond everyday empathy while others described how beggars were punished rather than why they were punished harshly. A few candidates were able to root their answers in the attitudes and context of the sixteenth century and wrote about issues such as Puritan beliefs, the cost of relief, and the threat apparently posed by some beggars to social and political stability.

**1(c)** Many candidates got no further than describing the impressions of the police given by each source. Some even thought that the policeman in C was kindly and helpful while the police in Source D were doing a brilliant job. For some Source D was about Peterloo. Better candidates did use their knowledge of attitudes during the nineteenth century towards the police and were able to write sensible answers.

**2** This question was generally answered by the better candidates and as result there were many good answers. Most candidates were knowledgeable about the work of medieval juries and for part (b) wrote detailed answers about trial by ordeal. Only a few made the mistake of describing the ordeals and forgetting to explain why they were used. Reasons given included: juries not able to reach a verdict, no witnesses to the crime, to let God decide, and to try priests. The only common error was to describe the swimming test for witches as a trial by ordeal. Part

(c) was answered less well. There some excellent answers based on accurate and specific knowledge but there were also a number of answers lacking such knowledge. Most could cite the odd example of something new introduced by the Normans, for example, forest laws or trial by battle, but that was as far as they could go. Chronology was a problem for some who wrote about the introduction of the Bloody Code. It was clear that there was great uncertainty about when the Middle Ages began and ended.

**3** Parts (a) and (b) were answered better than part (c). In answers to (a) there was some nonsense (for example, broomsticks and flying) but there was also enough valid material to ensure that most candidates scored a good mark. Candidates were well prepared for part (b) and there were many answers explaining two or more factors. The main weakness was a tendency for some candidates to just identify the reasons instead of explaining them. The only major misunderstanding was some candidates claiming that the introduction of a proper police force by Peel was a reason for the decline of highway robbery. A good number of candidates found it necessary to waste their time by writing lengthy explanations of the rise of highway robbery before they got onto its decline. In part (c) there were plenty of good answers about smuggling but candidates knew less about poaching although some were aware of the Black Acts. The most common weakness was a tendency to write about these activities as if they were happening today, for example, the goods being smuggled in some answers included drugs and even illegal immigrants. The best candidates realised that there was an obvious way to score 8 marks - by arguing that smuggling was more of a problem for government and poaching was more of a problem for the landed classes.

**4** Answers to all parts of this question divided between the very good and the very poor. In response to part (a) some candidates chose individuals that they knew something about while others failed even to name an individual. It was not quite clear what the latter group thought the question was about, their answers being full of vague assertions and generalisations. Some answers to (b) suffered from the same fault - some candidates wrote a page of general material without ever naming any particular examples of rebellion or protest. The better candidates wrote sensibly about a range of appropriate events, for example, Peterloo, the Rebecca Riots, the Peasants' Revolt and the Gunpowder Plot. Answers to (c) were also divided into two sharply contrasting groups. Some answers were so general they had nothing in them that could be identified as being about the nineteenth century, while other candidates wrote especially well about the impact of industrialisation and fairly well about religion.

### **Elizabethan England**

**1(a)** All parts of Q1 were generally well answered. In response to (a) a few candidates could get no further than stating that the source tells us that they tortured people in Elizabeth's reign. Most candidates were able to infer that the government feared or hunted down Jesuits and explained why. The best candidates were able to go on and explain that the source indicates the religious divisions at the time and the importance of religion.

**1(b)** This question produced a wide range of answers with most candidates rising to the challenge of a source they had not come across before. A few weak candidates were totally mystified why anyone would keep such a strange collection of objects and some mistakenly thought that the objects belonged to the Justice of the Peace. However, most candidates recognised the objects as having Catholic connections and explained that there were some people in Elizabeth's reign still secretly keeping Catholicism alive. The best candidates went further and explained why they were not surprised that the government was trying to seek out Catholics. Many answers had interesting additions, for example, the significance of this happening late in the reign or the significance of a member of the gentry being found with these objects.

**1(c)** Another unfamiliar source and more interesting and varied answers. It was encouraging to see a good number of candidates doing some real thinking and concluding that they did not think



that Elizabeth would have been all that concerned because at least the people described had attended her Church and all that she required was outward obedience in religion. A small number of weaker candidates were sure that Elizabeth would have been outraged by such behaviour in a church while many used their contextual knowledge and understanding to produce more thoughtful answers, for example, about the significance of this happening at the end of the reign or the importance of the Church of England as an institution that was vital in controlling the country.

**2** Part (a) was answered well with candidates able to identify a series of relevant problems. The most common misunderstanding was to think that Mary Queen of Scots was a real problem in 1558. A number of candidates ignored 'the beginning of the reign' and wrote about problems throughout the reign. This sometimes led them to telling the story of Mary, Queen of Scots and the plots and rebellions at great length. A few candidates got their Marys mixed up and had Mary Queen of Scots as queen of England before Elizabeth. However, there were also many answers that made excellent use of Mary Tudor's reign to explain the problems facing Elizabeth in 1558. Candidates fell on part (b) with enthusiasm and there were many excellent answers. The main weakness was a tendency to tell the story of Mary without explicitly explaining why she posed problems for Elizabeth. In some answers this was implicit. Candidates found (c) rather more difficult. Some thought that this question gave them a licence to write about anything in Elizabeth's reign and as a result failed to get to grips properly with the concept of a 'Golden Age'. However, the better candidates coped well and there were some interesting and well argued judgements about 'how far?'.

**3** This question was less popular than Q2 and slightly less well answered. Part (a) produced many good answers with candidates able to identify a series of relevant achievements. In response to (b) some candidates failed to read the question carefully and ignored the reference to 'Elizabeth and her governments' and wrote about Puritan objections to the theatre. Clever candidates were able to turn this to good use by explaining that some members of Elizabeth's government were Puritans. Weaker candidates found it impossible to believe that the theatre caused Elizabeth any worries because of her fondness for watching plays. In (c) weaker candidates were able to write something about colonies and trade but failed to address other reasons why sea power was important to England. However, there were many good candidates who wrote well balanced answers and reached interesting conclusions.

### **Britain, 1815–1851**

**1 (a)** Many candidates, even some of the better ones, thought that Source A was about the Chartists. Luckily, this was often no more than a passing reference and examiners were able to give credit to the remaining sections of the answers where candidates did make good use of their contextual knowledge to check details in the source. Fewer candidates considered the overall message or purpose of the source and little use was made of the text under the source.

**1(b)** This question was fairly well answered with many candidates able to use their contextual knowledge to develop and explain some of the points in the source, for example, the reference to the 1832 Reform Act. However, only a small number of candidates directly addressed the issue of 'how useful'. To do this it was necessary to also consider the limitations of the source; for example, it does not tell us about other grievances of the Chartists such as the New Poor Law.

**1(c)** This question produced a wide range of answers. Some of the weaker candidates failed to see that the cartoon is poking fun at the Chartists and explained how useful the source is as evidence of the weapons used by them. However, there were plenty of better answers. Some candidates used their knowledge of the physical force/moral force debate to explain the cartoon while others considered the purpose of the cartoon in terms of ridiculing the threat posed by the Chartists. Only a few candidates were able to reach the top level which involved placing the

cartoon in the context of 1848. This involved explaining the ridiculing of the Chartists in the context of the failed demonstration of 1848.

**2** In (a) better candidates made sure that they wrote about problems specific to the Liverpool and Manchester Railway while weaker candidates wrote general answers that could have been about railway building anywhere. In (b) some candidates did not understand the term 'Railway Mania' and just wrote about good things to do with railways. Better candidates were familiar with the term and were able to write about Hudson, the rush to build railways everywhere and the money to be made and financial speculation. They also used the success of early railways such as Liverpool and Manchester to explain why there was a period of 'mania'. Part (c) was answered very well. Most candidates were able to explain the benefits for both the working class and the factory owners. The final challenge in (c) questions, the need to reach and justify a conclusion, still defeats many candidates. The elements often missing in their answers are comparison and argument. To score full marks candidates needed to compare the benefits for the two groups and then argue a case for one group benefiting more than the other.

**3** This question was much less popular than Q2. It tended to be chosen by the better candidates and as a consequence there were many good answers. Part (a) was answered well with the candidates demonstrating plenty of relevant contextual knowledge. Part (b) also produced many good answers with candidates able to explain several reasons why employers opposed reforms including the threat to their profits and attitudes of laissez faire. A few candidates lost their focus and ended up writing about why parents opposed the reforms. There were many good answers to part (c) although a few candidates seemed to think that the poor law reforms brought nothing but wonderful benefits to the poor. The best candidates introduced some very interesting qualifications into their answers, for example, the lack of enforcement of the factory and mine reforms lessening their effectiveness, and the argument that the workhouses, although dreadful places, may also have had some beneficial impact on some of the poor. These qualifications often came in useful in supporting conclusions for full marks.

### **The American West, 1840–1895**

**1 (a)** This question was generally answered well. Many candidates were able to suggest a valid message or purpose for the illustration. These answers were usually along the lines of encouraging people to hate the Plains Indians or, from the better candidates, to justify anti-Indian policies. The question did ask why the illustration was published in the 1860s and candidates were less successful in placing it in the immediate context of the 1860s and the Sioux Wars.

**1(b)** This question produced a wide range of different but often interesting answers. It was good to see so many candidates thinking on their feet, using their contextual understanding, and producing thoughtful answers. A few of the weaker candidates simply described how the sources differ but most were able to at least suggest that they differ because they were painted by different types of people – a white man and a Plains Indian. It was encouraging to see many candidates exploring the possible messages of the paintings in context and the best candidates went on to concentrate on possible purpose. Good use was made by some candidates of the information provided about the provenance of both sources, especially the fact that Source B was hung over the bar in saloons across America. No matter which route candidates took, few lost sight of the question and most ended up by providing reasons why the paintings differ.

**1(c)** This question made the candidates think and most rose to the challenge. There were a few who could get no further than being surprised by the fact that the officer did not want Indians killed and a few were distracted by minor details such as the fact that the army was giving away free ammunition. However, most candidates realised that the officer wanted the buffalo killed as a way of finishing off the Indians. Good contextual knowledge was used to explain their answers.

**2** Part (a) was not answered well with many candidates writing accounts that could have been about a woman's role almost anywhere, anytime, for example, looking after children, doing the housework and shopping. Candidates should be encouraged to base their answers on specific context, for example, using dried buffalo dung as fuel, the difficulties of keeping sod houses clean and hygienic and the loneliness. A significant minority of candidates ignored the reference to homesteads and wrote about the lives of Plains Indian women. Responses to part (b) showed that there are still some candidates who think the Mormons went west to seek gold, but most of the answers showed a good understanding of both push and pull factors. The quality of explanation was high with few candidates simply telling the story or identifying reasons. There were many interesting answers to (c) with the best candidates finding similarities and differences in why Indians and homesteaders wanted to live on the Plains. Most candidates were able to produce good explanations for the Indians but the responses about the homesteaders were more varied with some candidates believing that they moved to the Plains because, for example, they were looking for gold or they wanted to farm buffalo.

**3** Part (a) was answered much better than questions on this topic have been answered in the past. Many candidates knew specific detail about the work of the cowboys, for example, riding the line, branding and going on cattle drives. There were still a few candidates who thought that cowboys spent all their time fighting in bars or robbing stagecoaches. Some candidates still find the whole topic of cattle ranching moving to the Plains very difficult and confusing. They get into a mess over the chronology and would benefit from a clear and simple timeline showing the main developments. Part (c) produced much better answers with a range of reasons being explained, for example, demand for beef falling, over-supply of cattle, the Johnson County War, and barbed wire. The weakest parts of some answers were the sections about the weather where some candidates thought it was sufficient to describe harsh weather without explaining the impact on cattle ranching.

### **Germany, c.1919–1945**

**1(a)** Most candidates rose to the challenge of this unfamiliar cartoon. Some ignored the date and assumed it is about Kristallnacht. In some ways this was an understandable mistake and these candidates could often be rewarded for other parts of their answers. Most understood that the cartoon is criticising Hitler and his anti-Jewish policies and the best were able to go on and explain how the cartoonist is actually criticising Hitler's lying about his policies.

**1(b)** The weaker candidates merely repeated or paraphrased the information in the source and added that the source was published to tell people who to marry. However, candidates were generally familiar with Nazi ideas about race and most were able to explain these ideas as the reason for the source being published. A good number of candidates added that the purpose of the source was to brainwash people into believing these ideas. The best candidates were able to take their answers to a higher level and explained what Hitler hoped to achieve if his racial policies were successful, for example, world domination.

**1(c)** A few weaker candidates were extremely surprised by the behaviour described in the source. They thought it most odd that anyone would go round sticking plasticine in their keyholes. However, most candidates realised that in the context of Nazi Germany there was no reason to be surprised. Some just asserted that Nazi Germany was full of spies but the better candidates were able to explain this through references to, for example, the Gestapo and members of the Hitler Youth reporting on their parents. Very few of even the better candidates thought to explain that they were surprised by the fact that the journalist was surprised. Surely he should have expected this kind of behaviour.

**2** Part (a) was generally answered well with the candidates' knowledge demonstrating accurate knowledge. A small but significant minority of candidates wasted time by writing down all the terms of the Treaty whether they had military relevance or not. The topic of the problems

facing Weimar in its early years is clearly taught well as there were many excellent answers to (b). Many candidates were able to explain four or five reasons, all of them backed up with detailed knowledge. In some answers to (c) there was confusion about the depression. Candidates still confuse this with the hyperinflation of the early 1920s. Even those who knew the key characteristic of the depression was unemployment were rather vague in explaining the link with Hitler coming to power. Other reasons were explained much better.

**3** Answers to (a) were very mixed. Some candidates wrote some very general answers while others provided specific, contextual examples, for instance, radios in factories, mass rallies, the staging of the Olympics. Answers to part (b) divided into two groups – those who wrote about why Hitler was generally popular, and those who were able to focus on the events of 1933 and 1934 and write about, for example, Hitler's use of the Reichstag Fire, the emergency decree, banning of political parties, the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives. Some candidates did not score many marks for part (c) because they simply described the Hitler Youth. However, there were plenty of answers that covered both sides of the argument and sound knowledge of youth opposition groups was displayed.

### **South Africa, 1948–c.1995**

**1 (a)** Most candidates recognised Sophiatown and were able to write about the context of the forcible removals of black South Africans. The best candidates considered the message or purpose of the photograph in context and wrote some excellent answers.

**1(b)** The majority of candidates interpreted the cartoon successfully – it is criticising the Bantustans and commenting on the government's misrepresentation of them. Good candidates used their contextual knowledge of the government's reasons for introducing the Bantustans, and of the reality of the Bantustans, to develop their answers. A few weaker candidates took the cartoon at face value and thought it was telling people how wonderful the Bantustans were.

**1(c)** This question made the candidates think carefully. A few took what Verwoerd said in Source C at face value and argued that after reading Source D he would have been disappointed with the Bantustans. Better answers, and these were in the majority, argued that he would have regarded the description in Source D as success because this is what he was hoping for from the Bantustans. Answers were fully explained through further detail about Verwoerd's reasons for introducing them.

**2** Part (a) was generally answered well as was part (b). In (a) most candidates were able to provide a lot of detail and in (b) most were able to explain several sound reasons. Part (c) was answered rather less well with some responses lacking specific detail. However, the best candidates were able to provide examples on both sides and reach well supported conclusions.

**3** Events in Soweto were generally well known for part (a), and most candidates were aware of several external factors such as sporting and economic sanctions and the gaining of independence by neighbouring states. These were generally explained well, especially the economic sanctions. One worry examiners had about part (c) was that candidates might produce very one-sided answers. In fact, this did not happen with many candidates able to make out a perfectly good case for de Klerk as well as for Mandela. There were some very interesting conclusions where candidates compared the contributions of the two.

## **Comments on 1035/01 short course questions not appearing in the long course papers**

### **Medicine through Time**

**1(b)** A good number of candidates were able to make valid inferences from Source C about ideas such as the Four Humours, bad air, and the influence of the planets. Some candidates are still confused about whether these are natural or not. A number of candidates claimed that the Four Humours and the influence of the planets are supernatural ideas. Weaker candidates were able to make some response by using the surface information in the source and failing to make any inferences.

**1(e)** Most candidates were able to use the source as evidence that there were opponents to vaccination. Better candidates explored the motivation for opposition suggested by the source and even the fact that opposition had some element of organisation (as shown by the production of envelopes like this one). Questions about 'how useful' also require candidates to consider the possible limitations of sources and the best candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain important details about the development of vaccination which would not be learned from this source.

**1(f)** This question was answered better than in the last few years. Most candidates were able to explain how some sources support the hypothesis and others disagree with it. There was still a tendency for a number of candidates to identify the correct sources but then to simply assert that, for example, they support the hypothesis, instead of explaining how they support it.

### **Crime and Punishment through Time**

**1(b)** Weaker candidates simply took the information in the source about robberies and arson as evidence that there was little law and order. However, better candidates were able to suggest the source also contains a lot of evidence to the contrary, for example, the widening of the roads and the determination to improve the work of juries.

**1(e)** There was a range of interpretations of the postcard and all reasonable ones that were consistent with what is shown on the card and with the historical context were allowed. Unfortunately, although many candidates produced interesting and valid interpretations, they stopped with the message and failed to go on and explore the possible purpose of the postcard. When candidates are asked about why a source was published, they should try and consider the purpose of the source. Weaker candidates simply asserted that the source was making fun of women or of the police.

**1(f)** There were some interesting answers to this question with most candidates able to explain how some sources support the hypothesis while others disagree with it.

## 1935/21 Paper 2 – Medicine through Time

### General Comments

This year's paper seemed very much to the candidates' liking and the topic was obviously very well-known. However, such familiarity with the subject matter can have dangers. Candidates must be aware of where use of contextual knowledge is needed to support answers or evaluate sources and where it is irrelevant. Certainly many candidates would have more time to devote to Questions 2-6, if their response to Question 1 had been limited to working in, and responding from, the source.

Generally, however, this year's performance was strong with increasing numbers of students showing excellent examination technique.

### Specific Questions

#### Question 1

In their keenness to impress, many candidates wrote over lengthy answers to this question. This often involved considerable use of contextual knowledge or analysis of the reliability of the source. Neither of these approaches is required on this question and neither leads to increased reward. Candidates need to understand that the task involved is making a number of inferences (judgements which the source does not directly state) and supporting them from the source. To gain full marks, as in the example below, two supported inferences are required.

*What we can learn from this source is that at this time surgery was very dangerous. We know this because the source tells us that in some London hospitals the death rate was 90%. We can also learn that surgery was not able to develop effectively because they lacked an effective painkiller and so had to limit surgery to just external wounds and could not carry out long or complicated surgery.*

#### Question 2

This was a question which the vast majority of candidates were able to access and there was a wide spread of marks. Only the very weakest answers produced responses unsupported from the source or rejected Source B as result of low level evaluation (*we cannot use Source B because it is a cartoon just to make people laugh*).

Most answers concentrated on the apparent improvement between the dates of the two sources in terms of cleanliness and orderliness. Since such answers were often based on little more than comprehension, they did not receive high reward - though higher marks were given when candidates pointed out that there was some continuity as 'ordinary clothes' were still being worn (some candidates mistakenly saw the surgeons in Source C as wearing 'uniforms').

Better answers used their contextual knowledge to point out that the improvements seen were as a result of medical progress, with Simpson's carbolic spray or the introduction of chloroform bringing about the improvements noted.

To reach the top level, as is always the case on this type of question, candidates had to move beyond the face value of the sources. The question asked about improvements in the standard of operations in the nineteenth century. Best answers were those that identified the improvements (and used their knowledge to explain why they had happened) but then went on

to point out that Source C was a single snapshot of one hospital at one particular time. Other candidates cross-referenced to prove the validity of the evidence in Source B or that in Source C. Plenty of evidence existed on the paper to do this, though examiners saw some very good use of contextual knowledge to evaluate the evidence.

### Question 3

This question certainly caught the imagination of the candidates and there was considerable dismay expressed at the death of such a young child. Weaker candidates failed to explain why they were surprised/not surprised and lower scoring answers restricted themselves to general comments about *'low standards'*, *'poor and dangerous surgery'* or the fact that *'it is not right to operate on such a small child and it is certainly not right to give him alcohol'*.

What the examiners were looking for, and saw in a pleasing number of scripts, was the use of contextual knowledge (or cross-reference to other sources) to support answers. Those who weren't surprised talked about the dangers of chloroform, problems of dosage, other deaths etc. Those who were surprised talk of previous usage (e.g. Queen Victoria) and the fact that the operation occurred sufficiently far after the introduction of chloroform for surgeons to be aware of its dangers.

Regrettably, the suggestions that it was not the chloroform, but the continuing dangers of infection, which killed the child were misplaced.

### Question 4

A question which produced a good spread of marks and seems to have been accessible to all candidates. Poorer answers simply comprehended the statistics and explained what they show *'We can see that between 1864 and 1870 the percentage of people dying in operations declined'*. Better answers were able to make inferences from the statistics *'These statistics show that carbolic acid was an important development in medicine. You can see that the number of amputations went up so surgeons must have had confidence in carbolic so were prepared to operate more.'* Best answers then considered the statistics as historical evidence. Less convincing were arguments that in personal records Lister would tell the truth. More rewardable were answers which explained why it might be in Lister's interests to show success or which noted that the statistics were from one short period, in one hospital and relating to only one type of surgery.

### Question 5

Answers to this question were often disappointing. Many candidates produced responses which were little more than comprehension (*'they did not work because Fleming says he could see for himself that the antiseptics did not kill all microbes. But they also might have worked because the results were better than not using them'*). Often these arguments were followed by irrelevant discussion of Fleming's work on penicillin. What examiners hoped was that candidates would make a case from the source, perhaps consider the context of the war and then support their arguments from contextual knowledge or by reference to other sources. Clearly Sources E and G were of greatest relevance here.

### Question 6

The vast majority of candidates are now very skilled in answering this type of question. Many of them used Sources A, B, D and G to suggest that standards of surgery were poor and survival, therefore, unlikely. Sources C, E and F were used to counter the argument and suggest that survival rates were, indeed, improving. Better answers noted that a number of the sources could

*Report on the Components taken in June 2009*

be used to both support and oppose the hypothesis. Source G lent itself most easily to this approach, but there was also good argument put forward for the ambivalence of the evidence is Sources D, E and F

Many candidates would benefit from paying more attention to the fact that extra marks can be scored on this question by addressing the reliability of the sources. It is still the case that only a minority of candidates do so.



## 1935/22 Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment through Time

### General Comments

The paper was accessible and almost all candidates were able to give positive answers to each of the six questions. Despite the relative complexity of some of the sources, there was little evidence in the scripts of miscomprehension. Indeed, there is an apparent paradox as far as the length of sources is concerned. Within reason, weaker candidates find it easier to use sources that offer a fair amount of depth and detail, and can be confounded by short sources that offer them little to work with. The greatest problem for many candidates this year was the topic on which the paper was set. The amount of contextual knowledge that most candidates possessed on women and the law in the Middle Ages was limited. The reason for this may be that one of the most popular books for the Crime and Punishment unit almost ignores the topic. Nonetheless, the specification is explicit in including it, and candidates should, therefore, have been prepared. This lack of contextual knowledge had an inevitable impact on the quality of answers, and sometimes closed off the top levels of the mark scheme to many candidates.

### Comments on Individual Questions

#### Question 1

As usual, the first question required candidates to make inferences from a source, which on this occasion described a case in which a man sold his wife for a pig. One of the most common weaknesses was to make inferences about men, despite the question asking about women and the law. Any valid inference consistent with the legal position at the time was permitted, and most candidates could make at least one – e.g. *I can tell from the source that the law treated women badly* – with the obvious support from the source – *because the man could sell his wife for a pig*. One aspect of marking that limited many candidates from going further was that the same support was not permitted for more than one inference. Detecting a different inference and finding new support for it was quite difficult, though better candidates did make something of the fact that the wife had actually been sold to another woman, which opened up a range of possibilities, based on the idea that not all women were treated badly by the law, quite separate from the more obvious conclusions.

#### Question 2

The issue of lack of contextual knowledge was at the forefront in this question. The provenance gave the information that the woman in the ducking stool was a scold, yet significant numbers of answers insisted that the picture showed a witch being tried through 'floating'. All such answers were awarded a low mark, regardless of what other conclusions they reached. However, this was not the only issue arising from contextual knowledge. The woodcut was from the seventeenth century, and the question asked about the utility (or lack of it) of the source as evidence about the treatment of women in the Middle Ages. Answering effectively depended, therefore, on knowing whether or not women were treated in this, or similar, manner in the Middle Ages. Many avoided the issue by showing the utility of the source as evidence about the seventeenth century, focusing on how women were still being treated after the Middle Ages. Surprisingly few answers took the route of trying to judge the issue in the light of what the other sources on the paper said about women and the law – indeed, this was the first of several occasions on the paper when cross-reference to other sources would have been effective, and yet it was rarely used. The very best candidates were able to answer using their own knowledge of other aspects of the ways in which scolds were treated, such as the scolds' bridle.

### **Question 3**

There were some questions on the paper where a small but significant number of candidates failed to answer the question, even though they wrote, sometimes at considerable length, about the sources. Thus on **Q5** they would never say whether or not the source was reliable, on **Q4** they never said whether or not they were surprised, and here they never addressed the issue of proof. These answers fail to score. The two sources could, depending on how they were interpreted, be seen both as contradictory and complementary. It was a rare candidate who perceived this and was able to demonstrate it, using the source content, to discuss the issue of proof. There was much mismatching of content based on partial miscomprehension of aspects of the source content, a common example being on the issue of consent for marriage, where candidates assumed 'unofficial marriage' in Source D implied lack of consent. Most answers did, however, see the basic contradiction – Source C asserted that women had few legal rights, whilst Source D showed that they did have rights and the law was prepared to protect them – and concluded that Source D proved Source C wrong. This earned a reasonable mark. The best answers compared the content of the two sources, but then went on to use other sources on the paper to help decide about proof. As in **Q2**, though, it was surprising how few candidates this year saw the need and the opportunity to cross-refer.

### **Question 4**

This question generated a good range of answers, but as with **Q5**, the explanations given in many answers were based on a much generalised awareness of the historical context, rather than on specific detail or cross-reference. As the source was completely contrary to much of the information they had used in answering the first three questions, most candidates expressed surprise at the sight of a woman beating a man with a spindle. The weakest answers were unable to use anything about the Middle Ages in their explanations. Slightly better were those answers that focused on the fact that the picture was from a prayer book, for example by explaining their surprise that a religious book would show a scene of violence. The largest number of answers were surprised on the basis that the picture was the opposite of what would have been expected in the Middle Ages, yet gave only the slimmest of support for this contention, and certainly nothing that could be seen as taken specifically from another source. In effect the answer would be little more than an assertion that one would be surprised because in the Middle Ages this kind of thing did not happen. These answers received reasonable credit, but the top levels were reserved for candidates who could either offer specific support from other sources for their explanation, or who could offer a plausible historical explanation of lack of surprise based on the possibility of the source showing a woman of higher social status beating, for example, a servant.

### **Question 5**

There were many candidates who failed to use the content of the source, and answered solely on the basis of the provenance – either dismissing the source as fiction, or accepting that it was reliable because the characters in it were said to be realistic. These answers did not receive many marks. A better approach was to compare the impressions given by the source against one's knowledge of the true situation in the Middle Ages. As in **Q4**, many candidates did this, but in a much generalised way, with no specific examples or references to other sources. In fact, there were two different impressions given by the source, either or both of which could be used as a basis for the answer – first, that women were beginning to challenge male authority, but second, that male authority was still very strong. The very best answers identified both of these aspects and provided specific cross-references to check their reliability. With regard to cross-reference, it is worth mentioning that many candidates attempt to do it, but have no idea what its purpose is. They merely note that two sources agree or disagree, but reach no conclusion about what this tells you.

### **Question 6**

Although the given hypothesis specifically mentioned the law, in practice many answers dealt with this only implicitly, focusing instead on whether the sources showed women to be inferior or superior to men. This was permitted, not least because some of the sources (e.g. Sources E and

F) were themselves more about the social status of women, and only by implication about legal status. Although some sources could be used both ways, most answers simply showed how Sources A, B and C illustrated inferiority, Sources D and E superiority or at least equality, and Source F either one side or the other. As usual the two bonus marks for source evaluation were ignored by the vast majority of candidates. However, as always, the most significant weakness in answers was a lack of awareness that sources must be *used* to question or support the hypothesis. This means that there should be specific reference to relevant source content to illustrate how a particular source casts light on the hypothesis, and not merely an assertion that a source does or does not support it.

## **1035/02, 1935/03 Coursework**

There has been a small improvement in the quality of SHP coursework again this year, built around a few centres adapting their assignments to achieve a focus in their work that clearly encourages the students to hit the assessment objectives. This has been achieved at the same time as maintaining the usual high level of enthusiasm and interest students manage in tackling the History Around Us and Modern World Study. This is highly commendable set against the timing of the overall specification, as this is the penultimate year before significant change impacts upon the SHP course. Moderators suggest that the vast majority of the centres who take this award have been extremely conscientious in the marking of the work, with the administration being of a similarly high standard. In the odd instance where this has not been the case, there are usually understandable difficulties to explain the problem.

Following the arrival of the MS1 with moderators on 15 May, the importance of a quick response to a request for a sample of coursework is generally understood, with many centres providing the information ahead of the deadline. The crucial nature of this aspect of timing is magnified by the half term holiday for most centres. Well over 90% of centres have their sample of coursework with the moderator before half term, but the small minority who do not, begin to build up difficulties. It seems to be worth highlighting this point at this time, because the issue will remain when the new specification starts. Indeed, next summer may be extremely busy for some moderators with the normal Year 11 workload, in addition to the potential for many centres wishing to take the opportunity to put their Year 10 students through the first round of the generic controlled assessment tasks. This will make everybody's co-operation in this matter of timing even more important.

In terms of specific issues around the HAU, many of the moderators had an interesting year, as the regional nature of the allocation of centres was ended this year, with many commenting on the fascinating range of assignments they saw as a consequence of the change. There remains a great deal of sound methodology around the HAU, with the best centres using only one or two tasks to encourage students to address a full range of Objective 2 and 3 skills. These centres seem to avoid giving too much assistance to their students, allowing students to show originality and genuine interpretation and evaluation through the way they bring the site together with other sources. Relatively few centres now see evaluation as merely saying a source is biased, primary or secondary. Mostly when this approach is used, the student is merely being negative, which fails to build an answer. Better candidates answer the task but realise that small groups of evidence help them to build up a picture of the answer they are seeking to support. Hopefully this will become an even more common approach. Variety in the evidence available, and not forgetting the site, all seem to help the majority of students achieve their potential. This is not an easy task, because too many sources can be daunting. Perhaps the solution is again a good focus, ensuring that interesting written sources are not left too long for the students to effectively interpret or evaluate from them. Some centres seem to ignore the potential of the site that can be developed through photographs, paintings and maps of the site. These all offer students a great opportunity to bring evidence together and begin to produce 'real' historical reasoning. Now that many centres have effective intranet systems, this can be used to reduce the drawback caused by access.

Moderators have reported a wider gap between the better centres and others, in terms of the MWS, with weaker centres falling down in two key areas that are quite clearly linked. The first problem involves some centres failing to do much to encourage their students to keep relating their work to the current situation. This then follows on to create, in some centres, a tendency to write mainly narrative history, which does not really address the objectives, but records various historical events. By constantly reminding students that the MWS is about recognising the influence of the past on current events, this problem largely disappears, as the student is encouraged to analyse events and impact, rather than tell stories.

### *Report on the Components taken in June 2009*

In respect of the topics considered, aspects of terrorism have grown in favour, but those centres who stayed with Northern Ireland found events and their own ingenuity paid off. It has also been good to see that the range of topic areas has grown again this year with a couple of centres realising that Afghanistan offers some potential for drawing out links between the past and the present. South Africa, race in the USA and China have all been done well, although the latter subject has also been tackled without due regard to more recent events. Opportunities are always around, an instance of this being the developments in Gaza, which offered a clear and well focussed option rather than some of the very broad studies of the Middle East that are still attempted. This is perhaps a good time to remind everybody that we are looking to cover a period of 50 to 100 years, certainly no longer. Whilst a quick run through of the bigger picture may be seen as beneficial, the scale of the target can cause some candidates to be overwhelmed, before they get properly underway, with complex issues that our present politicians often seem to struggle to grapple with!

In conclusion, I hope that most centres have taken one of the options OCR has put in place in preparation for the new controlled assessment. Should you have concerns with a possible topic and whether it fits the generic task or whether you have broader concerns, you can contact OCR and your questions will be forwarded to a centre consultant. Alternatively, there will be further INSET sessions in the Spring term which will focus mainly on controlled assessment. Based on the performance of most centres this year, in terms of the resources they can bring to the new assessments and the quality of marking, teachers can be confident about the process of change.

## **Report for GCSE History A (SHP) 1035 (Short Course)**

### **Coursework**

Although the short course continues to have a small take-up with centres, there did appear to be a change in the candidature this year. In respect of coursework there was a clear increase in the standard of the work. There were plenty of examples of candidates' work that reflected the high standards of the full course. There were a number of centres who had produced assignments that allowed their candidates to access all the assessment objectives in the single assignment. Many of these followed the full course trend in asking a smaller number of tasks. Usually this has the benefit of encouraging students to give responses that develop more of the higher order skills required, such as proper evaluation. This change in entry was reflected in the fact that the work of several centres was adjusted upwards by moderators.

At the same time, there is still evidence that other centres make use of the short course to assist candidates from the lower end of the ability range, who they believe cannot cope with the full course. Although these centres present a very different profile of candidates for the course, the value of the course can be appreciated for those individuals. Understandably, these centres are more often found using older, more directed assignments.

Standards of marking and administration for the short course very much mirror the full course. This means most staff involved in the process can be very proud of the professionalism and care which they provide for their candidates.

# Grade Thresholds

**General Certificate of Secondary Education  
History A (Schools History Project) 1935  
June 2009 Examination Series**

## Component Threshold Marks

Component	Max Mark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
11	75	60	51	43	35	28	21	14
12	75	60	53	46	38	29	21	13
13	75	61	53	46	39	31	23	16
14	75	61	54	47	40	33	26	19
15	75	59	52	45	37	29	21	14
21	50	38	35	32	29	25	21	18
22	50	31	28	25	23	19	16	13
03	50	43	37	31	25	20	15	10

## Option Thresholds (weighted marks)

### Option A (Medicine with Elizabethan England)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	174	157	139	121	102	83	65	47
Percentage in Grade		5.5	17.0	18.3	22.2	16.6	9.5	7.1	2.6
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		5.5	22.5	40.8	63.0	79.6	89.1	96.1	98.7

The total entry for the examination was 622.

### Option B (Medicine with Britain)

	Max Mark	A*	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Overall Threshold Marks	200	176	159	142	125	105	85	65	45
Percentage in Grade		17.4	22.1	17.0	14.3	12.5	6.8	4.6	2.9
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		17.4	39.5	56.4	70.7	83.2	90.0	94.6	97.4

The total entry for the examination was 702.

**Option C (Medicine with American West)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	173	157	141	125	106	87	68	49
Percentage in Grade		7.4	16.7	18.9	18.6	16.0	10.1	6.4	3.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.4	24.0	42.9	61.5	77.5	87.6	94.1	97.5

The total entry for the examination was 15,731.

**Option D (Medicine with Germany)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	174	158	142	126	107	89	71	53
Percentage in Grade		7.7	17.8	19.1	18.2	14.6	9.9	6.3	3.7
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		7.7	25.4	44.5	62.8	77.4	87.2	93.5	97.2

The total entry for the examination was 10,269.

**Option E (Medicine with S Africa)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	165	149	133	117	99	82	65	48
Percentage in Grade		16.7	5.6	5.6	27.8	11.1	11.1	16.7	5.6
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		16.7	22.2	27.8	55.6	66.7	77.8	94.4	100.0

The total entry for the examination was 18.

**Option F (Crime with Elizabethan England)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	163	147	129	112	94	76	59	42
Percentage in Grade		3.3	14.7	18.8	26.4	15.5	12.6	7.1	1.3
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		3.3	18.0	36.8	63.2	78.7	91.2	98.3	99.6

The total entry for the examination was 239.



**Option G (Crime with Britain)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	165	150	133	116	97	78	59	40
Percentage in Grade		8.6	21.0	22.8	21.0	14.2	8.0	3.1	0.6
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		8.6	29.6	52.5	73.5	87.7	95.7	98.8	99.4

The total entry for the examination was 162.

**Option H (Crime with American West)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	162	147	130	114	96	79	62	45
Percentage in Grade		4.4	10.4	19.4	20.5	19.8	11.7	7.7	4.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		4.4	14.7	34.1	54.6	74.4	86.1	93.8	98.2

The total entry for the examination was 958.

**Option J (Crime with Germany)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	165	149	133	117	99	82	65	48
Percentage in Grade		6.8	16.8	19.7	21.0	15.4	9.9	4.6	2.6
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		6.8	23.6	43.3	64.3	79.7	89.7	94.3	96.9

The total entry for the examination was 2645.

**Option K (Crime with South Africa)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	200	169	151	133	115	96	77	59	41
Percentage in Grade		24.1	55.2	20.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		24.1	79.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

The total entry for the examination was 29.

**Overall**

	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Percentage in Grade	7.5	17.0	19.0	18.8	15.5	10.0	6.2	3.4
Cumulative Percentage in Grade	7.5	24.5	43.5	62.3	77.8	87.8	94.0	97.5

The total entry for the examination was 31,404.

**General Certificate of Secondary Education (Short Course)**  
**History A (Schools History Project) 1035**  
**June 2009 Examination Series**

**Component Threshold Marks (raw marks)**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
01	60	49	42	36	29	22	16	10
02	25	21	18	15	12	10	8	6

**Option Thresholds (weighted marks)**

	<b>Max Mark</b>	<b>A*</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>G</b>
Overall Threshold Marks	100	90	79	68	57	47	37	28	19
Percentage in Grade		1.3	9.8	15.1	16.5	15.1	13.5	10.6	8.8
Cumulative Percentage in Grade		1.3	11.1	26.3	42.7	57.8	71.4	82.0	90.7

The total entry for the examination was 394.

Statistics are correct at the time of publication.

**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**1 Hills Road**  
**Cambridge**  
**CB1 2EU**

**OCR Customer Contact Centre**

**14 – 19 Qualifications (General)**

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

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

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

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

**Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations**  
**is a Company Limited by Guarantee**  
**Registered in England**  
**Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU**  
**Registered Company Number: 3484466**  
**OCR is an exempt Charity**



**OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)**  
**Head office**  
**Telephone: 01223 552552**  
**Facsimile: 01223 552553**