OCR
RECOGNISING ACHIEVEMENT

GCSE

History A

General Certificate of Secondary Education **GCSE 1935**

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

Reports on the Components

June 2010

1935/1035/R/10

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of pupils of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, OCR Nationals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the Examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the Examination.

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

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: publication s@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

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

This was the last examination for the present version of this specification although much of what is said below is, in a general way, relevant to the new SHP specification. The overall performance of candidates was generally in line with that of last year. There were many strong scripts with candidates able to respond well to questions designed to make them think about the application of their knowledge rather than simply regurgitating it. Examiners reported a general improvement in candidates' contextual knowledge and a greater willingness to answer the question set rather than the one they would have liked to have been asked. The advice given in past reports that candidates should try and decide what their answer is before setting pen to paper, and should directly answer the question in the first sentence, appears generally to have been acted upon. The number of rubric errors remains constant. The worrying aspect of this is that such errors are to be found in large numbers in a small number of centres. There were some centres with large entries where nearly every candidate made a rubric error. It is clearly a good idea to ensure that candidates are thoroughly familiar with the organisation and demands of the paper.

Medicine remained significantly more popular than Crime and Punishment, with American West and Germany the most popular Depth Studies. The entries for Britain 1815-51 and Elizabethan England continued to slowly decline. The answers in the Medicine option were generally better than those for Crime and Punishment, where some candidates rely on general knowledge and bland assertions. There was a noticeable improvement in the quality of many answers in the American West option, with many candidates' contextual knowledge being more precise and more relevantly used.

Despite the general high standard of answers there is, of course, always room for improvement and the following part of this report identifies general areas where many candidates could have performed better. These are equally applicable to all of the options.

Source-based questions
Candidates are gradually getting better at answering the source-based questions but some continue to describe the sources rather than make inferences from them. Candidates should realise that questions that ask them what they can learn from a source always require them to go beneath the surface information of a source and make inferences. In Medicine Q1(a), for example, Source A is particularly useful because it tells us that the Egyptians had natural approaches to medicine and not because it tells us that they used bandages. Candidates are also gradually getting better at applying their contextual knowledge to sources, but some candidates are happy to write about sources as if they were from a topic area they had never studied. 'Are you surprised?' questions always require contextual knowledge to be used. For example, American West Q1(b) requires knowledge and understanding of settlers, Plains Indians and the relationship between them. Some candidates tried to answer the question only from the events described in the source. Finally, 'how useful?' questions about sources will often require candidates to explain the limitations of sources, as well as ways in which they are useful. However, this will not always be the case. Similar questions can work differently with different sources, e.g. the real importance of Source D in American West comes from what it tells us about the attitudes of the person who painted it. This makes points about what factual information about the American West is missing from the painting of little significance.

Coaching candidates to answer different kinds of source-based questions in certain ways usually backfires. Instead, candidates should be helped to respond to sources on their own particular and unique qualities. Different sources make similar questions into different questions.

Candidates who have been heavily coached lack the real understanding and the mental agility required to answer these questions in imaginative and relevant ways.

Importance and significance
Questions about the importance or significance of an individual or development appear frequently. It is important that candidates understand how to assess importance. For example, in response to Medicine Q2(b) about the importance of Hippocrates to Greek medicine, it is not enough to simple describe the Four Humours or explain the Hippocratic Oath. Candidates need to be able to explain why, for example, the Four Humours mattered at that time. Candidates will be helped if they start with some criteria for establishing importance, e.g. the concept of turning point is a useful one which would enable candidates to make a proper assessment of the importance of Hippocrates. Answers to importance questions that simply describe will never receive high marks.

Explain questions
There are still too many candidates who, in response to part (b) questions, list large numbers of reasons but fail to explain any of them. The target of these questions is the ability to construct a (usually) causal explanation. Lists of causes do not meet this target. Candidates are better advised to just use two or three causes and to explain how they contributed to the end result. This involves going further than simply telling the story. For example, in Germany Q2(b) candidates need to take a factor such as unemployment and explain how it contributed to the crisis faced by Germany. A description of people being unemployed will not be enough.

Reading questions carefully
There remain some candidates who are still far too cavalier with the actual wording and meaning of questions. One example stood out this year. In Crime and Punishment Q2(a) candidates were asked to describe how vagrants were punished. A significant number used their answers to explain what vagrants did. In Elizabethan England Q3(a) candidates were asked to describe the activities of vagrants. They described how they were punished. Candidates should be given opportunities to discuss and explore what particular questions are asking them to do. Responding to an examination question can be a daunting experience for many candidates. They have to be able to select from everything they know the knowledge that will work with each individual question. This appears to be the hardest skill for many candidates. They know a lot and they fill their answers up with everything they know about the topic rather than selecting what is relevant leaving the rest out. Leaving knowledge out of an answer because it is not relevant is a crucial skill and one that many candidates struggle with. They need confidence to do this which can be developed in the classroom through exercises that give them practice in working out what should be included, and what should be left out.

Development Studies
These are challenging for 14-16 year olds and it is always comforting to see so many candidates dealing so well with many tricky issues. However, although candidates are very comfortable within a given period, e.g. the Greeks or the nineteenth century, they are far less confident when required to range across several periods. There is often confusion over chronology and many candidates struggle to make links between, or to compare, different periods. More attention could be paid to helping candidates develop a clear overview of a Development Study including the main individuals and developments and their part in the overall story.

Medicine Through Time
All parts of Question 1 were generally answered well with many candidates making use of appropriate contextual knowledge, e.g. part (b) - the fact that Paré had shown how the treatment in Source C could be improved on long before the time of Source B, or the use of chloroform by Queen Victoria in part (c). Question 2 was easily the most popular of the optional questions and was generally well answered. Candidates' knowledge and understanding of Greek medicine is usually sound. Their understanding of why public health suffered after the Romans was not so good and there were some very general answers. Question 4 divided candidates into two clear

groups: those who based their answers on precise examples and those who wrote general answers without an example in sight.

Crime and Punishment Through Time
In response to 1(a) some candidates made the mistake of ignoring the sources and writing generally about Robin Hood. Parts (b) and (c) were generally well answered. Answers to 3(c) were disappointing. This is, after all, a key issue that runs through the history of Crime and Punishment. Many answers either lacked examples or were about punishments. The other parts of Question 3 were answered well, as were all parts of Question 4.

Elizabethan England
Most questions were answered well with knowledge and understanding of the theatre, Puritans and the religious issues of Elizabeth's reign. Candidates were less sure about assessing the success of the government in dealing with poverty and vagrancy, although the causes of poverty and vagrancy were known in some detail.

Britain 1815-51
Detailed knowledge of the work of the navvies remains beyond many candidates. In response to 1(a) most wanted to write about the drinking and womanising of the navvies and appeared to have little understanding of the work they did. Question 3 was more popular than Question 2 but was not answered as well. Some candidates knew little about emigration and struggled with 'Old' and 'New' Poor Laws. Some even wrote about the Reform Act in answers to 3(c).

The American West
Most of the questions produced many thoughtful and well-informed answers. The questions answered least well surprisingly included 2(c) where not a few candidates thought that the Indians had been defeated on the battlefield of the Battle of the Little Big Horn. Answers to 3(a) were mostly about cow towns and drunken cowboys. Candidates' appear to have little knowledge of the particular problems faced by mining towns and they still struggle with the issues that separated cattlemen and homesteaders.

Germany 1919-45
The main issue was the inability of many candidates to separate the economic problems following the First World War from those at the end of the 1920s and in the early 1930s. For many candidates the two crises were identical with both involving hyperinflation and unemployment. Such misunderstanding caused problems for some candidates with Questions 1(b) and 2(b). Most of the other questions were generally answered well although some candidates thought that Source B is evidence of how well off people were because they could afford to play with bank notes. Parts (a) and (c) of Question 3 were answered well although events in Germany during the war appeared to be a neglected area.

South Africa
This option was taken by a small number of candidates and does not appear in the new specification. It is pleasing to report the gradual improvement in a lot of answers. Knowledge of Sharpeville and apartheid was sound, and there were some very interesting assessments of de Klerk in answers to 3(c).

1935/21 Paper 2 – Medicine Through Time

General Comments

This was the final examination of the June paper of this legacy specification. The paper was accessible to the candidates, posing no particular problems in responding positively to the questions. Candidates displayed a pleasing ability to deal with a range of sources and discuss a central proposition. However, there was a tendency for some candidates to address issues that were not relevant to the particular question. In addition, some candidates struggled to interpret some of the sources.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

The question required candidates to use the specific information in Source A to reach general conclusions about the Black Death. This was generally answered well. There were a range of good inferences made by candidates. However, some used this as an opportunity to write down all they knew about plague and infectious disease in general without making specific reference to the source or addressing the question directly. A further weakness was that occasionally, some candidates did not support the inferences they made by showing how the source could offer support. Candidates need to be encouraged to answer briefly and to the point. A couple of well-supported inferences is usually enough to score full marks in this type of question.

Question 2

Candidates often struggle with answers based on comparison of sources. The most common faults are:

- Concentration on the simple provenance or dates of the sources.
- Misinterpretations of the message of the source.
- Description of the detail in one source, followed by description of the detail in the other source with the assumption that this is comparative.

The best answers were those which compared the similarities and differences in the ideas displayed about the causes of the disease. There was extensive source use to explain how Source B offered religious explanations for the cause of the disease, whereas Source C offered more rational explanations. A few very good answers looked at the provenance of the sources and were able to offer developed explanations of the roles and responsibilities of the two authors. The Archbishop, as head of the Church, was keen to portray God's power and the responsibility of people to worship regularly. Edward III had a duty to protect his people. Some candidates also looked at the timing of the two sources and were able to argue that this affected each author's view of the severity of the plague and its continued impact on the population despite all previous preventative measures.

Question 3

In order to explore the notion of 'proof' candidates need to be able to use details from the source in order to put it into its historical context. They need to assess the typicality and limitations of the source. In this case, the picture shows **one** priest blessing a few plague victims in **one** locality. As such, it cannot prove that **all** people in the middle ages believed that the plague had been sent by God. Many candidates were able to make good use of the source details to demonstrate the dependence of the victims on the healing powers of the priest, some referring to the similarity between this image and those that show the power of the monarch to heal by touch. Some subtle points were made about the divine right of kings. Some candidates referred to Source B as further proof of the power of the Church over individual belief. However, even

better responses were those which used contextual knowledge and cross-reference to other sources to challenge the proposition in the question.

Question 4
This question was less well answered. Too many candidates asserted that both writers believed that the plague had been sent by God. The message of Source F was more subtle. It points to supernatural and natural disasters that were a forerunner of the outbreak of the plague and gives a clear warning that only God's kindness could spare people. In this sense, the purpose of both sources was broadly similar; both were warning of the dangers of the sinfulness of man and the deadly consequences it could bring. Most candidates used the detail in both sources to find similarities and differences in content, without going on to develop points about the tone, message or purpose of the sources. Such higher level thinking is needed in order to secure top marks in such questions.

Question 5
A surprising number of candidates took this source at face value. Most candidates picked up the point that this set of explanations for the plague included the 'bad air' theory. Disappointingly, some mistook the ringing of church bells as a sign of their belief that only God could spare them. It was also disappointing that some candidates reverted to simple and erroneous evaluation. They argued that because the source was secondary, it couldn't be reliable because it wasn't written at the time. Centres really should be preparing candidates to avoid falling into such simplistic thinking. Opportunities to refer to other sources on the paper or to contextual knowledge were often missed.

Question 6
Although some of the sources offered straightforward material either for or against the given hypothesis, others could only be used by inference. Generally, the balance of the sources was in favour of the proposition. However, a pleasing number of candidates were able to address both sides of the argument. Several recognised the importance of Sources A and C. Whilst these sources did not prove that medieval attempts to stop the plague were effective, they at least show that some medieval people were beginning to offer rational explanations for the cause and treatment of the Black Death. Source G confirms this point. However, there were some weaknesses in answers to this question:

- Some candidates failed to make direct use of sources, either failing to cite them by letter, or by failing to provide supporting detail.
- There was a general unwillingness to address the reliability or sufficiency of the sources in relation to the question.
- Some candidates resorted to 'source trotting'. That is, they simply went through the sources in order, giving a brief description of the content of each source without addressing the question directly.
- Some candidates lumped more than one source together and reached an overall conclusion which was not valid for all of the sources so listed.
- Some candidates had been clearly advised to tackle question 6 first, before answering any other questions on the paper. This is not sound advice. Candidates need to work through the earlier questions first in order to reach a rounded understanding of the sources before tackling the hypothesis in this final question. Only by doing this will they develop an overall perspective of the events covered and the sources used.

1935/22 Paper 2 – Crime and Punishment Through Time

General Comments

This was the last examination on the old specification, though it should be emphasised that the new specification will bring little change to Paper 2, which continues with the same structure and approach. The paper this year was on the Bloody Code, a topic with which candidates seemed comfortable, with obvious opportunities to use contextual knowledge in several of the questions. Although some candidates appeared to believe that the Bloody Code was contained entirely within the eighteenth century, in practice this made little difference to the quality of their answers in relation to Sources E and F, both of which fell outside that timeframe. Neither the sources nor the questions seemed to pose any particular problems, though the interpretation of Source F was undoubtedly the most challenging task on the paper. The different qualities of answers were as one would expect from a question paper targeted on the full ability range, yet even the weakest candidates were able to offer positive responses, albeit of a limited nature.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1

The first question generally requires no more than the ability to comprehend and make inferences from a source, and this was no exception. Candidates were given an account of a trial for shoplifting from 1771 and asked what they could tell from this about the Bloody Code. Answers which merely repeated or paraphrased the source gained few marks. However, most candidates were able to perceive that the trial suggested things about the Bloody Code, without actually saying these things. The most obvious aspect was its harshness, as the trial was of a young woman, forced into shoplifting through poverty and the wish to feed her young children, yet for a trivial offence she was sentenced to death. Other, less obvious inferences were possible; for example, that the Bloody Code was ineffective, since it was intended as a deterrent, yet this young woman was not deterred. Making these judgemental inferences about the Bloody Code earned a reasonable level of reward, but the highest marks were given to answers which both made the inferences, and indicated how the source allowed the inferences to be reached.

Question 2

It is hard to fail to score on a question – indeed, all positive responses are given some reward. However, the one way to score zero is to fail to answer the question at all. This question asked candidates whether they were surprised by a list of prisoners tried at Durham in 1786. If the answer failed even to state whether or not the list was surprising, then whatever else was written could not possibly be perceived as a valid response. There were some candidates who did this, as there were similarly on Question 4, in which they failed to mention whether or not the source was useful. This problem can be easily avoided by instructing students to begin their answers with a statement directly responding to the question - *'I do find Source B surprising because ……'* – which then automatically validates everything that follows.

Returning to the list of prisoners, it gave details of the results of twelve trials, covering a variety of offences, and the sentences passed on those found guilty. There were various details which could be regarded as surprising or not, depending on the explanation given in the answer. For example, the sentences in comparable cases were not always consistent. However, this was one of the questions where the candidates' knowledge of the Bloody Code had a significant shaping effect on their answers. If they assumed that the Bloody Code was harsh, then the fact that some offenders were sentenced to death would not be surprising. However, this was to miss the fact that in only four of the cases was the death penalty the sentence. Better answers,

therefore, were built on the awareness that the Bloody Code was not as harsh in practice as it was on paper, and the variety of less harsh sentences, as well as several verdicts of not guilty, would then be perceived as relatively unsurprising. Another well rewarded approach was to cross-refer to other sources to help judge the issue of surprise. For example, Source A had already provided an example of where someone was hanged for shoplifting whilst many of those convicted of theft in Source B escaped the death penalty, which, on the face of it, is surprising. One final point is worth mentioning: many answers foundered on a lack of logic. Their statement of surprise was matched with examples from the source that were unsurprising, or vice versa. Such answers defaulted to the lowest rewardable level, unsupported assertions about surprise.

Question 3

This question was based on two sources, both concerning men convicted of stealing a horse, and sentenced to death, but one of whom was reprieved from the death sentence (William Beavon in Source D). Candidates were asked whether this was proof that the other man (Robert Evance in Source C) would also be reprieved. The concept of proof is found hard to grasp by many candidates, but this question elicited a good proportion of effective answers. It must also be admitted that there was an equal proportion of answers that showed considerable confusion, not least in thinking that the same man was referred to in both sources. There was also a more understandable misunderstanding, caused by the reference in Source D to 'William Beavon of the parish of Colva'. Many thought that this meant he was a priest, or was in some way associated with the church, and thus more likely to be reprieved. In practice this made little difference to the answer since the sources were so rich in other issues that this one misunderstanding was unlikely to prevent other, valid lines of argument.

It was remarkable that the obvious answer – *'They have both committed the same crime, one has been reprieved, why shouldn't the other also be reprieved?'* – was either ignored or rejected by so many candidates. There were differences between the cases – they were fifty years apart, tried in different places – and many answers thought these differences meant that Robert would not be reprieved. But noticing these differences did not, on its own, get the argument very far. Others ignored what Source D had to say, and judged the likelihood of reprieve on what Source C provided. There were two ways of doing this. First, by judging Robert's case in the light of what background knowledge about the Bloody Code might suggest (probably that it was harsh so he was doomed) or second, by believing that the arguments advanced by his wife in the source for his reprieve would be accepted. Perhaps a majority of candidates failed to progress any further; that is, they did not use the obvious answer. However, those who did were also usually able to address the issue of proof with some sophistication. They could see that the similarity between the two cases made it *more likely* that Robert would be reprieved, but (because of the differences between the two cases) still did not prove it. The very best answers then went further by comparing Robert's case with other cases in other sources. Source B provided two cases of horse stealing, one of which produced a verdict of not guilty, and the other leading to a sentence of whipping, thus adding further to the likelihood of Robert being reprieved.

As in Question 2, weaker answers showed again logical flaws and inadequacies. It was common to read answers which claimed *'William has been reprieved, so therefore Robert will be too.'* By this logic, every candidate sentenced to the death penalty will be reprieved. The critical point missed in such answers was that the two men *had committed the same crime*; the cases were comparable, so therefore Robert had a chance of reprieve.

Question 4

Candidates must surely be aware by now that the highest levels of response to utility questions must address ideas of reliability, and will require them to look beyond the surface of the source to see its true usefulness as evidence. This will never simply be the information it contains. About half of the marks can be earned by treating the source as information – *'It is useful because it shows….', 'It is not useful because it does not tell us….'* – but this question had a slight extra twist in that it asked about the usefulness of the source as evidence about the *impact*

of the Bloody Code. For the purposes of marking this was defined as what one could infer from the source about the success/failure of the Bloody Code *(e.g. I can tell that the Bloody Code must have been failing because why else would they need to hang so many people at once?)* and answers that focused on this achieved slightly higher marks. The highest level answers adopted a more critical approach, and sought to evaluate the source. This could mean doubting its reliability, by noting that it gave an impression of the Bloody Code as being extremely violent that ran counter to the facts. The problem with this approach is that it culminates in a conclusion that the source cannot be useful because it cannot be believed, which ignores the fact that its lack of reliability as factual information is actually the key to understanding its true utility. The very best candidates understood that the source is a reflection of what the authorities wanted people to think about the Bloody Code; that it is useful as evidence of the kinds of messages that the authorities wanted to send out about crime and the way in which it would be punished.

The one problem of comprehension that Source E created was that a significant number of candidates thought the crowd watching the execution was actually a queue of prisoners waiting to be hanged.

Question 5

This question was based on a cartoon about the repression of riots in rural England in 1831. These were the Swing Riots, but no contextual awareness of this specific context was required (though many candidates had it). Candidates were asked why the cartoon was drawn. At the lowest level, answers simply focused on the events – *'It was drawn because of the riots going on'*. To get further than this, it was necessary to interpret the cartoon in order to detect both its message, and ultimately the cartoonist's reasons for wanting to transmit this message to his audience. For various reasons, there were many misinterpretations, and although these were given some reward, inevitably this was at a lower level than that given to correct interpretations. Misinterpretations were broadly of two types. First, there were those based on the idea that the cartoonist supported efforts to repress the riots. Second, there were those that assumed the Bloody Code was not working because the riots were being successful and nobody was being hanged. In reality, the cartoonist opposed the repression of the riots because it was too bloody – effective, not ineffective – and the cartoon offered several clues that this must be the case (the gallows, the crow, the judge's wig and death cap, the ironic reference to 'Merry England' - any or all of which would make sense in terms of a general contextual awareness of the workings of the Bloody Code). This was the essential understanding that underpinned all successful answers. However, answers which focused only on messages – the idea that the cartoon was drawn because of what the cartoonist wanted to say – were still ignoring the important aspect of the artist's purpose (defined here as the intended impact on the behaviour of the audience). Of course, it was possible to infer an incorrect purpose based on misinterpretation – *'I think he drew it to get people to support the government's efforts to repress the rioters'* – but this earned no extra credit. However, those who could see that the true purpose of the cartoon was to arouse opposition to the government's repressive policies achieved the highest marks.

This was another question on which it was possible not to score at all by ignoring what was actually asked. The question demanded *reasons* why the cartoon was drawn, and if no reason was ever mentioned – even if the interpretation of the cartoon was accurate – no marks could be awarded.

Question 6

The requirements of Question 6 – to test a given hypothesis against the set of sources – should be familiar enough by now, but remarkably some candidates still fail to use the sources at all, and focus exclusively on the accuracy or otherwise of the hypothesis. This earns a low mark. Another aspect of the exercise is that candidates can always expect the sources to offer evidence both for and against the hypothesis, yet a large number of candidates this year answered solely on the idea that the Bloody Code was indeed brutal, again significantly limiting the number of marks that could be scored. The most important point to report, however, is that some candidates have considerable problems in using the content of a source to illustrate how it

either does or does not support the hypothesis. It is commonplace to read comments that show awareness that a source can be used in support of one side or other, but fail to show how. For example: *'I think Source A shows that the Bloody Code was brutal because she didn't have her husband with her and she was left penniless.'* The thought process here is presumably that it was therefore brutal to execute her for a petty crime, but this would not be stated. Another problem was what could count as brutal. Some candidates would say *'I think Source E is brutal because a man is being hanged'* which is missing the true brutality of the source which is that it shows up to nine people could be hanged at once, with a crowd watching for entertainment. Nonetheless, the sources so clearly gave opportunities on both sides of the hypothesis – indeed all except Source F could each be used to support both 'Yes' and 'No' – that most candidates were able to achieve a good mark. Where the sources were perhaps a little more limited than usual was in giving candidates the chance to earn bonus marks for source evaluation. Two bonus marks are available (1+1) for use of a source that does not simply take it at face value. These marks are not awarded for 'stock' comments about source types – *'This cartoon is reliable because it was drawn at the time' etc* – even when these comments actually make some sense. So, for example, we can assume that the list of prisoners in Source B is accurate as it is drawn from court records, but the evaluation bonus would not be earned by saying so. For such a source, face-value acceptance of its content is enough. Rather there needs to be an evaluation of source content that reveals how face-value treatment is not enough. Only Sources E and F really lent themselves to this approach, as both could be seen as exaggerating the true impact of the Bloody Code, and therefore as unreliable evidence of its brutality.

1035/02, 1935/03 Coursework

The legacy specification felt very odd this year with the first wave of new controlled assessment sitting alongside it. Despite efforts to slim down the work over a number of years, with some notable success, the coursework folders still appeared massive alongside the new A953 offerings. In simple terms the great strengths and occasional weaknesses of SHP coursework remained to the end. There are still huge numbers of centres who have students producing History Around Us assignments that reflect pride and interest in genuinely local aspects of history. At the same time they achieve a great deal of focus on the assessment objectives. These centres always seem to have found a happy knack of getting their students to interpret, evaluate and consider impressions from evidence in a most natural and relevant way. They avoid simplifications and generalizations that do little to promote understanding of their chosen site. For these centres, the move to controlled assessment should present few difficulties based upon the excellent resources they have gathered together for their students to use.

At the same time, there are still some centres who give poor opportunities for students to interpret and evaluate evidence for a range of reasons. The most obvious reason being the lack of evidence available or unsuitable nature of it. Clearly focused evidence, coming from a good range of different types helps students most. Do not bury the key aspects of a source in masses of irrelevant text, as few students will have the patience to find it. Photographs, paintings and maps are all good to use alongside written evidence.

The Modern World Study (10037/02, 1937/03) has a similar set of strengths and problems, with the majority encouraging some good understanding of complex modern issues which students analyse through the past. The teaching programme and sources used again play a part in avoiding the biggest pitfall, which is a descent into simple narrative. Writing about Bloody Sunday and then about Northern Ireland today does not represent high calibre thinking. Finding the influences on events and attitudes between the two, or questioning the potential links represents a much better standard of work. Fortunately, there are many more examples of the good analysis than the poor. Another common fault has been to stop the work well before the current day, which also helps to undermine the real aims of the study.

Overall, despite all the general criticisms made about coursework, I would have to conclude that there have been many privileges in moderating SHP assignments. I have been given some fascinating tours of the country's historical sites, along with explanations of their importance. From the Modern World Study, there have been explanations of thorny problems that world leaders have struggled to grasp. Hopefully the new controlled assessment will manage to capture some of these qualities, whilst avoiding the general pitfalls of coursework. Hopefully this is a more fitting finale than complaining about certain aspects of administration in the final year.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

14 – 19 Qualifications (General)
Telephone: 01223 553998
Facsimile: 01223 552627
Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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