GCSE

History A (Schools History Project)

Examiners' Reports

June 2011

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

History A (Schools History Project) (J415)

EXAMINERS' REPORTS

A951/11-14 Medicine Through Time/Crime and Punishment Through Time Development Study/Depth Study

General comments

The overall high standard of answers was maintained in this year's examination. The most able candidates demonstrated some excellent high-level thinking, whilst other candidates were able to show what they knew and understood. The overall knowledge demonstrated by candidates was impressive. Generally, candidates were more comfortable with the structured essay questions than the source-based question.

There are some areas where candidates could improve their answers. The two key issues are selection and deployment, and chronology.

In order to do well in a History examination candidates need to read the question carefully, taking note of dates and key words, and then select from their knowledge what is relevant to the particular question. They need to plan how they will use this material so that it helps to support a relevant and effective answer. Most candidates, by careful planning, can significantly reduce the amount they write and end up with better answers. This skill needs to be practised.

Chronology is important, especially in the Development Studies but also in the Depth Studies. Candidates will benefit from regular reinforcing exercises on the basic chronology of the key landmarks in a Development or a Depth Study with an emphasis on key events and people.

Questions in the Development Studies will often ask about the importance of a person or development in the history of medicine or crime and punishment. In responding to these questions it is necessary to go outside the immediate time of the person or development. Two approaches are helpful. First, one could ask about the longer-term impact of the person or development – did it make other developments possible later? An alternative approach is to ask how far the person or development represented a turning point compared to what had gone before. For example, an answer about the importance of the Theory of the Four Humours requires candidates to consider either why it was such an important advance on what had been believed before, or why (and with what results) it lasted as a key belief for hundreds of years.

In part (c) of the structured essay questions candidates are usually required to consider two arguments and decide which is the stronger. The highest marks are achieved by those candidates who produce a supported argument for why one argument is stronger than the other. This always involves comparison and linking. For example, if asked whether Pasteur was more important than Jenner, a link needs to be found between them. Pasteur used and developed Jenner's work and took it much further and understood aspects of it that escaped Jenner. This provides candidates with several ideas they could use for comparing the importance of the two and arguing that one was more important than the other.

The Development Studies sometimes contain 'factor' questions', eg about the importance of government or religion. These appear to be completed more successfully in Medicine than in Crime and Punishment. Candidates studying the latter could be encouraged to build up lists of specific examples for each factor. Examination answers about factors that do not contain specific examples are ineligible for the highest marks.

In source-based questions it is crucial to read the information provided about a source - its date, when it was produced, who produced it and so on. This information matters and can be used to answer the question. For example the key to good answers to Questions 5(a) and (b) is that Source A was published by a railroad company and that Source B was drawn by a New York artist. The fact that Source C in the Germany paper was published in 1932 and not later is also important.

Candidates also need to be able to understand when a question is asking for message and when it is asking for purpose. A message question will normally have the word message in it, but candidates still need to work out the difference between what, eg, a cartoon shows and what the cartoonist wanted to say to his audience. Candidates need to differentiate between the big point that the author/artist wants to make and all the other possible sub-messages that might be submersed in a source. It is the big message that matters.

A purpose question will often be worded 'Why was this source published?' With this type of question candidates need to work out the message but they then need to think about why does (eg) the artist want to send out this message – what impact does he/she want to have on the views, beliefs or actions of the audience. If the question also contains a date (eg 'why was this cartoon published in 1858') then candidates also need to consider why the artist wants to have that impact at that particular time. Context must come into the answer.

Comments on specific questions

Medicine Through Time

Question 1
Part (a) was well answered by candidates who were familiar with the plague broadsheet and could explain, eg, searchers, fires purifying the air and crosses on doors. The mark scheme accommodated those candidates who understood Source A but were unfamiliar with the terms used in B and whose ability to compare the two was consequently inhibited. Part (b) was generally answered well by candidates who focused on the big message, which included the filthy state of the Thames, drinking water, and spread of disease, and on the purpose of publishing the cartoon at this time. Part (c) was answered well, with many candidates being able to explain that the cartoons both showed that doctors did not like Bevan's National Health Service.

Question 2
This question was generally answered well. There were many good answers to part (a) from candidates who focused on Roman public health, rather than writing general accounts about the Romans. Most avoided confusing Roman public health with Egyptian and Greek programmes of health. In Part (b) the best answers focused on the fact that the Theory of the Four Humours was a natural explanation, how this was a step forward and on its influence over medicine in the Middle Ages and even later. In (c) the best candidates explained why Roman times and the Renaissance were important in the history of medicine. To be able to do this well many candidates concentrated on Galen for the Romans. This then gave them a link with the Renaissance which enabled them to compare the importance of the two and reach the top level in the mark scheme.

Question 3
Candidates clearly welcomed part (a) and many of the answers scored maximum marks. Part (b) was answered less well than the other parts of this question but a good number of candidates rightly focused on developments following the discovery of penicillin and the roles of Chain, Florey and the American government. Part (c) produced a full range of answers, the majority being good. Many candidates were armed with a good range of specific examples often ranging

over hundreds of years for both religion and government. The better answers included an element of complexity by explaining that they both held up and helped progress in medicine.

Question 4
Answers to part (a) were successful when they focused on the period and mentioned ideas such as spontaneous generation and miasma. Many candidates were knowledgeable about opposition to smallpox vaccination for part (b), with answers ranging across the nineteenth century and not limited to just the initial opposition. There were excellent causal answers. Part (c) produced a full range of answers. The best answers looked beyond the immediate work of Jenner and Pasteur and considered either their later impact or how what they did was an important improvement on what was believed or done before.

Crime and Punishment Through Time

Question 1
There was a wide range of answers to part (a) although most candidates realised that the illustrations showed ordeals. The role of God was used by many candidates to establish a similarity between the two sources, while a small number of candidates used the different ways these ordeals worked as an example of difference. Part (b) was answered less well. Successful candidates made good inferences by putting the source into a broader context and suggesting that it showed attempts at extending royal control. The question asked 'how useful?' and this prompted the better candidates to explain that there are other aspects of medieval law and order that the source tells us nothing about. In part (c) knowledge of the practice of sanctuary was needed to produce a good answer.

Question 2
All parts of this question were generally answered well. Answers to (a) were focused and knowledgeable and avoided drifting off to nineteenth-century workhouses. Part (b) produced a lot of good causal answers with a wide range of valid reasons being explained. In response to part (c) many candidates were able to explain why juries would not convict and explain other reasons such as moves towards reforming criminals, public executions being counter-productive, and the introduction of transportation. Only a few successfully addressed the 'how far' part of the question.

Question 3
In part (a) most candidates focused on conditions during the journey. This was perfectly acceptable but specific knowledge of what happened to the convicts after they arrived in Australia would have benefited answers. There was a wide range of answers to (b). A good number of candidates knew about the 'separate system' and were able to explain several reasons for its introduction. There was no need to explain why it was later abandoned. In (c) most candidates could explain either how prisons became harsher or less harsh. Only a few explained both. Future candidates would benefit from being able to outline the main developments.

Question 4
This question was generally the least well answered, although there were some outstanding answers in all three parts of the question, demonstrating that 'factor' questions can work well in Crime and Punishment. Candidates need to be more confident about the role of factors in the development of crime and punishment. In (a) witchcraft was mentioned, but many of the other points needed to be more specific. In part (b) many answers would have benefited from specific examples. Answers to part (c) were better with some candidates focusing on individuals such as Fry or Peel. 'Government' as a factor was dealt with less well and more specific examples were needed.

Elizabethan England

Question 5
Part (a) was answered very well. There were some good thoughtful inferences made with many of them supported by careful reference to the portrait and to relevant knowledge. Many candidates also made use of the information provided for them under the source. Q5 (b) produced the full range of answers with many being good. Once candidates understood Elizabeth's reluctance in Source C (and some thought she was agreeing with Parliament) they wrote some excellent answers. The best explained how there are very good reasons for being both surprised and not surprised. Part (c) was answered well. Nearly all candidates recognised that the medal was about the Armada and were able to explain possible political purposes for it.

Question 6
Part (a) produced many good answers with most candidates focusing on religious divisions (excellent knowledge of events before 1558 was often demonstrated), financial and economic problems, and relations with various European countries. Some candidates mistakenly thought that Mary Queen of Scots was a problem as early as 1558 while a few others ignored the reference in the question to 'the beginning of her reign' and wrote a survey of problems from 1558 to 1603. There were also many good answers to (b) and candidates were able to explain several aspects of the Religious Settlement that they did not like. Answers mostly focused on vestments, decorations in churches, and the governmental structure of the Church. In part (c), some candidates wrote about the problems posed by Catholics and Puritans rather than about how successfully the government dealt with them. Successful candidates took the seriousness of the problem into account when assessing how well the government dealt with it.

Question 7
Part (a) produced many accurate descriptions of theatres although some wrote instead about the various activities that went on (eg pick pocketing) and the opposition to theatres by Puritans. Part (b) produced many good answers. Candidates had a good knowledge of the details of the events and were able to explain several reasons why the Armada was defeated. In fact some candidates knew so many reasons that they tended to write just a few lines about each rather than properly explaining two or three. Some simply told the story without explaining 'why'. There was a wide range of responses to part (c). Generally, candidates were able to explain the importance of voyages of exploration better than the importance of the theatre. However, there were some outstanding candidates who explained both well. Specific detail was needed to be successful.

Britain 1815-1851

Question 5
There was a wide range of answers to part (a). Most realised that that the unpopularity of Speenhamland had to be inferred from the source using contextual knowledge and understanding. There were many excellent answers focusing on its cost and on claims that it encouraged laziness and large families. Only a few claimed that it was unpopular with the poor because it did not give them enough to live on. Source B in part (b) also divided candidates into two groups – those who understood that the cartoon is approving of the reforms and those who thought it was criticising them because the poor were being dealt with so badly. Nearly all candidates were able to relate the cartoon to the Old and New Poor Laws. Part (c) was generally well answered. Many candidates were familiar with the Andover scandal and nearly all understood that the cartoon was criticising both the treatment of the inmates of workhouses and the people who were meant to be responsible for them.

Question 6
This question was generally answered well. In part (a), details of child labour in both factories and mines were well known. Part (b) produced a greater range of responses. The most successful answers explained that there were various limitations to the effectiveness of the reforms such as a lack of inspectors and the uncertainty over people's age. There were many good answers to part (c). Most candidates were able to explain the opposition from factory and mine owners but some also explained how some of the workers themselves opposed restrictions on their working. Most candidates were also aware of the arguments for reform made by people like Shaftesbury and avoided simply listing the dreadful working conditions by way of explanation.

Question 7
In part(a) successful candidates concentrated on the work of the navvies rather than their dubious moral standards, eg the digging of cuttings, the building of viaducts and the dangers involved in their work. Some candidates successfully used the building of the Liverpool-Manchester railway as a way of exemplifying the navvies' work to produce some excellent answers. Part (b) was answered well with the opposition of a range of different types of people being explained. There were also many good answers to part (c) although a few candidates needed to be clearer over what is meant by 'working class'. Most candidates were able to explain how the railways brought benefits to a range of different groups of people but only the best dealt satisfactorily with the 'how far' aspect of the question.

The American West 1840-1895

Question 5
Answers to part (a) were divided into two groups. Better answers considered the motives of the railroad company by focusing on either the land they owned alongside the track or on how their profits would increase because of increased business. Some candidates missed the significance of the fact that the poster was issued by a railroad company and wrote general answers about trying to persuade people to move west. This illustrates the need to carefully consider all the information that is provided about a source. Part (b) was well answered by many candidates who explained the unrealistic nature of Source B and went on to suggest that it still had a use in terms of showing us how people in the East saw, or wanted people to see, what life was like in the West. Many candidates used their contextual knowledge well to explain what was happening in Source C. Only a few answers referred inappropriately to photographs being more useful than paintings. In response to part (c), a good number of candidates properly focused on 'how far' and used their knowledge to develop the points in the source and to explain other problems that were not solved by barbed wire.

Question 6
Part (a) was answered well with most candidates able to describe the main features. There were also many good answers to (b). Most candidates focused on scalping and exposure. To achieve the higher levels in the mark scheme candidates needed to explain why white Americans thought practices such as these made the Indians savages. It was not enough to describe the practices. Many part (b)answers properly explained why the battle of the Little Big Horn can be seen as a defeat in the long run, but rarely explained why the battle can be considered as a victory. They needed to do both.

Question 7
Part (a) was reasonably well answered with most candidates at least able to identify two or three specific problems. Answers to (b) focused very much on the nature of life in mining towns, eg gambling, prostitution and vigilantes, and tended to neglect broader factors such as the vast distances involved and the speed with which towns appeared and grew. In part (c) many candidates made knowledgeable and thoughtful comparisons between the experiences of Mormons in the East and at Salt Lake but clearly knew more about the former than the latter.

Germany c.1919-1945

Question 5
Part (a) was not well answered by many. It was necessary to compare the two sources for evidence of change rather than compare Source A with what had happened in the 1920s. Whilst a good number of candidates compared the two sources, few used their knowledge of the period to develop their answers. Some candidates had no knowledge of the 'people's car' or knew little about what happened in Germany during the war years. Part (b) on the other hand was answered very well. Many candidates were able to use their knowledge to infer and explain valid purposes for publishing the drawing in a child's book. The most common answer was about persuading children to join the Hitler Youth. Both the source and knowledge had to be used to reach the top level in the mark scheme. Candidates needed to look carefully at the date of the source and realise that it was published before the Nazis had come to power. Part (c) produced a range of answers. The best explained valid reasons for being surprised and not surprised. Only a few based their responses on everyday empathy. Some were surprised by the fact that people were willing to oppose the Nazis while others were surprised by the fact that the Nazis didn't seem able to deal with the problem. Better answers expressed a lack of surprise either because this was the kind of thing the Nazis would want to stamp down on, or because there were groups of young people who did cause trouble for the regime in these ways. All of these different answers were explained through knowledge and understanding.

Question 6
Weimar Germany is now known and understood very well. This was reflected in the quality of the answers to all parts of this question. Part (a) was answered very well. Many candidates scored 4 or 5 marks. Part (b) also produced many good answers. Some candidates only wrote about events before the occupation of the Ruhr but many properly took their explanation through to the reactions of the government to the occupation. Part (c) produced some excellent two-sided answers but needed to deal with 'how far' by arguing a supported conclusion. Many neglected to do so but arguments both pro and anti Weimar were well informed.

Question 7
Part (a) was not answered well. The knowledge of most candidates of events in the crucial years of 1932 and 1933 needed to be more specific and accurate on details like when Hitler actually became Chancellor. Both parts (b) and (c) produced much better answers. Most candidates knew about the Communists, the Enabling Act and the various restrictions on liberty that were introduced. For part (c) many candidates were knowledgeable about the apparent threat that Rohm posed to Hitler and the associated issues about the army. The Enabling Act was known slightly less well but there were many candidates able to write a two-sided answer. Successful answers compared the importance of the two.

A952/21 Developments in British Medicine, 1200-1945

General Comments

There was a very good range of responses. The most able candidates were able to score very highly indeed. The paper was accessible to the candidates, who had no particular problems in responding positively to the questions. Despite the fact that this is a relatively new topic for examination in A952/21, it was clear that a significant number of centres had prepared candidates well. There was a good deal of contextual knowledge about Mary Seacole on display, and refreshingly, candidates did not fall into the trap of telling the examiner all they knew about Florence Nightingale. 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, a significant number of candidates struggled to interpret some of the sources, especially Source E.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1
The question required candidates to use the specific information in Source A to make inferences about the impression given of Mary Seacole. This was generally answered well. There was a range of good inferences made by candidates. However, some used this as an opportunity to discuss the reliability of the source, which was not relevant to this question. It was pleasing to see that most candidates in most centres had grasped the fact that they did not need to write lengthy essays to score high marks in this question.

Question 2
It was pleasing to see that most candidates had been trained well to deal with questions about the utility of sources. Many were able to select information from Source B to explain how it was useful. This meant that very few candidates scored lower than level 2. Furthermore, candidates in some centres had a good grasp of the information that was missing from the source; for example, Russell does not mention Seacole's struggles to get to the Crimea, or the details of what happened at the British Hotel, or indeed, Mary's fate on returning to England in 1856. However, it was disappointing to note that a significant number of candidates got bogged down in talking about the reliability of the source in an undeveloped way. Too many saw Russell as reliable because he was an eye witness, or unreliable because he wrote for a newspaper and as such, had to exaggerate the truth. As a point of interest, it is worth noting that candidates were given no credit for saying that Russell had to tone down his reports to ensure morale in Britain was protected. This was not the case. Nonetheless, the relatively few candidates who did address the typicality of the source by showing that other interpretations of Seacole's role existed, were able to reach level 4, provided they substantiated their answers either by cross-reference to other sources or by the deployment of contextual knowledge.

Question 3
Answers to this question were largely disappointing. Candidates were required to compare Sources C and D and discuss how far they disagreed. Average and below average candidates still find this kind of question difficult. A number described the content of Source C and then did the same for Source D and then concluded that they were different. More frequently, weaker candidates failed to compare like for like between the two sources. There were some obvious differences to be spotted. Similarities were harder to detect. However, many candidates believed that the 'loud and riotous parties late into the night' (Source C) must have been due to the presence of alcohol, yet Source D says drinking was 'discouraged'. Perhaps those who came 'as

a friend' after 8.00pm to the British Hotel were allowed to drink and buy cigars. It is worth noting that Seacole says drinking was discouraged among the men. Officers (for whom gambling was discouraged) may still have been able to partake in luxuries like drinking and smoking. The crucial point of this question was that candidates were being asked how far the sources disagreed. The better candidates were able to see that the differences were more subtle.

Question 4
This question was answered well. Candidates made extensive use of the detail in the Background Information to explain the context that Mary had returned to England bankrupt in 1856. The four-day festival that was organised was referred to and the sympathies of Punch magazine explained. However, there was a difference in the degree to which candidates used detail in Source E. Indeed, a significant number of candidates suggested that the source was published to mock Seacole's work, or to suggest that, as a 'Vivandiere', she did little more than get the troops drunk. Some believed that the patient was pleading for help from Mary, who, they thought, had just confiscated his magazine. Such answers did not get beyond level 2. A more valid argument was that Punch magazine was using Mary's popularity to promote sales of their publication. However, the best marks were reserved for those who recognised that this source was published in order to encourage the public to donate funds to the appeal on behalf of Mary, who had returned home penniless, having been unable to sell her extensive stocks at the British Hotel for anything but a loss after the end of the war in 1856.

Question 5
Candidates found this question much more difficult. Candidates could not reach higher than level 3 if their answers were based on details in the source. However, many candidates seemed to be aware that Mary had applied to join Florence's team of nurses who went out to the Crimea, but had been rejected. Unfortunately, there was too much speculation about why Mary was rejected to justify awarding higher than level 3. There is no evidence to prove that Florence was racist. In fact, by 1870, Florence had already anonymously donated to the Seacole fund. In addition, it was irrelevant to suggest that Florence's comments were prompted by jealousy or a sense of rivalry. Such answers missed the point that the source was published in 1870. By this time, Florence had published her extensive works on nursing. Mary, by contrast, had virtually gone bankrupt twice and her contribution to the Crimean War had been largely forgotten. Why did Florence write these comments to her brother-in-law in 1870? No-one knows for certain. It is possible that Mary had applied to take up the role of a nurse in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870-1. Perhaps Florence had been asked for her views. There is no doubt that their very different views on the role of nurses and the function of hospitals would have been at the forefront of Florence's mind.

Question 6
Although some of the sources offered straightforward material either for or against the given hypothesis, others could be interpreted as being useful both to support and oppose the idea that Seacole's work in the Crimea was a success. However, a pleasing number of candidates offered a balanced view about the proposition. Better candidates argued about the impact of Mary's work, both in the short term and the long term. Many saw Sources A, B and D as offering the greatest support to the idea that Mary was a success. A good number of candidates recognised that Source F, whilst generally critical of Mary's methods, still suggested that Mary did some good, and therefore should not necessarily be seen as an indication of a lack of success on Mary's part. Source E proved interesting. Some candidates, having earlier said that the source was published in order to help raise much needed money for Mary (Q4), argued here that it demonstrates that Mary was not successful, since she was depicted as only a vivandiere. However, those candidates who argued that the very existence of the source coincided with Mary's bankruptcy and therefore was in itself an indication that Mary had not succeeded were credited. Weaker candidates struggled to cope with Source G. Some said that the article explains that Mary was 'stupid'. However, more able candidates were able to make the subtle point that the article is really an argument that it was Florence Nightingale who was more

important in the development of nursing. These were some of the most common 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.
- The reliability or sufficiency of the sources in relation to the question was usually done in a simplistic way. This was not enough for the award of additional marks.
- 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 combined more than one source together and reached an overall conclusion which was not valid for all of the sources so listed.

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

General Comments

As usual, the sources and questions proved accessible to most candidates, although a small number of answers indicated miscomprehension of Sources A and F, the consequences of which are discussed in the question-specific comments that follow. The paper was on a well-known area of content, the early years of the Metropolitan Police Force, which meant that candidates had ample opportunity to make effective use of contextual knowledge in informing their answers. Almost all scripts were complete, indicating that candidates experienced no significant time problems. A noticeable feature of many scripts was that source evaluation was more effective where the source provenance gave clear clues to the reliability (or otherwise) of the content, as in Qs.4 and 5, rather than where candidates needed to analyse source content without such clues, as in Qs. 2 and 3. The obvious inference to take from this is that candidates are attuned to thinking of source reliability as more a matter of who is saying something, rather than of what they are saying. In practice, the strongest answers always are based on the source content, with the provenance in a secondary role, helping to explain why the source says or shows what it does.

Comments on Individual Questions

Question 1
Where a question asks why something occurred, then it follows that what will be rewarded is the ability to provide reasons. The source content provided plenty of material from which relevant reasons for the government producing this notice could be deduced, and candidates generally had little difficulty in providing at least one, and often more. Typically these covered wanting to deter people from attending the meeting, wanting to inform people that the meeting was dangerous and illegal, or wanting to let people know the role the police would play in dealing with people who turned up. A few weaker answers assumed that the notice was to encourage people to attend the demonstration, which made it hard for any of the rest of the answer to be valid. The best answers moved beyond the confines of the source content and used contextual knowledge of the government's fear of revolution at this time to further explain the reasons provided by the source, perhaps even mentioning specific events such as the French Revolution or Peterloo.

Question 2
In asking how far the source could be believed, the question was an explicit invitation to evaluate its reliability. Many candidates limited themselves to assertions about which aspects of the source could or could not be believed, with no valid explanation. Alternatively, others answered on the basis of the provenance, either asserting it was/was not reliable because, for example, it was from a broadside, or produced at the time, or, slightly better, trying to explain why the provenance affected its reliability, maybe by noting that in the three-day gap between the riot and publication witnesses could have been interviewed and a coherent account produced. Much rarer were answers that analysed the source content and reached a judgment on the basis of what it actually said. This approach opened up several fruitful possibilities. However, fundamental to this analysis was appreciating that the account was hostile to the police, and sympathetic to the crowd. There were some answers that thought it was the opposite – sympathetic to the police – which so clearly was not the case that it was disallowed. Given that the anti-police bias was detected, good answers proceeded to illustrate this bias from the wording of the source (without such illustration the bias would be no more than an assertion), in order to argue its lack of reliability, or to point out that despite the bias, the source offered some

balance (in expressing regret about PC Culley's death) which would make it more reliable. There were further ways in which the source content could be doubted. It was mentioned that 3000 policemen broke up the meeting of 1000 demonstrators. Some answers noted the sheer implausibility of the ratio of police to demonstrators. Others spotted that the Background Information gave a figure of 3000 as the total membership of the Metropolitan Police at this time, and questioned the likelihood of them all dealing with this one demonstration. Alternatively, other sources on the paper could be used as the basis of cross-references on the events of the riot in order to reach a judgement on the reliability of the account in Source B.

Question 3
This question raised many of the same issues as Question 2. As with all questions dealing with the concept of source utility, a vital stepping-stone to providing a high-level answer was first to analyse reliability. However, Source C offered even fewer clues through its provenance than Source B had. It was obvious that this created a real problem for many candidates, who still spent time noting that they did not know when the picture was drawn, where it was published, who drew it (even though the artist's name was printed on the picture, for all the good it did to candidates that actually noticed this), and so on. Many even stated that perhaps the artist was biased, assuming that this would have been detectable had the provenance only given them more information. In truth, of course, the attitude of the artist is clear enough from the detail of the source, but only better answers perceived this. Despite the provenance issues, most answers did use the source content, but generally in an uncritical manner; that is, they accepted what it showed at face value as a factual and accurate reproduction of the events. This led to the conclusion that it was useful for what it showed about the riot, and/or that it was not useful because there were things about the riot that it did not show. Taking a critical approach – questioning what the source showed – was more unusual. Some candidates doubted the seriousness of the image because of the dog flying through the air. Other, more effective, answers analysed the perspective of the artist, concluding that the bias made the source unreliable, so not useful. For these answers to be rewarded, it was essential that the bias was illustrated with reference to source detail. Although, as some candidates were able to point out, the angle from which the picture was drawn betrayed a pro-police bias, answers were also accepted that argued an anti-police bias, since it was plausible to suggest that it showed them being brutal to members of the crowd. Finally, the very best analysis moved away from rejection of the source because of bias, returning to the issue of utility by demonstrating that the real usefulness of the source was in revealing how people at the time thought about the police, and here again both pro- and anti-police opinions were accepted.

Question 4
This question was based on two contradictory accounts of the riot, with candidates being asked whether one account made them surprised by the other. Since the provenance details made it obvious that the accounts were, in effect, from the two opposing sides in the riot, many candidates (in contrast to their answers on Qs 2 and 3) found it fairly straightforward to provide a proper evaluation of the source content in relation to the purposes of the authors. The first task, however, was to identify what it was about the two sources that might make one surprised – that is, the glaring contradictions in the two accounts. Without an identification of these contradictions, answers did not make full sense, since they were arguing whether or not they were surprised, before making it apparent why one would be (or not). Many candidates concluded that they were surprised because of the contradictions, but these were demonstrably limited by the failure to consider who was giving the accounts. The moment the authorship was considered, it was no longer feasible to remain surprised. Some candidates thought that the authorship alone was sufficient explanation, but better answers developed this further by analysing the purposes of each author in representing the event in their particular ways. A final point needs to be made about answering 'Are you surprised?' questions. The reasoning in the answer needs to be logically consistent with whether or not the candidate is surprised. For example, some responses to this question identified the contradictions and then argued that they were not surprised by them. Without further development this was unrewardable.

Question 5
Like Source A, Source F gave rise to a small number of comprehension problems. For example, some candidates thought the cup was presented to PC Culley, or that PC Culley was put on trial and found not guilty (ie that he had committed 'justifiable homicide'). However, such misunderstandings were relatively uncommon, and answers to this question were generally good, not least since the provenance again gave significant help in evaluating the source content. Many used reference to the Milton Street Committee to argue that the cup could not be regarded as reliable evidence of Culley's guilt. However, the question also gave opportunities for candidates to cross-refer to other sources on the likelihood of Culley brutally attacking the crowd, and to use their own knowledge of public attitudes to the Metropolitan Police to judge the likelihood of the inquest jury being swayed by anti-police prejudice.

Question 6
The challenge posed by Q6 is to use source content to argue both for and against a given hypothesis. Some sources leant themselves straightforwardly to the issue of whether or not the police were to blame for the riot. For example, Source B suggested that the police attacked a peaceful crowd without warning, which indicates that the police were to blame. Other sources were a little harder to use. What, for example, to make of Source A, which was issued before the riot even took place? Here, using the source required a more developed point, perhaps suggesting that since the government had given people fair warning in advance about the dangers of the meeting, the crowd had only itself to blame when the worst happened. Most candidates were able to use several sources to argue that the police were to blame, but found it harder to summon evidence to support the contrary view. Almost all could point to Source E as offering a pro-police account, but many stumbled by failing to use the source content on the issue of blame, perhaps by saying only that the police had orders to do nothing until the meeting started. Some candidates like to group sources together and then make a point which they think applies to all the stated sources. This is a dangerous tactic, since it will earn no credit unless the point genuinely does apply to all the sources in the group. Much more effective is the approach of working through each source in turn, analysing whether or not its content supports the hypothesis.