

Examiners Reports; summary for each paper

Paper One, Medicine:

- Question 2a (how useful are sources...) many candidates trapped in L2 because they focused on source content, failed to include contextual knowledge or offered simplistic comments on the provenance.
- (Question 2a) Many candidates approached it in a formulaic way, through a mnemonic including a checklist of points, but offering generic comment. AO3: usefulness of the source; the effect of the provenance and the inclusion of relevant contextual knowledge. These strands are presented as a single bullet point, showing that they are inter-related, therefore an approach which covers all three separately, is unlikely to reach high marks.
- (Question 2a) The statement that the purpose of a source was 'to inform' is very generalised; when discussing purpose there needs to be some consideration of the intended audience and effect.
- (Question 2a) It is not necessary to cover every aspect of provenance (NOP), important to explain how aspects of the provenance affect the usefulness of the source.
- (Question 2a) Disappointing to see how many candidates assumed Source A was automatically reliable because it was a photograph, or assumed it was staged for propaganda purposes, and therefore unreliable.
- (Question 2a) Focus on assessing what is in the source rather than listing details that are not mentioned.
- (Question 2a) Practically all of the answers which needed extra paper focused on covering source content in detail and remained in L2, L3 were often more concise and focused on 'how useful' the information was in light of contextual knowledge and aspects of provenance.
- (Question 2a) No requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination, no marks for this. Candidates who treated each source separately were most likely to reach L3.
- Question 2b (follow-up source) seems to be the question found most challenging.
- (Question 2b) The aim is for candidates to show they know how historians work.
- (Question 2b) Details picked out needs to be from the source, not provenance.
- (Question 2b) No marks can be given if the candidate's question is not linked to the detail, or the overall enquiry.
- (Question 2b) Source must be a specific primary source- history books, the Internet and documentaries were all unsuitable answers.
- (Question 2b) In general the simple approach was most effective.
- Question 3 (Explain differences/ similarities in different time periods) Most candidates found this question straightforward.
- (Question 3) In some cases the difference was not clearly identified, in other cases the supporting information was unbalanced- simply stating that it was 'different' in the other time period.
- (Question 3) Some candidates wrote far too much; unnecessary waste of time.

- In questions 4, 5 and 6 stimulus points will usually relate to aspects of content rather than directly indicating a factor that should be included.
- If a question asks about the nineteenth century, an answer based on the 1900s is likely to score 0.
- Question 4 (Explain why...) Examiners noted that some L3 answers contained more detailed information than many L4 answers but stayed at L3 because analysis was not developed.
- (Question 4) Some excellent answers treated this chronologically, but equally excellent were those that treated it thematically; work of individuals, role of science and the role of government.
- Question 5/6 (Statement and judgment) Important that candidates identify the key theme in the question.
- (Question 5/ 6) Pleasing to see answers at L4 with a sense of argument and evaluation developing consistently throughout the answer and then in the conclusion, explicit criteria being applied to explain final judgement.
- (Question 5/ 6) Candidates who reached L4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus on which a judgement should be offered.
- (Question 5/ 6) Many answers remained at a L3 because the judgement tended to be simply a summary of the two sides of the issue and the decision that the statement was 'somewhat true'. At L4 there should be a sense of evaluation.
- (Question 5/ 6) More able answers often had a plan, showing that the argument was thought through before writing began.
- Paper summary: Need a secure understanding of chronological periods and terms used in the spec, as well as the term 'century'. Need to understand the themes within the spec; cause, prevention and treatment. Highest level students need to deploy precise detail. Not necessary to use stimulus points, but aim to cover three separate aspects of the question.

Paper two, Am West:

- Question 1 (two consequences) Some candidates provided more detail than was necessary.
- (Question 1) Tendency by some candidates to give generalisations for a consequence.
- (Question 1) Some candidates merely rephrased the same consequence for the second one, they were only credited for one.
- Question 2 Needs to be viewed as sequence, can cover several years or a much shorter period.
- (Question 2) Narrative concept, with a sense of beginning, development and end, rather than three paragraphs that do not directly link.
- (Question 2) Candidates do not need to use stimulus points but must show depth of knowledge, shown in three discreet points in the narrative, although this does not mean they need to identify three different events.
- (Question 2) Centres are reminded that indicative content in mark scheme does not imply what must be included, nor how candidates should structure their answers.

- (Question 2) Where extra sheets were used, these responses were not always as successful as more concise answers.
- (Question 2) Candidates should not continue answers in a question space reserved for another question, MUST ask for additional sheets.
- (Question 2) Overall structure of beginning, development and end was demonstrated by the candidates who attained L3, it was clear that candidates taught to use language such as 'consequently', 'which resulted in' were more successful, even if they had more limited knowledge.
- Question 3 (Explain the importance of X on Y) Candidates who addressed the importance of the factor raised in relation to development, produced L3 responses when supported by good knowledge and understanding.
- (Question 3) The responses that remained at L2 often demonstrated knowledge without explaining why it was important.
- (Question 3) Several candidates wrote the details in the form of a narrative which made it difficult to complete the analysis required for L3.

Paper two, Elizabeth:

- Candidates receive an examination paper with two Tudor depth studies, candidates need to ensure that they answer questions on the particular option for which they have been entered. There was a significant number who started answering the wrong questions then crossing out and moving to correct section.
- A number of candidates continued their answers in the spaces for the option they had not studied rather than asking for extra paper.
- Question 5b (Explain why) There was an over-reliance from some candidates on content that was only obliquely relevant to the topic (I know it so I'll write about it).
- Question 5c (statement and judgment) Important to note that stimulus points will not necessarily be presented in chronological order.
- (Question 5c) In the mid-range knowledge was usually accurate and quite detailed.
- (Question 5c) Tendency to continue adding causes (of Armada) rather than analysing those already identified, often led to a 'list-like' outcome.
- (Question 5c) Answers that achieved highly in L3 and in L4 were marked on their ability to group causes together and provide supported judgement.
- (Question 5c) Short plans are a good tactic to use for essay questions.

Paper three, Germany:

- Question 1 (two inferences) No marks available for simple paraphrasing, or for those who ignored the specific focus of the question.
- Question 2 (Explain why) Will always focus on causation, does not require a judgment/conclusion, or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors.
- (Question 2) Most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus.
- (Question 2) Do not need to use stimulus points, but there is an expectation of depth of knowledge shown by three discrete points. Pleasing to see candidates had

understood this and most answers were clearly structured in paragraphs; making it easy for examiner to identify three points.

- Question 3a (how useful are sources) No need to compare the two sources, some candidates tried to determine which was 'most useful' which is not the focus of the question and therefore is not rewardable.
- (Question 3a) Remember that judging utility may involve some comments about reliability but answers which focus solely on this aspect tend to be extremely negative towards the source. Reliability can only ever be a small element of utility because an unreliable source can still be very useful.
- (Question 3a) Provenance of source was often dealt with on a generic level and this is only likely to gain marks at L1.
- (Question 3a) Candidates often commented on things such as a photograph being a 'snapshot in time' or that the technology to manipulate photographs did not exist then so it is trustworthy; these statements too basic to be considered analytical, also they are demonstrably untrue.
- (Question 3a) In attempting to analyse utility many candidates have obviously been encouraged to describe what is missing and this led to some answers which could only be marked at L1. Primary focus should be to judge utility of what is there, not what is not there.
- (Question 3a) No requirement to compare sources; wastes time.
- Question 3b (what is the difference between two interpretations) L2 was achieved when the candidates indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts.
- (Question 3b) Candidates' success in 3d is influenced by how well they identify the views given in the interpretations.
- Question 3c (why are the interpretations different) Candidates found this question more challenging. It was not possible to substantiate reasons for difference based on where and when the interpretations were published.
- (Question 3c) Only one reason, substantiated, is required to get into L2.
- (Question 3c) Successful candidates were able to show an understanding of why historians have come to different conclusions, or have different emphases.
- (Question 3c) Successful candidates selected one of the above approaches and evidenced their reasoning with specific support from the interpretations.
- (Question 3c) Those who stayed in L1 did not fully understand the question. A troubling number of candidates merely repeated what had been said in 3b.
- (Question 3c) A significant minority of candidates attempted to speculate as to the background motivations of the historians which is not a requirement of this question. Those who did this tried to use the date of the interpretation, the title of the book or the nature of the interpretation. Candidates who did this stayed in L1.
- (Question 3c) Candidates should appreciate that historians legitimately have differences of view and come to different conclusions.
- (Question 3c) The interpretations need to be treated differently than the sources, and without reference to the provenance.

- Question 3d (How far do you agree with interpretation 1 / 2) Strongest answers focused clearly on the interpretations, coming to a substantiated judgment.
- (Question 3d) Candidates who focused exclusively on one interpretation and their own knowledge were less successful than those who considered the alternative views from both interpretations.
- (Question 3d) There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal measure but both should be dealt with explicitly.
- (Question 3d) The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation, it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation and not just used to display aspects of the topic.
- (Question 3d) Strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgments.
- (Question 3d) Less successful candidates showed an awareness of the gist of the interpretation but did not analyse it effectively.
- (Question 3d) Successful candidates were able to pick apart the details of the interpretation and show how these details were valid using their own knowledge.
- (Question 3d) The most successful candidates used precise evidence to support both interpretations.
- (Question 3d) Only a handful of candidates were able to successfully address the strand of L4 which requires candidates to 'indicate how the difference of view are conveyed', beyond the selection of information. These differences may be conveyed through, for example, language or tone, or points of emphasis. 'Best-fit' marking means candidates can get into a L4 even if they were unable to do this.
- (Question 3d) Most impressive aspect of SPaG was the use of specialist terms.
- Paper summary: In question 3a focus on linking the provenance to the content of the sources. When analysing the reasons for the different views in the interpretations focus on their content- candidates should not be concerned with the book title, the author or type of publication.