

## **A LEVEL**

*Examiners' report*

# **HISTORY A**

**H505**

For first teaching in 2015

## **Y318/01 Summer 2018 series**

Version 1

## Contents

Introduction .....	3
Paper Y318/01 series overview .....	4
Section A.....	5
Question 1 .....	5
Section B.....	9
Question 2* .....	9
Question 3* .....	14
Question 4* .....	23

## Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates. The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report. A full copy of the question paper can be downloaded from OCR.

## Paper Y318/01 series overview

Y318 is one of twenty one units for the revised A Level examination for GCE History. This unit tests an extended period of History of at least one hundred years through an interpretation option on a named in-depth topic and two essays. The paper is divided into two sections. In Section A candidates are required to use contextual knowledge to test the views of two historians about one of the three named in-depth topics or an aspect of one. The question does not require them to comment on the style of writing or the provenance of the interpretation. In Section B candidates are required to answer two essay questions from a choice of three.

To do well on Section A, candidates need to explain the view of each interpretation in relation to the question and then evaluate the interpretation by the application of contextual knowledge. Responses should show an understanding of the wider debate connected to the issue.

To do well on Section B, candidates need to make connections and links across the whole period, explaining similarities and differences between the events they are discussing in order to show an awareness of continuity and change across the whole period unless instructed otherwise. The comparisons made may be either between periods within the topic or between regions. The strongest answers will test an hypothesis and reach a supported judgement.

### *Overview of candidate performance*

Candidates who did well on this paper generally did the following:

- showed a clear understanding of the views of the two interpretations in relation to the question
- were able to use contextual knowledge to test the interpretations, linking that knowledge directly to the interpretation through evaluative words
- were able to consider both the strengths and limitations of both Interpretations using contextual knowledge
- in answering the essay questions, covered the whole period in a balanced way
- adopted a thematic approach
- made links and comparisons between aspects of the topic
- explained the links and comparisons
- supported their arguments with precise and relevant examples
- reached a supported judgement about the issue in the question.

Candidates who did less well on this paper generally did the following:

- showed a limited understanding of one or both of the interpretations
- did not go beyond a basic explanation of part of the interpretation
- did not link any contextual knowledge directly to the interpretation and therefore did not evaluate the interpretation
- in answering the essay adopted a chronological rather than thematic approach
- did not make links or comparisons even if events from different parts of the period were discussed in the same paragraph
- failed to cover the whole period
- did not focus on the precise wording of the question
- made unsupported comments about issues which were no more than assertions.

## Section A

### Question 1

- 1 Evaluate the interpretations in **both** of the two passages and explain which you think is more convincing about the consequences of Alexander II's Great Reforms. [30]

This question was, on the whole, well answered. The majority of candidates were able to access the higher levels by clearly linking their own knowledge to the views and opinions mentioned. Stronger responses were able to select three or four different views within each interpretation and assess the relative nature of each one. At the top end, candidates used precise and accurate own knowledge, explaining that A presents a more positive view of the consequences of the Great Reforms whereas B argues the converse view. The most successful answers dealt with each interpretation in turn before coming to a measured conclusion. Answers which attempted a thematic approach often were confused and lacked evaluation, leading to an essay-like approach. Centres should be aware that credit is given in assessing the relative convincingness of the views that are present in each interpretation. Answers which proceeded to list impacts that were not present in each interpretation did not score highly, as they were not explicitly evaluating the view of each historian. Centres should also be aware that there is no requirement to mention other historians.

In regards to Interpretation A, the majority of candidates were able to locate the positives, such as the explosion of culture and the role of the railroad. They then furthered this with examples of their impact. Those at lower levels just described them, rather than explaining. There were also a good number of candidates who had excellent knowledge in relation to conditions in towns and countryside. However, some candidates merely listed the points made by the author and did not evaluate. Many, for example, used the statistic given in relation to Livny as evidence in support. This would have received no credit as it is given in the interpretation. As for Interpretation B, most were able to identify its key message that Great Reforms were not successful. Many discussed the role of the courts and the nature of the zemstvo. Some candidates were keen to use their knowledge of Alexander's desire for a national assembly and its promise before he was assassinated. This was credited on the acceptance that it was linked to explaining the view presented about the 'Tsar's refusal to establish a national assembly.'

Exemplar 1 is a Level 6 response.

#### Exemplar 1

1	These 2 passages offer differing arguments concerning the impact of Alexander II's reforms. Passage A argues that they had a huge impact on society & changed Russia fundamentally. Passage B on the other hand argues that there were severe limitations to these reforms and claims that they did not go far enough to <del>far</del> change Russian society meaningfully. Overall, passage A provides the more compelling argument as it is corroborated by historical facts whereas passage B overlooks the successes of the reforms and is not as strongly backed up by the evidence.
---	--

	<p><del>Passage A</del> D. Saunders in <u>Passage B</u> does make some correct points, even if his argument as a whole is unconvincing. <del>He is right to</del> It is right to point out the limitations of the 1861 Emancipation Edict as many peasants were constrained by the 49 years of redemption payments (46% in the Black Earth Belt were in arrears by 1871-1881). This text leads on to another point which is factually correct; many peasants were short of land following emancipation, as is proven by the fact that the average peasant holding in the North-East of Russia decreased in size from over 8 hectares in 1860 to just 4 hectares by 1890. These statistics thus give weight to his assertion that 'peasants were the poorest (...) section of society. Saunders' <del>is</del> also argument that the limited impact of the zemstvo was greatly limited is also rather compelling. He describes the zemstvo as 'the nests of the gentry' which is true in many respects as the nobility held 45%</p>
AN	
KU	
AN	
	<p>of the vote &amp; therefore a disproportionate level of influence over the composition of the zemstvo. It is also correct that the Russian government had to approve the chairmen of the zemstvo &amp; these factors meant that the provincial level of government was overwhelmingly dominated by the gentry.</p>
AN	
	<p>However, despite these strong arguments, the overall message is unconvincing because the passage fails to acknowledge the impact of some reforms &amp; also makes some factually incorrect statements. For example Saunders is not entirely correct when writing that the introduction of new courts aided the exploitation of the peasants. In fact, the legal reforms such as the introduction of a jury and the abolition of different courts for different classes were actually key in achieving some social levelling and were certainly an improvement from the days in which the nobles owned the serfs as property. Saunders' argument is further</p>
AN	

	AN	undermined by his misleading statements such as 'the Tsar was not to be persuaded to create a national assembly.
		This overlooks <del>the</del> the key developments in 1881 of the Loris-Melikov proposals which would have allowed a national committee and was seen by many as a stepping stone to a fully fledged national assembly. Alexander II was due to approve these plans on the day of his assassination, a fact which clearly contradicts passage B. As a result,
	AN	even though Saunders does make some strong points, his overall argument is unconvincing because it <del>does not</del> overlooks or ignores key facts as well as setting unrealistically high expectations for any reform.
		<b>Passage A</b> in contrast provides a more convincing argument as it is more strongly supported by historical facts as well as setting more realistic expectations for the success of these reforms in 19th Russia. C. Evtuhov does tend to exaggerate the impact of some reforms however. For instance, regarding the effect of the zemstvo, the claim that 'it was the cornerstone of [...] political culture' and
	AN	was 'the defining institution of the era' is slightly excessive. This is due to the fact that the zemstvo had no power over taxation or the police which meant that in reality the autocracy was in no way threatened. Furthermore, the passage overemphasises the urbanisation of the period. The significance of comments such as 'the population of small towns doubled' is undermined by the low base levels of
	KU	urbanisation at the time; only 5% of the population lived in towns in 1855 and by 1881 well over 75% of the population were still rural.
		Despite these limitations, Evtuhov's broader argument is a compelling one as it is <del>backed</del> strongly backed up. It would not be an exaggeration to say that

	<p>Emancipation, let alone the Great Reforms<sup>W</sup> in general, 'changed the social fabric profoundly' as the <del>the</del> legal liberation of 83% of the population is a massive change, as was the doubling of school students from 1855-65 or reduction of military service from 25 years to 7 active years of service. The zemstvo also led to the creation of the '3rd element' as Evtuhov implies, and the growth of the middle class. The passage is also correct to emphasise</p>
AN	
KU	
	<p>the impact of industrialisation. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century. If anything, Evtuhov is underplaying the growth of railways when he describes it as 'slow'; and under Finance Minister Reuter<sup>R</sup> Reuten, the amount of railway track increased 7fold. When the passage says 'industry flourished', it is given weight by the fact that industrial production doubled from 1862-78. As a result, the general message of the source (that reforms 'changed the social fabric profoundly') is given credence by all the historical evidence which backs it up, even if it exaggerates at times.</p>
AN	
	<p>In conclusion, Passage A provides the more convincing argument because it is well supported by historical facts. Whilst it does exaggerate the role of the zemstvo, this is counterbalanced by its underestimation of the role of industrialisation and the lack of mention of Golovin's educational reforms which would only back up the argument more strongly. Passage B is right to be cynical about the impacts of the emancipation and the zemstvo, but its overlooking <del>of</del> contradiction with historical facts undermines it, as does its unrealistically high expectations of <del>get</del> a full transition from complete autocracy to having a national assembly in just 30 years when so many other concessions were made.</p>
JU	
JU	



## Section B

### Question 2\*

2\* 'The Tsars wanted to reform the nature of government more than the communists.' To what extent do you agree with this view of the period 1855–1964? [25]

This was the most popular question on the paper. Most candidates were aware that this was a nature of government question and, as such, were able to utilise thematic paragraphs. These tended to be ideology, structure of government and repressive methods. Some centres also used local and national government, which worked well for their candidates, as long as they were able to give clear and precise examples and explanation, in particular in regards to local government under the communists.

At the top end, candidates wrote in thematic paragraphs, giving examples across the time period. They explained firstly the Tsars approach and then the communists and clearly delineated which wanted to reform more in each area and why. This either happened continually through the paragraph or, in most cases, in a judgement at the end of each paragraph. At the very top, answers assessed the most important theme in defining Russian government in the conclusion (often ideology in the answers received this year) to present a highly analytical response.

Candidates who were less successful either: wrote a paragraph on the Tsars and then on the commissars; wrote thematically but did not to compare (often characterised by the word similarly without an explanation); assessed reform of government but did not explore the nature of 'wanting' to reform' and/or included information on the provisional government.

Exemplar 2 is a Level 6 response.

#### Exemplar 2

2	<p>The nature of government changed radically from 1855 - 1964 as a complete autocracy transitioned into a one-party system with a collective leadership in power. The changes to the nature of government can be seen in 3 key areas; structures of government, ideology and repression. Whilst the Tsars did implement some key reforms to the structures of government and repression, overall it was the communists who wanted to reform more than the Tsars as the Tsars reformed primarily in order to maintain the status quo and reduce further change.</p>
---	---

		The Tsars without doubt allowed a great deal of reform to the structures of government; however they merely reformed an existing system whereas the Communists destroyed the old structures of government and replaced them with their own.
		The introduction of the zemstvo under Alexander II was certainly a major reform, especially when combined with the enlargement of the franchise to include many peasants.
	EXP	This was the birth of any kind of representative government and allowed the <del>two</del> increased participation in local government. However there were many limitations to this reform and it was not as radical as may seem; the nobles controlled a disproportionately large 55-45% of the vote and the zemstvo had no control over taxation or policing, 2 of the most important aspects of government. Having said this, the Communists did little more to extend democracy as they abolished the universal direct suffrage or freedoms of union and assembly which the PG brought in. However they did
		not try to introduce democracy half-heartedly (as Nicholas II did when he allowed a State Duma and then undermined it in 1906 & 7 with Stolypin's Coups & the Fundamental Laws which allowed him to govern as an autocrat once more). Instead the Communists zealously completely
	AN	changed the structures of government through their one party system. It could be argued that a Communist dictatorship was simply a return to autocracy, however this is contradicted by the extreme power of the party which was a completely new introduction to the political system. Under Khrushchev the democratisation of the party saw 11 million people join the party whilst under Stalin the party privileges included such essentials as food rations and housing. Whilst this new one-party system of government was not as radical as the PG's switch from

		autocracy to a republic with universal, direct suffrage, it lasted 70 years which makes it far more significant in the long-term. As a result, even though the Tsars did not allow large changes such as the birth of politics in 1905 with the emergence of political parties, their backtracking & limitations reveal their reluctance to really want to change the systems of government.
	AN	
		Unlike the structures of government, the Tsars & presided over <del>much less change than the Communists</del> very little ideological change. Alexander III may have attempted to increase the role of the autocrat with the 'Manifesto of Unshakeable Autocracy' in 1881 but this was mostly an effort to limit the changes of his father, who had been planning on allowing the Louis-Melikhov project. Yet even under Alexander II, the political ideology of the role of the autocrat barely changed as he sought to limit the impact of his other reforms on his ideological role. In contrast, under the Communists the role of the autocrat reached unprecedented levels with the rule of the 'vozhd' and the cult of the personality under Stalin who was nicknamed 'Generalissimus' after WWII. Stalin However the greatest change to the role of the autocrat came under Khrushchev who <del>allowed</del> tried to <del>de-</del> remove the 'cult of the personality of a 'vozhd' through his policy of de-Stalinisation. Furthermore, the transition to a collective leadership was the first time any of the Tsars or the Communists had wanted to rein in the powers of the leader, even if Khrushchev himself did have a relatively large degree of personal power. The entire introduction of Marxist ideology in government was also a major reform with projects such as the Stakhanovite movement emphasising the role of the proletariat and their importance to
	C	
	AN	

	AN	<p>the government. This was also the first time the government had not based its power on the 'Divine Right' as Lenin issued a Decree on the Separation of Church and State whilst Khrushchev declared religion 'unscientific' in 1958 and closed 15,000 out of 200,000 churches. Therefore, it appears clear that whilst both most Tsars &amp; Communists upheld the role of the autocrat, it was Khrushchev who wanted to reduce this whilst the basis of the government on Marxist ideology was another</p>
		<p>revolutionary <del>act</del> change to the ideology.</p>
	S	<p>When it comes to repression, it was the Tsars who laid the <del>basic</del> foundations of mass repression, however the Communists <del>completely</del> massively increased the scale of repression whilst once again Khrushchev was the only leader who sought to reverse the trend of growing repression. The roots of mass repression originate with Nicholas II and Alexander III. Alexander III was the first ruler who could be said to have a police state as under him there was an Okhrana agent in every factory and following his father's assassination he arrested 10,000 political opponents. This, combined with Stolypin's necktie (where 1,500 people were executed following the 1905 revolution and 45,000 more were deported) can be said to be the first signs of mass repression. However Lenin and Stalin both made</p>
	S	<p>these numbers pale in comparison to their statistics. Lenin's Cheka killed 500,000 people during the Red Terror - an unprecedented number. Stalin took this to new levels with his purges which killed between 9 and 21 million people with 1 in 8 people being arrested at some point and over 8 million in gulags. It was only under the Communists that <del>opposition</del> <sup>repression</sup> became pre-emptive, before then the</p>

		Tsarist repression had been reactionary. The Communist
	AN	philosophy of eliminating people based on class & any
		perceived threat rather than actions marks a major change
		in the nature of repression. Furthermore, Khrushchev tried to
		change this through trend of increasing repression by releasing
		even going prisoners (5.5m in 1953, 11,000 in 1964).
		These fundamental reforms to the nature of repression mean
		that the Communists wanted change more than the
		Tsars.
		In conclusion, it appears clear that the Communists
		were far more eager & zealous in changing the nature
		of government, even if the Tsars did implement reform
	JU	to the structures of government & repression. The main
		reason why the Communists can be said to want reform
		more is that the Tsars only agreed to change reluctantly.
		This is proven when Alexander II said 'it is better to
	JU	liberate the serfs from above rather than wait for
		them to do so from below'. This quotation shows that
		the Tsars didn't want reform unless it would prolong the
		status quo & reduce <del>to</del> future change.

## Question 3\*

- 3\* How far was war more responsible for changing the lives of the working class than revolutions in the period 1855–1964? [25]

This was a popular question. Most candidates were able to identify the key themes within the lives of the working class. Two common approaches, which worked well, were either: political, economic, and social or: working conditions, living conditions, education. Some answers also included repression and religion which again allowed candidates to access the highest levels.

At the top end, candidates wrote in thematic paragraphs, giving examples across the time period which were only wars or revolutions. They explained firstly why war was more responsible and then revolutions and clearly delineated which was more responsible for changing lives and why. This either happened continually through the paragraph or, in most cases, in a judgement at the end of each paragraph. At the very top, answers assessed the most important theme in defining the lives of the working class in the conclusion (often economic in the answers received this year) to present a highly analytical response. It was also excellent to see responses that looked in particular at the First World War and its role as a cause of the 1917 revolutions, something that, when handled well, garnered high marks.

Candidates who were less successful tended to write about wars in separate paragraphs (often just the First World War and the two revolutions of 1917). Again, as with Question 2, some candidates attempted to write thematically, but ended up writing a list of wars or revolutions within each theme, often starting sentences with 'another war....'. Finally, the focus of the question is on the working class, not the peasantry. Candidates who strayed into exploring the latter were only given credit if they were able to link this to the working class, for example the role of the worker peasant in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Exemplar 3 is a Level 6 response.

## Exemplar 3

3	<p>Wars had a profound impact on the lives of the working class in Russia 1855-1964 as the atom refugees fleeing from invading armies, most notably in the second and first world wars, caused living standards to reach a crisis point as urban centres such as Petrograd and Moscow were overcrowded. However, as well as this, though revolutions such as the October 1917 revolution should have, in theory, transformed the lives of the working class as Marxist ideas Bolshevik ideology placed the needs of the</p>
---	---

protection above the needs of any other group. The fact that it did not, as shown by the fact that living standards actually declined under Lenin and Stalin, suggests that revolution had a limited impact on the lives of the working class. Therefore, as well as impacted housing and working conditions, as well as civil liberties, other did have a greater impact on the lives of the working class across the period.

Throughout the period, housing conditions were relatively poor, with crisis points being reached during and after war. For example, the after World War 2, over 25 million people were made homeless and the collectivisation campaign of Stalin, which was deemed necessary due to the threat of war meant that 20 million peasants moved to the cities after in the 1930s. This resulted in severe overcrowding (75% of families in Moscow lived in one room with 2 or more other families) just as the effects of the Emancipation, which was primarily brought about due to the failure of the Crimean War led to the urban population quadrupling to 28 million by 1900. ~~The effect of the~~ In addition, just as

	<p>The Russo-Japanese War and the First World War caused starvation in the cities, so too did the Civil War, which saw the population of Petrograd fall by 93%. Therefore, and this was despite the Bolsheviks claiming before the needs of the proletariat before the needs of the peasants, as shown by War Communism. Therefore, although the October</p>
301	<p>1917 Revolution undoubtedly brought about the Civil War, ultimately it was the war which brought about this significant decline in living standards due to overcrowding and poor food supplies. As well as this, the October Revolution should have improved living standards instead of worsening them as private property was placed in the hands of the proletariat. As well as this, the fact that the living conditions continued to worsen under Stalin until Khrushchev addressed the housing crisis by moving 108 million households into new apartments in the 1950s undermines the extent to which the revolution can be considered to have had a greater impact on the lives of the working class than war.</p>



War had a profound impact on the working conditions of the working class as it led to workers being forced to work longer hours in order to prepare the Russia for war. For example,

during the Second World War, workers worked 17 hour days, often living in poor accommodation near factories. Similarly, as Nicholas II began to prepare Russia for World War One, workers worked on average, 11-hour days and strikes were ruthlessly suppressed, just as they were under Stalin, as they undermined the war effort. As well as this, the war impacted the working conditions of the working class as less attention was paid to regulations, as shown by the fact that many factory bosses continued to use child labour under Nicholas II, despite it having been outlawed by Alexander II in 1882. As well as this, just as the Crimean War transformed the working conditions of the working class by driving the peasants from the country side to the cities, the need to strengthen the Soviet economy to cope with the Cold War would do the opposite, as the

Virgin Lands Campaign drove  
 around 300,000 ~~non~~ ~~homosocial~~  
 volunteers to the countryside as a  
 strong rural economy was needed  
 to cope with the total war. This  
 succeeded in transforming the working  
 lives of the workers as they moved  
 from being members of the urban  
 working class to members of the  
 peasantry. However, one of the  
 primary reasons why war had  
 a greater impact than revolution  
 on the lives of the working classes  
 was that it helped to justify the  
 repressive tactics employed  
 by Stalin to ensure that targets  
 were met. By contrast, no such  
 targets were employed by Lenin  
 after the October 1917 Revolution.  
 And though the lives of the working  
 class did not improve as much as  
 expected, they were not actively  
 persecuted for missing targets as  
 they would be in the run-up  
 to the Second World War. Therefore  
 wars did have a greater change  
 the working lives of the working  
 class more than revolutions as  
 they demanded that the workers  
 work longer hours than ever  
 before, although the clearing the

Cold War under Khrushchev, hours decreased on average as he sought to distance himself from Stalin, ~~ensure~~ to prevent serious opposition to the communists from flowering.

~~The~~ The Revolutions, particularly the October 1917 Revolution, did have a significant impact on the status of the working class as, after October 1917, the workers were, due to Marxist ideology, given greater importance than the peasantry, who were actively persecuted. As well as this, the relaxation of contraception and abortion laws by Lenin after the Revolution did have a profound impact on the lives of working class women as they had a greater ability to organise the bearing of children around their working lives. ~~As~~ Therefore, as these changes were brought about due to the Revolution changing the government, it could be argued that Revolutions did have a significant impact on the ~~personal liberties~~ <sup>personal liberties</sup> enjoyed by the working class, as abortion and contraception could not have been introduced

under any Tsar due to their strict adherence to the Orthodox faith. As well as however, just as Lenin introduced measures to reduce the population, Stalin banned abortion and restricted access to contraception as he sought to increase the population in preparation for war. This was similar to the Tsars, and though they did not give out medals for having children as Stalin did, recognised that a large urban population was needed to bring about the industrialisation needed for war. As well as this, the Tsars sought to increase the provision of primary education, in the case of Alexander II as he recognised that, not only was it necessary to improve literacy so that the effectiveness of army training was increased, but it was also necessary to help increase industrialisation. Similarly, under the 5-year plans of both Stalin and Khrushchev, there was a greater emphasis on vocational education as this

was seen to help increase elements of industrialisation which was deemed necessary for both the 2nd World War and the Cold War. Therefore, this shift in education policies shows that the education of the working class was changed more by war than revolution as neither the Provisional Government after the February 1917 revolution nor Lenin after October 1917 altered the upward trend in literacy, although the effects of the February 1917 revolution on women's literacy are difficult to determine due to the brevity of the Provisional Government. Therefore, although the October 1917 may have altered the status of working class women by giving them free access to abortion and contraception than ever before, in general, wars did have a greater impact on the liberties enjoyed by the working class, as shown by the women in China they lost their civil liberties prior to World War Two under Stalin.

Although the 1905 Revolution impacted

the lives of the working class by  
 organising trade unions, just as  
 October 1917 then revised the  
 status of the proletariat and February  
 1917 led to the worsening of living  
 conditions as the price of food  
 continued to rise, as these  
 revolutions were ultimately  
 caused primarily by the  
 decline in living standards  
 due to the wars which preceded  
 them, war changed the lives  
 of the working class far more  
 than revolutions in the period  
 1855-1964. As well as this, the  
 social impacts of the wars  
 across the period, from the Crimean  
 War to the Cold War, were much  
 greater as they led to the increased  
 mobilisation of the working class in order  
 to rapidly industrialise Russia  
 in order to cope with the effects of  
 war. Therefore wars had a greater  
 impact as the impacts were seen both  
 before during and after the war whereas  
 the revolutions, which by their nature,  
 were less planned, only had impacts  
 afterwards and ultimately these  
 impacts were limited.

## Question 4\*

- 4\* 'The policy of Russification under the Tsars had a greater impact than any other government policy in the period 1855–1964 on the lives of the nationalities in the Russian Empire.' To what extent do you agree? [25]

This question garnered very few responses. Most candidates could write about Russification but were unable to compare to other policies. There were also very few references to the provisional government.

Two common approaches were either: political, economic, and social or: working conditions, living conditions, education. The latter was more restrictive to the higher levels in this case due to the lack of examples given by candidates. Some answers also included repression and religion which did, however allow candidates to access the highest levels.

At the top end, answers considered the policy of Russification under the Tsars at the start of each paragraph before comparing it to two other government policies (in each paragraph). Successful answers were able to compare throughout the paragraph ('this had a greater impact than.... because....') At the very top, answers assessed the most important theme in defining the lives of the nationalities in the conclusion (often political in the answers received this year) to present a highly analytical response. At the lower end, answers either:

a) contained three policies, written chronologically, which limited the ability of candidates to access higher marks

or

b) wrote three policies in thematic paragraphs but did not to compare and explain the importance of each one. These were often characterised by phrases such as 'another policy' or 'similarly'. It was common to see only two policies per paragraph.

Centres should be aware that a question such as this is not an exercise in assessing the similarities between events or rulers; it is about evaluating relative importance to come to a sustained judgement. The caveat to this is, clearly, if two turning points have a similar impact in the development of lives (for this question).

## Supporting you

For further details of this qualification please visit the subject webpage.

### Review of results

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our review of results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#). If university places are at stake you may wish to consider priority service 2 reviews of marking which have an earlier deadline to ensure your reviews are processed in time for university applications.

## activeresults

Active Results offers a unique perspective on results data and greater opportunities to understand students' performance.

It allows you to:

- Review reports on the **performance of individual candidates**, cohorts of students and whole centres
- **Analyse results** at question and/or topic level
- **Compare your centre** with OCR national averages or similar OCR centres.
- Identify areas of the curriculum where students excel or struggle and help **pinpoint strengths and weaknesses** of students and teaching departments.

<http://www.ocr.org.uk/administration/support-and-tools/active-results/>



Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear exam feedback directly from a senior assessor or drop in to an online Q&A session.

<https://www.cpdhub.ocr.org.uk>





We'd like to know your view on the resources we produce. By clicking on the 'Like' or 'Dislike' button you can help us to ensure that our resources work for you. When the email template pops up please add additional comments if you wish and then just click 'Send'. Thank you.

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR, or are considering switching from your current provider/awarding organisation, you can request more information by completing the Expression of Interest form which can be found here:

[www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest](http://www.ocr.org.uk/expression-of-interest)

#### **OCR Resources:** *the small print*

OCR's resources are provided to support the delivery of OCR qualifications, but in no way constitute an endorsed teaching method that is required by OCR. Whilst every effort is made to ensure the accuracy of the content, OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions within these resources. We update our resources on a regular basis, so please check the OCR website to ensure you have the most up to date version.

This resource may be freely copied and distributed, as long as the OCR logo and this small print remain intact and OCR is acknowledged as the originator of this work.

Our documents are updated over time. Whilst every effort is made to check all documents, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, therefore please use the information on the latest specification at all times. Where changes are made to specifications these will be indicated within the document, there will be a new version number indicated, and a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource please contact us at:

[resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk).

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content:  
Square down and Square up: alexwhite/Shutterstock.com

Please get in touch if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support delivery of our qualifications:  
[resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk](mailto:resources.feedback@ocr.org.uk)

#### **Looking for a resource?**

There is now a quick and easy search tool to help find **free** resources for your qualification:

[www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/](http://www.ocr.org.uk/i-want-to/find-resources/)

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

#### **General qualifications**

Telephone 01223 553998

Facsimile 01223 552627

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

OCR is part of Cambridge Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge. *For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored.*

© **OCR 2018** Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.



Cambridge  
Assessment

