

GCSE (9-1) History

Developing planning and
teaching for Sources and
Interpretations at GCSE

Updated pack, spring 2020





Aims of the training

- Look at how sources and interpretations are assessed
- Provide general feedback on the summer 2019 series
- Talk through some marked exemplar work
- Discuss both common barriers and what makes a high-level response
- Share teaching ideas and strategies



Agenda

- Introduction and key messages
- Sources (AO3)
 - Reflection on summer 2019 series
 - Common barriers and good practice
 - Exemplar responses
- Interpretations (AO4)
 - Reflection on summer 2019 series
 - Common barriers and good practice
 - Exemplar responses
- Planning for future teaching

Introduction and key messages





History subject advisor

- Mark Battye
 - 0333 016 4084
 - qualifications.pearson.com/contactus
 - [@PearsonHistory](https://twitter.com/PearsonHistory)
 - Sign up to Mark's regular subject advisor updates
- qualifications.pearson.com/history
 - Live chat – coming soon



History

Overview

News

Live events

Pre-recorded feedback on Summer 2019

GCSE and A level History network events

GCSE History entry code calculator

Pre-recorded feedback on Summer 2019

This term we are providing pre-recorded feedback events which will be available free of charge on our website for everyone to view. There will be events for GCSE History, International GCSE History and A level History. They will be available on our training page in early November.





Latest support materials

- quals.pearson.com/GCSEHistSupport
 - updated topic booklets
 - pre-recorded feedback events for each paper
 - new guide to Paper 2
 - Exam Wizard updated
 - Summer 2019 exemplar packs (Feb)
 - updated Paper 1 guide (Feb/March)
 - updated getting started guide (March)
 - Results Plus/Access to scripts guide for Humanities teachers (summer)
- Keep checking for new additions
- What further resources would you find useful?

Sources (AO3)





AO3

AO3 (15%)

Analyse, evaluate and use sources (contemporary to the period) to make substantiated judgements, in the context of historical events studied.

Paper 1 Section A

- Q2(a), 8 marks: analysis of two sources and evaluation of their utility
- Q2(b), 4 marks: ability to frame historical questions

Paper 3 Section A

- Q1, 4 marks: making inferences from one source

Paper 3 Section B

- Q3(a), 8 marks: analysis of two sources and evaluation of their utility



Planning and teaching Sources (AO3)

- What challenges have you faced when preparing students for source questions?
- What changes have you made so far to overcome these barriers?
- Are there any key differences in your preparation now you are a couple of series in?



Summer 2019 feedback on source questions

- Positives
 - Inference question works well as intro to Paper 3.
 - Evidence that there was some improvement for the 8-mark source utility question – less rigid structure, more focus in responding to the sources.
- Room for improvement
 - Many Level 1 answers gave only generic comments about reliability or provenance of sources.
 - Some higher-attaining students couldn't access the higher marks for not including contextual knowledge.
 - Some students found it difficult to link content, historical context and provenance in the AO3 utility question.
 - Follow-up enquiry question proved challenging – candidates should see the question as a package.



8 mark utility question

- Study the generic mark scheme for 8 mark utility questions.
- The mark scheme identifies three key strands of evaluation. The usefulness of a source for an enquiry depends on:
 - how the historian could use the content of the source as evidence for the enquiry.
 - whether the provenance of the source strengthens or weakens its usefulness.
 - how contextual knowledge could be applied, e.g. to consider whether the source is evidence of the 'typical' situation.
- An overall judgement on each source should be based on a combination of these three elements.



Reliability and utility

- These are not the same.
- Reliability affects utility – it is an aspect candidates can consider as part of the discussion of utility.
- However, it is not a reason to dismiss the source.
- An unreliable (e.g. inaccurate or biased) source might still be useful.
- It can give scope for inference, for example about attitudes or an intention by the author to mislead.
- If using reliability as a criterion for judgement, it should be clearly linked to utility.



Limitations of sources

- The mark scheme does not *require* the noting of limitations.
- The application of contextual knowledge can note the accuracy / typicality / untypicality of the evidence.
- No source can provide a complete picture of events or situations.
- The ‘it does not say / show’ approach rarely strengthens the answer.
- Responses should focus on utility of source content, not what is missing, unless it might be expected to be included.



Paper 3 Question 3a: marking exercise

- The best answers evaluate usefulness for the *specified enquiry*, e.g. the challenges to the Weimar Republic 1919–23.
- Exemplar 1 – June 2018 Paper 3 Germany.
- Using the mark scheme for Q3a, read the answer in your pack and try to identify the level.
- Delegate booklet, pp.2–6.



Paper 3 Question 3a:

Answer 1

- Answer 1 was awarded Level 3 for all three strands: content, provenance and use of knowledge.
- The coverage of both sources was awarded Level 3 – so Level 3 overall.



Paper 1 Question 2a: Medicine example

- Read the example response for Question 2a.
- Exemplar 2 – June 2018 Paper 1 Medicine.
- Using the mark scheme for Q2a, read the answer in your pack and try to identify the level. Consider the different strands of the mark scheme.
- Delegate booklet pp.7–10.
- How could it be improved?



Paper 1 Question 2a: Medicine – Answer 2

Answer 2 was awarded Level 2.

- The comment about the nature of Source A is a general one, that a photograph must give an accurate view. The content of the photograph is briefly described with the implication that this is useful because it shows what a Casualty Clearing Station looked like. The brief reference to other stations and the Base Hospital suggests an understanding that there was a range of treatment centres and the source might not show a typical situation but this was not developed.
- This evaluation was low Level 2, as there was an understanding that provenance and contextual knowledge affected the usefulness of the source content but none of the comments was developed.
- The nature of Source B was seen as making the source reliable, and there was a brief use of source content, but the comments about the source content being limited in its usefulness because it does not mention illnesses is not relevant to this enquiry about the treatment of battle injuries. This evaluation was Level 2.



Paper 1 Question 2a: Crime example

- Read the example response for Question 2a.
- Exemplar 3 – June 2019 Paper 1 Crime.
- Using the mark scheme for Q2a, read the answer in your pack and try to identify the level. Consider the different strands of the mark scheme.
- Delegate booklet pp.11–15.
- How could it be improved?



Paper 1 Question 2a: Crime – Answer 3

Answer 3 was awarded Level 2.

- The answer recognises the focus on the link between poverty and crime and shows how the content of Source A is relevant.
- The purpose of Source A is considered and linked to an evaluation of the source but there is no additional contextual historical knowledge.
- The content of B is related to the enquiry and an aspect of the provenance is stated. However, the effect of the stated purpose is not explained and there is no additional contextual knowledge.
- The evaluation of each source fits Level 2 of the mark scheme but the answer cannot receive the top mark in the level as there is no use of contextual knowledge.



4 mark inferences question

- Paper 3 Question 1 – introductory question.
- This question requires candidates to make supported inferences related to a specific enquiry.
- One mark for each valid inference and one mark for supporting detail selected from the source.
- In summer 2019, most candidates were able to provide two supported inferences.
- No marks were awarded for inferences which merely paraphrased the source or ignored the focus of the enquiry.



Inferences: marking exercise

- Read the two example responses.
- Exemplar answers 4 and 5 – June 2019 Paper 3 Germany Question 1.
- Using the mark scheme for Q1, read the answer in your pack and try to identify the marks awarded for each answer.
- Delegate booklet pp.16–18.



Inferences: Answer 4

- Good responses provided valid inferences with support from the source.
- The first and second inferences are both valid and have appropriate support from the source.
- The second mark for each inference was gained by identifying the part of the source on which the inference was based.
- This answer received 4 marks.



Inferences: Answer 5

- The first inference did gain credit, the second inference was not credited.
- Consider what problems can be seen in the second inference which meant that it did not gain any credit.
- If an attempted inference is not valid then a mark cannot be awarded for the supporting information.
- This candidate response was awarded 2 marks.



Paper 1: follow-up enquiry

- The four stages in this question should be seen as a package.
- The first two stages focus on the idea of the candidate acting as an historian following up an enquiry. In the first stage, one mark is given for identifying a detail from the source relevant to the enquiry.
- In the second stage, a second mark is given for a question arising from that detail but linking it to the broader enquiry – here about the treatment of battle injuries.
- The mark scheme is explicit that the question in the second stage must be linked to the detail identified from the source, therefore if the first stage is not answered correctly, no mark can be given for the second stage, even if a valid question is posed.



Paper 1: follow-up enquiry

- The third and fourth stages ask candidates to offer specific examples of how the enquiry should be followed up.
- They should be able to indicate a valid source to consult and to explain how the information located in that source would help to answer the question posed in the second stage.
- Candidates are expected to have knowledge of sources appropriate to the historic environment being studied, as indicated in the specification.



Paper 1 Question 2b: marking exercise

- Read the two example responses.
- Exemplar answers 6 and 7 – June 2018 Paper 1 Medicine Question 2b.
- Delegate booklet pp.19–21.
- Decide on the marks that each should be awarded.



Paper 1 Question 2b:

Answer 6

- Answer 6 was awarded 4 marks.
- The first stage of the answer identifies a specific detail from Source B.
- A valid question is posed which relates that detail to a wider enquiry about the treatment of battle injuries.
- The third stage suggests a valid type of source to consult and the final stage explains how the information that could be found in these sources would help to answer the question posed by the candidate.



Paper 1 Question 2b:

Answer 7

- Answer 7 was awarded 0 marks.
- The answer does not identify a detail from Source A.
- The question posed in stage 2 is a valid one, but it is not linked to a detail from the source and, therefore, no mark can be given for either of these two answers.
- In the third stage, a potentially relevant source is identified, although an individual diary or letter would not give a range of details to answer the broader enquiry about the treatment of battle injuries. However, the explanation of what information could be gained from this source is not linked to the question that the candidate had posed about the ratio of nurses to soldiers (including two questions at the second stage was not helpful – the second question was ignored but the explanation was not linked to this question either).

Interpretations (AO4)





AO4

AO4 (15%)

Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied.

Paper 3 Section B

- Q3b, 4 marks: analysis and explain how two interpretations are different
- Q3c, 4 marks: suggest why interpretations differ
- Q3d, 16 marks (+ 4 SPAG): evaluate the view of one of the interpretations



Planning and teaching Interpretations (AO4)

- What challenges have you faced when preparing students for interpretations questions?
- What changes have you made so far to overcome these barriers?
- Are there any key differences in your preparation this year?



Summer 2019 feedback on interpretation questions

- Positives
 - Question 3b – the majority of candidates identified a difference and supported it with detail from each interpretation.
 - Question 3d – candidates across the attainment spectrum were able to analyse the interpretations. Good to see little evidence of overly structured responses.
- Room for improvement
 - Question 3c – this is not a question on ‘historiography’ – focus on the intention of the author.
 - Question 3d – overly structured answers hindering top level performance.



Paper 3 Question 3b: identifying difference

- Candidates need to identify the difference between the views given in Interpretations 1 and 2 about the specified enquiry – e.g. in June 2018, the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–23.
- Candidates are expected to offer a difference in the **overall view** that the interpretations present.
- They are expected to support this with details from both interpretations.



Paper 3 Question 3b: marking exercise

- Read the two example responses.
- Exemplar answers 8 and 9 – June 2018 Paper 3 Germany Question 3b.
- Delegate booklet, pp.22–25.
- Using the mark scheme, decide on a mark for each response.



Paper 3 Question 3b:

Answer 8

- Answer 8 was awarded Level 2, 4 marks.
- The candidate shows a clear understanding of the main difference in view between the two interpretations. They have identified that Interpretation 1 focuses on external political challenges while Interpretation 2 suggests that it was the actions of the Weimar Government itself which created the challenges faced.



Paper 3 Question 3b:

Answer 9

- Answer 9 was awarded Level 1, 2 marks.
- The candidate has asserted that there is a difference of view between the two interpretations with Interpretation 1 being described as taking a political view and Interpretation 2 looking at the lack of support from the people of Germany.
- However, the response does not contain any direct support from the interpretations so cannot be awarded marks in Level 2.



Paper 3 Question 3c: explaining difference

- Candidates may consider a variety of different possibilities.
- For example, they may choose to focus on the weight the authors have given to different sources and they can use Sources A and B to support their explanation.
- Candidates could also look to explain how the authors have emphasised different details from the past or have considered the past from different perspectives.
- Answers must be substantiated by using details from the interpretation, and sources if relevant, to support the explanation in order to reach Level 2.



Paper 3 Question 3c: marking exercise

- Read the two example responses.
- Exemplar answers 10 and 11 – June 2018
Paper 3 Germany Question 3c.
- Delegate booklet, pp.26–27.
- Using the mark scheme, decide on a mark for each response.



Paper 3 Question 3c:

Answer 10

- Answer 10 was awarded Level 2, 4 marks.
- This answer has looked at the different perspectives employed by the historians writing the interpretations and explains the difference between the economic and political perspectives given. The use of the word 'focus' and the valid reference to political and economic indicate there is an awareness of historians working from different perspective.
- The answer is substantiated by references to the specific claims made in the interpretations and is, therefore, placed at the top of Level 2.



Paper 3 Question 3c:

Answer 11

- Answer 11 was awarded Level 1, 1 mark.
- The candidate has tried to explain the differences by incorrectly asserting that they can be explained because one interpretation is from a website and one is from a book. Speculative reasons based on provenance cannot be rewarded as the question is rooted in the interpretations themselves.
- In the final sentence, the candidate does show some understanding of the political perspective given in Interpretation 1 so can be awarded 1 mark.



Paper 3 Question 3d: evaluating an interpretation

- Paper 3 qu.3d How far do you agree...
 - Must consider both interpretations
 - At top level, shows awareness of how the different points of view are conveyed,
e.g. language/tone/emphasis/selection - use the appropriate tool(s)
 - See Getting Started guide pp.42–44 and
Sources and Interpretations guide pp.11–12



Paper 3 Question 3d: responses that did well

- Showed understanding of Interpretation 2.
- Separated out key points made in Interpretation 2 and supported them using own knowledge.
- Used Interpretation 1 to challenge Interpretation 2, supporting and developing on the points made in Interpretation 1 by using own knowledge.
- Used precise own knowledge.
- Showed awareness of how the different points of view were conveyed.
- Made a judgement about how far they supported the view in Interpretation 2.



Paper 3 Question 3d: weaker responses

- Gave the gist of the interpretations but did not adequately analyse them.
- Failed to refer to Interpretation 1.
- Gave vague supporting evidence which lacked precision.
- Answered the question as if it were just asking for an assessment of challenges facing the Weimar Republic.



AO4 – Level 4 mark scheme

- Answer provides an explained evaluation, reviewing the alternative views in coming to a substantiated judgement.
- Precise analysis of the interpretations is shown, indicating how the differences of view are conveyed and deploying this material to support the evaluation.
- Relevant contextual knowledge is precisely selected to support the evaluation.
- An overall judgement is justified and the line of reasoning is coherent, sustained and logically structured.



Paper 3 Question 3d: marking exercise

- Read the two example responses.
- Exemplar answers 12 and 13 – June 2018
Paper 3 Germany Question 3d.
- Delegate booklet, pp.28–36.
- Using the mark scheme decide on a mark for each response. Look at the performance in each strand of the mark scheme.



Paper 3 Question 3d: Answers 12 and 13

- Answer 12 was awarded Level 2, 7 marks. It was also awarded 3 marks for SPaG.
- Answer 13 was awarded Level 4, 14 marks. It was also awarded 4 marks for SPaG.
- See last page of delegate booklet for commentaries on each response.



Paper 3 Question 3d: conveying differences of view

- Extract of exemplar answer from June 2018
Paper 3 Germany Principal Examiner report,
pp.30–32.

I do not agree with the approach taken by interpretation
2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in
the years 1919-23. The words "forced" and "could not
find" used by the writer convey the ideas that the
Weimar had no other choice ^{than to print more money} and that the hyperinflation wasn't
their fault. To a certain extent I agree that the French

Reflections





Things to take away from today

- What 3 key ideas will you take back to your department to improve your teaching of sources and interpretations?
- How can you put these ideas into action straight away?
- Ideas for developing practice questions on sources and interpretations?

Questions?

