

History A

Advanced Subsidiary GCE

Unit **F963/01**: British History Enquiries.
Option A: Medieval and Early Modern 1066-1660

Mark Scheme for June 2012

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

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

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which marks were awarded by examiners. It does not indicate the details of the discussions which took place at an examiners' meeting before marking commenced.

All examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and the report on the examination.

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

© OCR 2012

Any enquiries about publications should be addressed to:

OCR Publications
PO Box 5050
Annesley
NOTTINGHAM
NG15 0DL

Telephone: 0870 770 6622
Facsimile: 01223 552610
E-mail: publications@ocr.org.uk

Subject-specific Marking Instructions that apply across the whole question paper to be included here.

Question (a) Maximum mark 30

	A01a and b	AO2a
1	13-14	15-16
2	11-12	13-14
3	9-10	10-12
4	7-8	8-9
5	5-6	6-7
6	3-4	3-5
7	0-2	0-2

Notes related to Part A:

- (i) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (ii) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (iii) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

Marking Grid for Question (a)

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Total for each question =30	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. - 	As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent and developed comparison of the key issue with a balanced and well-supported judgement. There will be little or no unevenness. • Focused use of a range of relevant historical concepts and context to address the key issue. • The answer is clearly structured and organised. Communicates coherently, accurately and effectively. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focused comparative analysis. Controlled and discriminating evaluation of content and provenance, whether integrated or treated separately. • Evaluates using a range of relevant provenance points in relation to the sources and question. There is a thorough but not necessarily exhaustive exploration of these. <p style="text-align: center;">15-16</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Largely comparative evaluation of the key issue with a balanced and supported judgement. There may be a little unevenness in parts. • Focused use of some relevant historical context with a good conceptual understanding to address the key issue. • The answer is well structured and organised. Communicates clearly. <p style="text-align: center;">11-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant comparative analysis of content and evaluation of provenance but there may be some unevenness in coverage or control. • Source evaluation is reasonably full and appropriate but lacks completeness on the issues raised by the sources in the light of the question. <p style="text-align: center;">13-14</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some comparison linked to the key issue. Is aware of some similarity and/or difference. Judgements may be limited and/or inconsistent with the analysis made. • Some use of relevant historical concepts and contexts but uneven understanding. Inconsistent focus on the key issue. • The answer has some structure and organisation but there is also some description. Communication may be clear but may not be consistent. <p style="text-align: center;">9-10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a comparison but there is unevenness, confining the comparison to the second half of the answer or simply to a concluding paragraph. Either the focus is on content or provenance, rarely both. • Source evaluation is partial and it is likely that the provenance itself is not compared, may be undeveloped or merely commented on discretely. <p style="text-align: center;">10-12</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some general comparison but undeveloped with some assertion, description and/or narrative. Judgement is unlikely, unconvincing or asserted. • A general sense of historical concepts and context but understanding is partial or limited, with some tangential and/or irrelevant evidence. • Structure may be rather disorganised with some unclear sections. Communication is satisfactory but with some inaccuracy of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">7-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts a comparison but most of the comment is sequential. Imparts content or provenance rather than using it. • Comparative comments are few or only partially developed, often asserted and/or 'stock' in approach. <p style="text-align: center;">8-9</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited comparison with few links to the key issue. Imparts generalised comment and /or a weak understanding of the key points. The answer lacks judgement or makes a basic assertion. • Basic, often inaccurate or irrelevant historical context and conceptual understanding. • Structure lacks organisation with weak or basic communication. <p style="text-align: center;">5-6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identifies some comparative points but is very sequential and perhaps implicit • Comment on the sources is basic, general, undeveloped or juxtaposed, often through poorly understood quotation. <p style="text-align: center;">6-7</p>

A0s	A01a and b	A02a
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparison is minimal and basic with very limited links to the key issue. Mainly paraphrase and description with very limited understanding. There is no judgement. • Irrelevant and inaccurate concepts and context. • Has little organisation or structure with very weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little attempt to compare. Weak commentary on one or two undeveloped points, with basic paraphrase. Sequencing is characteristic. • Comments on individual sources are generalised and confused. <p style="text-align: center;">3-5</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fragmentary, descriptive, incomplete and with few or no links to the key issue. There is little or no understanding. Much irrelevance. • Weak or non existent context with no conceptual understanding. • No structure with extremely weak communication. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No attempt to compare either content or provenance with fragmentary, brief or inaccurate comment. • Makes no attempt to use any aspects of the sources. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>

Question (b) Maximum mark 70

	A01a and b	AO2a and b
1	20-22	42-48
2	17-19	35-41
3	13-16	28-34
4	9-12	21-27
5	6-8	14-20
6	3-5	7-13
7	0-2	0-6

Notes related to Part B:

- (iv) Allocate marks to the most appropriate level for each AO
- (v) If several marks are available in a box, work from the top mark down until the best fit has been found
- (vi) Many answers will not be at the same level for each AO

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Total mark for the question = 70	<p>Recall, select and deploy historical knowledge appropriately, and communicate knowledge and understanding of history in a clear and effective manner.</p> <p>Demonstrate understanding of the past through explanation, analysis and arriving at substantiated judgements of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - key concepts such as causation, consequence, continuity, change and significance within an historical context; - the relationships between key features and characteristics of the periods studied. 	<p>As part of an historical enquiry, analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.</p> <p>Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.</p>
Level 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convincing analysis and argument with developed explanation leading to careful, supported and persuasive judgement arising from a consideration of both content and provenance. There may be a little unevenness at the bottom of the level. • Sharply focused use and control of a range of reliable evidence to confirm, qualify, extend or question the sources. • Coherent organised structure. Accurate and effective communication. <p style="text-align: center;">20-22</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A carefully grouped and comparative evaluation of all the sources with effective levels of discrimination sharply focused on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates the strengths, limitations and utility of the sources in relation to the interpretation. Uses and cross references points in individual or grouped sources to support or refute an interpretation. • Integrates sources with contextual knowledge in analysis and evaluation and is convincing in most respects. Has synthesis within the argument through most of the answer. <p style="text-align: center;">42-48</p>
Level 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good attempt at focused analysis, argument and explanation leading to a supported judgement that is based on the use of most of the content and provenance. • A focused use of relevant evidence to put the sources into context. • Mostly coherent structure and organisation if uneven in parts. Good communication. <p style="text-align: center;">17-19</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grouped analysis and use of most of the sources with good levels of discrimination and a reasonable focus on the interpretation. • Analyses and evaluates some of the strengths and limitations of the sources in relation to the interpretation. May focus more on individual sources within a grouping, so cross referencing may be less frequent. • Some, perhaps less balanced, integration of sources and contextual knowledge to analyse and evaluate the interpretation. Synthesis of the skills may be less developed. The analysis and evaluation is reasonably convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">35-41</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mainly sound analysis, argument and explanation, but there may be some description and unevenness. Judgement may be incomplete or inconsistent with the analysis of content and provenance. • Some relevant evidence but less effectively used and may not be extensive. • Reasonably coherent structure and organisation but uneven. Reasonable communication. <p style="text-align: center;">13-16</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some grouping although not sustained or developed. Sources are mainly approached discretely with limited cross reference. Their use is less developed and may, in parts, lose focus on the interpretation. There may be some description of content and provenance. • Is aware of some of the limitations of the sources, individually or as a group, but mostly uses them for reference and to illustrate an argument rather than analysing and evaluating them as evidence. There is little cross referencing. • There may be unevenness in using knowledge in relation to the sources. Synthesis may be patchy or bolted on. Analysis and evaluation are only partially convincing. <p style="text-align: center;">28-34</p>
Level 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attempts some analysis, argument and explanation but underdeveloped and not always linked to the question. There will be more assertion, description and narrative. Judgements are less substantiated and much less convincing. • Some relevant evidence is deployed, but evidence will vary in accuracy, relevance and extent. It may be generalised or tangential. • Structure is less organised, communication less clear and some inaccuracies of expression. <p style="text-align: center;">9-12</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources are discussed discretely and largely sequentially, perhaps within very basic groups. Loses focus on the interpretation. The sources are frequently described. • May mention some limitations of individual sources but largely uses them for reference and illustration. Cross referencing is unlikely. • An imbalance and lack of integration between sources and knowledge often with discrete sections. There is little synthesis. Analysis and explanation may be muddled and unconvincing in part. <p style="text-align: center;">21-27</p>
Level 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little argument or explanation, inaccurate understanding of the issues and concepts. The answer lacks judgement. • Limited use of relevant evidence or context which is largely inaccurate or irrelevant. • Structure is disorganised, communication basic and the sense not always clear. <p style="text-align: center;">5-8</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A limited attempt to use the sources or discriminate between them. The approach is very sequential and referential, with much description. Points are undeveloped. • There is little attempt to analyse, explain or use the sources in relation to the question. Comment may be general. • There is a marked imbalance with no synthesis. Analysis and explanation are rare and comments are unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">14-20</p>

AOs	A01a and b	Ao2a and b
Level 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is very little explanation or understanding. Largely assertion, description and narrative with no judgement. Extremely limited relevance to the question. • Evidence is basic, generalised, patchy, inaccurate or irrelevant. • Little organisation or structure with poor communication. <p style="text-align: center;">3-4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very weak and partial use of the sources for the question. No focus on interpretation. • A very weak, general and paraphrased use of source content. • No synthesis or balance. Comments are entirely unconvincing. <p style="text-align: center;">7-13</p>
Level 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No argument or explanation. Fragmentary and descriptive with no relevance to the question. • No understanding underpins what little use is made of evidence or context. • Disorganised and partial with weak communication and expression. <p style="text-align: center;">0-2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little application of the sources to the question with inaccuracies and irrelevant comment. Fragmentary and heavily descriptive. • No attempt to use any aspect of the sources appropriately. • No contextual knowledge, synthesis or balance. There is no attempt to convince. <p style="text-align: center;">0-6</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
1	(a)	<p>The Sources are similar in content in that they both agree that William could behave badly towards the church. Source C, William of Malmesbury, particularly condemns him for doing nothing to amend abuses, but actually adding to them by delays in appointing to major positions. D, Simeon of Durham, suggests he was ferocious in his attitude to some monasteries and also quarrelsome in falling out with bishop William of Durham.</p> <p>The Sources also differ in that Source D does not wholly condemn William but indicates that he did not ill treat the monks of Durham while they were leaderless, although the tone of Source D shows a degree of surprise at William's moderation. The author of Source D adds that William and the bishop were on good terms for a time thus suggesting William was not irrevocably hostile. But Source C is much less ready to see any good in William and implies that he was so lacking in respect for the church that he took sides in the papal dispute simply on the grounds that his enemy's enemy was his friend.</p> <p>The provenance and context of the Sources should be used to evaluate these similarities and differences. Both of these are church chroniclers, so William's attitude might particularly annoy them, although Source D is more favourable to William. Durham was a long way from London and once the bishop was in exile, William could afford to be quite generous. Source C takes an ironic approach in the comment that William might have been assessing the relative merits of candidates. The implication is that it was the profits from vacant sees that attracted him.</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Source 'as evidence for.....' The Headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>A supported judgement should be reached on their relative value as evidence. No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement should be reached for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources contain references to different interpretations so they may be grouped according to their view. The supporting view, that the church had some strengths is mainly in Source A, Henry of Huntingdon, with some references in Sources B, Eadmer, D, Simeon of Durham, and E, the modern historian, whereas the opposing view, that the church was weak is largely in Sources B, C, William of Malmesbury, and E with references in A.</p> <p>The supporting argument indicates that the church had considerable strengths. Sources A and E make it clear that Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury from 1093, was a holy and saintly figure, while both Sources refer to the capabilities of other bishops who had served as royal administrators, and even as Chancellor. These men would give their support to the king as both sources make clear. Source D shows that William could be a friend of a bishop and could respect the position of a monastery such as Durham. Source E adds that Anselm showed determination in pursuit of his aims, although candidates could assess how far these aims really strengthened the English church. Source A illustrates his determination and the bishops who opposed him were obviously aware that he was a formidable opponent.</p> <p>The opposing argument that the church was in a poor way is seen in all the Sources to an extent. Source B makes clear the division between Anselm and his bishops and illustrates all too clearly the criticisms made of Anselm in Source E. He lacked the worldly experience of the bench of bishops and could not obtain their backing. Even his appointment, as revealed by Source A, only came about when William II feared he was about to die. Source A adds that there was a need for peace in the church, hinting at further divisions. From Sources A and C William's main preoccupation was to use the church to make money by exploiting vacant sees and abbacies, seizing on any pretext to avoid payments to Rome and extorting what amounts to simony.</p> <p>Candidates may well conclude that the attitude of Anselm coupled with the lack of concern shown by William II for the fate on his immortal soul show the church was weaker, rather than stronger.</p>	70	<p><u>Focus: Judgement in context, based on a set of Sources and own knowledge.</u></p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual evidence and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>Supported overall judgement should be reached on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the question. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>Contextual knowledge relating to the nature of the conflict between Anselm and William II, Anselm's exile and the reaction in England can be used to support the more negative view. Candidates could consider whether the real strength of the church lay in its relationship with the king or in the devoted service of many of its leaders and adherents. With regard to provenance candidates might suggest that a series of monastic writers are likely to be critical of a king who rowed extensively with his church leader. William of Malmesbury is clearly resentful of the failure to reform abuses and the capricious nature of William II is revealed in Sources A and D. Candidates might point out that the modern source is less impressed by Anselm's holiness and more doubtful about whether he had the necessary skills for the job and so provides a useful antidote to the chroniclers. Source D is interesting in that no real explanation is given as to why William was relatively lenient towards Durham after his falling out with bishop William, although the proximity of the Scottish border and the ambitions of Malcolm may have played a role. St Cuthbert was a powerful influence as well and his relics at Durham had considerable political significance.</p>		
2	(a) <p>The Sources are similar in content in that they both discuss secret Protestant religious activities within private houses in response to Mary's religious policy. In both people are absent from official church services. Both hint at some conformity. In Source E conformists are said to have been lured away from church services, and in Source D Rose Hickman seeks advice on a church baptism for her child. The context of both is the investigation of heresy and the start of persecution.</p> <p>The content of the Sources differs. Source D refers to Protestant Londoners and the well-off merchant class, whereas Source E refers to the laity of Colchester. In Source E fearless Protestants abuse priests in the streets and openly criticise the sacrament, whereas in Source D fearful Protestants are secretly smuggled out of the country. The boldness of those mentioned in Source E is explained by bishop Bonner sending back heretics to the town without punishment, encouraging open opposition to popish services, which persists into the final year of Mary's reign despite public burnings. The naming of Protestants in Source E as defiant, blasphemous 'schismatics' with open 'schools of heresy' differs from Source D, where the attitude is fear and secret support for escape.</p>	30	<p>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>The context and provenance of the Sources are different. Source D refers to the early part of the reign, before Protestant bishops were martyred. Latimer and Ridley went to the stake in October 1555. However, Source E is written more than two years later, well after the burning of Cranmer in February 1556, showing that persecution is patchy and has not deterred opposition. It is not expected that candidates will know that Bonner, as bishop of London, ousted Ridley or that Bonner led the degrading of Cranmer and was physically attacked in the streets on at least two occasions. Credit should be given if they do. Rose Hickman, author of Source D, is a committed Protestant whereas Thomas Tye, author of Source E, is a Catholic parish priest who disapproves of Protestants. Wife of a wealthy London merchant, Rose Hickman's connections to Antwerp help exiles escape persecution, but the Colchester Protestants defy the authorities and stay in England to convert others.</p> <p>The tone of both sources reflects dislike of the opposing religious group - 'idolatrous mass', 'unashamed' heretics, 'detestable schismatics', 'bold', 'abused', 'blasphemed', 'criticised in every ale house'. However, Source D is a memoir. Although produced for her children candidates are not expected to know this and are more likely to see it as a published work, its purpose to enthuse the Puritan Godly at the end of Elizabeth's reign when they still felt under some pressure, despite the essential Protestantism of the Elizabethan Church. It might be selective recollections, and could have been used as propaganda in the light of anti-Catholic sentiment under James I. In contrast, the author of Source E blames his bishop for being too lenient with 'detestable' heretics, lessening the credibility of the fears shown in Source D, or perhaps implying that resistance increased rather than being snuffed out by the burnings. Source E might therefore be seen as less subjective, though both are typical only of their local area. A substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>		

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
(b)	<p>The Sources may be grouped by interpretation. The argument for conformity is shown in Sources A and C, whereas Sources B and D argue for secret resistance and Source E for open resistance. Sources A and C argue mostly for conformity with little resistance. Parkyn, author of Source A is typical of the moral stance of celibate Catholic priests against married clergy. The regional provenance, Yorkshire, limits the utility of this source. His tone is gloating, disparagingly calling priests' wives 'whores', and he suggests that many will conform unwillingly. Canon law is imposed to enforce conformity, whereas in Source C conformity is willing but conditional. Renard advises Charles V that Pole needs powers to enforce conformity.</p> <p>Knowledge should be used to develop this evaluation in light of the question. Source C refers to Mary's deal with Parliament ensuring purchased monastic land remains in the legal possession of the gentry, many of them Catholic. Only then will Parliament legalise the reconciliation with Rome. These two sources consider church personnel and legal authority, unlike the other three sources which refer mainly to resistance amongst the ordinary people. The limitation of the counter argument is also regional, as Sources B, D and E refer only to Essex and London. However, there are also hints of conformity among the ordinary people in these areas in Sources B and E. In Source B, an audience has gathered at St Paul's Cross to hear Bonner's Catholic sermon. In Source E some in Colchester had conformed to Catholic services until heretics had lured them away.</p> <p>The significance of the 'villainous event' in Source B should be explained, to bring out the resistance of Londoners to church hierarchy and the religious changes concerning the sacrament - mentioned also in Sources D and E. The similarity between the resistance in Sources B and D is the secrecy of the action, unlike the overt opposition in Source E. The tone of the chronicler in Source B is one of shock at the insult to the church hierarchy, a 'villainous event'. Sources D and E also have an emotive tone. The reward and the imprisonment of suspects in B, suggest that the authorities took such subversive acts very seriously. In contrast, the author of Source E knows all about illegal conventicles. He accuses the bishop of weak action against heretics, resulting in open criticism, blasphemy and the loss of Catholics to heresy, suggesting he supports conformity and persecution.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p> <p>A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of the changing religious context. No specific judgement is expected.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		The authors of Sources B, D and E are all highly subjective, with Wriothesley a royal official and Tye a catholic priest, so resistance may have been exaggerated. Rose Hickman, trying to establish a heroic reputation in her memoir, underplays resistance and talks of 'good Christians' leaving rather than resisting.		
3	(a)	<p>The Sources are similar in content, as both mention ceremonies and bishops. Both Sources refer to reactions to church ceremonies which include images and bowing to the altar. In both cases, some are said to consider these as idolatrous. However some reactions are different. The clergyman at York Minster is reported in Source C as willing to conform to an Arminian (crypto-Catholic) style of church ceremony, as he believed he did not adore the sacrament but was 'bowing to God'. On the contrary, in Source E the puritans brought before Star Chamber openly attack the ceremonies which they claim are 'popery, superstition and idolatry'.</p> <p>The Sources are also similar in that they both refer to the bishops' role in enforcing policy. Source C's reference to the bishops records the Scots' reaction, with the opinion that this is less a reaction to religious policy than 'an excuse for wickedness', implying political or social reasons. Source E has an emotive tone - bishops are quoted as 'invaders of the king's prerogative', who 'oppressed the King's subjects and served the Devil', whereas the tone of Source C is more conciliatory. Provenance might be compared to develop this point. The authorship and date are also different – Source C is a contemporary diary entry by a <i>later</i> royalist without propaganda value, whereas Source E is Cromwell's secretary writing after his death, to point out the heroic example of puritans for the godly cause, prior to Anglican resurgence in 1660. Source C might be seen as less subjective than Source E.</p> <p>Knowledge of the context of religious changes under Laud might be used to extend Source C - for example the 'beauty of holiness' and railing off the altar, in context of the traditional Catholicism of Yorkshire. In contrast, it might be known that the severity of the punishment meted out to Prynne, Burton and Bastwick in Source E made them popular martyrs, and focused puritan opposition to Laudian reforms. The reaction of the church hierarchy implies that religious policy is harsh and repressive unlike Source C. Though candidates are not expected to know</p>	30	<p><u>Focus: Comparison of two Sources.</u></p> <p>No set answer is expected, but candidates need to compare the contents, evaluating such matters as authorship, dating, utility and reliability, so using the Sources 'as evidence for ...'. The headings and attributions should aid evaluation and reference to both is expected in a good answer.</p> <p>No set conclusion is expected, but substantiated judgement is required for the top levels of the Mark Scheme.</p>

Question		Answer	Marks	Guidance
		<p>this, these actions are illegal, as prerogative courts like Star Chamber had no right to give 'life and limb' penalties – ears being seen as 'limbs'. Source E's reference to heavy fines also suggests that religious policy was seen as a means to raise much needed funds. By its date and nature, Source E might be judged less valuable.</p>		
3	(b)	<p>The Sources may be grouped by interpretation. Sources A and B suggest that financial grievances were unfounded and caused little opposition, though the context of Source A and tone of Source B suggest otherwise. Sources D and E also partly support the interpretation but prioritise other factors such as religious change and political liberties, as does Source A. Sources C and E prioritise religion as a reason, though Source C emphasises religious opposition in Scotland and Source E may exaggerate due to its date and provenance.</p> <p>The argument that financial grievances was the main reason for opposition to the government during this period is in Sources D and indirectly E (fines), the context of A and the terms used in B. Source A is the testimony of the royal judge for the prosecution of John Hampden in the Ship Money case, which, together with the wave of opposition he represented, might be explained using knowledge. Candidates should not use this as an excuse for an essay on general financial exactions during the Personal Rule. Though Source B tries to play down the opposition to financial exactions, it is implicit in terms such as 'sigh discontentedly', 'injustice' and 'uneasiness'. Source D states finances as one of three types of grievance, actions 'against property ownership' 'financial impositions are a great grievance'. Source E mentions heavy fines imposed, though the source emphasises religion as the main reason.</p> <p>The provenance of Sources A and B is very subjective - judges were appointed 'at the king's pleasure' at that time, and this was a test case on the legality of non-parliamentary taxation, so highly significant. The audience of Source B is the king's ambassador in Paris, so the semi-official letter as part of a news service will be in the public domain and will not expose the true level of opposition, its tone suggests opposition and speculation, and the author's purpose might be to reassure foreign governments of English royal stability.</p>	70	<p>Focus: Judgement in context, based on the set of Sources and own knowledge.</p> <p>Successful answers will need to make use of all five Sources, testing them against contextual knowledge and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses, any limitations as evidence. A range of issues may be addressed in focusing upon the terms of the question but no set conclusion is expected.</p>

Question	Answer	Marks	Guidance
	<p>An alternative view therefore emerges from Sources A and B. The content of Source A justifies non-parliamentary taxation, citing the trust placed in the king and implicitly the Divine Right of Kings, that the king can do no wrong. Thus the underlying reason for opposition is absolutism rather than finances themselves. Source A's content argues that financial opposition is unjustifiable as 'the king can do no wrong'. Pym repeats this in Source D, as a bishop is said to preach that property is held 'at the king's pleasure'. However, Pym accepts royal prerogative and blames undeserving advisers, showing his caution and statesmanship. Source E's date also suggests a purpose to shift the blame to bishops who 'invaded the king's prerogative'; Star Chamber was a prerogative court acting illegally and was swiftly ended by the Long Parliament. The tone is emotive to elicit sympathy for the victims.</p> <p>The counter-argument that religion was the main reason is in Sources C, D and E. The author of Source C, later a royalist, plays down religious opposition in York and questions the religious sincerity of the Scots. Content suggests a serious cause of opposition in the Arminian Prayer book and ceremonies. Source D sees innovations in religion and bishops attitudes as grievances. The comment on using the Book of Sports on Sundays reveals a puritan provenance. Knowledge of Pym's role might be used effectively. Source E perhaps exaggerates religious reasons to glorify the puritan opposition. A supported overall judgement is required on the extent to which the Sources accept the interpretation in the light of knowledge and Source limitations. It is up to candidates to assess and decide upon relative importance here, there being no set conclusion.</p>		

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2012

