

---

<b>OCR AS GCE in History</b>	<b>(3835)</b>
<b>OCR Advanced GCE in History</b>	<b>(7835)</b>

## **Generic Mark Bands**

**AS Document Studies Units 2580-2582**

**AS Period Study Units 2583-2586**

**Historical Investigations Units 2587-2589**

# Units 2580-2582: GENERIC MARK BANDS AS DOCUMENT STUDIES

---

- For answers in Bands I-III, provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- for answers in Bands IV-VII, provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see General Marking Instructions #5].
- Remember that you are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].
- Time is limited. Candidates may begin all their answers directly **without an introduction**.
- The quality of the English can **NEVER** be the sole criterion to put an answer in a lower Band.

## Question (a)

### BAND/20: Comparison

**NB Contextual knowledge is NOT required for any Band in sub-question (a), but credit should be given for any which is used relevantly and effectively.**

- I (16-20) The response provides a genuine comparison and/or contrast about most of the qualities of authenticity, completeness, consistency, typicality and usefulness in relation to the question. Areas of agreement and/or disagreement are discussed. The argument shows judgement. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (14-15) The response provides an effective comparison and/or contrast. The judgements are supported by appropriate references to internal evidence. The answer is relevant but the answer lacks completeness and the full range of the available comparative criteria. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (12-13) The response provides a comparison and/or contrast but makes limited links with the Sources. The answer is relevant, but the organisation of the answer is uneven. The quality of the answer is satisfactory rather than sound. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- IV (10-11) The response attempts a comparison and/or contrast but the comments are largely sequential and with few points of internal analysis or discussion of similarities and/or differences. The answer is largely relevant. The organisation of the answer is limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.

- V (8-9) The response provides a very basic answer to the question and can identify some points of agreement and/or disagreement. The comparison and/or contrast is mostly implicit. There may perhaps be significant irrelevance. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain frequent errors.
- VI (5-7) The response is very limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There may be very basic paraphrase which lacks a genuine attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-4) The response is extremely limited in its commentary, organisation and relevance. There is no attempt to provide a comparison and/or contrast. The answer is irrelevant. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

### Question (b)

#### **BAND/40: Context**

##### **NB For sub-question (c):**

- **Answers which use the Sources but no own knowledge may not be put in Bands I and II.**
- **Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Sources may not be put in Bands I or II or III.**

- I (32-40) The answer contains a good balance between analysis of all four Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge which is used appropriately and effectively in relation to the question. (This independent knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.) There is a clear judgement on the question. There may be some indication about the limitations of the Sources or what may be required to add to their completeness and explanatory power. The strongest answers **may** offer views on the general consistency and completeness of the Sources as a set, as well as individually, but this is **not** a pre-requisite for being placed in this Band.
- II (28-31) The answer contains a fair balance between analysis of at least three of the Sources and of independent ('own') knowledge, although the comment may not be complete or fully developed, and the judgement on the question may not be entirely convincing. There may be some imbalance between discussion of the Sources and use of external analysis. The writing mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

- III (24-27)** The response attempts to address the Sources and deploy independent ('own') knowledge, although the balance between them may be uneven. The argument is fairly clear, but the comments may not be fully sustained and the overall judgement may be incomplete. The organisation of the answer is uneven. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- IV (20-23)** The response shows a clear imbalance between source analysis and use of independent ('own') knowledge. These aspects are not linked effectively into an argument. The Sources are discussed sequentially; a basic argument is provided, but overall judgement on the question is very limited. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some careless errors.
- V (16-19)** The response provides little comment on the context of the key issue. There is some evidence of knowledge of the key issue, but the relevance is implicit with a limited attempt to analyse the Sources. The argument lacks a coherent structure. The writing shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but will contain some frequent errors.
- VI (9-15)** The response shows serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent ('own') knowledge. The attempt to address the question will be very limited, and the argument may be fragmentary, and there may be serious irrelevance and frequent errors of fact and understanding. The writing shows significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-8)** The response shows extremely serious weaknesses in knowledge and the ability to handle Sources and independent ('own') knowledge. There is no attempt to address the question. There is no argument. The answer is irrelevant. At least most of the fact and understanding are wrong. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**Revisions to OCR AS GCE History  
From First Phase of Curriculum 2000 Review  
Revised generic mark schemes, AS Period Study Units  
2583-2586  
June 2002 exams and onwards**

**Band/45: Perspective/Evaluation**

Perspective means an understanding of the variety of history involved in the question (e.g. political, religious, social).

Evaluation means the ability to apply the historical skills relevant to the question (e.g. analysis, assessment, comparison).

*After marking the essay, the examiner will double the mark given so that the raw mark entered on the mark sheet is out of 90.*

A 36-45 The response evaluates the key issues and deals with the perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

At the higher level (40-45), responses will effectively justify why one factor is the most important or the main factor and will also explain why other factors are less important. There will be a sense of judgement in relation to the factors shown by discrimination between them in terms of type and nature of the factor. How factors are linked to each other will also be addressed.

At a lower level (36-39), responses will justify why one factor is most important but the explanation of why others are less so will be less effective. There will be some attempt to classify and draw links between factors.

B 32-35 The response is mostly successful in evaluating the key issues in the question convincingly and relevantly. It develops most of the relevant aspects of the perspectives(s) in the question. The answer is successful in showing a high level of understanding. The answer focuses on explanation rather than description or narrative. The answer will deal with several factors and come to a judgement as to which was most important (i.e. how far...? or to what extent...? will be addressed). However, the reasoning will often be patchy and may be confined to a lengthy conclusion. Similarly the establishment of links between factors and their classification may not be extensive and, at the bottom end, hardly present at all.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The answer is well organised. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

C 27-31 The response is reasonably successful in evaluating key issues and in dealing with perspective(s) in the question convincingly and relevantly. The answer is reasonably successful in showing a good level of understanding. The answer tends to be descriptive or narrative in approach but the argument depends on some analysis. The quality of recall, selection and accuracy of historical knowledge, applied relevantly, is mostly sound and is communicated in a clear and effective manner. The organisation is uneven but there is a sustained argument.

The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The response will recognise the need to deal with a number of factors and may well provide some very limited argument why one factor was more important than others. A list of factors will be dealt with and explained effectively but the explanation of most important or of linkages will be slight and undeveloped. The writing generally shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.

D 23-26 The response has some success in discussing some key issues and in dealing with some of perspective(s) in the question. The answer is descriptive or narrative in approach but there is some implicit analysis. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is satisfactory and is communicated in a competent manner. The comments miss some points or are less satisfactory in terms of supporting historical knowledge. The organisation is uneven but the answer pursues an argument. The writing usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some errors.

E 18-22 The response discusses some key issues in the question but only at a basic level. The answer is adequate in its level of understanding and is descriptive or narrative in approach. The quality of historical knowledge supporting the argument is basically acceptable and is communicated in a competent manner. The organisation is uneven but overall the argument is valid. There is some irrelevance but most of the answer focuses on the question. The writing shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some frequent errors.

U2 10-17 The response does not discuss the key issues in the question and shows little understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is inadequate in its level of understanding with poor description or narrative. The quality of historical knowledge is thin or significantly inaccurate. There is significant irrelevance. The answer is communicated in a competent manner and the organisation of the answer is very poor. The writing shows significant weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

U1 0-9 The response fails to discuss the key issues in the question and shows no understanding of the perspective(s) in the question. The answer is completely inadequate in its level of understanding. Historical knowledge is either absent or completely inaccurate or irrelevant. There is no organisation to the answer. The writing shows very major weaknesses in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.

**NB** The quality of the English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower band.

If a candidate discusses the wrong topic (eg evaluates foreign policy when the question asked for domestic or analyses William II when the question was on William I) but writes sensibly about that wrong subject, examiners may award up to the top of Band U2.

# Units 2587-2589: GENERIC MARK BANDS

## HISTORICAL INVESTIGATIONS

---

Examiners are reminded that

- in Bands I-III they should provisionally award the top mark in the Band and then moderate up/down, while
- in Bands IV-VII they should provisionally award the middle mark in the Band and then moderate up/down [see General Marking Instructions #5];
- are looking for the 'best fit', not a perfect fit, in applying these Bands [see General Marking Instructions #5].

The questions, especially the document question, allow candidates to interpret, evaluate and use a range of source material, primarily from historians. Sub-question (ii) and the essays encourage candidates to address and evaluate historical debate. **Answers require some broad understanding of historical debate, but never depend on any reference to the views of particular historians** (pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit - as in any AS/A2 Unit). **Demonstration of a broad understanding of historical debate does not involve anything very sophisticated: even hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the top Bands.**

The required study of Passages and of historical debate is reflected in the weight given to AO2.

The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is never to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.

---

## PASSAGES QUESTION

---

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may NOT be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- Answers which use the Passages but no own knowledge may not be put in Band I.
- Answers which use own knowledge but make no use of the Passages may not be put in Bands I or II.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is NEVER to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.



## **BANDS I-VII/45: Contextual Evaluation**

- I (36-45)** The response **focuses very sharply on the key issue** in the question, using good and very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. Contextual knowledge is used **very appropriately and effectively** in relation to the question. (This contextual knowledge does **not** require lengthy descriptions but brief and pertinent references to support the argument.). The answer **contains a very good balance** between Passage and contextual evaluation in **reaching a judgement** about the issue. There is **clear and substantial evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved by comments on the validity of the arguments in the Passages using the other Passages or own knowledge (**not** all the Passages need to be evaluated). The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31-35)** The response **focuses on the key issue** in the question, using very relevant references to the Passages and contextual material. The quality of the contextual comments and some aspects of the internal analysis of the Passages, whilst sound, will be **less rigorous** than in Band I. There is a **fairly clear and fairly full evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved and a **judgement is reached**. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (27-30)** The response **considers the interpretations** in the Passages and deploys some contextual knowledge. The argument is clear, but comments will be **thinner** and overall **judgements less effective** than in Band II. The organisation of the answer is **uneven**. There is a **reasonable degree of evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing is generally fluent and historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.
- IV (22-26)** The response shows **considerable imbalance between** Passage evaluation and contextual knowledge. A **basic argument** is provided. The Passages may be largely used to **illustrate the argument** put forward and not as the focus of the answer. There is **some attempt at evaluation** of the different historical interpretations involved. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (18-21)** The response shows **some evidence of knowledge** of the key issue, but may make **little use** of the Passages. The answer **lacks coherent structure** but the direction of the attempted argument is **mostly relevant**. There is **little evaluation** of different interpretations involved. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer contains frequent errors in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VI (10-17)** The response shows **serious weaknesses in knowledge** and ability to handle contextual questions. The argument may be **fragmentary**. There may be **serious irrelevance**. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0-9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding. There is no attempt to answer the question. There is no argument and no supporting evidence for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the grammar, punctuation and spelling.

# ESSAY

---

## NB

- Answers which make absolutely no use of/reference to historical debate may **NOT** be put in Band I, however good the general quality of their analysis and evaluation.
- The quality of English (grammar, spelling, punctuation) is **NEVER** to be used as the sole criterion to pull an answer down into a lower Band.
- Some topics by their very nature are less strongly focused around historical debate. Question-specific mark schemes will provide the necessary guidance on this.
- Answers require some understanding of broad schools of historical debate, but **NEVER** depend on any reference to the views of particular historians; pertinent references to such will, however, be given credit, as in any AS/A2 Unit.
- Demonstration of an understanding of broad schools of historical debate need **NOT** involve anything very sophisticated: hints and fragments of it in an answer will meet in full the criterion for AO2 and satisfy the demands of the high Bands.

## BANDS I-VII/45

- I (36–45) *The response is not perfect but the best that a candidate can be expected to achieve at A2 Level in examination conditions.* The response is **focused clearly** on the demands of the question, even if there is **some unevenness**. The approach is clearly **analytical rather than descriptive** or narrative and, in particular, there is a **clear and evident** (but not necessarily totally full) **evaluation** of the historical debate bearing upon the topic which is **carefully integrated** into the overall approach. The answer is fully relevant. Most of the argument is structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material - the degree of that support will help to distinguish between answers higher and lower in the Band. The impression is that **a good solid answer** has been provided. The writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- II (31–35) The response is **focused clearly** on the question but there is **some unevenness in content**. The approach is **mostly analytical and relevant**. The answer is generally structured coherently and supported by appropriate factual material. However, the answer will **not be equally thorough throughout**, for example evaluating the relevant debate less well. Most of the writing is fluent and uses appropriate historical vocabulary. The answer mostly shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- III (27–30) The response reflects clear understanding of the question and a **fair attempt** to provide an appropriate argument and factual knowledge. The approach contains **analysis or explanation but it may be inadequately supported**. There is a reasonable grasp of the elements of the debate which bears upon the topic, and this is to a degree integrated into the overall approach. The answer is mostly relevant. The answer may **lack balance and depth** in factual knowledge. Most of the answer is structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence. The writing is generally fluent and the historical vocabulary is usually appropriate. The grammar, punctuation and spelling are usually accurate.

- IV (22–26)** The response indicates an **attempt to argue relevantly**. The approach may depend more on **some heavily descriptive or narrative sections** than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. There **is some knowledge of the historical debate** which bears upon the topic, but this may be **'bolted-on'** to the other material. Alternatively, the answer may consist largely of **description of schools of thought** that is not well directed at the specific question and is not well supported factually. Factual material may be used to **impart information** or describe events **rather than to address directly** the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively. The writing may lack fluency and there may be some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer usually shows accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains some careless errors.
- V (18–21)** The response offers **some elements of an appropriate answer** but there is little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of a question. The approach **lacks analysis and explanation** and the quality of the description or narrative, although mostly accurate and relevant, **is not linked effectively to the answer**. There may be **some hints of the historical debate** which bear upon the topic, but it will probably be poorly understood. Alternatively, there may **be extensive description of schools of thought** that is only slightly directed at the specific question. The structure of the argument shows weaknesses in organisation and the treatment of topics within the answer is unbalanced. The writing contains some inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows some accuracy in grammar, punctuation and spelling but contains frequent errors.
- VI (10–17)** The response is not **properly focused on the requirements** of the question. There may be many **unsupported assertions**. The argument may be of very **limited relevance** and there may be **confusion about the implications** of the question. There will be **no sense of the historical debate** on the topic. The answer may be largely **fragmentary and incoherent**, perhaps only in brief note form. The writing contains very inappropriate historical vocabulary. The answer shows very significant weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.
- VII (0–9)** The answer demonstrates a **completely unsatisfactory attempt** to convey relevant knowledge and understanding of the general topic and of the historical debate on it. There is **no attempt to answer** the question. There is **no argument and no supporting evidence** for any assertions. The answer is irrelevant and/or incoherent, perhaps in note form. The writing shows very major weakness in the accuracy of grammar, punctuation and spelling.